



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

November 30, 1999

Mr. Douglas R. Gipson
Senior Vice President
Nuclear Generation
Detroit Edison Company
6400 North Dixie Highway
Newport, MI 48166

SUBJECT: FERMI 2 - COMPLETION OF LICENSING ACTION FOR GENERIC LETTER 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," DATED JULY 14, 1998 (TAC NO. MA4048)

Dear Mr. Gipson:

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 the 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. The summary shall 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 coatings, 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:

DFOI

PD R A D O C K

D. Gipson

- 2 -

- (a) The date and findings of the last assessment of coatings and the planned date of the next assessment of coatings.
 - (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 the 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 the 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 the plant's 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 the 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 Fermi 2. This submittal provided the information requested by GL 98-04. Clarification was provided during a phone call that took place on August 4, 1999. The staff has reviewed your response and has concluded that all requested information has been provided; therefore, we consider GL 98-04 to be closed for your facility. We thank you for your prompt and complete response.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact me at (301) 415-2828.

Sincerely,



Andrew J. Kugler, Project Manager, Section 1
Project Directorate III
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-341

cc: See next page

**Mr. Douglas R. Gipson
Detroit Edison Company**

Fermi 2

cc:

**John Flynn, Esquire
Senior Attorney
Detroit Edison Company
2000 Second Avenue
Detroit, Michigan 48226**

**Drinking Water and Radiological
Protection Division
Michigan Department of
Environmental Quality
3423 N. Martin Luther King Jr Blvd
P. O. Box 30630 CPH Mailroom
Lansing, Michigan 48909-8130**

**U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Resident Inspector's Office
6450 W. Dixie Highway
Newport, Michigan 48166**

**Monroe County Emergency Management
Division
963 South Raisinville
Monroe, Michigan 48161**

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

**Norman K. Peterson
Director, Nuclear Licensing
Detroit Edison Company
Fermi 2 - 280 TAC
6400 North Dixie Highway
Newport, Michigan 48166**

- (a) The date and findings of the last assessment of coatings and the planned date of the next assessment of coatings.
 - (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 the 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 the 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 the plant's 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 the 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 Fermi 2. This submittal provided the information requested by GL 98-04. Clarification was provided during a phone call that took place on August 4, 1999. The staff has reviewed your response and has concluded that all requested information has been provided; therefore, we consider GL 98-04 to be closed for your facility. We thank you for your prompt and complete response.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact me at (301) 415-2828.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:
 Andrew J. Kugler, Project Manager, Section 1
 Project Directorate III
 Division of Licensing Project Management
 Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-341

cc: See next page

DISTRIBUTION

File Center OGC CLauron
 PUBLIC ACRS JDavis
 PDIII-1 Reading RPulsifer AVeget, RIII

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

OFFICE	PDIII-1/PM	C	PDIII-1/LA	C	EMCB/SC		PDIII-1/SC	C
NAME	AKugler: <i>AK</i>		RBouling <i>RB</i>		ESullivan <i>ES</i>		CCraig <i>CC</i>	
DATE	11/29/99		11/19/99		11/29/99		11/30/99	

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\PDIII-1\FERMI\trA4048.wpd

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

- (a) The date and findings of the last assessment of coatings and the planned date of the next assessment of coatings.
 - (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 the 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 the 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 the plant's 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 the 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 Fermi 2. This submittal provided the information requested by GL 98-04. Clarification was provided during a phone call that took place on August 4, 1999. The staff has reviewed your response and has concluded that all requested information has been provided; therefore, we consider GL 98-04 to be closed for your facility. We thank you for your prompt and complete response.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact me at (301) 415-2828.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:
 Andrew J. Kugler, Project Manager, Section 1
 Project Directorate III
 Division of Licensing Project Management
 Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-341

cc: See next page

DISTRIBUTION

File Center OGC CLauron
 PUBLIC ACRS JDavis
 PDIII-1 Reading RPulsifer AVege, RIII

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

OFFICE	PDIII-1/PM	C	PDIII-1/LA	C	EMCB/SC		PDIII-1/SC	C
NAME	AKugler: <i>AK</i>		RBouling <i>RB</i>		ESullivan <i>ES</i>		CCraig <i>CC</i>	
DATE	11/29/99		11/19/99		11/29/99		11/30/99	

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\PDIII-1\FERMI\trA4048.wpd

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY