REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR:8311210153 DOC.DATE: 83/11/15 NOTARIZED: NO DOCKET #
FACIL:50-244 Robert Emmet Ginna Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, Rochester G 05000244
AUTH.NAME AUTHOR AFFILIATION
MAIER,J.E. Rochester Gas & Electric Corp.
RECIP.NAME RECIPIENT AFFILIATION
CRUTCHFIELD,D. Operating Reactors Branch 5

SUBJECT: Responds to questions re simulator training for steam generator tube rupture,per request,Training program addressing instruction differences in plant responses, procedures & control room design discussed.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: A001S COPIES RECEIVED:LTR 1 ENCL 0 SIZE: 3
TITLE: OR Submittal: General Distribution

NOTES:NRR/DL/SEP 1cy. 05000244

	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME		COPIES LTTR	COPIES ENCL	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME		COPIES LTTR	COPIES ENCL
	NRR ORB5 BC	01	7					
INTERNAL:	ELD/HDS4		1	0	NRR/DE/MTEB		1	
	NRR/DL DIR		1	1	NRR/DL/ORAB		1	0
	NRR/DSI/METB		1	1	NRR/DSI/RAB		1	
	REG FILE	04	1	1	RGN1		1	
EXTERNAL:	ACRS	09	6	6	LPDR	03	1	1
	NRC PDR	02	1	1	NSIC	05	1	1
	NTIS		1					
NOTES:			1					

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTTR 26 ENCL 24

REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR:8511[illegible]0153 DOC.DATE: 85/11/[illegible] NOTARIZED: NO DOCKET #
FACIL:50-244 Robert Emmet Ginna Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, Rochester G 05000244
AUTH.NAME AUTHOR AFFILIATION
KOBER,R.W. Rochester Gas & Electric Corp.
RECIP.NAME RECIPIENT AFFILIATION
ZWOLINSKI,J. Operating Reactors Branch 5

SUBJECT: Responds to questions re simulator training for steam generator tube rupture,per request.Training program addressing instruction differences in plant responses, procedures & control room design discussed.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: A001D COPIES RECEIVED:LTR __ ENCL __ SIZE:__________
TITLE: OR Submittal: General Distribution

NOTES:NRR/DL/SEP 1cy. 05000244

	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME		COPIES LTTR	ENCL	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME		COPIES LTTR	ENCL
	NRR ORB5 BC	01	7	7				
INTERNAL:	ELD/HDS4		1	0	NRR/DL/TSRG		1	1
	NRR/DL DIR		1	1	NRR/DL/ORAB		1	0
	NRR/DSI/METB		1	1	NRR/DSI/RAB		1	1
	REG FILE	04	1	1	RGN1		1	1
EXTERNAL:	ACRS	09	6	6	LPDR	03	1	1
	NRC PDR	02	1	1	NSIC	05	1	1
	NTIS		1	1				
NOTES:			1	1				

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTTR 26 ENCL [illegible]

ROCHESTER GAS AND ELECTRIC CORPORATION • 89 EAST AVENUE, ROCHESTER, N.Y. 14649

JOHN E. MAIER
Vice President

TELEPHONE
AREA CODE 716 546-2700

November 15, 1983

Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Attention: Mr. Dennis M. Crutchfield, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch No. 5
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Subject: Simulator Training for Steam Generator Tube Rupture
R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant
Docket No. 50-244

Dear Mr. Crutchfield:

In our letter dated November 22, 1982 regarding the Ginna steam generator tube rupture, we discussed the simulator training of the Ginna operators for steam generator tube ruptures. The following information is in response to questions from members of the NRC Staff:

NRC REQUEST 1

"Explanation, in detail, of how the SGTR training will address the differences between the Ginna plant and the SNUPPS and Zion simulators. Specifically, indicate how the training program instructs the trainees on the differences:

- in plant responses
- in procedures (RGE procedures used)
- in control room design"

Response

The staff at SNUPPS and Zion simulators who are involved in training the RGE staff have been well versed in the SGTR transient of Ginna by use of required reading, video tapes, and lectures, and so being are able to point out the differences, if any, in each transient that is conducted on the Zion or SNUPPS simulator while the transient is actually being conducted. The guidance for the resolution or mitigation of the transients are provided by use of the actual Ginna procedures. The differences in control room design are minimized by having the majority of instructors who

A001
1/0

teach RGE personnel well versed in the Ginna control room design and therefore able to point out differences in locations of instrumentation, switches, etc. as needed to avoid and/or clear up any confusion resulting from design differences.

NRC REQUEST 2

"(A) listing of the parts of the overall (simulator) training program where the (plant) difference is discussed."

Response

Each difference in the simulator vs. Ginna control board is discussed in the initial indoctrination phase of training for each course. Temporary magnetic tags are placed on the control boards that give the RGE nomenclature and component identification number while the program is in progress. One-half size pictures of the Ginna control board are also available for reference. In addition, as noted above, the use of instructors knowledgeable of the Ginna plant and control board design allows constant attention to the needs of the student and helps to eliminate errors which would result from these differences.

NRC REQUEST 3

"Description of how the students are requested (tested) to demonstrate their knowledge and skills to respond to SGTR on the Ginna control console."

Response

The students are monitored at all times during their training program to assess their knowledge of each aspect of nuclear power plant operations. This assessment is then formalized by means of a written operational training evaluation which is returned to RGE, along with their record of reactivity manipulations.

NRC REQUEST 4

"(Add the) qualification of the approximation in the licensees' letter referred to as "close approximation" of the Ginna plant response on the two simulators."

Response

The simulator response was compared to available data from the Ginna SGTR. In order to more closely approximate the actual event, the following conditions were used. A larger break size (100 gpm) was required to obtain the initial rate of pressure

decrease. High head SI pumps (not available at Ginna) were placed in pull-to-lock. This was necessary to obtain the large pressure drop following the Reactor Trip and SI. In order to insure the subsequent loss of condenser vacuum experienced at Ginna, the air ejectors were failed at the start of the transient. With these conditions the simulator was found to approximate the actual event to the point where any differences are not of sufficient magnitude to distract from the training process.

Very truly yours,

John E. Maier