

June 21, 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 219 REGARDING ADOPTION OF PRESSURE AND TEMPERATURE  
LIMITS REPORT (TAC NOS. MA8459 AND MA8460)

Dear Mr. Sellman:

By letter dated March 10, 2000, the Wisconsin Electric Power Company submitted a license amendment request for the Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2, to adopt the use of a pressure and temperature limits report and revise pressure-temperature and low-temperature overpressure protection limits. The staff requires additional information in order to complete its review of this amendment request.

The enclosed request was discussed with Mr. Tom Malanowski, representatives from Westinghouse, and other members of your staff during a conference call on May 24, 2000. A mutually agreeable target date of 60 days from the date of this letter was established for your response. 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

June 21, 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 219 REGARDING ADOPTION OF PRESSURE AND TEMPERATURE  
LIMITS REPORT (TAC NOS. MA8459 AND MA8460)

Dear Mr. Sellman:

By letter dated March 10, 2000, the Wisconsin Electric Power Company submitted a license amendment request for the Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2, to adopt the use of a pressure and temperature limits report and revise pressure-temperature and low-temperature overpressure protection limits. The staff requires additional information in order to complete its review of this amendment request.

The enclosed request was discussed with Mr. Tom Malanowski, representatives from Westinghouse, and other members of your staff during a conference call on May 24, 2000. A mutually agreeable target date of 60 days from the date of this letter was established for your response. 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	RBouling
PDIII-1 Reading	LBerry
SBlack	OGC
CCraig	ACRS
BWetzel	RLanksbury, RIII

OFFICE	PDIII-1/PM	PDIII-1/LA	PDIII-1/SC
NAME	BWetzel	RBouling	DHood for CCraig
DATE	6/21/00	6/20/00	6/21/00

**ACCESSION NO. ML003725664**

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 Duveneck  
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

## REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

### POINT BEACH NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2

#### PRESSURE VESSEL FLUENCE

In a letter dated March 10, 2000, the Wisconsin Electric Company submitted information and requested approval of a pressure temperature limits report (PTLR) and revision of the pressure-temperature curves and low-temperature overpressure protection (LTOP) limits. The fluence information required for the proposed limits is included in WCAP-12794 Revision 4 and WCAP-12795 Revision 3. Preliminary review of these reports revealed several problems which were communicated to the licensee and Westinghouse in a conference call on May 24, 2000. At the licensee's request, the same questions raised in the conference call are in this request for additional information.

1. The cavity dosimetry for Unit 1 (WCAP-12794 Revision 4), in addition to the normal complement of dosimeters, employed solid-state track recorders (SSTRs). As far as the staff is aware, the SSTRs were disqualified more than 15 years ago due to U-235 weight-deposition measurement problems. Why are they now qualified for service and what is the supporting documentation?
2. In Section 6, "Evaluation of Cavity Dosimetry" (WCAP-12795 Revision 3), Tables 6.2-5 through 6.2-10 include M/C terms with significant deviation from unity (example Table 6.2-8 line on U-235(n,f)). What are the criteria for accepting (or rejecting) a measurement? These measurements are consistently lower than the corresponding calculated values. Are they indicative of a systematic error in the measurement or the calculation?
3. In view of the large adjustments (nearly 300 percent for the U-235 measurement of item 2 above), explain why such adjustments are necessary and how they are justified.
4. Table 7.1-1 (WCAP-12794 Revision 4) indicates that the cavity dosimetry measurements are consistently lower than the in-vessel dosimetry and on the average by an amount larger than the uncertainty indicated in Section 5 of the same report. In view of items 1, 2 and 3 above, why are the results of this cavity dosimetry acceptable?

ENCLOSURE