

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of)
) Docket 50-344
PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY,)
et al) (Control Building Proceeding)
)
(Trojan Nuclear Plant))

LICENSEE'S SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES
DATED OCTOBER 27, 1978
TO CONSOLIDATED INTERVENORS INTERROGATORIES
RECEIVED AUGUST 14, 1978

The following are Licensee's Supplemental Responses dated October 27, 1978 to Consolidated Intervenors Interrogatories received August 14, 1978. Persons responding to each Interrogatory are indicated by their initials as follows: L. W. Erickson (LWE), Ronald W. Johnson (RWJ), Bart D. Withers (BDW) and D. J. Broehl (DJB).

I. DAVID B. MCCOY

Interrogatory 7

The design approach to correct the Control Building structural deficiencies was a structural extension. Other methods were considered according to Report #78-13, May 5, 1978. What were those other repair methods? What was the cost of each? What were the technical problems of each method? What were the reasons for the rejection of each particular method? What was the impact of each method on plant operations?

Supplemental Response to Interrogatory 7

Attachment 1 indicates methods, including various sizes of structural extensions, which are currently being considered to correct Control Building structural deficiencies.

(LWE)

7811100126

Interrogatory 11

Provide for Interrogatory #10 the following information:

(c) the location of this equipment [seismic instrumentation] at Trojan.

Supplemental Response to Interrogatory 11

The previous response to this Interrogatory was in error as to the location of the System 3 accelerograph in the Fuel Building. It is located at Elevation 93 ft, rather than on the Fuel Building roof as previously indicated. The remainder of the previous Response is correct. (DJB)

Interrogatory 18

Provide an analysis of how the alternatives to structural extension would affect the safety margins with respect to #15 Interrogatory. Compare each alternative to structural extension in a cost-benefit analysis.

Supplemental Response to Interrogatory 18

As indicated in Attachment 1, analyses of alternatives to, and several forms of, a structural extension are in progress. Cost-benefit analyses have not been performed.

(LWE)

II C. GAIL PARSON

Interrogatory 7

Where is PGE getting replacement power from now? How much and at what cost?

Supplemental Response to Interrogatory 7

Surplus power from the Bonneville Power Administration is no longer available to PGE.

(RWJ)

Interrogatory 10

Provide detailed descriptions of where each accelerograph and accelerometer is located in the plant.

Supplemental Response to Interrogatory 10

See Supplemental Response of this date to McCoy's Interrogatory 11 (above).

(DJB)

Interrogatory 13d

To what extent is the decision to shut down when the PSA lights up discretionary.

(d) Is there an audible signal triggered by the Peak Shock Annunciator?

Supplemental Response to Interrogatory 13d

Although there is no audible signal triggered by the Peak Shock Annunciator (PSA), an event triggering the PSA would also trigger the Time-History Accelerograph recorder (Systems 2) which makes a sufficiently loud noise to alert an operator (for a minimum of 30 sec following actuation of the seismic trigger at 0.01g).

(BDW)

Interrogatory 17

Provide written and oral communications regarding criteria for, and descriptions of, all seriously considered design approaches/ other methods of corrective action.

Supplemental Response to Interrogatory 17

Attachment 1 briefly describes several methods of corrective action being considered.

(LWE)