

June 2, 2000

MEMORANDUM TO: James W. Clifford, Chief, Section 2
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Robert J. Fretz, Project Manager, Section 2 */RA/*
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: SALEM GENERATING STATION, FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION,
ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED IN AN UPCOMING MEETING
(TAC NOS. MA7381 and MA7382)

The attached information was transmitted by facsimile on May 9, 2000, to Public Service Electric & Gas Company. This information was transmitted to facilitate an upcoming public meeting in order to clarify the licensee's submittal dated November 24, 1999. The application requested a revision to the Salem Generating Station Technical Specifications concerning new requirements for charcoal filter testing in response to Generic Letter 99-02. This memorandum and the attachment do not convey a formal request for information or represent an NRC staff position.

Docket Nos. 50-272 and 50-311

Attachment: Issues for Discussion in Upcoming Telephone Conference

June 2, 2000

MEMORANDUM TO: James W. Clifford, Chief, Section 2
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Robert J. Fretz, Project Manager, Section 2 */RA/*
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: SALEM GENERATING STATION, FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION,
ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED IN AN UPCOMING MEETING
(TAC NOS. MA7381 and MA7382)

The attached information was transmitted by facsimile on May 9, 2000, to Public Service Electric & Gas Company. This information was transmitted to facilitate an upcoming public meeting in order to clarify the licensee's submittal dated November 24, 1999. The application requested a revision to the Salem Generating Station Technical Specifications concerning new requirements for charcoal filter testing in response to Generic Letter 99-02. This memorandum and the attachment do not convey a formal request for information or represent an NRC staff position.

Docket Nos. 50-272 and 50-311

Attachment: Issues for Discussion in Upcoming Telephone Conference

DISTRIBUTION

PUBLIC
JClifford
RFretz
PDI-2 Reading

DOCUMENT NAME: C:\MemMA7381-1.wpd

OFFICE	PDI-2/PM	C
NAME	RFretz	
DATE	05/10/00	

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DRAFT REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (RAI)

PLANT NAME: SALEM GENERATING STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2

RAIs

1. For all three systems in both units, (1) Control Room Envelope Air Conditioning System (CREACS), (2) Auxiliary Building Ventilation (ABV) System, and (3) Fuel Handling Ventilation (FHV) System, please provide the current and proposed charcoal bed residence times and the efficiencies credited in the accident analyses.

2. In the November 24, 1999 letter LR-N99501, page 2 of 4, near the bottom of the page, it states:

“...In addition, system face velocities for FHV and CREACS will be with 110% of 40 ft/min. For ABV, the face velocities for carbon testing will be a nominal 69 fpm based on the design calculation for the ABV system. The nominal design flow rate for this system is 21,400 cfm. There are 20 cells per carbon filter bank, the resulting cfm/cell is 1070. The area of carbon media per cell is 15.5 square feet. This results in a face velocity of 69.03 fpm. The carbon test data supplied to the laboratory will specify a nominal face velocity of 69 fpm for the ABV system.”

2.1: For the Unit 1 ABV, TS page 3/4 7-23, paragraph 3, states:

“Verifying that the HEPA filter banks remove $\geq 99\%$ of the DOP when they are tested in place while operating the ventilation system at a flow rate of 21,400 cfm $\pm 10\%$.”

For the Unit 2 ABV, TS page 3/4 7-19, paragraph 4 states:

“Verify that the system flowrate does not exceed the design limit of 23,540 cfm (21,400 cfm + 10%) when the HEPA + Charcoal adsorber filter train is aligned to the ECCS equipment areas.”

Therefore, why is the nominal flow rate of 21,400 cfm not increased to 23,540 cfm to calculate the face velocity for the laboratory testing? Is this related to the fact that the test face velocities for the ABV are now proposed as 69 ft/min instead of the current 74 ft/min?

2.2: For the CREACS and FHV system in both units, please indicate if the face velocities of 44 and 43 ft/min, respectively, indicated for test purposes under ASTM D3803-1989 are also the actual face velocities as calculated by considering the nominal design flow rate and the area of carbon media per cell? Is the upper limit of +10% on the TS system flow rates accounted for? Please indicate how the velocities were calculated.

3. The proposed credited efficiency for the CREACS of 98% is unacceptable. It is the staff view that a generic change to the staff position stated in RG 1.52 would require a research effort to demonstrate that it is reasonable to credit a 2 inch charcoal filter with greater than 95% efficiency. RG 1.52 allows a credit efficiency of up to 95% for a 2 inch filter and the licensee is requesting 98%. The 95% efficiency in the RG includes a 1% bypass which is not included in the licensee's proposal. It has not been demonstrated that a 2 inch filter is capable of maintaining an efficiency greater than 95% during the course of a design basis accident.