

July 16, 1991

R

Docket Nos. 50-488
and 50-499

MEMORANDUM FOR: Samuel J. Collins, Director
Division of Reactor Projects
Region IV

THRU: George F. Dick, Jr., Acting Director
Project Directorate IV-2
Division of Reactor Projects III, IV, and V
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation *GFJ*

FROM: George F. Dick, Jr., Senior Project Manager
Project Directorate IV-2
Division of Reactor Projects III, IV, and V
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: NRR SALP REPORT INPUT, SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT, UNITS 1 AND 2,
ASSESSMENT PERIOD, FEBRUARY 1, 1990 TO MAY 31, 1991

Enclosed is Project Directorate IV-2's input to the South Texas Project SALP report for the functional area of Safety Assessment/Quality Verification. This input was prepared taking into account the assessments received from the NRR technical review branches. The Project Manager, through participation in Quarterly Plant Progress Reviews and discussions with the Region IV staff, is cognizant of the writeup for the area of Plant Operations and Engineering/Technical Support and has no new, independent input to submit.

The information in the enclosure was previously provided informally to your staff.

Original Signed By

George F. Dick, Jr., Senior Project Manager
Project Directorate IV-2
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV/V
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

XA Enclosure:
Input to Salp
910725004B 910716
CF ADOCK 0300049B
CF

951013

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File	GDick
PDIV-2 R/F	EPeyton
PDIV-2 P/F	AHowell, R-IV
JPartlow	WBrach
BBoger	WRussell
MVirgilio	

NRC FILE CENTER COPY

OFC	: PDIV-2/LA	: PDIV-2(A)D	:	:	:
NAME	: EPeyton	: GDick	:	:	:
DATE	: 7/16/91	: 7/16/91	:	:	:

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY
Document Name: LTR. TO S. COLLINS

2000

9pp

B/4)

df

OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

INPUT FOR SALP REPORT

HOUSTON LIGHTING AND POWER COMPANY

SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT, UNITS 1 AND 2

Safety Assessment/Quality Verification

During this period there were 12 license amendments issued on Unit 1 and 11 on Unit 2. The licensee's submittal continued to show a clear understanding of the technical issues. Quality was almost always good. There were two instances where quality was below the normal (license amendment requests of November 15, 1990 and January 8, 1991). Both submittals were discussed with the licensee at the time of receipt by the staff. In response to the staff's requests for additional information, the licensee provided quick, timely, and accurate responses.

Staff review of the South Texas PRA continued. In 1990 there were two meetings at the site, two at headquarters, and a number of requests for information. Licensee preparation for the meetings as well as the responses to the staff's questions were thorough and indicated a significant amount of management interest and involvement.

Licensee responses to NRC Bulletins and Generic Letters continued to be technically complete and timely. Generic Letter 90-04 requested information about the implementation of Generic Safety Issues. In addition to the acceptability of the licensee's response, an inspection of the records showed them to be well organized and traceable.

Enclosure 2

SALP INPUT

FACILITY NAME: SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT ELECTRIC GENERATING STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2

SUMMARY OF REVIEW ACTIVITIES:

The review consists of evaluating the proposed deletion of the containment spray additive system and replacement it with the containment sump pH controlling system. The areas of review consist of iodine removal capability of the modified system and corrosion of stainless steel, aluminum and zinc in a modified environment.

ENGINEERING AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT:

The licensee provided a submittal with clearly stated objectives. The analysis supporting the proposed modifications was thorough and provided us with the information required to perform our review.

B/42

SALP INPUT

FACILITY NAME: South Texas Project, Unit 2

SUMMARY OF REVIEW ACTIVITIES

The staff has reviewed the licensee's request and has concluded that the extension can be granted because the method in RG 1.99, Rev. 2 precludes the use of one set of surveillance data to calculate the ART for the beltline materials. This position makes the availability of the surveillance data for the first capsule of Unit 2 insignificant to the status of the current P/T limits for the reactor coolant system for heatup, cooldown, leak test, and criticality through 32 EFPY. In addition, the report on the first capsule from a reactor vessel of a similar design (Unit 1) gives further indication that the safety consequences due to this extension will be minimal.

NARRATIVE DISCUSSION OF LICENSEE PERFORMANCE-FUNCTIONAL AREA

Based on licensee's previous submittals on pressure-temperature limits, the licensee has demonstrated its capability in calculating pressure-temperature limits.

AUTHOR: Simon Sheng, EMCB/DET
x-20708

B/43

SALP INPUT

FACILITY : South Texas Project Electric Generating Station,
Units 1 and 2

SUMMARY OF REVIEW ACTIVITIES

The review consisted of the evaluation of the proposed deletion of Technical Specification (TS) 3/4.6.2.2, "Spray Additive System". The licensee proposed to remove the spray additive tanks which are utilized to provide caustic (NaOH) for the containment spray system. Caustic is utilized to remove radioactive iodine from the containment atmosphere following a large break LOCA. The use of the caustic in the sprays minimizes the release of radiiodine to the environment resulting from containment leakage and thus, ensures that the offsite dose consequences are within the guidelines of 10 CFR 100.

A determination was made on the impact of the removal of the spray additive tanks on the Part 100 site boundary and exclusion area boundary doses. In addition, a determination was made as to the impact on the control room operators doses and whether these doses met the limits of GDC 19.

ENGINEERING AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT

The licensee provided a submittal with clearly stated objectives. The analysis supporting the amendment request contained most of the information required to perform the review. However, some information was contained in a prior submittal which was not referenced by the licensee but should have been.

B/44

Enclosure 2

SPLB SALP INPUT

Plant Name: South Texas Project Electric Generating Station
SER Subject: Auxiliary Feedwater Storage Tank Volume Reduction
TAC Nos.: M81552 and 81553

Summary of Review/Inspection Activities

Plant Systems Branch reviewed the Licensee's Technical Specification change request for a reduction in the minimum volume requirement for the auxiliary feedwater storage tank (AFST). The change was discussed with licensee personnel during a site visit. SPLB found that the volume reduction in the AFST was acceptable based on the guidelines of SRP Section 10.4.9.

Narrative Discussion of Licensee Performance - Functional Area

The submittal contained all the necessary information but was unclear. A discussion with the licensee helped to clarify the submittal. The licensee understood and addressed the requirements for an Auxiliary Feedwater source.

Author: A. Dummer

Date: December 18, 1991

B/45

ENCLOSURE 2

SYSTEMATIC ASSESSMENT OF LICENSEE PERFORMANCE

FACILITY NAME South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2

SUMMARY OF REVIEW

The SER involved a Technical Specification Bases change to the method of determining the end of cycle life moderator temperature coefficient and 300-ppm boron surveillance requirements limits specified in the Core Operating Limits Report. The review was conducted by the Reactor Systems Branch, DST/NRR. Based on its review, the staff concludes that the proposed Technical Specification Bases change is acceptable.

NARRATIVE DISCUSSION OF LICENSEE PERFORMANCE - SAFETY ASSESSMENT/QUALITY VERIFICATION

The SER involved a review of the technical analysis provided by the licensee to support the proposed Technical Specification Bases change. The licensee addressed all aspects of the issues without NRC prompting. A request for supporting documentation was fulfilled in a timely manner. This achievement indicated good interdepartmental communications, a technically qualified staff, and responsiveness to NRC issues.

AUTHOR: A. Attard
DATE: 1/ /92

B/46

ENCLOSURE 2

SYSTEMATIC ASSESSMENT OF LICENSEE PERFORMANCE

FACILITY NAME South Texas Project Units 1 & 2

SUMMARY OF REVIEW

The SER involved a review of proposed Technical Specification changes that reflect the revision of the criticality analyses and the rack utilization schemes for the spent fuel storage racks. This review was conducted by the Reactor Systems Branch/DST/NRR. The review was performed during May and June 1992. Based on its review, the staff concludes that the proposed Technical Specification changes are acceptable. Associated changes to the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report were also reviewed and approved.

NARRATIVE DISCUSSION OF LICENSEE PERFORMANCE - SAFETY ASSESSMENT/
QUALITY VERIFICATION

The licensee addressed all aspects of the issues in this relatively complex action and was prompt in responding to several phone calls with the NRC. Based on these conversations, supplementary information was submitted in a timely and adequate fashion. This achievement indicated good interdepartmental communications, a technically qualified staff, and responsiveness to NRC issues.

AUTHOR: L. Kopp
DATE: 7/6/92

B/47



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

SALP Input - Technical Specification Change to
Toxic Gas Monitoring System - STP 1&2

9/29/92

ENCLOSURE 2

SYSTEMATIC ASSESSMENT OF LICENSEE PERFORMANCE

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CHANGE REQUEST

TOXIC GAS MONITORING SYSTEM

HOUSTON LIGHTING & POWER COMPANY

SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT ELECTRIC GENERATING STATION UNITS 1 AND 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-498, 50-499

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated June 2, 1992, Houston Lighting & Power Company (HL&P) proposed to amend Operating License NPF-76 and NPF-80, of South Texas Project Generating Station (STPGS) Units 1 & 2 by incorporating proposed revised change to Technical Specification 3.3.3.7 and 4.3.3.7 regarding the Toxic Gas Monitoring System.

2.0 EVALUATION

We concluded from review of this submittal that additional information was required in order to complete our evaluation. On August 13, 1992 the licensee submitted by FAX this additional information. The licensee's response to our request for additional information was timely and complete.

B/48