ORIGINAL DUE DT: 06/20/00   TICKET NO: 020000180
FROM: DOC DT: 05/26/00
    Michael Mulligan   NRR RCVD DATE: 05/30/00

TO:

    Victor Dricks

FOR SIGNATURE OF :   ** YEL **

DESC: ROUTING:

    Immediate Safety Concern at NMP-2   Collins/Zimmermn
                                               Sheron
                                               Johnson
                                               NRR Mailroom

ASSIGNED TO: CONTACT:

        DLPM   Zwolinski

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS OR REMARKS:

TAC MA9073

From: "Michael Mulligan" <stmshvl@together.net>
To: "Deb Katz" <can@shaysnet.com>, "Victor Dricks" <VL...
Date: Fri, May 26, 2000 9:49 PM
Subject: Immediate Safety Concern at NMP-2

Dear Mr. Dricks
On Nine Mile Point 2, LER 00-07 talks about throttling SW flow to both RHR
HX'S that temporarily compensates for a design flaw of the SW system. As A
LA Vermont Yankee 1991 Loop and service water problems, would there be
enough SW flow to the throttled flow of the RHR HX at NMP 2- worst case or
or most limiting condition- such that it meets the needs of the DBA LOCA or
core cooling needs of RHR. Including worst case river or pond level, worst
case service water temp or most limiting flow. Can that throttled flow meet
all of the design needs of core cooling portion of RHR? Would the flow
restriction of the throttle valves create less that design flow at some
minimum system line-up simular to the Vermont Yankee 1991 LOOP?
Thanks
mike mulligan

Dear Mr. Dricks On Nine Mile Point 2, LER 00-07 talks about throttling SW flow to both RHR HX'S that temporarily compensates for a design flaw of the SW system. As A LA Vermont Yankee 1991 Loop and service water problems, would there be enough SW flow to the throttled flow of the RHR HX at NMP 2- worst case or or most limiting condition- such that it meets the needs of the DBA LOCA or core cooling needs of RHR. Including worst case river or pond level, worst case service water temp or most limiting flow. Can that throttled flow meet all of the design needs of core cooling portion of RHR? Would the flow restriction of the throttle valves create less that design flow at some minimum system line-up simular to the Vermont Yankee 1991 LOOP? Thanks mike mulligan

Received: from igate.nrc.gov ([148.184.176.31])
         by smtp (GroupWise SMTP/MIME daemon 4.1 v3)
         ; Fri, 26 May 00 21:54:10 EDT
Received: from nrc.gov
      by smtp-gateway ESMTPœ id VAA14176
      for <VLD@nrc.gov>; Fri, 26 May 2000 21:54:06 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from oemcomputer (dial-230-tnt-03.btvt.together.net [209.91.3.230])
         by mx02.together.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id VAA18075;
         Fri, 26 May 2000 21:48:47 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Michael Mulligan" <stmshvl@together.net>
To: "Deb Katz" <can@shaysnet.com>, <dlochbaum@ucsusa.org>,
      "Victor Dricks" <VLD@nrc.gov>, "Mike D" <necnp@sover.net>,
      <Jim_Perkins@lewnet.avcnet.org>, <sylvia.field@valley.net>,
      "Raymond shadis" <shadis@ime.net>, "Mike Daley" <mjd@necnp.org>,
      "Judy Johnsrud" <johnsrud@csrlink.net>
Subject: Immediate Safety Concern at NMP-2
Date: Fri, 26 May 2000 21:49:34 -0400
Message-ID: <000001bfc77d$cf0ae3a0$e6035bd1@oemcomputer>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
        boundary="----=_NextPart_000_0001_01BFC75C.47F943A0"
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2173.0
Importance: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600