

50-312

Rand's Doc

JUSTIFICATION FOR INTERIM OPERATION

- 1) FRC indicated that continued reactor operation is acceptable if the justifications for interim operation provided in ~~the~~ SMUD's November 1980 and January 1981 submittals is applicable to the deficiencies identified in our May 1981 SER.

In a conversation with the licensee on 1-27-82, the licensee informed me that the justifications given on their November 1980 and January 1981 submittals are presently applicable to the deficiencies identified in our May 1981 SER.

Thus, continued reactor operation is acceptable.

In 2 Padua

1/27/82

EQUIPMENT ENVIRONMENTAL QUALIFICATION (EEQ)  
Review of Licensees' Resolution of Outstanding Issues  
From NRC Equipment Environmental Qualification  
Safety Evaluation Reports

SUMMARY OF REVIEW  
OF LICENSEE 90-DAY RESPONSE

Utility: Sacramento Municipal Utility District  
Plant Name: Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station  
NRC Docket No. 50-312  
NRC TAC No. 42507  
NRC Contract No. NRC-03-79-118  
FRC Project No. C5257  
FRC Assignment No. 13  
FRC Task No. 486

References:

1. W. C. Walbridge  
Letter to J. F. Stolz, NRC. Subject: Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating  
Station Unit No. 1 - Response to 5/29/81 letter on EEQ  
Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 08-Sep-81
2. Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation  
Safety Evaluation Report for Rancho Seco Unit 1  
Environmental Qualification of Safety-Related  
Electrical Equipment  
NRC, 29-May-81
3. Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station, IE Bulletin 79-01B Response  
Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 03-Nov-80  
12
4. J. J. Mattimoe  
Letter to D. G. Eisenhut, NRC. Subject: Amendment 1 to the  
Submittal of October 31, 1980 on IE Bulletin 79-01B  
Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 13-Jan-81

The Licensee has submitted technical information in Reference 1 in response to the NRC SER [2] on environmental qualification. FRC has reviewed these documents [1, 2]. As a result of this review, FRC concludes that the Licensee has not addressed the subject of continued operation in the 90-day response to the SER; however, in previous submittals [3, 4], the Licensee identified unqualified equipment and provided a technically sound rationale as a basis for justification for continued plant operation and provided a technically sound rationale or other additional information which in FRC's judgment provides a basis for justification for continued operation; with the following exceptions:

<u>Equipment Item</u>	<u>Equipment Description/ Function</u>	<u>SCEW Sheet No.</u>	<u>Status Code</u>	<u>Basis for Deficiency</u>
None				

The Licensee's submittal in response to the SER did address the deficiencies identified in the SER but was deficient in providing justification for interim operation. Although no reference was made to the previous submittals [3, 4], FRC reviewed the justifications for interim operation that were provided in the November 1980 [3] and January 1981 [4] submittals and determined that adequate rationale for continued operation was provided. The Licensee should verify that the justifications for interim operation contained in References 3 and 4 are presently applicable to the deficiencies identified in the SER [2].

The Licensee has submitted technical information in Reference 1 in response to the NRC SER [2] on environmental qualification. FRC has reviewed these documents [1, 2]. As a result of this review, FRC concludes that the Licensee has not addressed the subject of continued operation in the 90-day response to the SER; however, in previous submittals [3, 4], the Licensee identified unqualified equipment and provided a technically sound rationale as a basis for justification for continued plant operation and provided a technically sound rationale or other additional information which in FRC's judgment provides a basis for justification for continued operation; with the following exceptions:

<u>Equipment Item</u>	<u>Equipment Description/ Function</u>	<u>SCEW Sheet No.</u>	<u>Status Code</u>	<u>Basis for Deficiency</u>
None				

The Licensee's submittal in response to the SER did address the deficiencies identified in the SER but was deficient in providing justification for interim operation. Although no reference was made to the previous submittals [3, 4], FRC reviewed the justifications for interim operation that were provided in the November 1980 [3] and January 1981 [4] submittals and determined that adequate rationale for continued operation was provided. The Licensee should verify that the justifications for interim operation contained in References 3 and 4 are presently applicable to the deficiencies identified in the SER [2].

50-333  
I PLANT: JAMES A. FITZPATRICK

II PM: PAUL POLK

II. ARE REFERENCES CORRECT?

A. ☒ YES

B. ☐ NO — IF NO, INDICATE  
CORRECT REFERENCE(S)

III. HAS LICENSEE PROVIDED ADEQUATE  
JUSTIFICATION FOR CONTINUED OPERATION?

A. ☐ YES

B. ☒ NO — IF NO, CAN YOU STATE THAT  
THERE IS NO REASON TO  
DISAGREE WITH THE FRC  
CONCLUSION

1. ☒ YES

2. ☐ NO



I PLANT: COOPER

50-298

II PM: SIGBET

II. ARE REFERENCES CORRECT?

A. ☒ YES

B. ☐ NO — IF NO, INDICATE  
CORRECT REFERENCE(S)

III. HAS LICENSEE PROVIDED ADEQUATE  
JUSTIFICATION FOR CONTINUED OPERATION?

A. ☐ YES

B. ☒ NO — IF NO, CAN YOU STATE THAT  
THERE IS NO REASON TO  
DISAGREE WITH THE FRC  
CONCLUSION

1. ☒ YES

2. ☐ NO

Subject: Equipment Qualification Tom Novak's  
letter 1-26-82 NSP Prairie  
Island unit 1 + 2

As per your request an assessment was  
made of conclusions reached by FRC on  
the review of E Q for the Prairie Island  
1 + 2 ~~unit~~ submitted by letter 8-26-81.  
FRC indicated that ~~the~~ justification  
for interim operation had some exception.  
~~Based~~ Based on my review, ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> license  
submitted has provided adequate rationale  
as a basis for justification for interim  
operation.

The basis for this determination is as  
follows:

FRC indicated that signal converters

(2)

for main & auxiliary steam dump valves  
and DC Distribution Panels 153, 163, 253  
263. ~~It~~ were not justified for interim  
operation. For these items justification  
is not required since the items are not  
required ~~for~~ to bring the units to cold  
shutdown. In addition the license is  
replacing the distribution panels with  
units that are governmental qualified  
~~are~~ because they would be needed to  
service certain monitoring equipment <sup>that</sup> ~~that~~  
would be used ~~after~~ for long term monitoring  
after the plant has been brought down  
to cold shutdown. In the case for unit 1  
they are installed & operational in  
case of unit 2 they are also installed



(3)

but will be connected during the next  
refueling cycle..

77

On this basis the licensee has provide  
adequate justification on the E Q matter  
for continued operation.

DC Di Lanni

PM

ENCLOSURE 2