OCT 2 7 1980

MEMORANDUM FOR:	W. Kreger, Assistant Director for Radiation Protection Division of Systems Integration		
FROM:	G.C. Lainas, Assistant Director for Safety Assessment Division of Licensing		

1 -

Central Files ORAB Reading

SUBJECT: USE OF A TWO ASSEMBLY FUEL SIPPING DEVICE

The purpose of this memorandum is to assure that you are aware of activities at operating reactors, relating to radiation protection concerns. The attached memorandum from the Office of Inspection and Enforcement deals with the subject of using a fuel assembly sipping device to sip two assemblies at the same time. IE has determined that utility's safety evaluation performed under 10 CFR 50.59 was appropriate. We agree with the IE determination for this case. However, it would be more desirable to have situations like this addressed in the FSAR, if such situations can be anticipated, since this would eliminate the need for a licensee review (under 10 CFR 50.59) and IE or NRR reviews as the situations develop. Therefore, it may be worthwhile to consider modifying the Standard Review Plan (Section 15.7.4) to address such cases.

We will attempt to keep you informed of operating reactor events and activities relating to radiation protection.

	_		HFIELD Assistant Director	
Contact: G. Holahan, X27112		V		
Attachment: As stated				
cc w/attachment: G. Lainas J. Olshinski G. Holahan				20
L. Barrett K. Wichman	1	8012220	524	file file
OFFICE DL:ORAB/SL GHolahan:sh	DL: PAR BC JOTshinski	GLAMAS fr.		
DATE / / /2//80	10/24/80	10 /22-80		

ATTACHMENT



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

SSINS: 6530

ACT P 1980

MEMORANDUM FOR: G. C. Lainas, Assistant Director for Safety Assessment, DL, NRR

FROM: Leo B. Higginbotham, Assistant Director, Division of Fuel Facility and Materials Safety Inspection, IE

SUBJECT: FUEL HANDLING ACCIDENT - USE OF A TWO ASSEMBLY FUEL SIPPING DEVICE

Enclosed for your consideration is a 10 CFR 50.59 safety evaluation performed by the Sacramento Municipal Utility District (Rancho Seco facility). The operation being supported by the evaluation is the use of a two assembly fuel sipping device as opposed to a single assembly sipper. IE has reviewed the licensee's evaluation and has agreed with the licensee's determination that an unreviewed safety question does not exist when considering the operational and time restrictions placed on the use of the sipper.

The licensee's evaluation is based on the failure of two complete fuel assemblies. This two assembly failure is outside the bounds on the routine NRR fuel handling accident consequences, which considers the failure of only one fuel assembly. Therefore, we are providing a copy of the licensee's evaluation for <u>NRR's generic consideration of fuel handling accidents</u> and the potential for more than a single effective fuel assembly failure.

Leo B. HiggLabotham Assistant Director Division of Fuel Facility and Materials Safety Inspection, IE

Enclosure: As Stated

cc: J. H. Sniezek, IE

- W. Kreger, NRR
- S. Bryan, IE
- W. Houston, DSE

Dupe of 8012160278

PROPOSED 50.59 TEST OR EXPERIMENT 'U 15 T

1. DESCRIPTION: Sipping of as many as two Spent Fuel Assemblies at a time will be accomished in the Spent Fuel Pool Cask Loading Pit. Special Test equipment will reprovided by bow; the installation and operation of this equipment is covered by TP 224/// Upitin Date/2-3-Cognizant Operating Engineer SAFETY ANALYSIS IX TEST OR EXPERIMENT: CALCULATIONS X 2 Calectations and Safety Anolysis to support this operation are attached. clash Date 12-3-79 her Date /= Cognizant Engineer Manager Gen. Engr. No X 50.59(b) Yes No 3. PRC RECONMENDATION: 50.59(a) Yes DISPOSITION OF PRC: d. Safety Analysis inadequate a. Unanimously recommends proposal e. MSRC review prior to implementing b. Send to MSRC for concurrence c. Recommends not to proceed call Clouds Date 12-11-Recommend to Proceed: Yes No Refer to MSRC 4. ANALYSIS: 50.59(a) Yes No 50.59(b) Yes No Date 2-28-2 Plant Superintendent No X Yes X No [50.59(b) 5. MSRC FINDINGS: 50.59(a) Yes DISPOSITION OF MSRC: a. Recommends proposal c. Recommends not to proceed d. Safety analysis inadequate b. Send to NRC for approval of Whintlene Date 9/19 ************* THIS 15.596 NA 6. COMMISSION APPROVAL OBTAINED 7. WORK DISPOSITION: Test or experiment completed. verified , tom data ilu Cognizant Engineer 8. OVERALL REVIEW: Documentation complete. Test or experiment complete. Date Quality Assurance Director Manager Nuclear Operations Date Dupe of 8012160282