Mr. Michael B. Sellman, President Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company 329 Bath Road Brunswick, ME 04011

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION - MAINE YANKEE PROPOSED TS CHANGE NO. 169 (TAC NO. M94930)

Dear Mr. Sellman:

By letter dated November 29, 1995, Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company requested a license amendment to change the technical specifications for the Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station. The proposed amendment would modify the maximum total primary-to-secondary leakage from any one steam generator. It would also modify requirements for unscheduled inspections of steam generator tubes following a tube leak. In order to complete the staff's review, the additional information provided in the enclosure is required.

Please respond to this request for additional information within 90 days of receipt of this letter. If you need more time or have questions regarding this request, please call me at (301) 415-1429.

Sincerely,

(Original Signed By)

Daniel H. Dorman, Project Manager Project Directorate I-3 Division of Reactor Projects - I/II Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulations

Docket No. 50-309

Enclosure: Request for Additional Information

cc w/encl: See next page

Distribution: Docket File PUBLIC PDI-3 Rdg. SVarga JZwolinski OGC ACRS

NRC FILE CENTER COPY

DFOI

CCougillaconte, Region I ESullivan

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\DORMAN\MAINYANK

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box C=Copy w/o attachment/enclosure E=Copy with attachment/enclosure N = No copy

OFFICE	PDI-3/PM	PDIV-2	(A)D\PQI-3	
NAME	DDorman &	EPeyton	PMilano	
DATE	05/19/97	05/13/97	05/ 19 /97	

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

220059 9703220363 970519 PDR ADOCK 05000309 PDR



UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

May 19, 1997

Mr. Michael B. Sellman, President Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company 329 Bath Road Brunswick, ME 04011

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION - MAINE YANKEE PROPOSED TS CHANGE NO. 169 (TAC NO. M94930)

Dear Mr. Sellman:

By letter dated November 29, 1995, Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company requested a license amendment to change the technical specifications for the Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station. The proposed amendment would modify the maximum total primary-to-secondary leakage from any one steam generator. It would also modify requirements for unscheduled inspections of steam generator tubes following a tube leak. In order to complete the staff's review, the additional information provided in the enclosure is required.

Please respond to this request for additional information within 90 days of receipt of this letter. If you need more time or have questions regarding this request, please call me at (301) 415-1429.

Sincerely,

Samil & Jon

Daniel H. Dorman, Project Manager Project Directorate I-3 Division of Reactor Projects - I/II Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulations

Docket No. 50-309

Enclosure: Request for Additional Information

cc w/encl: See next page

Mr. Michael B. Sellman, President

cc w/encl: Mr. Charles B. Brinkman Manager - Washington Nuclear Operations ABB Combustion Engineering 12300 Twinbrook Parkway, Suite 330 Rockville, MD 20852

Thomas G. Dignan, Jr., Esquire Ropes & Gray One International Place Boston, MA 02110-2624

Mr. Uldis Vanags State Nuclear Safety Advisor State Planning Office State House Station #38 Augusta, ME 04333

Mr. P. L. Anderson, Project Manager Yankee Atomic Electric Company 580 Main Street Bolton, MA 01740-1398

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

First Selectman of Wiscasset Municipal Building U.S. Route 1 Wiscasset, ME 04578

Mr. J. T. Yerokun Senior Resident Inspector Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission P.O. Box E Wiscasset, ME 04578

Mr. James R. Hebert, Manager Nuclear Engineering and Licensing Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company 329 Bath Road Brunswick, ME 04011

Friends of the Coast P.O. Box 98 Edgecomb, ME 04556 Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company

Mr. Robert W. Blackmore Plant Manager Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station P.O. Box 408 Wiscasset, ME (14578

Mr. Michael J. Meisner Vice-President Licensing and Regulatory Compliance Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company 329 Bath Road Brunswick, ME 04011

Mr. Bruce E. Hinkley, Acting Vice-President, Engineering Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company 329 Bath Road Brunswick, ME 04011

Mr. Patrick J. Dostie State of Maine Nuclear Safety Inspector Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station P.O. Box 408 Wiscasset, ME 04578

Mr. Graham M. Leitch Vice President, Operations Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station P.O. Box 408 Wiscasset, ME 04578

Mary Ann Lynch, Esquire Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company 329 Bath Road Brunswick, ME 04578

Mr. Jonathan M. Block Attorney at Law P.O. Box 566 Putney, VT 05346-0566

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

PROPOSED CHANGES TO TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS

REGARDING STEAM GENERATOR LEAKAGE AND TUBE SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

MAINE YANKEE ATOMIC POWER COMPANY

MAINE YANKEE ATOMIC POWER STATION

DOCKET NO. 50-309

- The proposed TS Section 4.10.C.4 does not address the unscheduled inspection of tubes that developed leak from tube plugs. The industry experience has shown that tube plugs fabricated with certain materials do leak. What is the licensee's inspection plan for tube plugs should they develop leaks?
- 2. TS Section 4.10.C.4 states that "(w)hen leaks are discovered, the cause of the leak <u>should</u> be evaluatedthe evaluation <u>should</u> form the basis for additional inspections....these inspections <u>should</u> include..." This type of wording (i.e., should) is not generally found in TSs. Please propose wording that is consistent with typical TS language.
- 3. TS Section 4.10.C.4. specifies tube inspection in the critical area. The critical area was defined in 4.10.D.1.(i) as "...(a)n area of the steam generator where degraded and/or defective tubes exist due to a steam generator physical and/or operating characteristic which would promote tube degradation in that identified area."

This definition is not specific for the proposed application and needs to be clarified. Please clarify, to the extent possible, (a) the size of a critical area in terms of number of tubes to be inspected, (b) the size of the critical area depending on the type or severity of the degradation mechanism, (c) inspection of a critical area in terms of whether the entire length of the tube will be inspected or only a certain region/section of the tube will be inspected, and (d) consideration regarding establishing a buffer zone beyond the critical area.

4. TS Section 4.10.C.4.(a) states that inspections should include, "(a) review of available historical ECT information to determine whether additional tubes require reinspection and conduct a 20% ECT sample inspection (using appropriate methods) of the critical area for that steam generator looking for the same defect mechanism." It is not clear from the above statement whether the "additional tubes require reinspection" refers to the tubes that are inside or outside of the critical area. If the tubes are outside of the critical area, clarify the inspection sample plan for those tubes that are outside of the critical area. If the tubes are inside of the critical area, revise the sentence to avoid potential confusion.

- 5. TS Section 4.10.C.4 specifies an expansion plan if more than 1% of the inspected tubes are found defective. This criteria does not provide an expansion sample plan if tubes are found degraded (but not defective) with the same degradation mechanism as that of the leaking tube. Clarify.
- 6. The inspection plan does not address the possibility that tubes are found to be defective due to more than one active degradation mechanism. Please address this aspect of an unscheduled inspection.
- 7. The staff is concerned that if a new degradation mechanism is found in the leaking tube, the same mechanism may degrade tubes outside of the critical area. For example, there may not be sufficient experience to define a critical area without some general inspection sampling outside the region of the leaking tube. Under the proposed sampling plan, the tubes outside of the critical area would not be inspected. Please address this possibility as it relates to the proposed TS.

9 13