



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

November 16, 1999

Mr. Roger O. Anderson, Director
Nuclear Energy Engineering
Northern States Power Company
414 Nicollet Mall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401

SUBJECT: MONTICELLO NUCLEAR GENERATING PLANT RE: COMPLETION OF
LICENSING ACTION FOR GENERIC LETTER 98-04 (TAC NO. MA4069)

Dear Mr. Anderson:

On July 14, 1998, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) issued Generic Letter (GL) 98-04, "Potential for Degradation of the Emergency Core Cooling System and the Containment Spray System After a Loss-of-Coolant Accident Because of Construction and Protective Coating Deficiencies and Foreign Material in Containment," to all holders of operating licenses or construction permits. The NRC issued GL 98-04 to determine the status of containment coating programs.

In GL 98-04, the NRC staff specifically requested that the licensees provide information outlined below for each of their facilities.

- (1) A summary description of the plant-specific program or programs implemented to ensure that Service Level 1 protective coatings used inside the containment are procured, applied, and maintained in compliance with applicable regulatory requirements and the plant-specific licensing basis for the facility. Include a discussion of how the plant-specific program meets the applicable criteria of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix B, as well as information regarding any applicable standards, plant-specific procedures, or other guidance used for (a) controlling the procurement of coatings and paints used at the facility; (b) the qualification testing of protective coatings; and (c) surface preparation, application, surveillance, and maintenance activities for protective coatings. Maintenance activities refer to rework of degraded coatings, removing degraded coatings to sound coatings, correctly preparing the surfaces, applying new coating, and verifying the quality of coatings.
- (2) Information demonstrating compliance with item (i) or item (ii).
 - (i) For plants with licensing-basis requirements for tracking the amount of unqualified coatings inside the containment and for assessing the impact of potential coating debris on the operation of safety-related systems, structures, and components during a postulated design-basis loss-of-coolant accident, the following information shall be provided to demonstrate compliance:
 - (a) The date and findings of the last assessment of coatings and the planned date of the next assessment of coatings.

0500263 P

NRC

DF01

PDR ADOCK.

- (b) The limit for the amount of unqualified protective coatings allowed in the containment and how this limit is determined. Discuss any conservatism in the method used to determine this limit.
 - (c) If a commercial-grade dedication program is being used at your facility for dedicating commercial-grade coatings for Service Level 1 applications inside the containment, discuss how the program adequately qualifies a coating for Service Level 1. Identify what standards or other guidance are currently being used to dedicate containment coatings at your facility.
- (ii) For plants without the above licensing-basis requirements, information shall be provided to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.46b(5), "Long-term cooling," and the functional capability of the safety-related containment spray system as set forth in your licensing basis. If a licensee can demonstrate this compliance without quantifying the amount of unqualified coatings, this is acceptable. The following information shall be provided:

If a commercial-grade dedication program is not being used at your facility for qualifying and dedicating commercial-grade coatings for Service Level 1 applications, provide the regulatory and safety basis for not controlling these coatings in accordance with such a program. Additionally, explain why the facility's licensing basis does not require such a program.

In response to GL 98-04, you provided a letter dated November 11, 1998, for Monticello. This submittal provided the information requested by GL 98-04. Clarification was provided during a telephone call on October 6, 1999, from C. Lauron (NRC) and myself with M. Voth and P. Tobin of your staff. The NRC staff has reviewed your response and has concluded that all requested information has been provided; therefore, GL 98-04 is closed for your facility. Thank you for your prompt and complete response.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact me at (301) 415-2296.

Sincerely,



Carl F. Lyon, Project Manager, Section 1
Project Directorate III
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-263

cc: See next page

Mr. Roger O. Anderson, Director
Northern States Power Company

Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant

cc:

J. E. Silberg, Esquire
Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge
2300 N Street, N. W.
Washington DC 20037

Commissioner
Department of Public Service
121 Seventh Place East
Suite 200
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2145

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Resident Inspector's Office
2807 W. County Road 75
Monticello, Minnesota 55362

Adonis A. Neblett
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
445 Minnesota Street
Suite 900
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127

Plant Manager
Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant
ATTN: Site Licensing
Northern States Power Company
2807 West County Road 75
Monticello, Minnesota 55362-9637

Site General Manager
Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant
ATTN: Site Licensing
Northern States Power Company
2807 West County Road 75
Monticello, Minnesota 55362-9637

Robert Nelson, President
Minnesota Environmental Control
Citizens Association (MECCA)
1051 South McKnight Road
St. Paul, Minnesota 55119

Commissioner
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
520 Lafayette Road
St. Paul, Minnesota 55119

Regional Administrator, Region III
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
801 Warrenville Road
Lisle, Illinois 60532-4351

Commissioner of Health
Minnesota Department of Health
717 Delaware Street, S. E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55440

Douglas M. Gruber, Auditor/Treasurer
Wright County Government Center
10 NW Second Street
Buffalo, Minnesota 55313

- (b) The limit for the amount of unqualified protective coatings allowed in the containment and how this limit is determined. Discuss any conservatism in the method used to determine this limit.
 - (c) If a commercial-grade dedication program is being used at your facility for dedicating commercial-grade coatings for Service Level 1 applications inside the containment, discuss how the program adequately qualifies a coating for Service Level 1. Identify what standards or other guidance are currently being used to dedicate containment coatings at your facility.
- (ii) For plants without the above licensing-basis requirements, information shall be provided to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.46b(5), "Long-term cooling," and the functional capability of the safety-related containment spray system as set forth in your licensing basis. If a licensee can demonstrate this compliance without quantifying the amount of unqualified coatings, this is acceptable. The following information shall be provided:

If a commercial-grade dedication program is not being used at your facility for qualifying and dedicating commercial-grade coatings for Service Level 1 applications, provide the regulatory and safety basis for not controlling these coatings in accordance with such a program. Additionally, explain why the facility's licensing basis does not require such a program.

In response to GL 98-04, you provided a letter dated November 11, 1998, for Monticello. This submittal provided the information requested by GL 98-04. Clarification was provided during a telephone call on October 6, 1999, from C. Lauron (NRC) and myself with M. Voth and P. Tobin of your staff. The NRC staff has reviewed your response and has concluded that all requested information has been provided; therefore, GL 98-04 is closed for your facility. Thank you for your prompt and complete response.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact me at (301) 415-2296.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:
 Carl F. Lyon, Project Manager, Section 1
 Project Directorate III
 Division of Licensing Project Management
 Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-263

cc: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

File Center OGC JDavis
 PUBLIC ACRS RPulsipher
 PDIII-1 Reading CLauron RLanksbury, RIII

TO RECEIVE A COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT, INDICATE "C" IN THE BOX

OFFICE	PDIII-1/PM	C	EMCB		PDIII-1/LA	C	PDIII-1/SC	C
NAME	FLyon	J	ESullivan	[Signature]	RBouling	[Signature]	CCraig	[Signature]
DATE	11 / 16 /99		11 / 16 /99		11 / 16 /99		11 / 16 /99	

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\PDIII-1\MONTICEL\LTRA4069
 OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

- (b) The limit for the amount of unqualified protective coatings allowed in the containment and how this limit is determined. Discuss any conservatism in the method used to determine this limit.
 - (c) If a commercial-grade dedication program is being used at your facility for dedicating commercial-grade coatings for Service Level 1 applications inside the containment, discuss how the program adequately qualifies a coating for Service Level 1. Identify what standards or other guidance are currently being used to dedicate containment coatings at your facility.
- (ii) For plants without the above licensing-basis requirements, information shall be provided to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.46b(5), "Long-term cooling," and the functional capability of the safety-related containment spray system as set forth in your licensing basis. If a licensee can demonstrate this compliance without quantifying the amount of unqualified coatings, this is acceptable. The following information shall be provided:

If a commercial-grade dedication program is not being used at your facility for qualifying and dedicating commercial-grade coatings for Service Level 1 applications, provide the regulatory and safety basis for not controlling these coatings in accordance with such a program. Additionally, explain why the facility's licensing basis does not require such a program.

In response to GL 98-04, you provided a letter dated November 11, 1998, for Monticello. This submittal provided the information requested by GL 98-04. Clarification was provided during a telephone call on October 6, 1999, from C. Lauron (NRC) and myself with M. Voth and P. Tobin of your staff. The NRC staff has reviewed your response and has concluded that all requested information has been provided; therefore, GL 98-04 is closed for your facility. Thank you for your prompt and complete response.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact me at (301) 415-2296.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:
 Carl F. Lyon, Project Manager, Section 1
 Project Directorate III
 Division of Licensing Project Management
 Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-263

cc: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

File Center OGC JDavis
 PUBLIC ACRS RPulsipher
 PDIII-1 Reading CLauron RLanksbury, RIII

TO RECEIVE A COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT, INDICATE "C" IN THE BOX

OFFICE	PDIII-1/PM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EMCB	PDIII-1/LA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PDIII-1/SC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
NAME	FLyon <i>J</i>		ESullivan <i>ES</i>	RBouling <i>RB</i>		CCraig <i>CC</i>	
DATE	11 / 16 / 99		11 / 16 / 99	11 / 16 / 99		11 / 16 / 99	

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\PDIII-1\MONTICELL\TRA4069
 OFFICIAL RECORD COPY