

MAR 28 1975

E. J. Brunner, Chief, Reactor Operations Branch, IE:I

THRU: J. H. Sniezek, Chief, Facility Inspection Branch, IE

ROCHESTER GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY - RO INSPECTION REPORT NO.
80-244/75-01 - GINNA - (F14060H1)

The transmittal memorandum for the subject report requests the full term license technical specifications (TS) include a specific definition regarding what constitutes a physics test at power. The transmittal memorandum also states that such a definition would help minimize confusion in this area during future testing at power. A review of Details 9.f.(5) of the inspection report and discussions with the assigned inspector revealed the confusion was concerned with possible differences between physics tests and experiments.

At operating light-water power reactors there is very little difference between a physics test and an experiment. The administrative section of the standard TS requires the onsite safety review committee to review all proposed tests and experiments which affect nuclear safety. We note that Section 6.1.4.1 of the licensee's TS is more restrictive in that the plant operations review committee is required to review all proposed tests and experiments. In our view, Regulatory has established appropriate requirements for the conduct of tests or experiments at water-cooled power reactors, e.g., prior review by the onsite review committee and conformance with TS or 10 CFR 50.59 requirements. We believe that any action to provide specific definitions for tests and experiments can only establish an interface problem which will result in additional confusion.

E. J. Brunner

- 2 -

MAR 28 1975

With respect to the problem identified in the subject report, we believe the inspector took the proper course of action, i.e., questioning the test. However, we believe this is an isolated case which doesn't warrant development of a special definition for an at-power physics test. The basic problem appears to be a breakdown in RL policy relating to informal approval. As a result, the IE/RL interface meeting appears to be the proper forum for resolving such problems, and we plan to include it on the agenda for future meetings.

Based on the above information, we do not plan any further action regarding your request. If you require additional information or wish to discuss this matter further, please contact me.

Original Signed by
F. J. Nolan

F. J. Nolan
Senior Reactor Inspection
Specialist
Facility Inspection Branch
Office of Inspection &
Enforcement

cc:

HDThornburg, IE:HQ
FIB-8 (STS & SAR Cmts)

DISTRIBUTION:

✓ IE Files (2)
IE Rdg
FIB Rdg-JHS
Nolan Reading

3/28

C&O:962 -	IE:FIB	IE:FIBC				
OFFICE >	FJNolan 7	JHSniezek				
F14060HT	7451/mib					
SURNAME >						
DATE >	3/ /75	3/ /75				



THE
FIRST
PART
OF
THE
HISTORY
OF
THE
CITY
OF
NEW
YORK
FROM
1609
TO
1789
BY
JOHN
BURNETT
NEW
YORK
1846

NEW
YORK
1846

NEW
YORK
1846

NEW
YORK
1846

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION I
631 PARK AVENUE
KING OF PRUSSIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19406


FEB 14 1975

H. D. Thornburg, Chief, Field Inspection and Enforcement Branch, HQ

RO INSPECTION REPORT NO. 50-244/75-01
ROCHESTER GAS AND ELECTRIC CORPORATION
LICENSE NO. DPR-18 (TRACK # F14060HO)

The subject inspection report is forwarded for appropriate Headquarters action. The action requested is discussed below:

Detail ^{9, f} 8.b of the inspection report discusses an inspection finding related to the lack of specific definition in the Technical Specifications regarding what constitutes a physics test at power. IE:I requests that an appropriate definition be included in the full term license Technical Specifications which would help minimize confusion in this area during future testing at power.


Eldon J. Brunner, Chief
Reactor Operations Branch





[The text in this section is extremely faint and illegible due to low contrast and noise. It appears to be several lines of a document.]