

March 2, 1994

Docket Nos. 50-295
and 50-304

Mr. D. L. Farrar, Manager
Nuclear Regulatory Services
Commonwealth Edison Company
Executive Towers West III, Suite 500
1400 OPUS Place
Downers Grove, Illinois 60515

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File
PDIII-2 r/f
(A)ADP/NRR
JLieberman
JZwolinski
CShiraki
OGC
GHill(4)
OPA
EDO

NRC & Local PDRs
TMurley/FMiraglia
ERossi
JRoe
JDyer
TClark
EJordan
ACRS(10)
OC/LFDCB
BClayton, RIII

Dear Mr. Farrar:

SUBJECT: SAFETY EVALUATION OF RELIEF REQUESTS FOR THE SECOND 10-YEAR INTERVAL OF THE INSERVICE INSPECTION PROGRAM FOR ZION NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2 (TAC NOS. M87278 AND M87279)

The staff, with technical assistance from its contractor, the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (INEL), has reviewed and evaluated the information provided by Commonwealth Edison Company (CECo or the licensee) in its letter dated August 19, 1993, and supplemented on December 3, 1993, related to Hydrostatic Requests for Relief Nos. 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15, and Technical Approach and Position 11 for the Zion Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Inservice Inspection (ISI) program.

Based on the information submitted, the staff adopts the contractor's conclusions and recommendations presented in the Technical Evaluation Summary (Enclosure 2). The staff concluded that the alternative examination contained in Hydrostatic Request for Relief No. 11 is authorized pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(a)(3)(i). In addition, for Hydrostatic Request for Relief Nos. 13, 14, 15, relief is granted pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(g)(6)(i), and Hydrostatic Request for Relief No. 12 is denied. Technical Approach and Position 11 concerning isolation of instruments during pressure testing of the system is acceptable.

The staff's evaluation and conclusions are contained in the enclosed Safety Evaluation (Enclosure 1).

Sincerely,

Original Signed By:

James E. Dyer, Director
Project Directorate III-2
Division of Reactor Projects - III/IV/V
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

9403070193 940302
PDR ADOCK 05000295
Q PDR

040009

Enclosures:

- 1. Safety Evaluation
- 2. Technical Evaluation Report

NRC FILE CENTER COPY

cc w/enclosures:
See next page

OFC	LA:PDIII-2	PM:PDIII-2	D:PDIII-2	OGC <i>AG</i>		
NAME	TCLARK <i>JRC</i>	CSHIRAKI <i>J</i>	JDYER <i>ed-ter</i>	<i>A. Jorgensen</i>		
DATE	2/14/94	2/14/94	2/14/94	2/22/94	1/94	1/94
COPY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES/NO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES/NO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES/NO	YES/NO	YES/NO	YES/NO

JFO
11



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555-0001

March 2, 1994

Docket Nos. 50-295
and 50-304

Mr. D. L. Farrar, Manager
Nuclear Regulatory Services
Commonwealth Edison Company
Executive Towers West III, Suite 500
1400 OPUS Place
Downers Grove, Illinois 60515

Dear Mr. Farrar:

SUBJECT: SAFETY EVALUATION OF RELIEF REQUESTS FOR THE SECOND 10-YEAR INTERVAL OF THE INSERVICE INSPECTION PROGRAM FOR ZION NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2 (TAC NOS. M87278 AND M87279)

The staff, with technical assistance from its contractor, the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (INEL), has reviewed and evaluated the information provided by Commonwealth Edison Company (CECo or the licensee) in its letter dated August 19, 1993, and supplemented on December 3, 1993, related to Hydrostatic Requests for Relief Nos. 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15, and Technical Approach and Position 11 for the Zion Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Inservice Inspection (ISI) program.

Based on the information submitted, the staff adopts the contractor's conclusions and recommendations presented in the Technical Evaluation Summary (Enclosure 2). The staff concluded that the alternative examination contained in Hydrostatic Request for Relief No. 11 is authorized pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(a)(3)(i). In addition, for Hydrostatic Request for Relief Nos. 13, 14, 15, relief is granted pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(g)(6)(i), and Hydrostatic Request for Relief No. 12 is denied. Technical Approach and Position 11 concerning isolation of instruments during pressure testing of the system is acceptable.

The staff's evaluation and conclusions are contained in the enclosed Safety Evaluation (Enclosure 1).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "James E. Dyer".

James E. Dyer, Director
Project Directorate III-2
Division of Reactor Projects - III/IV/V
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:

1. Safety Evaluation
2. Technical Evaluation Report

cc w/enclosures:
See next page

March 2, 1994

Docket Nos. 50-295
and 50-304

Mr. D. L. Farrar, Manager
Nuclear Regulatory Services
Commonwealth Edison Company
Executive Towers West III, Suite 500
1400 OPUS Place
Downers Grove, Illinois 60515

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File	NRC & Local PDRs
PDIII-2 r/f	TMurley/FMiraglia
(A)ADP/NRR	ERossi
JLieberman	JRoe
JZwolinski	JDyer
CShiraki	TClark
OGC	EJordan
GHill(4)	ACRS(10)
OPA	OC/LFDCB
EDO	BClayton, RIII

Dear Mr. Farrar:

SUBJECT: SAFETY EVALUATION OF RELIEF REQUESTS FOR THE SECOND 10-YEAR INTERVAL OF THE INSERVICE INSPECTION PROGRAM FOR ZION NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2 (TAC NOS. M87278 AND M87279)

The staff, with technical assistance from its contractor, the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (INEL), has reviewed and evaluated the information provided by Commonwealth Edison Company (CECo or the licensee) in its letter dated August 19, 1993, and supplemented on December 3, 1993, related to Hydrostatic Requests for Relief Nos. 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15, and Technical Approach and Position 11 for the Zion Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Inservice Inspection (ISI) program.

Based on the information submitted, the staff adopts the contractor's conclusions and recommendations presented in the Technical Evaluation Summary (Enclosure 2). The staff concluded that the alternative examination contained in Hydrostatic Request for Relief No. 11 is authorized pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(a)(3)(i). In addition, for Hydrostatic Request for Relief Nos. 13, 14, 15, relief is granted pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(g)(6)(i), and Hydrostatic Request for Relief No. 12 is denied. Technical Approach and Position 11 concerning isolation of instruments during pressure testing of the system is acceptable.

The staff's evaluation and conclusions are contained in the enclosed Safety Evaluation (Enclosure 1).

Sincerely,

Original Signed By:

James E. Dyer, Director
Project Directorate III-2
Division of Reactor Projects - III/IV/V
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:

1. Safety Evaluation
2. Technical Evaluation Report

cc w/enclosures:
See next page

OFC	LA:PDIII-2	PM:PDIII-2	D:PDIII-2	OGC #		
NAME	TCLARK JRC	CSHIRAKI	JDYER	J. Tolgerson		
DATE	2/4/94	2/14/94	2/14/94	2/22/94	/ /94	/ /94
COPY	(YES)/NO	(YES)/NO	(YES)/NO	YES/NO	YES/NO	YES/NO

Mr. D. L. Farrar
Commonwealth Edison Company

Zion Nuclear Power Station
Unit Nos. 1 and 2

cc:

Michael I. Miller, Esquire
Sidley and Austin
One First National Plaza
Chicago, Illinois 60603

Dr. Cecil Lue-Hing
Director of Research and Development
Metropolitan Sanitary District
of Greater Chicago
100 East Erie Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Phillip Steptoe, Esquire
Sidley and Austin
One First National Plaza
Chicago, Illinois 60603

Mayor of Zion
Zion, Illinois 60099

Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety
Office of Nuclear Facility Safety
1035 Outer Park Drive
Springfield, Illinois 62704

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Resident Inspectors Office
105 Shiloh Blvd.
Zion, Illinois 60099

Regional Administrator
U. S. NRC, Region III
801 Warrenville Road
Lisle, Illinois 60532-4351

Robert Neumann
Office of Public Counsel
State of Illinois Center
100 W. Randolph
Suite 11-300
Chicago, Illinois 60601