



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555

June 16, 1992

Docket No. 50-244

Dr. Robert C. Mecredy  
Vice President, Nuclear Production  
Rochester Gas & Electric Corporation  
89 East Avenue  
Rochester, New York 14649

Dear Dr. Mecredy:

SUBJECT: ROCHESTER GAS & ELECTRIC CORPORATION'S APRIL 24, 1991, AND MAY 6, 1991, LETTERS REGARDING REVISIONS OF THE GINNA NUCLEAR POWER STATION QUALITY ASSURANCE MANUAL, APPENDIX B, INSERVICE INSPECTION PROGRAM FOR THE 1990-1999 INTERVAL (TAC NO. M74099)

In your letter of April 24, 1991, you supplied clarifications of two items in the "Third Ten-year Inservice Inspection Interval Plan," Appendix B to the "Quality Assurance Program" for the R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant (plan). In another letter of May 6, 1991, you forwarded Revision 1 to the plan. The staff of the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) reviewed the original version (Revision 0) of this plan and found it to be in compliance with Section 50.55a of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR 50.55a) as stated in our safety evaluation report attached to our letter to you of August 6, 1990. You also requested that request for relief no. 4, which was granted in the safety evaluation report be rescinded and stated that when the NRC approved the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Code Case No. N-481, you would adopt this Code Case into your ISI plan. Withdrawal of request for relief no. 4 is acceptable to the staff.

The NRC staff, with technical assistance from the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (INEL), has reviewed and evaluated your submittals.

Upon reviewing your April 24, 1991, letter, the staff found a misunderstanding between our staff on the meaning of request for relief no. 3. Although this request is not made to a specific paragraph of the ASME Code, you requested, "that Ginna's Station Quality Assurance Program be used in lieu of Code administrative functions."

In this request for relief you state, "the Code requires that certain administrative functions be performed by the 'Enforcement Authority' and the 'Authorized Nuclear Inservice Inspector' [ANII]." You justified this request for relief by your statement that, "this state [New York] has not endorsed ASME Codes and therefore [New York] does not provide administrative controls and functions such as 'Enforcement Authority,' 'Authorized Nuclear Inservice Inspector' and 'Reporting Systems.'"

9206170256 920616  
PDR ADDCK 05000244  
Q PDR

*M.P. [Signature]*  
*QFO 110*  
NRC FILE CENTER COPY

10/10/1954

June 16, 1992

The staff approved this relief request to allow you to assume the duties of the enforcement authority because the State of New York does not have such an authority. With the authority allowed by the granted relief, you were to enable the ANII to accomplish his or her duties required by the Code. The staff expected that you would accomplish certain administrative functions which would include those needed to meet the requirements of Section XI, IWA-6220(d)(1) and (2) of the 1986 Edition of the ASME Code. The staff did not intend to prevent or restrict the ANII from performing his or her duties. When the staff first granted the relief requested, for the first 10-year interval inservice inspection in our letter of May 17, 1977, it specifically stated that as a basis for the relief granted, an ANII would be provided by Hartford Steam Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company. The performance of administrative functions by a licensee is not a substitute for the Code-required third party duties and actions of the ANII.

The staff endorsed the technical evaluation report (TER) prepared by INEL and attached to the August 6, 1990, letter in which a basis for granting this relief was that, "The functions of the authorized nuclear inservice inspector . . . will be performed by personnel from the Hartford Steam Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company." You did not request relief from the duties of the ANII such as those specified in IWA-2110(f) and (g). These included the duty that the inspector shall certify the examination records only after verifying that the requirements have been met and that the records are correct, and that the inspector shall verify that repairs are performed in accordance with the requirements of the owner's repair program.

IWA-6220(d)(10) requires the NIS-1 and NIS-2 forms to be included in the required inservice inspection summary reports. These forms provide for the signature of the ANII. These forms are also specified in Mandatory Appendix II of Section XI, which does not provide for any alternative means of presenting data.

The staff viewed the procedures, approval methods, and review requirements discussed in request for relief no. 3 as part of a facility licensee's normal, internal approach to meeting Code requirements. The licensee performs these internal actions to support and supplement its efforts to meet Code requirements, but not to replace the efforts. The staff views these internal records and reports as internal control documents written to meet internal requirements in areas such as computer database enhancement and budget and cost accounting. The staff did not understand them to be a replacement of the NIS-1 and NIS-2 forms. The basis of approving the plan was that all requirements to the Code were met unless relief was specifically granted.

The second issue in your letter of April 24, 1991, concerns Section 1.10.3.2 of Appendix B, which addresses the removal of insulation at bolted joints during pressure testing. The staff does not agree with your basis for limiting the extent of inspections to bolted connections with ferrous steel fasteners because a non-isolatable leak could occur anywhere in the piping systems for controlling boration. The Code does not provide the exclusions you are using and you have not requested relief from the Code requirements. Accordingly, the Code requirements should be satisfied.



Handwritten marks and dots in the top right corner.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

June 16, 1992

The limitations in the plan appear to prevent meeting Code requirements; therefore, the plan must be changed to meet Code requirements.

The staff reviewed your letter of May 6, 1991, and determined that two of the revisions to the "Quality Assurance Program," may violate or circumvent requirements of the ASME Code. The first change relates to a subject addressed previously, the use of NIS-1 and NIS-2 forms. These revisions are in your letter, in Attachment II identified as the addition of paragraph 1.6.1, explaining your intention not to use Section XI, Mandatory Appendix II NIS-1 and NIS-2 forms. These forms are in a mandatory appendix of Section XI, and the Code makes no provisions for alternative means for presenting data. Section XI includes provisions in Non-mandatory Appendix B for other forms. However, you have not requested relief or provided a justification for relief, and thus are required to use the NIS-1 and NIS-2 forms as specified in the Code. Also in your letter, in Attachment II identified as a modification to paragraph 1.8.2.1, you commit to using applicable examination requirements of the Construction Code, but do not address Section XI requirements regarding weld repairs, except when the entire weld volume of the existing weld has been removed. IWA-4500(a) includes the following statement: "The repaired areas shall be examined to establish a new preservice record. The examination shall include the method that detected the flaw." Accordingly, the Code requirement should be satisfied.

The staff reviewed the plan, as stated in the INEL TER, against the applicable Code and appropriate regulations. The staff considered only the following: (1) the use of the appropriate edition and addenda of the Code, (2) the acceptability of the examination sample as specified by the Code, (3) the correctness of examination criteria for systems or components as specified in the regulations, (4) compliance with ISI-related commitments found during previous NRC reviews, and (5) compliance of requests for relief from regulatory requirements.

We request that you confirm within 60 days of the date of this letter, the following for the second ten-year inservice inspection interval:

- a. the repairs, modifications, and replacements under Section XI which met the requirements of the Code, and
- b. all duties accomplished by the ANII as required by the Code.

Where relief was required and such relief had been requested by you, so note. Also note those actions which required relief and for which relief was not requested. If an ANII was not used to the full extent of Code requirements, provide an assessment.

June 16, 1992

The reporting and recordkeeping requirements contained in this letter affect fewer than 10 respondents; therefore, OMB clearance is not required under PL 96-511.

Sincerely,

Original signed by  
Allen Johnson, Project Manager  
Project Directorate I-3  
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

cc: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket File 50-244  
NRC & Local PDRs  
PDI-3 Reading  
SVarga  
WLazarus  
MRushbrook  
AJohnson  
JCalvo  
VNerses  
OGC (f/info only)  
ACRS (10)

J.Lee  
B. Grimes  
CYCheng  
D.Smith  
E. Gray, Region I  
J. Linville, Region I  
R. Lobel  
R. McBrearty, Region I  
G. Johnson - 7D4

\*See previous concurrence

LA:PDI-3	PM:PDI-3 <i>WJ</i>	Tech Editor*	MCEB*	Allegations*	(A)D:PDI-3*
MRushbrook	AJohnson:sk	JMain*	RHermann	JLee	VNerses
6/3/92	6/16/92	3/30/92	06/01/92	06/02/92	06/03/92

OFFICE	Region I	Region I			
NAME	EGray <i>see tel</i>	RMcGrearty <i>see tel</i>			
DATE	06/15/92 <i>WJ</i>	06/16/92 <i>WJ</i>	/ /	/ /	/ /

DOCUMENT NAME: GIM0099.LTR



1000

1000

[The main body of the page contains extremely faint and illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the document. The text is scattered across the lower half of the page and is not readable.]

Dr. Robert C. Mecredy

Ginna

cc:

Thomas A. Moslak, Senior Resident Inspector  
R.E. Ginna Plant  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
1503 Lake Road  
Ontario, New York 14519

Regional Administrator, Region I  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
475 Allendale Road  
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406

Ms. Donna Ross  
Division of Policy Analysis & Planning  
New York State Energy Office  
Agency Building 2  
Empire State Plaza  
Albany, New York 12223

Charlie Donaldson, Esq.  
Assistant Attorney General  
New York Department of Law  
120 Broadway  
New York, New York 10271

Nicholas S. Reynolds  
Winston & Strawn  
1400 L St. N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3502

Ms. Thelma Wideman  
Director, Wayne County Emergency  
Management Office  
Wayne County Emergency Operations Center  
7370 Route 31  
Lyons, New York 14489

Ms. Susan Perry  
Administrator, Monroe County Office of  
Emergency Preparedness  
111 West Fall Road  
Rochester, New York 14620



100-100-100

100-100-100

100-100-100

100-100-100

100-100-100

100-100-100