



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

19
 850513

PERSONNEL FOR: Edward J. Fitcher, Group Leader
 Technical Specification Review Group, DL

FOR: Barry W. Holahan, Chief
 Operating Reactors Assessment Branch, DL

SUBJECT: RIVER BEND UNIT 1: TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS

We have reviewed the licensee's "Proof and Review Copy" of the River Bend "Amended" Specifications Section 3.6, as relates to the emergency diesel generators (EDGs), and Section 6, Administrative Controls. We have the following comments:

- ✓ 1. The EDGs at this plant were supplied by TDI and therefore the specific test load values, etc. should be reviewed by C. Berlinger's TDI Task Force. We understand, however, that the present plan is to derate the engine to a revised continuous duty rating (i.e., the "qualified" load rating) and to specify that there is no overload capability. We believe that the periodic test load runs should be at the revised continuous duty rating even if this value should be greater than the calculated accident load.
2. Action Statement 3.8.1.d should be incorporated in the Action Statement dealing with one EDG being inoperable rather than being a separate Action Statement.
- ✓ 3. The various start signals (Section 4.8.1.1.2.a.4, et al.) should be specified as to be used on a staggered basis, not allowing the same one to be used for every test.
4. The verification that the sum of the auto connected loads does not exceed an allowable value (Section 4.8.1.1.2.f.9) must be changed to agree with the revised continuous duty rating, since no overload capability is applicable.
5. We note that the proposed Technical Specifications for River Bend require more severe periodic testing than has recently been approved for North Anna Unit 2. For North Anna, the severity of each periodic test is less, the number of periodic tests is less, and the number of Action Statement tests is less. A copy of the North Anna Technical Specification is enclosed to provide the details of these changes. We believe you should determine if NRC management would agree to similar testing for River Bend at this time. With the appropriate numerical adjustments, there is no technical reason not to use the North Anna Technical Specifications. However, administrative matters (e.g., CRGR approval) may need to be considered.

See PSB
 comment
 p. 3/4 9-2.

OK, done
 by PSB.

CONTACT:
 J. T. Beard, ORAP
 x27465

8505230550XA

B/32

✓
Don't by PSD
to 1.2

6. We note that this applicant has proposed to expand the tolerances on generator frequency from 60 ± 1.5 Hz to 60 ± 3 Hz. We know of no reason for this expansion and believe that it should be ± 1.5 Hz, unless fully justified by the applicant to the satisfaction of the Operating Reactors Branch.

changed
by PSD.

We note that the footnote (p. 3/4 8-3, et al.) is different from the corresponding footnote in Generic Letter 84-15 and Technical Specifications for other plants (e.g. Perry). We think the change is probably acceptable, but suggest that you discuss it with the applicant to make sure we understand what was intended.

Adequately
covered by
6.5.2

Unlike some other Technical Specifications we have seen, it is not clear that the River Bend Facility Review Group will be required to review the Security Plan, Emergency Plan, and Fire Protection Plan, and appropriate radiological release plans (and changes to these documents) (Section 6.5.1.6).

The only
requirements
established
are those in
the Regs.

9. Provisions are made for reporting pursuant to 10 CFR 50.73; however, Section 6.6.1 does not provide for notifications pursuant to Section 50.72 of 10 CFR 50. This inconsistency should be resolved.

Gary M. Holahan, Chief
Operating Reactors Assessment Branch, DL

Enclosure:
As stated

cc w/o enclosure:
D. Crutchfield
L. Rubenstein
M. Srinivasan
D. Houston
C. Berlinger
S. Stern