

January 20, 2000

Mr. Ted C. Feigenbaum
Executive Vice President and
Chief Nuclear Officer
North Atlantic Energy Service Corporation
c/o Mr. James M. Peschel
P.O. Box 300
Seabrook, NH 03874

SUBJECT: 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; SEABROOK STATION (TAC NO. MA4098)

Dear Mr. Feigenbaum:

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 (SSCs) during a postulated design basis loss-of-coolant accident (DB LOCA), 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.
 - (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 (CSS) 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 6, 1998, for Seabrook Station. This submittal provided the information requested by GL 98-04. Clarification was provided during a phone call that took place on December 13, 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 Robert M. Pulsifer at (301) 415-3016.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Robert M. Pulsifer, Project Manager, Section 2
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-443

cc: See next page

- (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 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 (CSS) 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 6, 1998, for Seabrook Station. This submittal provided the information requested by GL 98-04. Clarification was provided during a phone call that took place on December 13, 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 Robert M. Pulsifer at (301) 415-3016.

Sincerely,
/RA/
 Robert M. Pulsifer, Project Manager, Section 2
 Project Directorate I
 Division of Licensing Project Management
 Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-443

cc: See next page

DISTRIBUTION: File Center PUBLIC PDI-2 r/f EAdensam (EGA1)
 CLauron JDavis JClifford RPulsifer TClark
 CAnderson, RI ACRS OGC

Document Name: C:\sma4098a.wpd

OFC	PM/PDI-2	LA/PDI-2	EMEB	SC/PDI-2
NAME	RPulsifer/vw	TClark	TSullivan	JClifford
DATE	01/11/00	01/10/00	01/11/00	01/11/00
COPY	YES/NO	YES/NO	YES/NO	YES/NO

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1
cc:

Lillian M. Cuoco, Esq.
Senior Nuclear Counsel
Northeast Utilities Service Company
P.O. Box 270
Hartford, CT 06141-0270

Mr. Peter Brann
Assistant Attorney General
State House, Station #6
Augusta, ME 04333

Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Seabrook Nuclear Power Station
P.O. Box 1149
Seabrook, NH 03874

Town of Exeter
10 Front Street
Exeter, NH 03823

Regional Administrator, Region I
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, PA 19406

Office of the Attorney General
One Ashburton Place
20th Floor
Boston, MA 02108

Board of Selectmen
Town of Amesbury
Town Hall
Amesbury, MA 01913

Mr. Dan McElhinney
Federal Emergency Management Agency
Region I
J.W. McCormack P.O. &
Courthouse Building, Room 401
Boston, MA 02109

Mr. Stephen McGrail, Director
ATTN: James Muckerheide
Massachusetts Emergency Management
Agency
400 Worcester Road
Framingham, MA 01702-5399

Philip T. McLaughlin, Attorney General
Steven M. Houran, Deputy Attorney
General
33 Capitol Street
Concord, NH 03301

Mr. Woodbury Fogg, Director
New Hampshire Office of Emergency
Management
State Office Park South
107 Pleasant Street
Concord, NH 03301

Mr. Roy E. Hickok
Nuclear Training Manager
Seabrook Station
North Atlantic Energy Service Corp.
P.O. Box 300
Seabrook, NH 03874

Mr. James M. Peschel
Manager of Regulatory Compliance
Seabrook Station
North Atlantic Energy Service Corp.
P.O. Box 300
Seabrook, NH 03874

Mr. W. A. DiProfio
Station Director
Seabrook Station
North Atlantic Energy Service Corporation
P.O. Box 300
Seabrook, NH 03874

Mr. Frank W. Getman, Jr.
Great Bay Power Corp.
20 International Drive
Suite 301
Portsmouth, NH 03801-6809

Mr. B. D. Kenyon
President - Nuclear Group
Northeast Utilities Service Group
P.O. Box 128
Waterford, CT 06385

Mr. David E. Carriere
Director, Production Services
Canal Electric Company
2421 Cranberry Highway
Wareham, MA 02571

Mr. Steve Allen
Polestar Applied Technology, Inc.
77 Franklin Street, Suite 507
Boston, MA 02110