TERA

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

October 24, 1979

Docket No. 50-312

POOR ORIGINAL

Mr. J. J. Mattimoe
Assistant General Manager and
Chief Engineer
Sacramento Municipal Utility District
6201 S Street
P. O. Box 15830
Sacramento, CA 95813

Dear Mr. Mattimoe:

RE: RANCHO SECO INSERVICE TESTING PROGRAM

During the Inservice Inspection and Testing Working Session held with your staff on October 3 and 4, 1979, we learned that certain valves in the Rancho Seco plant could only be partial-stroke tested periodically for the life of the plant. The NRC review group concluded that for these valves, additional information was needed to better evaluate the consequences of this limitation. Therefore, answers to the questions of Enclosure 1 should be provided to us for the following valves:

RCS 001	BWS 003	CBS 021	DHS 003
RCS 002	BWS 004	CBS 022	DHS 004
CFS 001	CBS 00?	CBS 027	HS 29015
CFS 0 2	CBS 01(	CBS 028	HS 29016

During the working session, your staff stated that answers to these questions could be formally provided to us by December 12, 1979, which is also the date by which the revised Inservice Testing Program could be submitted. At your earliest opportunity, please confirm your commitment to provide answers to the questions of Enclosure 1 and to submit your revised Inservice Testing Program by December 12, 1979.

Sincerely,

Robert W. Reid

Robert W. Reid, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #4
Division of Operating Reactors

Enclosure:
1. Additional Questions for
the Noted Valves

cc: w/enclosure
See next page

1304 324

7911090586

Sacramento Municipal Utility
District

cc w/enclosure(s):

David S. Kaplan, Secretary and
General Counsel
6201 S Street
P. O. Box 15830
Sacramento, California 95813

Sacramento County
Board of Supervisors
827 7th Street, Room 424
Sacramento, California 95814

Business and Municipal Department
Sacramento City-County Library
828 I Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Director, Technical Assessment
Division
Office of Radiation Programs
(AW-459)
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Crystal Mall #2
Arlington, Virginia 20460

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region IX Office
ATTN: EIS COORDINATOR
215 Fremont Street
San Francisco, California 94111

Mr. Robert B. Borsum
Babcock & Wilcox
Nuclear Power Generation Division
Suite 420, 7735 Old Georgetown Road
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Herbert H. Brown, Esq.
Lawrence Coe Lanpher, Esq.
Hill, Christopher and Phillips, P. C.
1900 M St., NW
Washington, D. C. 20036

Christopher Ellison, Esq.
Dian Grueuich, Esq.
California Energy Commission
1111 Howe Avenue
Sacramento, California 95825

Ms. Eleanor Schwartz
California State Office
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, S.E., Rm. 201
Washington, D.C. 20003

Docketing and Service Section
Office of the Secretary
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Michael L. Glaser, Esq.
1150 17th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dr. Richard F. Cole
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
Panel
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Mr. Frederick J. Shon
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
Panel
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Timothy V. A. Dillon, Esq.
Suite 380
1850 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

James S. Reed, Esq.
Michael H. Remy, Esq.
Reed, Samuel & Remy
717 K Street, Suite 405
Sacramento, California 95814

Mr. Michael R. Eaton
Energy Issues Coordinator
Sierra Club Legislative Office
1107 9th St., Room 1020
Sacramento, CA 95814

Sacramento Municipal Utility
District

cc w/enclosure(s):

Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
Panel
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal
Board Panel
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Mr. Richard D. Castro
2231 K Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Mr. Gary Hursh, Esq.
520 Capital Mall
Suite 700
Sacramento, California 95814

California Department of Health
ATTN: Chief, Environmental
Radiation Control Unit
Radiological Health Section
714 P Street, Room 498
Sacramento, California 95814

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE NOTED VALVES

1. Are these valves accessible for maintenance during power operations, cold shutdown, or refueling outages? If the answer is no, state the specific reasons used to support this determination.

2. Basically describe any pre-operational tests performed on these valves and the systems containing these valves? Did these tests verify full or partial stroke exercising? State the specific reasons why these tests cannot be performed during power operation, cold shutdown, or refueling outages? What dP* are these valves designed to open? What is the postulated dP across these valves after an accident? Has there ever been an inadvertent safety system initiation that would have full or partial stroke exercised these valves? If yes, when and what was the flowrate through these valves? Were any problems noted?

3. What failures, partial failures, operational or pre-operational problems have been experienced with these valves or valves of this type in any other system at your plant? Provide all failure data.

4. For each valve listed, what type valve is it (e.g. swing check, butterfly check)? Are there any special features designed into these valves that will aid in the prevention of valve disc to hinge pin, or valve disc to valve body binding? If so, explain these features.

5. Provide a complete list of all valve components and the materials they are made of.

6. Are any of these valves exposed to air on either side?

7. What type of chemicals and what maximum chemical concentration are these valves exposed to?

8. What specific types of debris (foreign material) could each valve be exposed to?

9. What is the design flowrate through each valve for accident mitigation? What is the design flowrate through each pump or accumulator that could provide flow through these valves?

10. What temperature ranges are these valves exposed to during power operations, cold shutdowns and refueling outages?

*dP=differential pressure

11. Do these valves have bolted or welded bonnets? Are these valves installed in the lines with bolted flanges or welded into place? Have any of these valves been removed for maintenance? If yes, were any problems discovered? Is there a planned preventative maintenance program for each valve? If yes, what is the frequency of the maintenance inspection? Describe this procedure.

12. How many man-hours would be involved in removing, bench testing, and replacing each valve? What specific plant conditions would be required to bench test one valve at a time? State the specific technical reasons as to why these valves cannot be bench tested during each cold shutdown or refueling outage. If a radiation hazard is present during removal of these valves, state the source and the mr/hr involved? What proof of full or partial stroke test would be required after you reinstall the valve into the line?

13. How long have these valves been installed in the system and not tested while being exposed to normal operating and shutdown conditions? If these valves were removed for bench testing, was a determination made on the rate of foreign matter buildup, and is there a program for the periodic removal, inspection, and bench testing of these valves?

14. Provide manufacturing cross sectional drawings for each valve.

15. Provide elevation diagrams for all sumps and piping runs that contain these valves.

16. What specific methods to full or partial stroke exercise these valves have been considered, and what specific technical basis was used to make the determination that these tests are impractical?

17. How is the spent fuel pool and the volume above the reactor vessel head filled during refueling outages?