LOCS

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

MAY 14 1987

MEMORANDUM FOR: William F. Kane, Director
Division of Reactor Projects, RI

William V. Johnston, Acting Director
Division of Reactor Safety, RI

FROM: Carl H. Berlinger, Chief
Generic Communications Branch
Division of Operational Events Assessment
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: STATUS OF IEB 85-03 REVIEW FOR REGION I PLANTS

Section 05.01 of IE Manual Temporary Instruction 2515/73, "Inspection Requirements for IE Bulletin 85-03, 'Motor-Operated Valve Common Mode Failures During Plant Transients Due to Improper Switch Settings,'" requires that a semiannual status report be issued on the review activities associated with IEB 85-03. Enclosure 1 provides the status of plants in Region I as of May 1, 1987, listing the most recent utility response and NRC correspondence. Enclosure 2 provides definitions of the terms used to describe the status. Enclosure 3 provides additional notes and a listing of relevant correspondence beyond that indicated in Enclosure 1.

Not specifically mentioned in the enclosures is the fact that our contractor has completed their review of the General Electric and Westinghouse Owners' Group reports. In both instances there were points which needed additional clarification. Copies of Edward L. Jordan's January 30, 1987 letters to the two owners' groups were forwarded to you when they were issued. You will be kept advised of our actions with respect to our review of their responses as they b :ome available.

The first utility's response reviewed was for the Callaway plant. It is our understanding that a number of other utilities plan on referencing the valve program (developed by MOVATS) in their individual programs. Our contractor has recently completed his review of the Callaway revised response to the bulletin. Unfortunately, several minor points still remain to be resolved and have resulted in a second request for additional information. You will be advised when we have completed our review and have accepted their program.

CONTACT: Richard J. Kiessel, NRR
49-29605

IDR-11A

XA 8/6/96

D11

I would also like to remind you that TI 2515/73 requested that you send copies of all inspection reports pertaining to IEB 85-03 to Robert L. Baer. Because of the reorganization, it is requested that these inspection reports now be sent to me.

To assist you in determining if I have received all of the applicable inspection reports, Enclosure 4 identifies all of the inspection reports which we have received to date. Please forward copies of any inspection reports which we have not previously received.

Carl H. Berlinger, Chief
Generic Communications Branch
Division of Operational Events Assessment
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:
1. Status of IEB 85-03 for Region I Plants, Summary by Plant Name as of May 1, 1987
2. Definition of Status Terms
3. Status of IEB 85-03 for Region I Plants, Summary of Comments as of May 1, 1987
4. Inspection Report Status of IEB 85-03 for Region I, Summary of Inspection Report Comments as of May 1, 1987

Distribution
RStarostecki, NRR
CERossi, NRR
CHBerlinger, NRR
RJKiessel, NRR
TKoshy, RI
RJSummers, RI
RClayton, EDO
DCS
DOEA Reading File
OGCB Reading File
RJKiessel Reading File

OGCB:DOEA
RJKiessel
5/13/87

C:OGCB:DOEA
CHBerlinger
5/13/87

Enclosure 1

REVIEW STATUS OF IEB 85-03 FOR REGION 1
SUMMARY BY PLANT NAME
AS OF
MAY 1, 1987

PLANT NAME	STATUS	UTILITY REPLY	GOB MEMO TO REGION	REGION LETTER TO UTILITY
BEAVER VALLEY 1	UNDER REVIEW W/O PROGRAM	05/16/86	/ /	/ /
BEAVER VALLEY 2	UNDER REVIEW	08/13/86	/ /	/ /
CALVERT CLIFFS 1	UNDER REVIEW W/O PROGRAM	05/15/86	/ /	/ /
CALVERT CLIFFS 2	UNDER REVIEW W/O PROGRAM	05/15/86	/ /	/ /
FITZPATRICK	UNDER REVIEW	10/01/86	/ /	/ /
GINNA	UNDER REVIEW	05/14/86	/ /	/ /
HADDAM NECK	UNDER REVIEW	06/11/86	/ /	/ /
HOPE CREEK 1	UNDER REVIEW	05/27/86	/ /	/ /
INDIAN POINT 2	UNDER REVIEW	08/14/86	/ /	/ /
INDIAN POINT 3	UNDER REVIEW	05/13/86	/ /	/ /
LIMERICK 1	UNDER REVIEW	10/02/86	/ /	/ /
LIMERICK 2	UNDER REVIEW	10/02/86	/ /	/ /
MAINE YANKEE	UNDER REVIEW	12/22/86	/ /	/ /
MILLSTONE 1	UNDER REVIEW	06/11/86	/ /	/ /
MILLSTONE 2	UNDER REVIEW	06/11/86	/ /	/ /
MILLSTONE 3	UNDER REVIEW	06/11/86	/ /	/ /
NINE MILE POINT 1	UNDER REVIEW	09/18/86	/ /	/ /
NINE MILE POINT 2	UNDER REVIEW	02/18/87	/ /	/ /
PEACH BOTTOM 2	UNDER REVIEW	10/02/86	/ /	/ /
PEACH BOTTOM 3	UNDER REVIEW	10/02/86	/ /	/ /
PILGRIM 1	UNDER REVIEW	12/31/86	/ /	/ /
SALEM 1	UNDER REVIEW	05/27/86	/ /	/ /
SALEM 2	UNDER REVIEW	05/27/86	/ /	/ /
SEABROOK 1	UNDER REVIEW	05/15/86	/ /	/ /
SEABROOK 2	UNDER REVIEW	05/15/86	/ /	/ /
SHOREHAM	UNDER REVIEW	10/08/86	/ /	/ /
SUSQUEHANNA 1	UNDER REVIEW	10/09/86	/ /	/ /
SUSQUEHANNA 2	UNDER REVIEW	10/09/86	/ /	/ /
TMI 1	UNDER REVIEW	05/27/86	/ /	/ /
TMI 2	EXTENSION, OPEN ENDED	05/15/86	/ /	/ /
VERMONT YANKEE	UNDER REVIEW W/O PROGRAM	05/14/86	/ /	/ /
YANKEE-ROWE	UNDER REVIEW - UNIQUE	05/14/86	/ /	/ /

Enclosure 2

DEFINITIONS OF STATUS TERMS

Extension, Open Ended - The licensee has responded requesting an extension without specifying a date. The facilities in this category are those whose construction has been delayed.

No Response - No response has been received from the licensee. The facilities in this category have licenses, but are in a long term shut down.

RAI Letter Sent - The region has forwarded a request for additional information to the licensee. The date of the letter is listed in the column headed "Region Letter to Utility." The letter is based on an NRR memorandum to the region listed in the column headed "GCB Memo to Region." The memorandum is based on our contractor's review of the licensee's response listed in the column headed "Utility Reply."

Second RAI Memo Sent - The GCB had forwarded to the region a second memorandum requesting additional information. The date of the memorandum is listed in the column headed "GCB Memo to Region." The memorandum is based on our contractor's review of the licensee's response listed in the column headed "Utility Reply." The response is in reply to our original request for additional information which is identified in enclosure 3.

Under Review - The licensee's response is currently under review by our contractor. The date of the licensee's response is listed in the column headed "Utility Reply."

Under Review w/o Program - The licensee's response is currently under review by our contractor. However, the licensee's description of the program to assure valve operability may lack all of the requested information. Enclosure 3 identifies the information missing and the reason for proceeding with the review. The date of the licensee's response is listed in the column headed "Utility Reply."

Under Review - Unique - The licensee's response is currently under review by our contractor. However, because the licensee has sited an unusual condition at his facility, a special review is required. The unique condition is identified in enclosure 3. The date of the licensee's response is listed in the column headed "Utility Reply."

Enclosure 3

REVIEW STATUS OF IEB 85-03 FOR REGION 1
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON ADDITIONAL ITEMS
AS OF
MAY 1, 1987

PLANT NAME	COMMENTS
BEAVER VALLEY 1	5/16/86 reply had little program description.
	8/1/86 memo sent indicating little program description.
	1/14/87 telcon with LETripp (Region I) indicated that the region s letter had not been sent. Because the formal review is underway, it was agreed to not send the letter and to rely on the formal review for all comments.
BEAVER VALLEY 2	5/13/86 reply requested W0G extension.
	6/12/86 letter approved W0G extension request.
CALVERT CLIFFS 1	8/1/86 memo sent indicating that no reply could be found in headquarters prompted the region to forward their copy.
	5/15/86 reply had no progran description.
	9/18/86 memo sent indicating no program description.
	1/14/87 telcon with LETripp (Region I) indicated that the region s letter had not been sent. because the formal review is underway, it was agreed to not send the letter and to rely on the formal review for all comments.
FITZPATRICK	5/14/86 reply had no program description.
	6/24/86 memo sent indicating no program description.
	7/29/86 letter sent indicating no program description.
	9/4/86 reply requested BWROG extension.
GINNA	4/14/87 reply forwarded requested P&IDs.
HADDAM NECK	10/28/86 reply did not address the bulletin for Haddam Neck.
INDIAN POINT 2	5/13/86 reply requested W0G extension.
INDIAN POINT 3	8/1/86 memo sent indicating no response could be found in headquarters prompted the region to forward their copy.
LIMERICK 1	6/2/86 reply requested BWROG extension (Limerick 1, only).
	7/29/86 reply confirmed meeting BWROG extension submittal date.

REVIEW STATUS OF IEB 85-03 FOR REGION I
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON ADDITIONAL ITEMS
AS OF
MAY 1, 1987

PLANT NAME	COMMENTS
LIMERICK 2	5/14/86 reply requested BWROG extension (Limerick 2, only)
MAINE YANKEE	5/21/86 reply requested two week extension.
	6/4/86 reply had little program description.
	6/24/86 memo sent indicating little program description.
	10/16/86 reply requested an extension to 12/1/86.
MILLSTONE 1	10/28/86 reply did not address the bulletin at Milstone Unit 1.
MILLSTONE 2	10/28/86 reply did not address the bulletin for Millstone Unit 2.
MILLSTONE 3	10/28/86 reply revised 6/11/86 reply.
NINE MILE POINT 1	5/16/86 reply indicated that the highest pressure system is not safety-related. However, they did not consider other, lower pressure, safety-related systems.
	Telcons with them indicated that they had a lower pressure safety-related system which they were willing to include in the program.
	6/18/86 memo sent indicating that the 5/16/86 reply is not acceptable.
	7/9/86 letter sent indicating that the 5/16/86 reply is not acceptable.
NINE MILE POINT 2	8/1/86 memo sent indicating that no reply could be found in headquarters prompted the region to forward their copy.
PEACH BOTTOM 2	6/2/86 reply requested BWROG extension.
	7/29/86 reply confirmed meeting BWROG extension submittal dates.
	11/3/86 reply revised and updated 10/2/86 reply.
PILGRIM 1	5/9/86 reply requested BWROG extension.
SEABROOK 1	8/1/86 memo sent indicating that no reply could be found in headquarters prompted the region to forward their copy.
SHOREHAM	5/14/86 reply requested BWROG extension.
SUSQUEHANNA 1	5/5/86 reply had little program description.
	6/24/86 memo indicated little program description.
	7/8/86 letter indicated little program description.

REVIEW STATUS OF IEB 85-03 FOR REGION I
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON ADDITIONAL ITEMS
AS OF
MAY 1, 1987

PLANT NAME	COMMENTS
TMI 1	9/15/86 reply contains results of MOVATS testing.
VERMONT YANKEE	2/27/87 reply indicated delay in fully implementing MOV procedures. 8/1/86 memo sent indicating that no response could be found in headquarters prompted the region to forward their copy. 5/14/85 reply had little program description. 9/18/86 memo sent indicating little program description. 11/12/86 telcon with WJRaymond (SRI @ Vermont Yankee) agreed that because of the delay in getting the region's letter out, the marginal nature of the deficiencies, and the nearness of the formal review, no formal letter would be sent. We will rely on the formal review for all comments.
YANKEE-ROWE	5/14/86 reply indicates that the required valves are locked in their proper position.

Enclosure 4

INSPECTION REPORT STATUS OF IEB 85-03 FOR REGION 1
SUMMARY OF INSPECTION REPORT COMMENTS
AS OF
MAY 1, 1987

PLANT NAME	COMMENT
BEAVER VALLEY 2	IR 86-06 (3/1-31/86) indicated the licensee's intent to use MOVATS equipment in their testing program.
CALVERT CLIFFS 1	IR 85-34 (12/11/85 - 1/20/86), a regional inspection report, described bulletin activities in relationship to the licensee's post maintenance testing program.
CALVERT CLIFFS 2	IR 85-34 (12/11/85 - 1/20/86), a regional inspection report, described bulletin activities in relationship to the licensee's post maintenance testing program.
HADDAM NECK	IR 86-24 (6/15 - 9/30/86) reported timely submittal of the licensee's reply to the bulletin.
HOPE CREEK 1	IR 86-06 (1/13 - 2/9/86), a team inspection report, reviewed correspondence from Bechtel indicating that the initial response will be on time.
MILLSTONE 1	IR 86-17 (8/18 - 9/29/86) reported timely submittal of the licensee's reply to the bulletin.
MILLSTONE 2	IR 86-19 (8/18 - 9/29/86) reported timely submittal of the licensee's reply to the bulletin.
MILLSTONE 3	IR 86-26 (8/12 - 10/6/86), a team inspection report, reported a timely submittal of the licensee's reply to the bulletin. IR 86-33 (10/7 - 11/17/86) described the licensee's submittals.
SHOREHAM	IR 85-42 (11/1-30/86) identified the bulletin as an open item.
SUSQUEHANNA 1	IR 86-11 (5/28 - 7/15/86) did not address the bulletin for Susquenanna unit 1.
SUSQUEHANNA 2	IR 86-11 (5/28 - 7/15/86) described the licensee's activities with respect to the failure of the RCIC pump discharge valve.
VERMONT YANKEE	IR 86-25 (11/4 - 12/31/86) describes timely response to the bulletin.