

DISTRIBUTION

DOCKET FILE

LB#4 Rdg
DEisenhut
KJabbour
EAdensam
JLee
SHanauer
RTedesco
RVollmer
TMurley
RMattson
RHartfield, MPA
OELD
OIE (3)
L/PDR
NRC/PDR

bcc: TERA/NSIC/TIC
ACRS (16)

JUN 18 1981



Docket Nos.: 50-369
and 50-370

Mr. William O. Parker
Vice President - Steam Production
Duke Power Company
P.O. Box 33189
Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

Dear Mr. Parker:

Subject: Staff Evaluation of Item I.C.1 for Westinghouse Facilities
(McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2)

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,

Elinor G. Adensam, Acting Chief
Licensing Branch No. 4
Division of Licensing

Enclosure:
As stated

cc: See next page

8107070200 810618
PDR ADOCK 05000369
P PDR

OFFICE	DL:LB#4	DL:LB#4	DL:RB/L			
SURNAME	KJabbour:eb	EAdensam	RTedesco			
DATE	6/16/81	6/17/81	6/17/81			

Mr. William O. Parker, Jr.
Vice President, Steam Production
Duke Power Company
P. O. Box 2178
422 South Church Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

cc: Mr. W. L. Porter
Duke Power Company
P. O. Box 2178
422 South Church Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

Mr. R. S. Howard
Power Systems Division
Westinghouse Electric Corporation
P. O. Box 355
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230

Mr. E. J. Keith
EDS Nuclear Incorporated
220 Montgomery Street
San Francisco, California 94104

Mr. J. E. Houghtaling
NUS Corporation
2536 Countryside Boulevard
Clearwater, Florida 33515

Mr. Jesse L. Riley, President
The Carolina Environmental Study Group
854 Henley Place
Charlotte, North Carolina 28207

J. Michael McGarry, III, Esq.
Debevoise & Liberman
1200 Seventeenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Ms. M. J. Graham
Resident Inspector McGuire NPS
c/o U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Post Office Box 216
Cornelius, North Carolina 28031

Shelley Blum, Esq.
1402 Vickers Avenue
Durham, North Carolina 27707

Robert M. Lazo, Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Dr. Emmeth A. Luebke, Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

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



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

MAY 20 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 that 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.

depc of
8106170284


MAY 26 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