

April 19, 2000

Mr. Michael B. Sellman
Senior Vice President and
Chief Nuclear Officer
Wisconsin Electric Power Company
231 West Michigan Street
Milwaukee, WI 53201

SUBJECT: POINT BEACH NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2 - REQUEST FOR
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CHANGE
REQUEST 206 REGARDING SERVICE WATER SYSTEM OPERABILITY
(TAC NOS. MA7821 AND MA7822)

Dear Mr. Sellman:

By letter dated December 12, 1999, the Wisconsin Electric Power Company submitted a license amendment request for the Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2, to incorporate changes to the Technical Specifications to more clearly define the requirements for service water (SW) system operability in accordance with the system configuration assumed in the SW system analysis.

The enclosed request was discussed with Mr. Jack Gadzala and other members of your staff during a conference call on March 21, 2000. A mutually agreeable target date of 60 days from the date of this letter for your response was established. If circumstances result in the need to revise the target date, please contact me at (301) 415-1355 at the earliest opportunity.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Beth A. Wetzel, Senior Project Manager, Section 1
Project Directorate III
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-266 and 50-301

Enclosure: Request for Additional Information

cc w/encl: See next page

April 19, 2000

Mr. Michael B. Sellman
Senior Vice President and
Chief Nuclear Officer
Wisconsin Electric Power Company
231 West Michigan Street
Milwaukee, WI 53201

SUBJECT: POINT BEACH NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2 - REQUEST FOR
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CHANGE
REQUEST 206 REGARDING SERVICE WATER SYSTEM OPERABILITY
(TAC NOS. MA7821 AND MA7822)

Dear Mr. Sellman:

By letter dated December 12, 1999, the Wisconsin Electric Power Company submitted a license amendment request for the Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2, to incorporate changes to the Technical Specifications to more clearly define the requirements for service water (SW) system operability in accordance with the system configuration assumed in the SW system analysis.

The enclosed request was discussed with Mr. Jack Gadzala and other members of your staff during a conference call on March 21, 2000. A mutually agreeable target date of 60 days from the date of this letter for your response was established. If circumstances result in the need to revise the target date, please contact me at (301) 415-1355 at the earliest opportunity.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Beth A. Wetzel, Senior Project Manager, Section 1
Project Directorate III
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-266 and 50-301

Enclosure: Request for Additional Information

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION

PUBLIC ACubbage
PDIII-1 Reading JTatum
SBlack OGC
CCraig ACRS
RBouling RLanksbury, RIII

OFFICE	PDIII-1/PM	PDIII-1/LA	PDIII-1/SC
NAME	BWetzel	RBouling	SCraig /RA by TKim for/
DATE	4/19/00	4/19/00	4/19/00

ACCESSION NO. ML003705097

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2

cc:

Mr. John H. O'Neill, Jr.
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge
2300 N Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037-1128

Ms. Sarah Jenkins
Electric Division
Public Service Commission of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7854
Madison, WI 53707-7854

Mr. Richard R. Grigg
President and Chief Operating Officer
Wisconsin Electric Power Company
231 West Michigan Street
Milwaukee, WI 53201

Mr. Mark E. Reddemann
Site Vice President
Point Beach Nuclear Plant
Wisconsin Electric Power Company
6610 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, WI 54241

Mr. Ken Duvencak
Town Chairman
Town of Two Creeks
13017 State Highway 42
Mishicot, WI 54228

Chairman
Public Service Commission
of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7854
Madison, WI 53707-7854

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

Resident Inspector's Office
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
6612 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, WI 54241

November 1999

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

SERVICE WATER SYSTEM OPERABILITY

- Attachment 1, Page 3 of 5; second paragraph under Basis for Change refers to modifications to provide redundant automatic isolation of non-essential loads; and Attachment 5, page 5, the first paragraph indicates that if isolation of an affected line is not required for accident mitigation, then the limiting condition for operation (LCO) in question would not apply.
 - a. On a simplified diagram, indicate which flow paths currently have redundant automatic isolation capability, which flow paths are scheduled to have redundant automatic isolation capability installed along with the completion dates, which flow paths are not required to be isolated for accident mitigation, and pipe diameters of these flow paths.
 - b. Discuss the isolation valve leak rates and service water (SW) flows that are assumed for all non-essential flow paths during accident conditions, and explain the basis for these values. Describe measures that are taken (including frequency) to assure that the actual leak rates and flows will not exceed the assumed values (e.g., valve leak rate testing and flow rate validation).
 - c. Briefly describe any additional measures that are taken (including frequency) to assure the continued functionality of the SW system boundary isolation valves (e.g., inservice testing, periodic maintenance). Indicate which tests (if any) are required by the Technical Specifications.
- Attachment 2, Page 3 of 6; regarding key assumptions:
 - a. Both units operating at 100 percent power; is this consistent with licensing basis (i.e., 102 percent is typical of most plants)?
 - b. The large-break loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA) is identified as the limiting event. This is not an assumption but rather, a statement of fact. Clarification is needed.
 - c. Manual action is taken for the recirculation phase to ensure that all nonessential loads are isolated prior to transferring from injection to recirculation. Identify any manual actions (if any) that are credited that have not previously been reviewed and approved by the NRC, including a time-line of when these actions must occur, and confirm that necessary actions are included in the appropriate plant procedures and that all areas are accessible for completing these actions.
 - d. SW is not needed to supply AFW for the design-basis LOCA. Similar to (b) above, this is not an assumption but rather, a statement of fact. Clarification is needed.
- Attachment 2, page 4 of 6; assumption no. 2 states that any or all SW pump, valve, and header LCOs may be in effect at the same time subject to the limitations specified in the LCO. Describe any situations that will be permitted by the proposed Technical

ENCLOSURE

Specification limitations (individually and collectively) where the SW system will not be able to satisfy the minimum flow requirements for accident mitigation.

- Attachment 2, page 4 of 6; the evaluation results indicate that boiling will not occur under steady-state conditions in the containment fan coolers. Confirm that the analysis that was performed to address GL 96-06 remains valid given the proposed TS requirements.
- Attachment 2, page 4 of 6 (last paragraph), Attachment 2, page 5 of 6 (last paragraph), and Attachment 5, under TS D.2.b.iii; additional explanation is needed as to what the evaluation process entails (e.g., bounding assumptions, acceptance criteria), and what actions plant operators will be allowed to take beyond those that have been reviewed and approved by the NRC. Confirm that the evaluation will satisfy the requirements of 10 CFR 50.65 in all respects, and that the evaluation includes provisions to assure that the SW model is valid for the specific situation being considered.
- Attachment 5, TS D.2.d does not provide an accurate representation of what is stated in the existing TS (i.e., the existing TS only allows this condition if at least five SW pumps are operable).