



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	

- (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	RBouling	JTS	CCraig	ALC
DATE	11 / 16 / 99		11 / 16 / 99	11 / 16 / 99		11 / 16 / 99	

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