

**From:** Peter Tam  
**To:** INTERNet:beveragel@nimo.com, INTERNet:laffreyj@ni...  
**Date:** Wed, Jan 24, 2001 11:21 AM  
**Subject:** Nine Mile Point, Unit 2, UFSAR Revision 13 (TAC MB0304)

Lynn:

I completed review of your Revision 13. It looks good. I do have a few comments/questions (below). Note that I am not trying to get any detailed information. Most comments/questions should be answered verbally by just a few words. These comments/questions do not constitute a formal NRC position, nor do they formally request additional information. Please give me the answers by phone when you are ready.

Upon completion of our discussion, I plan to close the review of Rev. 13 with an internal memo (i.e., no issuance to Niagara). But I shall tell you that it is done.

---

I am trying to determine the timeliness of Revision 13. When was the last refueling outage completed at NMP-2?

#### Chapter 2

Page 2.3-48 -- How did the dimensions of the natural draft cooling tower shrink from previous values?

#### Chapter 6

Page 6.3-7 -- What led to the 100% clogged assumption (from 50%) for suppression pool suction strainers? Design change? New analysis? New requirement?

#### Chapter 7

Pages 7.2-4, 7.6-20 -- New text added to describe the Oscillation Power Range Monitor (OPRM). Since implementation of the OPRM is an approved design basis change via a Technical Specifications amendment, I believe it would be a good idea for Niagara to, in the future, reference the NRC approval document (i.e., Amendment No. 92 dated March 2, 2000).

#### Chapter 9

Pages 9A.3-29, 29a -- What was the reason for now adding this paragraph regarding surveillance intervals? New requirement? Or was the description inadvertently omitted in the previous revisions?

#### Chapter 11

Table 11.1-6, regarding noncoolant activation products: what changes have been made?

#### Chapter 12

Table 12.2-6, regarding reactor core isolation cooling system design activities. What led to the extensive changes in this table? Fine-tuning of a previous calculation? Correction of previous error?

### Chapter 15

Page 15.2-2, Section 15.2.1.2.3 -- Does the word "interim" mean that something (e.g. evaluation model) is still under development, to be finalized in the future?

### Appendix A, Reload Analysis

Page A.4.4-1 -- ORPM. For the sake of completeness of documentation, it would be good to reference NRC approval documents in the UFSAR. Please consider this suggestion for future revisions.

### Appendix 6A

Consecutive pages are replaced wholesale with no side lines to indicate changes. Closer scrutiny still does not reveal any discernible changes, other than putting in the footer "October 2000 ". What is the reason for replacing these pages?

Peter S. Tam  
Project Directorate I-1  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation  
(Tel. 301-415-1451)

### **Mail Envelope Properties**

(3A6F00FC.501 : 10 : 20510)

**Subject:** Nine Mile Point, Unit 2, UFSAR Revision 13 (**TAC MB0304**)

**Creation Date:** Wed, Jan 24, 2001 11:21 AM

**From:** Peter Tam

**Created By:** OWFN\_DO.OWF4\_PO:PST

#### **Recipients**

Post Office INTeRnet  
beveragel (INTeRnet:beveragel@nimo.com)  
laffreyj (INTeRnet:laffreyj@nimo.com)  
leonardm (INTeRnet:leonardm@nimo.com)  
wolniakd (INTeRnet:wolniakd@nimo.com)

#### **Action**

Transferred

#### **Date & Time**

01/24 11:21 AM

#### **Domain.Post Office**

INTeRnet

#### **Delivered**

#### **Route**

INTeRnet:nimo.com

#### **Files**

#### **Size**

#### **Date & Time**

MESSAGE

6012

Wednesday, January 24, 2001 11:21 AM

**Options**

**Auto Delete:** No  
**Expiration Date:** None  
**Notify Recipients:** Yes  
**Priority:** Standard  
**Reply Requested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**To Be Delivered:** Immediate  
**Status Tracking:** Delivered & Opened