

TIC



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

MAY 23 1980

Docket Nos. 50-352
and 50-353

MEMORANDUM FOR: A. Schwencer, Chief
Licensing Branch No. 2, DL

FROM: D. Sells, Project Manager
Licensing Branch No. 2, DL

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF MEETING WITH PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY

A meeting was held on May 21, 1980 in Bethesda, Maryland, with Philadelphia Electric Company (PEC) to discuss the risk evaluation study that PEC was directed to conduct in a letter dated May 6, 1980, (Enclosure 1). A list of attendees is attached as Enclosure 2.

After opening remarks by V. Boyer (PEC) and H. Denton (NRC), R. Mulford (PEC) gave a background presentation that outlined the history of the Limerick Generating Station Project. He specifically highlighted those aspects of the plant design which PEC believes constitute significant improvement over the PEC operated Peach Bottom facility.

Following this presentation, R. McCandless (GE) presented the technical program outline that is to be followed in meeting the requirements of NRC's May 6, 1980 letter to PEC. General Electric will be the principle subcontractor to PEC for completion of the risk evaluation study and will call upon Science Application Incorporated (SAI) for support. In addition PEC has engaged S. Levine of NUS to provide additional consultation and assistance in the PEC review of the adequacy of the study.

A copy of the vu-graphs used in the presentation by R. McCandless is attached (Enclosure 3). The specific highlights centered around the development of probability risk curves that would display the relative risk of the Limerick plant compared to the reference BWR in WASH-1400. The work sequence proposed for this study was also outlined as were a number of design differences between Limerick and the WASH-1400 reference BWR (see Enclosure 3).

During the course of the meeting a number of questions came up relating to the approach and format of the final report. As a result of these questions the NRC staff provided the following specific guidance to PEC:

8006120121 A

MAY 23 1980

1. The report will address and provide probability risk curves for the WASH-1400 reference BWR, the Limerick design (plant specific configuration) at the Limerick site using WASH-1400 component failure data, common mode failures, and test and maintenance methodology except as modified by Limerick test and maintenance procedures, (the time for repair of equipment during outages should be the same as WASH-1400) and the Limerick design at the Limerick site using component reliability which may be different from WASH-1400 but which PEC considers appropriate and for which PEC provides adequate justification. WASH-1400 reference BWR at the Limerick site may be presented at PEC option.
2. The NRC staff indicated that a computer treatment of the phenomena from core melt to containment failure was desired similar to that of WASH-1400. PEC indicated this was their intent although different computer codes would be used.
3. The NRC staff emphasized that the study must utilize the same option of the CRAC code as was used in WASH-1400 for the base case (Limerick at Limerick site using WASH-1400 data). It was also requested that the meteorological data used in the study be provided to the staff as soon as it is developed.
4. In response to a question concerning the treatment of hydrological considerations, PEC was told that in order to provide consistency with the base case, the hydrological considerations were not to be included in the overall risk evaluation. Hydrological considerations are to be addressed separately, specifically addressing radioisotope transport time to major water sources and special problems that may result from this pathway.
5. The staff directed PEC to use 1970 population data in order to provide a valid comparison with WASH-1400, but also requested a similar analysis for the projected midlife population surrounding the facility.
6. The staff requested that PEC advise them when the study was sufficiently advanced to hold a second meeting to discuss methodology specifically, methodology and phenomenology to be applied to the core sequence, contents, and an outline of the final report, any other specific items that may be identified by PEC. The staff suggested that such a meeting might be appropriate in about three weeks. PEC was asked to contact D. Sells (Limerick project manager) to finalize the arrangements for this second meeting.

MAY 23 1980

At the conclusion of the meeting it was agreed that an NRC staff visit to the Limerick simulator currently undergoing testing in Silver Spring, Maryland would be arranged with F. Leitch. The NRC project manager, D. Sells, will make the final arrangements. The staff emphasized the need for an analysis in a relatively short time frame and requested to be kept informed of any slippage in the 120 day target date.



D. Sells, Project Manager
Licensing Branch No. 2
Division of Licensing

Attachments:
As stated

cc w/enclosures:
See next page

Mr. Edward G. Bauer, Jr.
Vice President & General Counsel
Philadelphia Electric Company
2301 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19101

MAY 23 1980

cc: Troy B. Conner, Jr., Esq.
Conner, Moore & Corber
1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Deputy Attorney General
Room 512, Main Capitol Building
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

Frank R. Clokey, Esq.
Special Assistant Attorney General
Room 218, Towne House Apartments
P. O. Box 2063
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105

Honorable Lawrence Coughlin
House of Representatives
Congress of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20515

Roger B. Reynolds, Jr., Esq.
324 Swede Street
Norristown, Pennsylvania 19401

Lawrence Sager, Esq.
Sager & Sager Associates
45 High Street
Pottstown, Pennsylvania 19464

Joseph A. Smyth
Assistant County Solicitor
County of Montgomery
Courthouse
Norristown, Pennsylvania 19404

Eugene J. Bradley
Philadelphia Electric Company
Associate General Counsel
2301 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19101

Mr. Joseph C. Mattia
Resident Reactor Inspector
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
P. O. Box 47
Sanatoga, Pennsylvania 19464



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

MAY 6 1980

Docket Nos.: 50-3⁵2/3⁵3

Mr. Edward G. Bauer, Jr.
 Vice President and General Counsel
 Philadelphia Electric Company
 2301 Market Street
 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19101

Dear Mr. Bauer:

SUBJECT: RISK EVALUATION - LIMERICK GENERATING STATION, UNITS 1 and 2

Due to a combination of factors which include high population densities and proposed power levels, the risk from certain nuclear facilities is believed to represent a disproportionately high segment of the total societal risk from reactor accidents. The Limerick facility is one of the facilities which appears to present such a risk. A base assumption of this judgment is that if the Reactor Safety Study (WASH-1400) reference plant were located at the Limerick site, the societal risk from that plant would be higher than the societal risk from the WASH-1400 plant located at the WASH-1400 reference site.

Because it is recognized that the Limerick facility design and site specifics are not identical to those of the WASH-1400 reference plant, and in order to further evaluate this risk considering Limerick site specific and plant specific information, the staff requests that you conduct a preliminary risk assessment of the Limerick facility utilizing the WASH-1400 methodology, but taking into account significant differences between the WASH-1400 reference plant and the Limerick facility.

Dominant high risk accident sequences to be evaluated should be selected based on Limerick plant-specific design considerations. Meteorological, population, and hydrological data specific to the Limerick site should be used in evaluating the consequences of selected accidents.

Various criticisms of the use of WASH-1400 should be recognized including those criticisms identified in the Risk Assessment Review Group Report to the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NUREG/CR-0400), but since the purpose of the proposed facility as a reference facility, it or the Limerick .00 reference manner is proper.

DUPLICATE DOCUMENT

Entire document previously
 entered into system under:

ANO 8605280011

No. of pages: 4