

ORIGINAL

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the matter of:

Docket No.

DISCUSSION OF STEPS TO DECISION IN
TMI-1 RESTART PROCEEDING

OPEN PORTION

Location: Washington, D.C.

Pages: 1 - 20

Date: April 15, 1983

TAYLOE ASSOCIATES

Court Reporters
1625 I Street, N.W. Suite 1004
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 293-3950

8304220291 830415
PDR 10CFR
PT9.7 PDR

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

3 DISCUSSION OF STEPS TO DECISION IN TMI-1
4 RESTART PROCEEDING

5 OPEN PORTION

6 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
7 Room 1130
8 1717 H Street, N. W.
9 Washington, D. C.

Friday, April 15, 1983

10 The Commission convened, pursuant to notice,
11 2:20 p.m.

12 COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

13 NUNZIO PALLADINO, Chairman of the Commission
14 VICTOR GILINSKY, Commissioner
15 JOHN AHEARNE, Commissioner
16 THOMAS ROBERTS, Commissioner
17 JAMES ASSELSTINE, Commissioner

18 STAFF AND PRESENTERS SEATED AT COMMISSION TABLE:

19 S. CHILK
20 H. PLAINE
21 J. VANVLIET
22 R. STAROSTECKI
23 G. LAINUS
24 M. MALSCH
25 R. PURPLE
A. KENNEKE

AUDIENCE SPEAKERS:

L. RUBENSTEIN

- - -

DISCLAIMER

This is an unofficial transcript of a meeting of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission held on April 14, 1983 in the Commission's offices at 1717 H Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. The meeting was open to public attendance and observation. This transcript has not been reviewed, corrected, or edited, and it may contain inaccuracies.

The transcript is intended solely for general informational purposes. As provided by 10 CFR 9.103, it is not part of the formal or informal record of decision of the matters discussed. Expressions of opinion in this transcript do not necessarily reflect final determinations or beliefs. No pleading or other paper may be filed with the Commission in any proceeding as the result of or addressed to any statement or argument contained herein, except as the Commission may authorize.

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I suggest we get started. I apologize for the delay.

The purpose of today's meeting is to take stock of some of the items that we have to address in reaching the decision on whether or not to lift the shutdown order against the Three Mile Island Unit 1 plant.

Because today's meeting relates in part to pending adjudication, it will be necessary to divide the meeting into two portions.

At this public session we will receive updates regarding various activities involving TMI-1. Following the public session we will hold a separate closed session.

In its adjudicatory capacity the Commission functions like a court and it would not be appropriate to hold our deliberations in public session. It will also be necessary to consider certain investigative matters in the closed session.

I would like to turn the meeting over to General Counsel to lead our discussions. Also at the table are NRC staff members, but let me first ask whether or not other Commissioners have comments to make at this time?

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: No.

(No response from the other Commissioners.)

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: All right, proceed.

1 MR. PLAINE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2 In this open session we propose to ask for a
3 report by the people representing NRR on two matters, the
4 status of the steam generator matter problem and the status
5 of the staff certifications.

6 When we finish with this portion of the meeting,
7 we will then go into the closed session.

8 Would you like to proceed, sir.

9 MR. PURPLE: Yes, I will.

10 I am Bob Purple from the Division of Licensing.
11 With me today is Rich Starostecki from Region I, Gus Lainus
12 from Licensing and the Project Manager of TMI-1,
13 Jim VanVliet.

14 We have some viewgraphs and we have passed out
15 some outline material that went to a couple of items beyond
16 what you mentioned, as it was our understanding that the
17 Commission wanted to hear something about the subject of
18 seismic qualification of aux feed and an inadequate core
19 cooling item, and we will cover those unless there is some
20 problem with that.

21 MR. PLAINE: No objection.

22 (Slide presentation)

23 MR. PURPLE: Put on the first viewgraph, please.

24 Now that simply repeats that, yes, we will talk
25 about the staff certification status and the following

1 three more technical items.

2 No. 2, please.

3 The last time the staff was here to brief the
4 Commission on certification status was in October and
5 essentially the same definition was used as here because it
6 is necessary to understand that when we say certification
7 status we are talking about a fixed, well identified
8 listing of items that the staff is accounting for and
9 ultimately will have to certify to the Commission as to
10 their completeness.

11 That definition is the short-term requirements
12 that were in the Commission orders as well as items that
13 were identified by the various Board actions. The total of
14 the items that we are tracking under this thing we call
15 certification is 130 items.

16 The prerequisite for certification is that the
17 item must be completed and that at least one of the offices
18 of NRC, the one responsible, will have to verify that it is
19 complete.

20 Ultimately it would lead when all are done to a
21 memorandum from the staff to the Commissioners certifying
22 that these 130 items are complete.

23 No. 3, please.

24 Of the 130 96 are presently complete, and 96
25 being complete means 34 are still incomplete. Back in

1 October that 34 was 64. So since October to now 30
2 additional items have been completed.

3 You will notice the column of numbers is in two
4 blocks. One is utility and one is NRC. Bearing in mind that
5 for each item of the 130 that action was required on, there
6 is also action required by the staff. So there is some
7 redundancy.

8 To look for the 34 items I direct your attention
9 to the bottom of the three columns under NRC, noticing at
10 the bottom 4, 22 and 8. That is the four items of which 22
11 are not yet done by the licensee.

12 There is a typographical error on your
13 viewgraphs, if you please. Up on the second line it says
14 "of the 34 items requiring staff certification" and it says
15 19 there. That should be 22, and that 22 is the same number
16 then at the bottom.

17 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I don't understand. These
18 are items which are yet to be done or have been completed
19 by the various NRC offices.

20 MR. PURPLE: No, yet to be done by the various
21 NRC offices.

22 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: And the numbers indicate
23 how many items each office has got to look at?

24 MR. PURPLE: That is correct.

25 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: What is it that I&E looks

1 at? Is that emergency planning?

2 MR. PURPLE: Emergency preparedness. I believe I
3 am correct essentially that all those seven items are
4 emergency preparedness items.

5 There is an entry "Pending Commission Review"
6 and it says one. That is really not I&E, but we didn't have
7 a more convenient place to put it if you look at the bottom
8 right hand corner of the table. That is an issue that does
9 relate to emergency preparedness. It has to do with a thing
10 that has been certified to the Commissioners having to do
11 with the Emergency Director and where he will be and how
12 soon he will be where.

13 The rest of the matrix gives a schedule for when
14 these various items would close themselves out showing up
15 through June for all items that can be done by then and
16 then showing for the rest of the items those that depend on
17 a hot functional test in order to complete and those that
18 require that the plant be operating in order to complete.

19 That would complete the first item for the
20 information I have on the staff certification. I would
21 propose to move on unless there are some questions on that
22 area to the second of the four items we were going to talk
23 about briefly today.

24 CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Can I ask you just one
25 question.

1 MR. PURPLE: Sure.

2 CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: These dates that you give,
3 do you view them as realistic, optimistic or pessimistic?

4 MR. PURPLE: I think we view them as realistic.
5 Certainly the dates of April, May and June, there is
6 nothing in there that we see a problem with. Certainly the
7 restart and power escalation testing date is a date based
8 on, and that shows July of '83, it is based on the physical
9 readiness of the plant and not the procedural things that
10 need to take place between now and then.

11 CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Is steam generator repair
12 one of these items?

13 MR. PURPLE: No, sir, that is separate from the
14 130.

15 CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: And the same with seismic
16 qualification, auxiliary feedwater and inadequate core
17 cooling?

18 MR. PURPLE: Well, you will find inadequate core
19 cooling, as I present it to you, it is a different item,
20 but you will see that three of the items that make up
21 adequate core cooling are items that are on the cert list
22 and I will explain those three. So it is sort of across the
23 line.

24 Steam generator repair is very briefly shown on
25 viewgraph No. 4. The expansion of the tube effort has been

1 completed. Currently the licensee is in a cold testing
2 program of the steam generator and the rest of the items
3 are indicate on here.

4 The RCS reactor coolant pump system clean up is
5 scheduled to be completed in May by the licensee. The staff
6 is scheduled in the same month to issue its safety
7 evaluation report, including a significant hazards
8 determination and hot testing could take place in June of
9 '83.

10 CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: You said all the kinetic
11 expansion is completed. Has it been reviewed by NRC?

12 MR. PURPLE: Well, you mean inspected? The
13 program for doing it we reviewed and wrote an SER on, a
14 safety evaluation on.

15 CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well then let me say
16 inspected.

17 MR. PURPLE: Okay.

18 Rich?

19 MR. STAROSTECKI: Yes.

20 MR. PURPLE: Yes, it has been.

21 CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: And are the conclusions
22 satisfactory?

23 MR. STAROSTECKI: We have identified no problems.

24 MR. PURPLE: I suppose if there were some, some
25 of the hot testing would actually show that, too, the rest

1 of the testing program that is currently in progress plus
2 to be done.

3 COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Bob, I notice on this
4 one you have as your fourth bullet issue staff safety
5 evaluation, including significant hazards determination.

6 Does that mean that the staff has decided that
7 an amendment to the license is necessary?

8 MR. PURPLE: Yes. An amendment to the license is
9 necessary and therefore we had to make a determination.

10 COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: What is the nature of
11 the amendment?

12 MR. PURPLE: The nature of the amendment is a
13 tech spec, and you can correct me and add to this if I am
14 wrong, but it is a tech spec change that would authorize
15 the use of this technique of fixing a tube, that is kinetic
16 expansion, where the present tech spec limits them to
17 nothing but plugging a tube that is found to not be good.

18 Is there more that has developed or is that
19 basically it?

20 MR. VANVLIET: No, that is correct.

21 COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I was going to ask,
22 when did the licensee submit an application to amend the
23 tech specs, if they have?

24 MR. VANVLIET: I believe that it was submitted in
25 February.

1 COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Why did they wait until
2 after they had done the work to submit the application?

3 MR. PURPLE: Because the amendment is needed in
4 order to operate the plant afterward and not in order to do
5 the work. We had reviewed their work. They didn't need it
6 ahead of time. They do need it in order to run the plant
7 with the tubes repaired in that manner, but they didn't
8 need it in order to do the mechanical work.

9 CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Were they working at their
10 own risk, so to speak, then?

11 COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I mean conceivably if
12 the amendment wasn't granted, then they can't operate the
13 plant now with the steam generators repaired in this
14 particular manner. It just seems to me puzzling that they
15 didn't apply for the license amendment before they did the
16 work.

17 MR. PURPLE: My recollection is we did right and
18 did issue a safety evaluation related to the repair
19 process. So they knew that we technically agreed with the
20 repair process. So that is not an issue. In other words,
21 there is no technical issue I know of where there is any
22 risk at all that it wouldn't be approved, the proposed
23 amendment, that is agreed to by the staff.

24 COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Was there any technical
25 reason why they couldn't have submitted this amendment say

1 six months before they did the work or whenever they
2 decided that this was the approach they were going to
3 follow but well before the work was actually done?

4 MR. PURPLE: I can't think of any technical
5 reason why they couldn't have done that, no.

6 COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Okay.

7 MR. PLAINE: Do you think this amendment involves
8 a no significant hazards determination?

9 MR. PURPLE: We haven't determined that yet. We
10 have told the Commissioners in an earlier memorandum that
11 we sent up on this subject that in our look so far we had
12 not determined any issue that would clearly make it a
13 significant hazards determination, but we haven't finished
14 that review yet.

15 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Is this the most limiting
16 item from the point of view of the plant being physically
17 ready for operation?

18 MR. PURPLE: It certainly had been. I am not sure
19 that it is any more. It is a close call between this and
20 some of the other items that need to get done that are
21 going to be done in June. I think the answer is yes, it is
22 the most limiting item now in completing up the steam
23 generator actions, but let me ask the region is they have a
24 different feel.

25 MR. STAROSTECKI: I would just say the hot

1 functional steam tests for the steam generator repair work
2 are controlling and they are scheduled for June and that is
3 what is driving the dates.

4 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Do they need any kind of
5 special approval to do the hot functional tests for the
6 steam generator?

7 MR. PURPLE: We don't think so.

8 CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: They don't need the
9 amendment to their tech spec?

10 MR. VANVLIET: They do need the licensing action
11 issued prior to taking the plant above either 200 or 250
12 degrees regardless of whether it is through critical
13 operation of the reactor or pump heat.

14 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Could you interpret that,
15 what you just said, when you say a licensing action.

16 MR. VANVLIET: That means that we have to issue
17 the tech spec before they can take the plant above.

18 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Are you saying that you
19 must issue the amendment before they take the plant above?

20 MR. PURPLE: Yes.

21 MR. VANVLIET: That is correct.

22 MR. PURPLE: The amendment that we are talking
23 about.

24 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: All right. Then in here
25 somewhere there is another bulletin, a bullet that fits

1 before steam generator hot testing, which is this
2 amendment; is that correct?

3 MR. PURPLE: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: And the date of that is
5 going to depend on whether or not you make a significant or
6 no significant hazards determination?

7 MR. PURPLE: That is correct.

8 CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: But on the basis that you
9 wrote a 6/83 date here, well, I don't want to push that
10 off.

11 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Since we now have a
12 notice, what is the actual procedure in that there are two
13 options. One option is that you reach the conclusion that
14 there is a significant hazard and one option is that you
15 reach the conclusion that there is no significant hazard in
16 order to apply a prejudgment on your part. Can you just
17 give me the steps that you see going through for both of
18 those cases approximately? I can try to get a sense of
19 the time.

20 MR. PURPLE: Well, the timing of course would be
21 in May, and I don't know that we have really focused yet
22 for sure on the impact of the recent policy statement of
23 the Commission that we call the Sholly amendment which
24 revises the procedure for how we do significant hazards and
25 prenoticing and so forth. So I don't think we have that

1 well defined right today. We are still trying to absorb
2 that and figure out where does this one fit.

3 CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: But I do gather that if you
4 make a no significant hazards determination, then you might
5 be able to proceed to the June date. If it is a significant
6 hazards consideration it could add a significant period of
7 time which you are not prepared to tell us.

8 MR. PURPLE: If we decided it did involve a
9 significant hazards consideration, then our rules require
10 us to prenotice it and invite a hearing, if there is a
11 request for a hearing and to hold that hearing before the
12 action could be taken, and I don't know how to estimate
13 that time.

14 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: My recollection of the
15 rules we have just put in place require you to go through
16 some steps even if you make a conclusion that there is no
17 significant hazard.

18 MR. PURPLE: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: How much time does that
20 involve?

21 COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: My recollection is the
22 same as John's. We have a notice requirement in any event.
23 You only get to the no significant hazards determination,
24 whichever way you go on that, if someone requests a
25 hearing.

1 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Right. You have got the
2 notice system and there is something about emergency
3 action, et cetera, in there, but I just don't see that this
4 is going to rise to that.

5 MR. PURPLE: One area, for example, I am not sure
6 of, and maybe it is clear to others, is to what degree do
7 existing applications for amendment fall under the new
8 procedure. If they have been received, are they -- we just
9 haven't.

10 COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: That is an easy one.
11 There is only one procedure.

12 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That is right. There are
13 no other procedures.

14 COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: That is right.

15 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That is it.

16 MR. PURPLE: And they become effective in May.

17 COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: No. Upon enactment of
18 this provision in the Act the Commission lost whatever
19 authority it had previous to that time to issue a no
20 significant hazards consideration amendment prior to
21 holding hearings.

22 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: It is in place, and what I
23 am trying to get across to you is there is a time period in
24 there.

25 MR. PURPLE: Okay.

1 CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Bob, could you look into at
2 least what is involved to go through to make a no
3 significant hazard and what is the range of times that
4 might be involved with a significant hazards determination.

5 MR. PURPLE: Sure.

6 CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Do you want to go on.

7 MR. PURPLE: Seismic qualification of aux
8 feedwater, I think the Commission has had a briefing from
9 the staff. I guess I don't really know when that was. It
10 was in the last six months or so, in December. The current
11 status is as shown on viewgraph No. 5.

12 The licensee has committed to have a seismically
13 qualified aux feed system at the next refueling where what
14 he would propose doing is to have two qualified motor
15 driven trains. He does have a turbine driven pump train
16 that is not qualified and he doesn't propose to qualify it
17 on the argument that it is not needed for safety.

18 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Let's see, that is their
19 position?

20 MR. PURPLE: That is their position. We don't
21 have an answer to that yet and that is shown on the very
22 bottom line down there.

23 We have found and agree that the current aux
24 feed system is largely qualified with some exceptions that
25 are shown on the second bullet.

1 This information really is based I guess
2 primarily on a meeting with the licensee within the last
3 couple of weeks, if not last week or early this week. He is
4 due to make a submittal to more fully describe this whole
5 approach of his and what he plans to do in May.

6 We really haven't scheduled a date for the
7 issuance of our SER. This is part of a program that you may
8 recall that we doing across the board with all existing
9 operating reactors taking a look at the seismic
10 qualification of all reactors from day one on up till now,
11 and all of that will have to be factored in to determine
12 where this one falls into the review schedule. So I don't
13 have a scheduled date for when we will have that SER done.

14 That is all I was going to say on the seismic
15 qualification of aux feed.

16 CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: This qualification, it this
17 by calculation or by test or by what?

18 MR. LAINUS: Some of it could be analysis to
19 demonstrate qualification.

20 MR. PURPLE: Inadequate core cooling
21 instrumentation, No. 6. We simply show at the top of the
22 viewgraph here that there are some items that are related
23 to inadequate core cooling instrumentation that are a part
24 of the 130 certification items, and I show those in those
25 first three bullets, all of which have been installed.

1 So therefore we would call that a short-term
2 resolution of that issue. The longer-term resolution is
3 consistent with other reactors that received an order
4 issued in December to install the system.

5 We had received the licensee's response on March
6 the 10th and in that response he has ---

7 CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: What sort of system are they
8 installing?

9 MR. PURPLE: This is an inventory trending
10 system. The inventory trending system that he has proposed,
11 he has proposed to install it by or at the next refueling
12 outage.

13 CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Which is when? Well, I guess
14 we probably don't know that.

15 MR. PURPLE: Well, whenever, "X" months after
16 they ever start up. Again, on this issue the staff has not
17 completed an evaluation of their submittal. So I can't tell
18 you where we come down on that proposal.

19 That completes the four items. I was going to
20 talk about the remainder of the handout. They are a bunch
21 of sheets which will add up to 34 items and it will show
22 you the status of each of the 34 items, where they are,
23 what the issue was and what remains to be done.

24 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: What is the difficulty in
25 installing a level meter? Is this something that was being

1 put off because the formulation that we have made in
2 putting out the order allows operating plants to go to the
3 next refueling?

4 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I think in the B&W case it
5 was that they hadn't had one designed.

6 MR. PURPLE: Let me ask Less Rubenstein to answer
7 that.

8 MR. RUBENSTEIN: They are right on schedule with
9 the other plants. In fact, they came in a little earlier.

10 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: When you say the other
11 plants you mean the other ---

12 MR. RUBENSTEIN: The other plants' responses were
13 due in today.

14 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: You mean the other B&W
15 plants.

16 MR. RUBENSTEIN: The other B&W plants responding
17 to the order are due in today. They have selected a delta P
18 system which is much like the instrumentation of the
19 Westinghouse system, but it is designed specific to their
20 plant utilizing the elevation of the candy cane.

21 Conceptually it will probably meet the staff's
22 requirements for engineering design. The specifics are, as
23 Mr. Purple said, under review.

24 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Let's see, you are
25 reviewing that now?

1 MR. PURPLE: Yes.

2 MR. RUBENSTEIN: Yes.

3 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: So they would have to
4 have your approval before they can go out and buy the
5 system.

6 MR. RUBENSTEIN: Yes, they will. Well, they asked
7 for a conceptual approval by May 15th and I think we will
8 probably be able to satisfy them in this regard.

9 CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I gather also that not only
10 must these items be completed, but they have to be checked
11 out by the staff and get their certification.

12 MR. PURPLE: That is correct.

13 CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Okay. Any other questions?
14 (No response.)

15 CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Thank you very much.
16 We will stand adjourned.

17 (Whereupon, at 2:40 p.m., the meeting
18 adjourned.)

19 - - -

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF PROCEEDINGS

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the
NRC COMMISSION

In the matter of: TMI-1 Commission Meeting

Date of Proceeding: April 15, 1983

Place of Proceeding: Washington, D.C.

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original
transcript for the file of the Commission.

Mary C. Simons

Official Reporter - Typed

Mary C. Simons
Official Reporter - Signature

COMMISSION BRIEFING

APRIL 15, 1983

TMI-1 STATUS

OUTLINE

1. CERTIFICATION STATUS
2. STEAM GENERATOR REPAIR
3. SEISMIC QUALIFICATION OF AFW
4. INADEQUATE CORE COOLING

2

1.0 CERTIFICATION STATUS

- DEFINED AS

- CERTIFICATION OF SHORT TERM REQUIREMENTS
IDENTIFIED IN AUGUST 9, 1979 AND MARCH 8, 1980
ORDERS AS WELL AS BOARD IMPOSED AND APPEAL
BOARD IMPOSED SHORT TERM REQUIREMENTS (130 ITEMS)
- CERTIFICATION PREREQUISITES
 - ITEM MUST BE COMPLETED
 - REGION I, IE, OR NRR WILL INSPECT OR VERIFY
COMPLETION WITH ALL OUTSTANDING ISSUES RESOLVED

SCHEDULE FOR COMPLETION OF CERTIFICATION

OF 130, 96 ARE TOTALLY COMPLETE

OF THE 34 ITEMS REQUIRING STAFF CERTIFICATION, ²²~~18~~ REQUIRE

LICENSEE ACTION:

	<u>UTILITY</u>	<u>NRR</u>	<u>NRC</u> <u>REG. I</u>	<u>I&E</u>
APRIL 1983	5	2	4	0
MAY 1983	3	1	3	7*
JUNE 1983	-	0	2	0
HFT (JULY 1983)	6	0	6	0
RESTART/POWER ESCALATION TESTING (JULY 1983)	8	1	7	0
PENDING COMMISSION REVIEW	-	0	0	1
TOTAL	22	4	22	8

*PENDING FEMA SUBMITTAL; EXPECTED LATE 4/83

2.0 STEAM GENERATOR REPAIR

- KINETIC EXPANSION COMPLETED 1/83
- COLD TESTING IN PROGRESS
- RCS PEROXIDE CLEANING 5/83
- ISSUE STAFF SAFETY EVALUATION INCLUDING
SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS DETERMINATION 5/83
- STEAM GENERATOR HOT TESTING 6/83

3.0 SEISMIC QUALIFICATION OF AFW

- LICENSEE HAS COMMITTED TO QUALIFY AFW SYSTEM AT NEXT REFUELING
 - AFWs CONTAINS 2 QUALIFIED MOTOR-DRIVEN TRAINS (100% CAPACITY EACH); 1 TURBINE-DRIVEN PUMP (NOT QUALIFIED & NOT NEEDED FOR SAFETY)

- CURRENT AFW SYSTEM LARGELY QUALIFIED EXCEPT FOR
 - CONDENSATE STORAGE TANK LEVEL INSTRUMENTATION
 - FLOW CONTROLS FOR AFW SYSTEM
 - VALVES

- REVIEW SCHEDULE

- LICENSEE SUBMITTAL	5/83
- STAFF SER	TBD

6

4.0 INADEQUATE CORE COOLING INSTRUMENTATION

- SHORT TERM RESOLUTION

- CERTIFICATION ITEMS

- IN-CORE THERMOCOUPLES - INSTALLED
 - EXTENDED T_H RANGE - INSTALLED
 - SATURATION METER - INSTALLED

- LONG TERM RESOLUTION

- ORDER FOR INSTALLATION OF SYSTEM ISSUED 12/10/82
 - LICENSEE RESPONDED ON 3/10/83
 - INVENTORY TRENDING SYSTEM TO BE INSTALLED AT
NEXT REFUELING

BACKUP

TMI-1 RESTART CERTIFICATION STATUS -ITEMS REMAINING
1. August 9, 1979 ORDER REQUIREMENTS

Attachment

March 31, 1983

Item	Description	Item Type	Licensee Status	NRC Inspection/Review Status	Estimated Completion/ Remarks
A. SHORT TERM					
<u>Order Item 1</u>	EFW Reliability				
1a-1	Auto Initiation of EFW	Mod	Complete	Complete	Test during power escalation testing (P
1a-3	Auto EFW Load on Diesels	Mod	Complete	Complete	Test during hot functional testing (H
1a-4	EFW Tech Specs	Tech Specs	Procedures Est. 4/83	NRR complete, Reg 1 partially completed	5/83
1a Additional Items	Reliability Analysis				
6	EFW Initiation Independent of AC	Mod	Rework in progress Est. 5/83	Region 1 partially complete	6/83 except PET
<u>Order Item 2</u>	IE Bulletins				
79-05A-5	Valve Position Review	Procedures	--	--	Valve lineup verification at time of HFT
79-05A-6	Containment Isolation	Mod	See Order Item 8 2.1.4	See Order Item 8 2.1.4	
79-05B-5	Anticipatory Reactor Trip (Safety Grade)	Mod	Complete	Complete	Test during PET
79-05B-7	Tech Spec Changes	Tech Spec	Procedures Est. 5/83	NRR Complete Region 1 to verify	6/83

<u>Item</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Item Type</u>	<u>Licensee Status</u>	<u>NRC Inspection/Review Status</u>	<u>Estimated Completion/ Remarks</u>
<u>Order Item 4</u>	Separation of TMI-1 & 2				
	B)Gaseous Radwaste -Leak Test of Waste System	Test	Complete	Region I Partially Complete	4/83 Region I review 01
<u>Order Item 6</u>	Managerial Capability				
	E)Inspectors Views -Resolve Insp. Findings in NUREG-0680	Inspection	Two of 163 items remain open. One item requires HFT. Est. 4/83 completion for remaining item.	Reg 1 Partially Complete	5/83, except HFT
<u>Order Item 8</u>	Lessons Learned - <u>Short Term</u>				
2.1.3B	Inadequate Core Cooling -Existing Instrumentation & Saturation Meter	Mod	Complete	Complete	Test during PET
2.1.4	Containment Isolation	Mod	Complete	Reg 1 Partially Complete	4/83
2.1.7b	EFW Flow Indication (Control Grade)	Mod	Complete	Complete	Licensee and Reg resolve 01, 5/83; test during PET

<u>Item</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Item Type</u>	<u>Licensee Status</u>	<u>NRC Inspection/Review Status</u>	<u>Estimated Completion/ Remarks</u>
2.1.8b	Radiation Monitors (Control Grade)	Mod			Licensee installing f monitors IAW II.F.1
	A) Hi Range Radiation Monitors		Complete except test	Region 1 Complete except test	5/83; resolve OIs
	B) Noble Gas Monitors		IWL Items Est. 5/83	Region 1 Partially complete	6/83; resolve OIs
	C) Radioiodine/Particulate Monitors		Complete except test	Region 1 Complete except test	5/83; resolve OIs

II. ASLB Imposed Requirements

<u>PID Item</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Licensee Status</u>	<u>NRC Inspection/Review Status</u>	<u>Estimated Completion/ Remarks</u>
<u>A. MANAGEMENT FINDINGS - AUGUST 27, 1981 PID</u>				
II.D	Accuracy of Maintenance Records	Committed	Complete	Completed 1/83 by Reg 1 Reg 1 report to Comm. Est 4/83
II.M	9. (a)-(g). Licensee Conditions for Shift Manning	Complete	NRR/DL issue License Cond. Reg 1 to verify	
<u>B. PLANT DESIGN, MODIFICATION AND PROCEDURES FINDINGS - DECEMBER 14, 1981 PID</u>				
II.E & F	Pressurizer Heaters Demonstrate RCS Pressure Control w/HPI (para. 755 & 772)	Complete	Complete	Test during PET
II.K	Computer -Incore Thermocouple Backup Display (Not safety grade) (para. 867)	Complete	NRR/DL issue License Cond., Reg 1 to verify	Before 5% power-HFT

<u>PID Item</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Licensee Status</u>	<u>NRC Inspection/Review Status</u>	<u>Estimated Completion/ Remarks</u>
II.N	Control Room Design -Correct NUREG-0752 Deficiencies (para. 914-915)	Complete	Reg 1 Partially Complete	Short-Term 4/83, LT Deficiencies 1st refue after restart (license condition)
II.O	Additional LOCA Analysis -Install HPI Cavitating Venturis (para. 943)	Complete	Complete	Test during HFT
II.Q	EFW Reliability A) EFW Cavitating Venturis	Complete	Complete	Test during HFT
II.S	Board Questions NUREG-0694 Items (para 1132) -I.G.1-Low Power Testing	Complete	NRR Complete Reg 1 to verify	Test during PET
II.T	Equipment Qualification - Staff review Flood Level Calculations (para. 1174)	Partially Complete	NRR/DL Par- tially Complete	4/83 Awaiting addition info. from licensee

PID Item	Description	Licensee Status	NRC Inspection/Review Status	Estimated Completion/ Remarks
<u>D. EMERGENCY PLANNING FINDINGS</u>				
IV.L Board Condi- tions	CONCLUSIONS Paragraph 2010			
	a. Emergency Support Director Staffing in EOF Prior to Full Emergency Support Organization Arrival (para. 2010(a)).*	Complete	Appeal Board has modified require- ment. Commission will review Appeal Board decision (CLI-83-7). Licensee will abide by Board finding pending resolution.	Pending Commission Action
	b. Staff Review County EP Brochures and PEMA EP Pamphlet and Advise Commission of Impact of Changes.	Complete	FEMA review complete staff-IE advise Commission.	5/83
	c. PEMA Pamphlet and County Brochure Distribution to Populace in EPZ.	Complete	FEMA confirmation due 4/83 IE review pending.	5/83
	d. Public Information Brochure Distribution to Transient Locations.	Complete	FEMA confirmation due 4/83-IE review pending.	5/83
	e. Licensee to Conduct EP Briefings to Major Employers and Operators of Transient Locations. Briefings to Begin Prior to Restart.	Complete	FEMA confirmation due 4/83-IE review pending.	5/83
	f. Staff Certify Satisfactory Com- pletion of Siren System Testing.	Complete	FEMA review complete IE review pending.	5/83
	h. Certify to Commission That EPZ School Plans are Complete.	N/A	FEMA confirmation due 4/83 staff-(IE) advise Commission.	5/83

<u>PID Item</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Licensee Status</u>	<u>NRC Inspection/Review Status</u>	<u>Estimated Completion/Remarks</u>
<u>E. REOPENED PROCEEDING ON CHEATING - JULY 27, 1982</u>				
V.	<u>Paragraph 2421</u>			
	2) Licensee Establish Criteria for Qualifications of Training Instructors	Partially Complete	NRR/LQB review in progress	5/83-Awaiting additional info. fm. licensee
	4) Licensee Implement a Procedure for Sampling and Review of Exam Answers to Detect Cheating. Review Process to be Approved by NRC.	Partially Complete	NRR/OLB review in progress	4/83-Awaiting additional info. fm. licensee
<u>III. APPEAL BOARD IMPOSED REQUIREMENTS</u>				
<u>A. ALAB 697/698 Appeal Board Decisions on Emergency Planning</u>				
	1. Commonwealth Agricultural Brochures to be Distributed to all Farmers in EPZ Prior to Restart (ALAB 697 at 34, 49)	N/A	FEMA confirmation due 4/83-IE Review pending.	5/83
	2. NRC Emergency Response Plans Modified and Distributed in Final Form to Commonwealth and Licensee (ALAB 698 at 48, 58)	N/A	N/A	The Commission has vacated this item (CLI-83-7), it will be deleted from future reports.

12/82

TRANSMITTAL TO: ☒

Document Control Desk, 016 Phillips

ADVANCED COPY TO: ☐

The Public Document Room

DATE:

4/18/83

cc: OPS File

FROM:

SECY OPS BRANCH

C&R (Natalie)

Attached are copies of a Commission meeting transcript(s) and related meeting document(s). They are being forwarded for entry on the Daily Accession List and placement in the Public Document Room. No other distribution is requested or required. Existing DCS identification numbers are listed on the individual documents wherever known.

Meeting Title: Dir of Steps to Decision in In-1
Restart Proceeding (open portion)

Meeting Date: 4/15/83 Open ☒ Closed ☐

DCS Copies
 (1 of each checked)

Item Description:

Item Description:	Copies Advanced To PDR	*	Original Document	May be Dup*	Duplicate Copy*
1. TRANSCRIPT (w/micrographs) When checked, DCS should send a copy of this transcript to the LPDR for: _____	1	*	1	—	—
2. _____	—	*	—	—	—
3. _____	—	*	—	—	—
4. _____	—	*	—	—	—

(PDR is advanced one copy of each document,
 two of each SECY paper.)

*Verify if in DCS, and
 Change to "PDR Available."