

JUL 24 1984

Docket Nos. 50-373/374

Mr. Dennis L. Farrar
Director of Nuclear Licensing
Commonwealth Edison Company
Post Office Box 767
Chicago, Illinois 60690

Dear Mr. Farrar:

Subject: Request for Additional Information Regarding TMI Action
Plan Item II.D.1

Commonwealth Edison Company has been participating in the BWR Owners Group in responding to NUREG-0737, Item II.D.1. A final report, NEDE-24988-P, "Analysis of Generic BWR Safety 1 Relief Valve Operability Tests Results," has been issued and submitted by the BWR Owners Group to the NRC for review.

Before the NRC staff can complete its review II.D.1 for La Salle County Station, Units 1 and 2, the applicability of the generic test results for the specific Safety/Relief Valves employed at La Salle must be justified. The staff concerns arising from the review of report NEDE-24988-P are enclosed and must be addressed on a plant specific basis and generally indicate the issues that should be addressed in the justification. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact A. Bournia, Project Manager.

Sincerely,

A. Schwencer, Chief
Licensing Branch No. 2
Division of Licensing

Enclosure: As stated

cc: See next page

DL:LB#2/PM
ABournia:bdm
7/24/84

DL:LB#2/BC
ASchwencer
7/24/84

Distribution:

Docket File
LB#2 Reading
A. Bournia
E. Hylton/P. Shuttleworth
NRC PDR
Local PDR
PRC System
NSIC
Woodhead, OELD
ACRS (16)
E. Jordan
N. Grace
Region III, RA

8408010107 840724
PDR ADOCK 05000373
P PDR



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

JUL 24 1984

Docket Nos. 50-373/374

Mr. Dennis L. Farrar
Director of Nuclear Licensing
Commonwealth Edison Company
Post Office Box 767
Chicago, Illinois 60690

Dear Mr. Farrar:

Subject: Request for Additional Information Regarding TMI Action
Plan Item II.D.1

Commonwealth Edison Company has been participating in the BWR Owners Group in responding to NUREG-0737, Item II.D.1. A final report, NEDE-24988-P, "Analysis of Generic BWR Safety 1 Relief Valve Operability Tests Results," has been issued and submitted by the BWR Owners Group to the NRC for review.

Before the NRC staff can complete its review II.D.1 for La Salle County Station, Units 1 and 2, the applicability of the generic test results for the specific Safety/Relief Valves employed at La Salle must be justified. The staff concerns arising from the review of report NEDE-24988-P are enclosed and must be addressed on a plant specific basis and generally indicate the issues that should be addressed in the justification. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact A. Bournia, Project Manager.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "A. Schwencer".

A. Schwencer, Chief
Licensing Branch No. 2
Division of Licensing

Enclosure: As stated

cc: See next page

La Salle

Mr. Dennis L. Farrar
Director of Nuclear Licensing
Commonwealth Edison Company
P. O. Box 767
Chicago, Illinois 60690

cc: Philip P. Steptoe, Esquire
Suite 4200
One First National Plaza
Chicago, Illinois 60603

Dean Hansell, Esquire
Assistant Attorney General
188 West Randolph Street
Suite 2315
Chicago, Illinois 60601

William G. Guldemon, Resident Inspector
LaSalle NPS, U.S.N.R.C.
P. O. Box 224
Marseilles, Illinois 61364

Request for Additional Information for LaSalle 1 and 2

TMI Action Item II.D.1

What is the basis for application of the test results presented in the final BWR Owners Group report on safety/relief valve testing to your plant? This basis should be described thoroughly, as indicated below.

1. The BWR/GE test program utilized a "rams head" discharge pipe configuration. Most plants utilize a "tee" quencher configuration at the end of the discharge line. Describe the discharge pipe configuration used at your plant and compare the anticipated loads in this configuration to the measured loads in the test program. Discuss the impact of any differences in loads on valve operability.
2. The test configuration utilized no spring hangers as pipe supports. Plant specific configurations do use spring hangers in conjunction with snubber and rigid supports. Describe the safety relief valve pipe supports used at your plant and compare the anticipated loads on valve internals for the plant pipe supports to the measured loads in the test program. Describe the impact of any differences in loads on valve operability.
3. Report NEDE-24988-P did not identify any valve functional deficiencies or anomalies encountered during the test program. Describe the impact of valve safety function of any valve functional deficiencies or anomalies encountered during the program.
4. The purpose of the test program was to determine valve performance under conditions anticipated to be encountered in the plants. Describe the events and anticipated conditions at your plant for which the valves are required to operate and compare these plant conditions to the conditions in the test program. Describe the plant features assumed in the event evaluations used to scope the test program and compare them to plant features at your plant. For example, describe high level trips to prevent water from entering the steam lines under high pressure operating conditions as assumed in the test event and compare them to trips used at your plant.
5. The valves are likely to be extensively cycled in a controlled depressurization mode in a plant specific application. Was this mode simulated in the test program? What is the effect of this valve cycling on valve performance and probability of the valve to fail open or to fail close?
6. Describe how the values of valve C_v' in report NEDE-24988-P will be used at your plant. Show that the methodology used in the test program to determine the valve C_v is consistent with your application.