

JUN 11 1981

Dist  
~~Docket File~~

LD#1 Rdg  
DEisenhut  
BJYoungblood  
JThoma  
MRushbrook  
RTedesco  
RVollmer  
TMurley  
RMattson  
RHartfield, MPA  
WJohnston  
OELC  
OIE (3)

bcc:  
TERA  
NRC/PDR  
L/PDR  
TIC  
ACRS (16)  
NSIC

Docket No.: 50-364

Mr. F. L. Clayton  
Senior Vice President  
Alabama Power Company  
Post Office Box 2641  
Birmingham, Alabama 35291

Dear Mr. Clayton:

Subject: Staff Evaluation of Item I.C.1 for Westinghouse Facilities

We have completed our interim review of the Westinghouse Owners Group submittal for Action Plan item I.C.1, Guidance for the Evaluation and Development of Procedures for Transients and Accidents. A copy of Mr. Eisenhut's May 28, 1981 letter to Mr. Jurgensen, Chairman, Westinghouse Owners Group is enclosed for your information. As indicated in the enclosure, further work will be necessary in order to produce a document which satisfies the staff positions in a timely matter.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:  
B. J. Youngblood

B. J. Youngblood, Chief  
Licensing Branch No. 1  
Division of Licensing



Enclosure:  
As stated

cc: See next page

REGULATORY DOCKET FILE COPY

\* See previous yellow.

DL:LB#1 DL:LB#1  
\*JThoma/ys BJYoungblood  
6/ /81 6/ /81

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS  
POOR QUALITY PAGES

P

81 06 28 0687

Mr. F. L. Clayton, Jr., Senior Vice  
President  
Alabama Power Company  
Post Office Box 2641  
Birmingham, Alabama 35291

cc: Mr. W. O. Whitt  
Executive Vice President  
Alabama Power Company  
Post Office Box 2641  
Birmingham, Alabama 35291

Mr. Ruble A. Thomas  
Vice President  
Southern Company Services, Inc.  
Post Office Box 2625  
Birmingham, Alabama 35202

Mr. George F. Trowbridge  
Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge  
1800 M Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

Mr. W. Bradford  
NRC Resident Inspector  
P. O. Box 1814  
Dothan, Alabama 36302



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

MAY 28 1981

Robert W. Jurgensen, Chairman  
Westinghouse Owners Group  
American Electric Power Service  
Corporation  
2 Broadway  
New York, New York 10004

Dear Mr. Jurgensen:

In your letter dated March 18, 1981 (06-54), you summarized a meeting held on February 20, 1981 between representatives of the NRC staff, Westinghouse Owners, and Westinghouse Electric Corporation. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Westinghouse Owners Group (WOG) activities in response to NUREG-0737, Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements, Item I.C.1, Guidance for the Evaluation and Development of Procedures for Transients and Accidents. Following the meeting summary, you requested that the staff acknowledge the acceptability of the program described in the meeting.

As indicated in a meeting with Tom Anderson, of Westinghouse, on April 8, 1981, we have concerns about the acceptability of the WOG program. The last submittal of generic WOG guidelines, including the Inadequate Core Cooling Guidelines, required the operator to diagnose a specific event using the diagnostic procedure included in the guidelines. Subsequent failures were, essentially, addressed by entry into one of the inadequate core cooling guidelines. As indicated in the February meeting and discussed in your letter, the guidelines do not provide smooth transitions from the event procedures to direct the operator if subsequent multiple or consequential failures occur. This leaves the operator with no guidance until entry conditions for the Inadequate Core Cooling Guidelines are reached. Furthermore, the guidelines do not address subsequent reevaluation of plant conditions to ensure that the expected plant response is occurring.

Our second concern is your proposed schedule for completing the program recognizing that development of emergency operating procedures is a dynamic process with no absolute end point. However, we are concerned that continual, major rewriting of emergency operating procedures is a burden on plant operating staffs and confusing to the operators who must relearn the procedures. In the February meeting, WOG representatives indicated they expect to have the initial development phase of the guidelines completed in July 1981, and would not expect major changes to the guidelines to result from the phases to be completed in January 1982 and July 1982. You also state in your letter that the initial phase will address over 98 percent of the total risk. However, we were also told in the meeting that the guidelines to be submitted in July would probably not differ greatly from those already submitted. Considering our concerns with the existing guidelines, as addressed above, we do not see how the July submittal can be responsive to NUREG-0737, Item I.C.1 without significant change. We believe that additional work is necessary.

dup.

810618-374


MAY 28 1981

The staff has not completed its review of WCAP 9691 or the probability estimates presented in the February meeting, and the Owners Group has not addressed the broad range of initiating events, including natural phenomena such as earthquakes, in the analysis presented to date. Therefore, we cannot assess the overall adequacy of the proposed program. Unless our concerns, as stated herein, are satisfied, the ability of licensees to meet the schedule for revising their procedures may be compromised.

As indicated in the April 8, 1981 meeting, we have serious doubts that the full range of initiating events and subsequent failures can be addressed within the event specific framework adopted by the Westinghouse Owners Group. If your additional work to date provides more insight into resolution of these concerns, we would be available to meet with you at your convenience.

By copy of this letter, each licensee and applicant of a Westinghouse-type plant, is being advised of our evaluation of your submittal.

Sincerely,

  
Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director  
Division of Licensing

cc: E. Murphy  
W Licensees  
W Applicants