

NORTHEAST UTILITIES



THE CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY
WESTERN MASSACHUSETTS ELECTRIC COMPANY
WATERBURY WATER POWER COMPANY
NORTHEAST UTILITIES SERVICE COMPANY
NORTHEAST NUCLEAR ENERGY COMPANY

General Offices • Selden Street, Berlin, Connecticut

P.O. BOX 270
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06141-0270
(203) 661-5000

March 31, 1992

Docket No. 50-423

B14090

Re: Inspection Report
50-423/91-07

Mr. T. T. Martin
Regional Administrator, Region I
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, PA 19406

- References: 1. J. P. Durr letter to E. J. Mroccka, NRC Inspection Report No. 50-423/91-07, dated May 15, 1991.
2. E. J. Mroccka letter to T. T. Martin, Response to IE Bulletin 88-04, Inspection Report 50-423/91-07, dated June 14, 1991.

Dear Mr. Martin:

Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3
Status of Unresolved Items 50-423/91-07-01 and 91-07-02

In a letter dated May 15, 1991 (Reference 1), the NRC transmitted the results of the Safety Issues Inspection conducted at Millstone Unit No. 3 on April 1-5, 1991. This inspection was directed at Northeast Nuclear Energy Company's (NNECO) activities related to the issues discussed in NRC Bulletin 88-04, "Potential Safety-Related Pump Loss." In the Inspection Report, the NRC Staff identified two unresolved items: 1) NNECO did not adequately document its evaluation of pump operation in minimum flow during a postulated accident scenario (50-423/91-07-01), and 2) Technical calculations or test results to support NNECO's determination that the residual heat removal (RHR) pumps are not susceptible to deadheading during parallel minimum flow operation was not available (50-423/91-07-02).

In a letter dated June 14, 1991 (Reference 2), NNECO stated that unresolved item 91-07-01 was expected to be completed by December 31, 1991, and unresolved item 91-07-02 was expected to be completed by May 31, 1991. The purpose of this letter is to provide a status of NNECO's commitments related to these unresolved items.

As committed, an evaluation was performed for the Millstone Unit No. 3 RHR pumps concerning unresolved item 91-07-02 and concluded that the RHR pumps are not susceptible to deadheading during parallel minimum flow operation. The supporting documentation is retained in the plant records.

060087

9204060381 920331
PDR ADDOCK 05000423
Q PDR

JE37

Mr. T. T. Martin
B14090/Page 2
March 31, 1992


With regard to unresolved item 91-07-01, Reference 1 stated that NNECO will be contacting various pump vendors to seek information to resolve the issue related to the adequacy of the minimum flow recirculation lines for the charging, safety injection, RHR and auxiliary feedwater pumps and the effort would be completed by December 31, 1991. On December 5, 1991, NNECO requested and received an extension from the NRC to complete this item by March 31, 1992. However, based on the progress made by various pump vendors, we expect to complete this item by the end of June 1992. Attachment 1 provides the present status of safety-related pump evaluation required per unresolved item 91-07-01.

Please feel free to contact us if any questions arise on this matter or if additional clarification is required.

Very truly yours,

NORTHEAST NUCLEAR ENERGY COMPANY

FOR: J. F. Opeka
Executive Vice President

BY: 
E. A. DeBarba
Vice President

cc: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Attn: Document Control Desk
Washington, DC 20555

V. L. Rooney, NRC Project Manager, Millstone Unit No. 1
W. J. Raymond, Senior Resident Inspector, Millstone Unit Nos. 1, 2, and 3
J. P. Durr, Chief, Engineering Branch, Division of Reactor Safety, Region 1

Docket No. 50-423
814090

Attachment 1

Millstone Unit No. 3

Status of Unresolved Item 91-07-01

March 1992

Mr. T. T. Martin
B14090/Page 1
March 31, 1992

Millstone Unit No. 3
Status of Unresolved Item 91-07-01

Pump Mtg.	No. of Pumps	Description	Status
Dresser-Pacific	3 2	Charging (CHS) Pumps Safety injection (SIH) pumps	<p>Dresser-Pacific has provided guidelines for continuous and short term minimum flow operation. They are not aware of any problems with these pumps when operated within the recommended guidelines. Dresser-Pacific recommended that any vibration testing used for trending should be done at the highest possible flow rate. This test data should be reviewed periodically to ensure that the pumps are operating within the acceptance range.</p> <p>A review of the Plant operating procedure has shown that the manufacturer's recommended guidelines are being followed to the maximum extent possible. Vibration testing is done quarterly at minimum recirculation flow rather than at pump full flow rate. Full flow testing can only be done during the refueling outage. The CHS pumps meet the minimum flow recommendations. The SIH pumps are 1 gpm less than the recommended flow rate of 45 gpm for short-term operation. However, the operation frequency (quarterly) is far less than the manufacturer's limits (10 hrs./month).</p>

Mr. T. T. Martin
B14090/Page 2
March 31, 1992

Pump Mtg.	No. of Pumps	Description	Status
Ingersol Rand	2	Residual Heat Removal (RHS) pumps	Ingersol-Rand has been requested to provide engineering services to address the questions raised in the inspection report. They have informed NNECO that their engineering evaluation cannot be completed by March 31, 1992. Their evaluation is expected to be completed by the end of May 1992.
Sulzer-Bingham	3	Auxiliary Feedwater System (AFW) pumps (Turbine and Motor Drive)	Sulzer-Bingham has been requested to provide engineering services to address the questions raised in the inspection report. They have informed NNECO that their engineering evaluation cannot be completed by March 31, 1992. Their evaluation is expected to be completed by the end of May 1992.