

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20556

ENCLOSURE

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO ACCUMULATOR PRESSURE AND LEVEL INSTRUMENTATION

RELAXATION OF REGULATORY GUIDE 1.97 ENVIRONMENTAL QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

SOUTHERN NUCLEAR OPERATING COMPANY, INC.

JOSEPH M. FARLEY NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-348 AND 50-364

1.0 INTPODUCTION

Section of the Generic Letter 82-33, Supplement 1 to NUREG-0737, "Require ints for Emergency Response Capability," requested licensees to provide a report on their implementation of Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.97, "Instrumentation for Light-Water-Cooled Nuclear Power Plants to Assess Plant and Environs Conditions During and Following an Acccident," (Revision 2), and methods for complying with the Commission's regulations, including a supporting technical justification of any proposed alternatives or deviations. A review of the licensee's submittals was performed by the staff and a Safety Evaluation (SE) was issued for each plant. Thes SEs concluded that the licensees either conformed to, or adequately justified deviations from, the guidance of RG 1.97 for each post-accident monitoring (PAM) variable except for the variables identified in the SE.

Exceptions were identified for the accumulator level and pressure monitoring. A large number of exceptions were requested to relax the equipment qualification (EQ) requirement from Category 2 to Category 3 to allow commercial grade instruments to be used in certain applications. However, none of the submittals requesting the exceptions provided sufficient justification for granting the exception. These requests were denied to the licensees and applicants whose RG 1.97 compliance SEs were issued by the staff before 1987. Since 1987, exceptions for the accumulator instrumentation were considered by the staff as an open item until a generic resolution could be found. Thirty-two plants requested relaxation of EQ requirements from Category 2 to Category 3 for the accumulator level and pressure instrumentation.

2.0 EVALUATION

Title 10 to the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), Section 50.49, requires licensees to establish a program for qualifying certain post-accident monitoring equipment for which specific guidance concerning the types of variables to be monitored is provided in Revision 2 of RG 1.97. This RG identifies the accumulator instrumentation as a Type D variable that provides

information to indicate the operation of individual safety systems and other systems important to safety that help the operator in selecting appropriate mitigating actions. The RG lists Category 2 qualification for this instrumentation. The Category 2 qualification criteria require the instrumentation to be qualified in accordance with RG 1.89, "Qualification of Class IE Equipment For Nuclear Power Plants," and the methodology described in NUREG-0588, "Interim Staff Position on Environmental Qualification of Safety-Related Electrical Equipment." Additionally, the instrumentation with Category 2 qualification should be energized from a high-reliab.lity power source, not necessarily standby power. In contrast to this, the Category 3 qualification criteria require only an off-site power source and the instrumentation to be only of high-quality commercial grade to withstand the specified service environment (mild environment as defined in 10 CFR 50.49, paragraph c).

Qualification criteria for instrumentation are established based on the safety function of the system whose variables are being monitored. The selection criteria for RG 1.97 variables qualification category is based upon whether monitoring of system parameters is needed during and following an accident and whether subsequent operator actions in the operating procedures are dependent on the information provided by this instrumentation.

The accumulators are pressure vessels filled with borated water and pressurized with nitrogen gas. Being a passive system, they provide a fast acting, high flow rate, cold leg injection during the injection phase of emergency cooling system operation. Both volume and pressure are monitored to assure the accumulator's function in accordance with the Final Safety Analysis Report safety analysis. During normal operation, the accumulator is isolated from the reactor coolant system (RCS) by two check valves in series. To prevent inadvertent closing, each accumulator's motor-operated isolation valve (MOV) is normally open with its power removed, and the status of the MOV is assured by the Technical Specification surveillance requirements. Should the RCS pressure decrease below accumulator pressure (as during a loss-of-coolant accident), the check valves open and the nitrogen gas pressure will force the borated water into the RCS. Thus, a mechanical operation of the swing-check valves is the only action required to open the injection path from the accumulator to the reactor core. No external power source or init, ting signal is needed for the accumulator to perform its safety function. The operator can or.y control the operation of the motor-operated valve which is used to isolate the accumulator from the RCS. Isolation from the RCS is not a safety function of the accumulator. Additionally, the accumulator is not designed to perform any post-accident safety function.

The above discussion establishes that the accumulator instrumentation does not perform a safety function during or in a post-accident environment and operator actions to mitigate the effects of an accident do not depend on the

- 2 -

information provided by the accumulator instrumentation. Additionally, successful performance of core cooling systems can be inferred from environmentally qualified instrumentation.

3.0 CONCLUSION

Based on our review, we conclude that the post-accident monitoring of the accumulator volume and pressure does not perform a safety function and no operator action is based on the information that will require Category 2 qualification of the instrumentation. In lieu of Category 2 qualification, Category 3 qualification of this instrumentation is acceptable.

Principal Contributor: I. Ahmed

Date: May 21, 1992