

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

Before Administrative Judges:
Sheidon J. Wolfe, Chairman
Dr. Walter H. Jordan
Dr. Harry Foreman

DOCKETED
USNRC

'82 AUG 12 P3:13

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

SERVED AUG 12 1982

In the Matter of

LOUISIANA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY,

(Waterford Steam Electric Station,
Unit 3)

Docket No. 50-382-0L

August 12, 1982

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER
(Requesting Staff's Affidavit)

MEMORANDUM

Appendix C of the Safety Evaluation Report (SER) (Staff Ex. 2) addresses thirteen unresolved generic safety issues. Although these issues are uncontested, we are required to examine them and to determine whether there is a reasonable basis for concluding that the Waterford Plant can be operated safely pending their resolution. Virginia Electric & Power Company (North Anna Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-491, 8 NRC 245 (1978).

1. Seismic Qualifications of Equipment in Operating Plants
(A-46)

With respect to Seismic Qualifications of Equipment, the Board notes that the Staff stated that its review of Waterford 3 against current seismic criteria was incomplete and that the results of its evaluation would be reported in a future supplement to the SER. However, Supplements 1, 2 and 3 (Staff Exs. 3, 4, and 5) reported that this issue had not yet been resolved.

2. Shutdown Decay Heat Removal Requirements (A-45)

In Appendix C to the SER, the Staff concludes that Waterford 3 can be operated safely prior to resolution of the issue whether an alternative means of decay heat removal should be required in plant design. The Staff bases its decision upon the capability of the steam generators to transfer decay heat to the main or auxiliary feedwater systems, and upon the capability of the high pressure injection system to add coolant at high pressure to the primary system while energy from decay heat is removed by releasing pressure through the power-operated relief valves (PORVs). This latter method of decay heat removal is known as "feed and bleed"; however, the Waterford 3 plant design does not have PORVs and hence has no feed and bleed capability.

This Board had previously raised the need for feed and bleed capability as a sua sponte question; we withdrew the issue, not because we were convinced that the question did not present a serious safety matter, but because we were satisfied that the need for feed and bleed

capability would be explored on a generic basis by Staff and the ACRS. (Memorandum and Order of April 27, 1982, at 2). In reaching that decision, we examined and found unconvincing the arguments proffered by Applicant and endorsed by the Staff that the reliability of the feedwater systems obviated the need for feed and bleed capability. (Id. at 3-8).

Similarly, in Supplement 3 to the SER (Staff Ex. 5), the Staff discusses the lack of feed and bleed capability in the reactor design and concludes that it is no longer confident that the steam generator is adequate as the sole means for shutdown decay heat removal. (Id. at 5-2). The Staff indicates that it is seeking more information and may require that Applicant provide justification for interim safe operation of the plant.

We, therefore, find Staff's conclusion that Waterford 3 can be operated safely pending resolution of generic issue A-45 to be without basis in the SER; Waterford 3 has no feed and bleed capability and the SER provides no support for relying solely on the steam generator/feedwater system to remove decay heat.

ORDER

1. With respect to A-45 and A-46, pursuant to Virginia Electric and Power Co. (North Anna Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-491, 8 NRC 245 (1978), the Staff is requested to provide us, in affidavit form, a full and detailed explanation of why it concludes that it would be acceptable to permit Waterford 3 to operate despite


the incompleteness of the Staff's review, or, if the Staff's review is now completed, to provide a full and detailed explanation justifying why it concludes that Waterford 3 can be permitted to operate.

2. The Staff's affidavit is to be filed by August 25, 1982 and the other parties may comment thereon by September 8, 1982.

Judges Jordan and Foreman concur, but were unavailable to sign this issuance.

IT IS SO ORDERED

FOR THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND
LICENSING BOARD


Sheldon J. Wolfe, Chairman
ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland,
this 12th day of August, 1982.