

EGG-NTA-7592

CONFORMANCE TO
ITEM 2.1 (PART 2) OF GENERIC LETTER 83-28
REACTOR TRIP SYSTEM VENDOR INTERFACE
MAINE YANKEE
ST. LUCIE-1 AND -2
WATERFORD-3

F. G. Farmer

Published March 1987

Idaho National Engineering Laboratory
EG&G Idaho, Inc.
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83415

Prepared for the
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555
Under DOE Contract No. DE-AC07-76ID01570
FIN Nos. D6001 and D6002

8703310229XA

ABSTRACT

This EG&G Idaho, Inc. report provides a review of the submittals for some of the Combustion Engineering (C-E) nuclear plants for conformance to Generic Letter 83-28, Item 2.1 (Part 2). The report includes the following Combustion Engineering plants, and is in partial fulfillment of the following TAC Nos.:

<u>Plant</u>	<u>Docket Number</u>	<u>TAC Number</u>
Maine Yankee	50-309	52851
St. Lucie-1	50-335	52883
St. Lucie-2	50-389	52884
Waterford-3	50-382	57699

FOREWORD

This report is provided as part of the program for evaluating licensee/applicant conformance to Generic Letter 83-28, "Required Actions Based on Generic Implications of Salem ATWS Events." This work is conducted for the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Division of PWR Licensing-A by EG&G Idaho, Inc.

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission funded the work under the authorization, B&R 20-19-19-11-3, FIN Nos. D6001 and D6002.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
FOREWORD	iii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. REVIEW REQUIREMENTS	2
3. GROUP REVIEW RESULTS	3
4. REVIEW RESULTS FOR MAINE YANKEE	4
4.1 Evaluation	4
4.2 Conclusion	4
5. REVIEW RESULTS FOR ST. LUCIE-1 AND -2	5
5.1 Evaluation	5
5.2 Conclusion	5
6. REVIEW RESULTS FOR WATERFORD-3	6
6.1 Evaluation	6
6.2 Conclusion	6
7. GROUP CONCLUSION	7
8. REFERENCES	8

CONFORMANCE TO
ITEM 2.1 (PART 2) OF GENERIC LETTER 83-28
REACTOR TRIP SYSTEM VENDOR INTERFACE
MAINE YANKEE
ST. LUCIE-1 AND -2
WATERFORD-3

1. INTRODUCTION

On July 8, 1983, Generic Letter 83-28¹ was issued by D. G. Eisenhut, Director of the Division of Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, to all licensees of operating reactors, applicants for operating licenses, and holders of construction permits. This letter included required actions based on generic implications of the Salem ATWS events. These requirements have been published in Volume 2 of NUREG-1000, "Generic Implications of ATWS Events at the Salem Nuclear Power Plant."²

This report documents the EG&G Idaho, Inc. review of the submittals of four of the Combustion Engineering plants, Maine Yankee, St. Lucie-1 and -2, and Waterford-3, for conformance to Item 2.1 (Part 2) of Generic Letter 83-28. The submittals from the licensees and applicants utilized in these evaluations are referenced in Section 8 of this report.

2. REVIEW REQUIREMENTS

Item 2.1 (Part 2) (Reactor Trip System - Vendor Interface) requires licensees and applicants to establish, implement and maintain a continuing program to ensure that vendor information on Reactor Trip System (RTS) components is complete, current and controlled throughout the life of the plant, and appropriately referenced or incorporated in plant instructions and procedures. The vendor interface program is to include periodic communications with vendors to assure that all applicable information has been received, as well as a system of positive feedback with vendors for mailings containing technical information, e. g., licensee/applicant acknowledgement for receipt of technical information.

That part of the vendor interface program which ensures that vendor information on RTS components, once acquired, is appropriately controlled, referenced and incorporated in plant instructions and procedures, will be evaluated as part of the review of Item 2.2 of the Generic Letter.

Because the Nuclear Steam System Supplier (NSSS) is ordinarily also the supplier of the entire RTS, the NSSS is also the principal source of information on the components of the RTS. This review of the licensee and applicant submittals will:

1. Confirm that the licensee/applicant has identified an interface with either the NSSS or with the vendors of each of the components of the Reactor Trip System.
2. Confirm that the interface identified by licensees/applicants includes periodic communication with the NSSS or with the vendors of each of the components of the Reactor Trip System.
3. Confirm that the interface identified by licensees/applicants includes a system of positive feedback to confirm receipt of transmittals of technical information.

3. GROUP REVIEW RESULTS

The relevant submittals from each of the included reactor plants were reviewed to determine compliance with Item 2.1 (Part 2). First, the submittals from each plant were reviewed to establish that Item 2.1 (Part 2) was specifically addressed. Second, the submittals were evaluated to determine the extent to which each of the plants complies with the staff guidelines for Item 2.1 (Part 2).

4. REVIEW RESULTS FOR MAINE YANKEE

5.1 Evaluation

Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company, the licensee for Maine Yankee, provided their response to Item 2.1 (Part 2) of the Generic Letter on June 18, 1985. In that response, the licensee describes the Maine Yankee interface program established for the RTS.

The interface program for the RTS described includes annual contact with each RTS component vendor, vendor certification of the validity of Maine Yankee technical information, and a system of positive feedback from the component vendors.

5.2 Conclusion

We find the program described in the licensee's submittal for the interface program for the RTS meets the staff position on Item 2.1 (Part 2) of the Generic Letter and is, therefore, acceptable.

5. REVIEW RESULTS FOR ST. LUCIE-1 AND -2

5.1 Evaluation

Florida Power and Light Company, the licensee for St. Lucie-1 and -2, provided their response to Item 2.1 (Part 2) of the Generic Letter on November 8, 1983. In that response, the licensee confirms that the NSSS for St. Lucie-1 and -2 is Combustion Engineering and that the RTS for St. Lucie is included as a part of the C-E interface program established for the St. Lucie NSSS.

The C-E interface program for the NSSS includes both periodic communication between C-E and licensees/applicants such as "INFOBULLETINS" containing information and recommendations concerning C-E systems, and a system of positive feedback from licensees/applicants in the form of signed receipts for technical information transmitted by C-E.

5.2 Conclusion

We find the licensee's confirming statement that St. Lucie is a participant in the Combustion Engineering interface program for the RTS meets the staff position on Item 2.1 (Part 2) of the Generic Letter and is, therefore, acceptable.

6. REVIEW RESULTS FOR WATERFORD-3

6.1 Evaluation

Louisiana Power and Light, the licensee for Waterford-3, provided their responses to Item 2.1 (Part 2) of the Generic Letter on November 4, 1983, and May 11, 1984. In those responses, the licensee confirms that the NSSS for Waterford-3 is Combustion Engineering and that the RTS for Waterford-3 is included as a part of the C-E interface program established for the Waterford-3 NSSS.

The C-E interface program for the NSSS includes both periodic communication between C-E and licensees/applicants such as "INFOBULLETINS" containing information and recommendations concerning C-E systems, and a system of positive feedback from licensees/applicants in the form of signed receipts for technical information transmitted by C-E.

6.2 Conclusion

We find the licensee's confirming statement that Waterford-3 is a participant in the Combustion Engineering interface program for the RTS meets the staff position on Item 2.1 (Part 2) of the Generic Letter and is, therefore, acceptable.

7. GROUP CONCLUSION

We conclude that the licensee/applicant responses for the listed Combustion Engineering plants for Item 4.5.2 of Generic Letter 83-28 are acceptable.

8. REFERENCES

1. NRC Letter, D. G. Eisenhut to all licensees of Operating Reactors, Applicants for Operating License, and Holders of Construction Permits, "Required Actions Based on Generic Implications of Salem ATWS Events (Generic Letter 83-28)," July 8, 1983.
2. Generic Implications of ATWS Events at the Salem Nuclear Power Plant NUREG-1000, Volume 1, April 1983; Volume 2, July 1983.
3. Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company letter to NRC, G. D. Whittier to Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, "Generic Letter 83-28, Items 2.1 and 2.2.2," June 18, 1985.
4. Florida Power and Light letter to NRC, J. W. Williams to Darrel G. Eisenhut, November 8, 1983.
5. Louisiana Power and Light letter to NRC, K. W. Cook to Darrel G. Eisenhut, "Required Actions Based on Generic Implications of Salem ATWS Events," November 4, 1983.
- 6. Louisiana Power and Light letter to NRC, K. W. Cook to Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, "Response to Generic Letter 83-28, Item 2.1," May 11, 1984.