

JUN 30 1981

Docket Nos.: STN 50-482  
and STN 50-483

APPLICANTS: Union Electric Company  
Kansas Gas and Electric Company

FACILITIES: Callaway Plant, Unit 1  
Wolf Creek Generating Station, Unit 1

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF MEETING HELD ON JUNE 16 AND JUNE 17, 1981 WITH CALLAWAY  
AND WOLF CREEK APPLICANTS REGARDING INSTRUMENTATION AND CONTROLS

A meeting was held on June 16 and 17, 1981 at the Bechtel offices in Gaithersburg, Maryland with representatives of the Union Electric Company, Kansas Gas and Electric Company, SNUPPS Organization, Bechtel Power Corporation and Westinghouse Electric Corporation. The meeting was held as a result of our letter of April 13, 1981 to the applicants requesting that a series of meetings be held related to instrumentation and control systems for the Callaway and Wolf Creek facilities. This meeting was the third in a series of meetings held on April 28, 1981 and May 18 through May 20, 1981 regarding this matter (see Summary of Meetings dated May 5, 1981 and June 15, 1981, respectively). A list of 49 items (discussion areas) was provided in the meeting summary dated May 5, 1981. Some or all of these items were discussed at all three meetings. At this meeting some additional items were identified and discussed. These are numbered in this summary beginning with item 50. The agenda for this meeting is provided as Enclosure 1. The list of attendees for each day of the meeting is attached as Enclosure 2.

We made a detailed presentation of the status of our review concerning the agenda items discussed in our letter April 13, 1981. We also advised the applicant of new areas that we wish to discuss further. These are addressed later in this summary.

Representatives of the Union Electric Company provided us with the construction status of electrical equipment at the Callaway Plant. We advised the applicant that we believe that based on the information provided a site visit scheduled to be conducted on July 7 through July 9, 1981 would be premature and would not be productive. We advised the applicants that we intend to conduct our site visit during September or October, 1981.

A discussion of the various items of interest follows.

Item 1 - The applicants made a detailed presentation of where instrument sensors or transmitters supplying information to more than one protection channel are located in a common instrument line or connected to a common instrument tap. On the basis of this discussion, we advised the applicants that we did not require any further information regarding this matter.

8107090495 810630  
PDR ADOCK 05000482  
A PDR

|           |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| OFFICE ▶  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SURNAME ▶ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DATE ▶    |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Item 2, 3 - and Q420.4 With respect to Agenda Items 2, 3 and formal question 420.4 in our letter of April 16, 1981 (related to failures in control systems and resulting plant transients) the applicants agreed to submit the results of analyses performed to determine the consequences of control system failures.

Item 4 - Regarding separation criteria, we advised the applicant in a meeting on April 28, 1981 that we had no further need for additional information regarding this matter.

Item 5- With respect to implementation of the bypass and inoperable status indication provided for engineered safeguards features (ESF), the applicants provided a draft response regarding this matter. We advised the applicants to submit their response formally. Subject to confirmation of the formal submittal, no further information is required on this subject.

Item 6, 8d - We advised the applicants that we are considering a requirement for automatic initiation to open remote operated auxiliary feedwater valves when the system receives an actuation signal. The applicants indicated that, if such a position is taken, they would most likely appeal our decision.

The applicants also indicated that they intend to manually bypass the signal to initiate the auxiliary feedwater system when the main feedwater system pumps are tripped during operating modes where the main feedwater pumps are intentionally taken out of service. We informed the applicants that we will advise them of our position concerning the need for automatic removal of the bypass when the plant is in an operating mode where the main feedwater pumps are needed. We also indicated that we will advise them of our position regarding the termination of the auxiliary feedwater flow in the event of a failure of one power division.

Item 7 - Item 7 is related to sizing of the steam generator power relief valve and auxiliary feedwater valve accumulators and testing of the check valves between the seismic and nonseismic portion of the system. With respect to this item we advised the applicants during the May 18 through May 20, 1981 meeting that we will discuss this matter with the Mechanical Engineering Branch and Auxiliary Systems Branch and inform them of our position regarding this matter.

Item 8, 22 - With respect to Items 8 and 22 related to main steam line and main feedwater line isolation valves, the applicant agreed to provide information in the FSAR indicating those test conditions where an actual isolation signal would override test signals and cause the valves to rapidly close. The applicants will also indicate whether each valve is individually blocked, only one train to one valve is blocked, or whether one train to all valves is blocked during test of the safeguards cabinets.

|           |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| OFFICE ▶  | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| SURNAME ▶ | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| DATE ▶    | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |

- Item 9 - With respect to Item 9 related to failure modes and effects analyses for entire system from sensor through to actuated equipment, the applicants presented a rough draft of their submittal regarding this matter. We advised the applicants that, subject to receipt of the formal submittal, no further information is required on this item.
- Item 10 - With respect to perturbing variables and inputs to the sensors, the applicants presented their proposed changes to the FSAR. We advised the applicants that subject to the confirmation of the documentation, no further information is required on this item.
- Item 11 - With respect to the logic for turbine trip following reactor trip, the applicants presented their proposed change to Figure 7.2.1. We indicated that, subject to receipt of the formal change to the FSAR, no further information is required on this item.
- Item 12 - With respect to sensors or circuits used to provide input signals to the protection system which are located or routed through non-seismically qualified structures, the applicants made a detailed presentation regarding this matter. We requested that the applicants document the effects of failure modes in the sensors and circuits located in non-seismically qualified structures and verify that failures will not affect other portions of the protection system.
- Item 13 - With respect to pressurizer relief valve actuation following a turbine trip below the power setpoint of P-9, the applicants provided a draft response for incorporation in the FSAR. We asked that the formal response address the fact that loss of condenser vacuum will both trip the turbine and block condenser steam dump. We will review their response and advise them of our position regarding this matter.
- Item 14 - Regarding response time and testing, the applicants made a presentation during the meeting and indicated that they will formally document in the FSAR how the sensors are to be tested. We advised the applicants that, subject to our confirmation of their formal response, no further information is required on this item.
- Item 15 - With respect to RTD bypass loop flow alarms, the applicants discussed how loop transport time was verified. We advised the applicants that we understood their position regarding this matter and that we intend to discuss this item with other members of the staff and advise the applicants of our position concerning periodic re-verification of the bypass loop flow.

|           |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| OFFICE ▶  | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| SURNAME ▶ | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| DATE ▶    | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |

- Item 16 - With respect to an analysis indicating the time between reaching each high pressurizer level alarm setpoint and filling the pressurizer with water assuming failure of the level channel used for control in the low direction, the applicants presented their proposed response to our request. We advised the applicants to formally respond and that we will advise them of our position regarding this matter.
  
- Item 17 - With respect to an analysis indicating the time between reaching each high steam generator level alarm setpoint and filling the steam generator with water assuming failure of the level channel used for control in the low direction, the applicants advised us that they are considering design changes regarding this item. The applicant will either provide us with a description of the design changes or provide us with an analysis to show that the present design is acceptable.
  
- Item 18 - With respect to the bypass, bypass interlock, and test provisions for the containment purge isolation and control room ventilation systems, we advised the applicants that no further information regarding this matter is required.
  
- Item 19 - Regarding isolation devices in the balance-of-plant Engineered Safeguards Features Actuation System, the applicants were asked to document the design criteria for the isolators and the testing performed to verify that the design criteria are met.
  
- Item 20 - With respect to clearly identifying all redundant counterparts, the applicants presented a draft of their proposed submittal regarding this matter. We advised the applicants that, subject to receipt of their formal submittal, no further information is required.
  
- Item 21 - The applicants provided a draft response to our request related to Table 7.3-11. We advise the applicants that, subject to confirmation of their formal submittal, no further information is required.
  
- Item 22 - For a discussion of Item 22 see item 8 of this summary.
  
- Item 23 - With respect to automatic switchover from the injection phase of emergency core cooling to the recirculation phase after a LOCA, we advised the applicant during the May 18 through May 20, 1981 that no further information regarding this matter is required.
  
- Item 24 - Items 24 and 49 relate to reactor trip and ESAF response times. The applicants provided a draft of how they intend to modify pages 7.3-35, 7.3-36 and Table 7.2-3 regarding this matter. We indicated that the proposed changes appear to be satisfactory.

|           |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| OFFICE ▶  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SURNAME ▶ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DATE ▶    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



- Item 25 - Item 25 is related to Westinghouse supplied Engineered Safeguards Features actuation equipment design features which assure that the actuation circuits which must be blocked during test are returned to normal operation at the completion of the test. As a result of discussions of this item, the applicants were asked to include in the FSAR the conditions which result in a General Warning Alarm in the Solid State Protection System.
  
- Item 26 - With respect to insuring that isolation valves are returned to their normal operating positions after testing of safety systems during shutdown, we advised the applicants during the May 18 through May 20, 1981 meeting that we did not require any further information regarding this item.
  
- Item 27 - Item 27 is related to the control of the Auxiliary Feedwater System from outside the control room should it be automatically initiated on low steam generator level following a manual reactor trip initiated during a temporary evacuation of the control room. During our meeting of May 18 through May 20, 1981 we advised the applicants that no further information regarding this item was required.
  
- Item 28 - Item 28 is related to procedures and instructions for terminating emergency core cooling from outside the control room should it be inadvertently initiated following a reactor trip initiated during a temporary evacuation of the control room. During our meeting of May 18 through May 20, 1981 we advised the applicants that no further information regarding this matter is required.
  
- Item 29 - With respect to shutdown capability, we advised the applicants during our meeting of April 28, 1981 that we would review the information on the test and advise them of any concerns regarding this matter.
  
- Item 30 - With respect to access to the auxiliary shutdown panel, we advised the applicants during our meeting of May 18 through May 20, 1981 that no further information regarding this matter is required.
  
- Item 31 - Item 31 is related to design features used to provide indication of pressurizer and steam generator relief and safety valve position indication.

The applicants discussed the design features and indicated that they will formally respond to these matters in their submittal of responses to NUREG-0737.

With respect to pressurizer safety and relief valve we indicated that the applicants' proposed response appears to be satisfactory.

|           |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| OFFICE ▶  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SURNAME ▶ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DATE ▶    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The applicants stated that they will determine steam generator safety valve position by recording steam generator pressure. Determining the safety valve position by this method will enable the applicants to calculate the secondary release rate. We advised the applicants that we will discuss this approach with other staff members and advise them of our position regarding this matter.

- Item 32 - Regarding letdown capability for the reactor coolant system, the applicants made a detailed presentation at the April 28, 1981 meeting of the letdown capability. The letdown will be accomplished by using piping, valves and controls designed to criteria used for systems performing a safety function. The applicants advised us that the FSAR will be revised as necessary, to include the design features described in the meeting of April 28, 1981.
- Item 33 & 35 - With respect to safety related displays, the applicants presented their proposed list for both NSSS and Balance-of-Plant systems. We advised the applicants that we will review the list and advise them as to the list's acceptability.
- Item 34 - With respect to compliance to Regulatory Guide 1.97 Rev. 2, the applicants during the meeting of May 18 through May 20, 1981 indicated that they will submit their formal response sometime during the summer of 1981.
- Item 35 - For a discussion of Item 35 see item 33 of this report.
- Item 36 - The applicants indicated the changes they would make regarding Table 7.5-2 during the May 18 through May 20, 1981 meeting. We indicated that the proposed changes to Table 7.5-2 appeared to be satisfactory.
- Item 37 - With respect to the sequence of operation for the RHR system isolation valves, we advised the applicants during the May 18 through May 20, 1981 meeting that no further information regarding this matter is required.
- Item 38 - With respect to Item 38 related to the power distribution for the accumulator valves and associated interlocks and controls, the applicants made a detailed presentation of their design. As a result of the review of the accumulator valve control circuits, there was a question concerning the acceptability of the bypass and inoperable status indication associated with the accumulator valve positions. We advised the applicants that we will inform them of our position regarding this matter.

|           |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| OFFICE ▶  | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| SURNAME ▶ | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| DATE ▶    | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |

Item 39 - Item 39 is related to the degree of redundancy in the logic for the low temperature interlocks for reactor coolant system pressure control. The applicants made a presentation concerning this matter and advised us that they will provide a description of the design in the FSAR. The applicants were asked to specify in their submittal the failure mode of the output relay for the motor-operated block valve when power to the relay is lost. We informed the applicants that we will review the information provided by them and advise them of our position regarding this item.

Item 40 - With respect to the moter operated block valve, the applicant provided a draft of the change they propose to submit regarding this matter.

Item 41 & 42 - With respect to Items 41 and 42 related to (1) the isolation of essential service water to air compressors and (2) isolation of the non-seismic portion of the component cooling system, we informed the applicants that we will advise them of our position regarding these matters. There is a question on the need for indication of the process signals to allow periodic channel/transmitter checks and the need for indication that the safety function has been automatically actuated.

Item 42 - For a discussion of Item 42 see item 41 of this summary.

Item 43 - With respect to the rod control system, the applicants provided a draft description of this system in accordance with our request. We provided comments to the applicants regarding the proposed submittal. They indicated that the comments will be considered and that they will formally submit the requested information (see summary of meeting dated June 15, 1981).

Item 44 - With respect to the calibration technique to be used for the boron concentration monitoring system, we advised the applicant during the May 18 through May 20, 1981 meeting that no further information regarding this matter is required.

Item 45 - Item 45 is related to the termination of an inadvertant born dilution event. During the May 18 through May 20, 1981 meeting, the applicants advised us that they intend to modify equipment to terminate an inadvertant boron dilution. A description of this equipment will be provided in the FSAR.

Item 46 - With respect to the qualification of the Reactor coolant pump breakers, we advised the applicants during our meeting of May 18 through May 20, 1981 that we will discuss this matter with the Reactor Systems Branch and the Power Systems Branch and advise the applicants of our position regarding this matter (see summary of meeting dated June 15, 1981).

|           |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| OFFICE ▶  | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| SURNAME ▶ | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| DATE ▶    | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |

- Item 47 - With respect to construction permit items, we advised the applicants that we will review their response regarding Section 7.5.2 of the construction permit SER and advise them of our position. We also indicated that we will review their response (letter of July 29, 1981) regarding power lockout to motor operated valves.
  
- Item 48 - Item 48 is related to compliance with Regulatory Guide 1.75. During the May 18 through May 20, 1981 meeting, the applicants stated that they will clarify their position regarding compliance to Regulatory Guide 1.75.
  
- Item 49 - For discussion of Item 49 see item 24 of this summary.
  
- Item 50 - A new item related to setpoint methodology for the reactor protection and safeguards actuation systems was discussed in detail. As a result of this discussion we requested the following documentation for NSSS and BOP safety-related setpoints: (a) Provide a reference for the methodology used. Discuss any differences between the reference methodology and the methodology to be used by the applicants. (b) Verify that environmental error allowances are based on the highest value determined in qualification testing. (c) List the protection channels where the Technical Specification setpoint, with allowance for channel statistical error, falls within 5% of the instrument range limit or within 5% of the range between level measurement taps. For those cases specify the remaining margin to the end of the range. (d) Document the environmental error allowance that is used for each reactor trip and engineered safeguards setpoint. (e) Identify any time limits on environmental qualification of instruments used for trip, post-accident monitoring or engineered safety features actuation. Where instruments are qualified for only a limited time specify the basis for the limited time. (f) Address the effect of test equipment accuracy on setpoint errors.
  
- Item 51 - A new item related to the evaluation of the effects of high temperatures in reference legs of steam generator water level measuring instruments subsequent to high energy line breaks (I&E Bulletin 79-21) was discussed. The applicants advised us that they will formally respond to our concerns regarding this matter.
  
- Item 52 - A new item related to balance of plant interface requirements was discussed. The applicants indicated that they met the interface requirements specified in WCAP 8584. We requested that the applicants verify in writing that both the NSSS suppliers and balance-of-plant designer agree that the interface requirements have been met.
  
- Item 53 - A new item regarding tests that are necessary to reveal manufacturing or failure of an interlock (P-4) was discussed. The applicants indicated

|           |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| OFFICE ▶  | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| SURNAME ▶ | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| DATE ▶    | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |



that they responded to this concern in a SNUPPS letter dated December 6, 1979. We advise the applicants that we will review the information provided and advise them of our position.

- Item 54 - A new item related to a generic deficiency reported by Westinghouse regarding volume control tank level was discussed. The applicants advised us that they will formally provide a response regarding this matter.
- Item 55 - We inquired whether the low-low level refueling water storage tank alarms used to determine the time at which containment spray is switched to the recirculation mode were safety grade. The applicants advised us that they were safety grade. On this matter we consider this new item resolved.
- Item 56 - We requested that the applicants discuss the redundancy of the spray additive tank isolation valves which are closed on low additive tank level (new item). On the basis of our discussion we informed the applicants that we will advise them of our position regarding this matter.
- Item 57 - We inquired as to whether the motor-operated valves in the safety injection pump lines from the refueling water storage tank receive an automatic signal following SIS initiation (new item). The applicants advised us that these valves did not receive an automatic signal following SIS initiation. We informed the applicants that we will advise them of our position regarding this matter.
- Item 58 - With respect to the applicants response concerning our request for additional information 420.1 regarding I&E Bulletin 79-27, we informed the applicants that we will advise them of our position regarding this matter.
- Item 59 - With respect to the applicants response concerning our request for additional information 420.2 regarding I&E Bulletin 80-06, we informed the applicants that we will advise them of our position regarding this matter.
- Item 60 - With respect to the applicants response to our request for additional information Q420.3 regarding I&E Information Bulletin 79-22, the applicants advised us that they will clarify their response regarding the effects of a high energy line break outside containment

|           |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| OFFICE ▶  | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| SURNAMF ▶ | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| DATE ▶    | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |

on the rod control system. The applicants indicated that they will verify whether the Westinghouse generic analysis concerning this matter is applicable to the SNUPPS plants. If it is not, an analysis for SNUPPS will be performed.

Original signed by  
Gordon E. Edison ✓

Gordon Edison, Project Manager  
Licensing Branch No. 1  
Division of Licensing

Original signed by  
A. W. Dromerick

A. W. Dromerick, Project Manager  
Licensing Branch No. 1  
Division of Licensing

Enclosure:  
As stated

cc: See next page

|         |                   |               |                |  |  |  |  |
|---------|-------------------|---------------|----------------|--|--|--|--|
| OFFICE  | DL:LB#1 <i>AE</i> | DL:LB#1       | DL:LB#1        |  |  |  |  |
| SURNAME | G Edison/lg       | A W Dromerick | B J Youngblood |  |  |  |  |
| DATE    | 7/29/81           | 6/30/81       | 6/30/81        |  |  |  |  |

Mr. J. K. Bryan  
Vice President - Nuclear  
Union Electric Company  
P. O. Box 149  
St. Louis, Missouri 63166

cc: Gerald Charnoff, Esq.  
Shaw, Pittman, Potts,  
Trowbridge & Madden  
1800 M Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

Kansas City Power & Light Company  
ATTN: Mr. D. T. McPhee  
Vice President - Production  
1330 Baltimore Avenue  
Kansas City, Missouri 64141

Mr. Nicholas A. Petrick  
Executive Director, SNUPPS  
5 Choke Cherry Road  
Rockville, Maryland 20850

Mr. J. E. Birk  
Assistant to the General Counsel  
Union Electric Company  
St. Louis, Missouri 63166

Kansans for Sensible Energy  
P. O. Box 3192  
Wichita, Kansas 67201

Mr. Tom Vandell  
Resident Inspector/Wolf Creek NPS  
c/o USNRC  
P. O. Box 1407  
Emporia, Kansas 66801

Mr. Michael C. Keener  
Wolf Creek Project Director  
State Corporation Commission  
State of Kansas  
Fourth Floor, State Office Building  
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Mr. Glenn L. Koester  
Vice President - Nuclear  
Kansas Gas and Electric Company  
201 North Market Street  
P. O. Box 208  
Wichita, Kansas 67201

Dr. Vern Starks  
Route 1, Box 863  
Ketchikan, Alaska 99901

Mr. William Hansen  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Resident Inspector's Office  
RR #1  
Steedman, Missouri 65077

Ms. Treva Hearn, Assistant General Counsel  
Missouri Public Service Commission  
P. O. Box 360  
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

Jay Silberg, Esquire  
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge  
1800 M Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

Mr. D. F. Schnell  
Manager - Nuclear Engineering  
Union Electric Company  
P. O. Box 149  
St. Louis, Missouri 63166

Ms. Mary Ellen Salava  
Route 1, Box 56  
Burlington, Kansas 66839

Eric A. Eisen, Esq.  
Birch, Horton, Bittner & Monroe  
1140 Connecticut Avenue, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

Ms. Wanda Christy  
515 N. 1st Street  
Burlington, Kansas 66839

ENCLOSURE 1

NRC - SNUPPS MEETING  
I.C.S.B.  
June 16-18, 1981  
Bechtel - Clydesdale Room

AGENDA

June 16, 1981

- I. Review status of agenda items  
and introduce new issues .....Ernie Rossi
- II. Response Time Testing of Sensors .....Fred Semper  
(agenda item #14) ..... Bill Ciaramitaro
- III. Setpoints (new agenda item).....Bob Klein  
Rick Tuley  
Dennis Grove
- IV. BOP ESFAS (extension of agenda item #19) .....Paul Rebstock
- V. Rod Control System (agenda item #43) .....Westinghouse

June 17, 1981

- I. Common Instrument Taps (agenda item #1) .....Jack Mesmeringer
- II. Common Instrument Taps (agenda item #2) .....Jack Mesmeringer  
Joe Rumancik
- III. Control-Grade System Failures (agenda item #3) .....Joe Rumancik
- IV. Sensors/Circuits in Non-Seismic Structures  
(agenda item #12) .....Phil Marasco
- V. Low Temperature Interlocks for RCS Pressure  
Control (agenda item #39) .....Joe Rumancik

Other Items (schedule as time permits)

- a. #5 - SNUPPS to supply written description of bypass panel
- b. #6 - auxiliary feedwater system issues
- c. #8 - testing of BOP cabinets -draft FSAR change
- d. #9 - draft FSAR change - Table 7.1-4, sheet 2, item 4
- e. #10- perturbing variables, inputs to sensors - FSAR change
- f. #13- no PORV lift after turbine trip below P-9 - FSAR change
- g. #15- NRC position on check of loop flow alarms
- h. #16- analysis for time to fill pressurizer - FSAR change
- i. #20- clarification of FSAR Table 7.3-8
- j. #24- response times -clarify by FSAR change; includes agenda item #49
- k. #25- conditions for general warning alarm, testing reset functions  
for the NSSS while at power - draft FSAR change
- l. #31- NUREG-0737 item II.D.3 Pzr PORV and SV position indication
- m. #33- safety grade displays -draft FSAR change
- n. #38- accumulator valve position indication -NRC position
- o. #41- isolation of ESW to compressors -NRC discussion
- p. #42- isolation of non-safety CCW - NRC discussion
- q. #47- CP stage SER items - review again
- r. Q420.1- Bulletin 79-27
- s. Q420.2- Bulletin 80-06
- t. Q420.3- Notice 79-22
- u. Comanche Peak SER - S/G reference leg
- v. Comanche Peak SER - FMEA WCAP 8584 -BOP interface requirements
- w. SLNRC 79-21, 12/6/79 P-4 permissive
- x. SPDS and ERFIS
- y. W generic deficiency on V.C.T. level failure



ENCLOSURE 2

Meeting - June 16, 1981  
Callaway Plant  
and  
Wolf Creek Station  
Attendance List

NRC

A. Dromerick  
G. E. Edison  
C. F. Rossi  
T. Dunning

EG&G

K. D. Jacoby  
B. Kountanis  
B. Nishimura

KG&E

B. Klein  
R. Houch  
G. P. Rathbun  
C. Morris  
S. Fu

SNUPPS

F. Schwoerer  
R. Stright

Union Electric

F. Semper  
A. C. Passwater

Westinghouse

R. Gopal  
W. L. Luce  
W. Ciaramitaro  
C. R. Tuley

Commonwealth Edison

K. Ainger

BECHTEL

T. Diperna  
D. Grove  
P. Rebstock  
A. Hassan  
N. Goel  
P. A. Ward  
J. H. Smith  
J. S. Prebula

NSC

M. Tramp

Meeting - June 17, 1981  
Callaway Plant  
and  
Wolf Creek Station  
Attendance List

NRC

A. W. Dromerick  
G. E. Edison  
C. E. Rossi  
T. Dunning  
P. A. Bender

EG&G

K. D. Jacoby  
B. Kountanis  
B. Nishimura

KG&E

B. Klein  
R. Hoch  
S. Fu  
C. R. Morris  
G. P. Rathbun

SNUPPS

F. Schwoerer  
R. Stright  
Union Electric Co.

F. Semper  
A. C. Passwater

Commonwealth Edison

K. A. Ainger

Westinghouse

J. A. Rumancik  
W. L. Luce  
J. C. Mesmeringer

BECHTEL

D. Grove  
T. Diperna  
P. A. Ward  
T. Habermas  
J. Prebula

JUN 30 1981

MEETING SUMMARY DISTRIBUTION

Docket File  
NRC PDR  
Local PDR  
C/NSIC/Tera  
N. Hughes  
LD-1 Reading  
H. Denton  
E. Case  
D. Eisenhut  
R. Purple  
B. J. Youngblood  
A. Schwencer  
F. Miraglia  
J. Miller  
G. Lainas  
R. Volmer  
J. P. Knight  
R. Bosnak  
F. Schauer  
R. E. Jackson  
Project Manager G. Edison  
Attorney, OELD  
M. Rushbrook  
OIE (3)  
ACRS (16)  
R. Tedesco

NRC Participants:

G. Edison, A. Dromerick, C. Rossi,  
T. Dunning, P. Bender

G. Lear  
N. Johnston  
S. Pawlicki  
V. Benaroya  
Z. Rosztoczy  
W. Haass  
D. Muller  
R. Ballard  
W. Regan  
D. Ross  
P. Check  
Chief, Power Systems Branch  
U. Parr  
F. Rosa  
W. Butler  
W. Kreger  
R. Houston  
Chief, Radiological Assessment Branch  
L. Rubenstein  
T. Speis  
M. Srinivasan  
J. Stolz  
S. Hanauer  
W. Gammill  
T. Murley  
F. Schroeder  
D. Skovholt  
M. Ernst  
R. Baer  
C. Berlinger  
K. Kniel  
G. Knighton  
A. Thadani  
D. Tondi  
J. Kramer  
D. Vassallo  
P. Collins  
D. Ziemann



bcc: Applicant & Service List

201 171-000-1188