

From: Tim McGinty
To: "TThompson@nacintl.com"@GATED.nrcsmtp
Date: Wed, Jun 7, 2000 9:41 AM
Subject: Re: Drawings changes for NAC-UMS per NUTUG comments

Thanks Tom, appreciate that.

Yes. It's 9-B-4 tomorrow. I'll pick you up at 1:15 - 1:20. Got the overhead.

I am trying to put the finishing touches on an e-mail to you regarding the UMS comments. Mostly related to NUTUG comments, but there are a couple of other comments that our response will need some clarification from you on. I also have some similar tech staff input on Maine Yankee that I will be working on after I get the UMS rulemaking info to you.

Tim

>>> "Tom Thompson" <TThompson@nacintl.com> 06/07 8:20 AM >>>
Tim,

I have reviewed the NUTUG drawing change comments with respect to the Draft CoC, Tech Specs, and SER. I found only one drawing change that would affect descriptive text (in the SER), as follows:

Drawing 790-564 proposes inclusion of an alternate configuration of the VCC shield plug, providing a 3.81-cm (1.5-inch) thickness of NS-4-FR, versus the 2.54 cm (1.0 inch) original configuration thickness that is described in SER Section 5.1.2 in the second paragraph on Page 5-2.

Since the alternate configuration provides increased shielding and ,therefore, better protection of public health and safety, any necessary justification is inherently obvious, I think.

Please advise if further input by NAC is needed.

Tom

P.S. Charlie Pennington, Bill Lee, Jim Ballowe, and I plan to be in the WF1 lobby by 1:00 PM for tomorrow's meeting on the Advance UMS System. The Meeting Notice says One White Flint North, Room 9-B-4.

Tim McGinty <TJM1@nrc.gov>
06/02/00 03:49 PM

C/41

To: TThompson@nacintl.com

cc:

Subject: Drawings changes for NAC-UMS per NUTUG comments

Tom:

We may be in a position to agree in full with the first NUTUG comment, implementing the drawing changes. The one thing I would not want to do is to contradict the existing SER that went out on November 1 due to any of the drawing changes.

Therefore, I ask your help (I have also asked the team to consider) to call to my attention if you think the drawing changes affect anything written in the CoC, Tech Specs or SER. I am hoping there are no such instances, but would feel better if you gave some thought to that also.

It appears that we are not in a position to grant all of the Tech Spec changes that were asked in the NUTUG comments, not because we don't want to, but primarily because it would not be fully supported within the existing documents that went out for public comment (i.e., I couldn't get away with it unless I re-opened the public comment period). Some we can, some we can't. I am trying to get it to the point of letting you know exactly what we can and can't...I would anticipate next week, at which time you need to obviously respond by sending in the final SAR so we can finish this thing.

Tim