

**From:** Peter Tam  
**To:** INTERNET:leonardm@nimo.com; internet:mackamanc@nimo.com;  
internet:wolniakd@nimo.com; John Knox  
**Date:** 4/25/01 4:29PM  
**Subject:** Nine Mile Point, TS change regarding overvoltage allowable values

Clyde:

This is regarding your amendment request dated 2/27/01. Our reviewer, John Knox, has a number of questions. We propose to first discuss them in a conference call, during which we will discuss how to disposition (i.e., edit, delete, issue formal RAI) each question. **Thus the following questions do not at this time constitute an official NRC position, nor do they convey a formal request for information.**

1. For the MSIV trip solenoids supplied by GE, the associated voltage calculations credits an increase from the maximum design rating of 125 volts to 128 volts ac. NMPC indicated that this increased rating was evaluated considering its effect on qualified life. It is not clear how an evaluation considering the effect on qualified life provides the required assurance that the MSIV trip solenoids will not exceed their maximum continuous operating rating of 125 volts and translates to an acceptable level of protection for the RPS. Provide clarification.
2. From the information presented, it is not clear that the reduced TS frequency of Channel Calibration adequately compensates for the reduced margin between the expected normal operating voltage range of the RPS power supply and the voltage range that will be permitted by the proposed reduced TS overvoltage Allowable Values. Provide clarification.
3. From a risk perspective, it is not clear that the possible improvement in risk from the apparent new conservative design basis (the load's continuous voltage rating for assuring essential loads will be operated within their design/qualified ratings) adequately compensates for the possible detriment to risk from the increased possibility for reactor trip and increased testing time at power. Provide clarification.
4. It appears from the information presented that the current licensing basis relied on testing, analysis, and/or engineering judgement to demonstrate qualification for sustained voltage conditions above the manufacturer's continuous rating. Clarify why this apparent current licensing basis is no longer considered valid or is not considered a viable approach for assuring compliance with GDC 2, 21, and 23.

Peter S. Tam, Senior Project Manager  
Project Directorate I-1  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

e-mail: pst@nrc.gov Tel.: 301-415-1451

**Mail Envelope Properties**

(3AE73391.501 : 10 : 20510)

**Subject:** Nine Mile Point, TS change regarding overvoltage allowable values  
**Creation Date:** 4/25/01 4:29PM  
**From:** Peter Tam

**Created By:** PST@nrc.gov

<b>Recipients</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
nimo.com leonardm (INternet:leonardm@nimo.com) mackamanc (internet:mackamanc@nimo.com) wolniakd (internet:wolniakd@nimo.com)	Transferred	04/25/01 04:29PM

nrc.gov owf2_po.OWFN_DO JLK (John Knox)	Delivered Opened	04/25/01 04:29PM 04/26/01 08:04AM
---	---------------------	--------------------------------------

<b>Post Office</b>	<b>Delivered</b>	<b>Route</b>
nimo.com owf2_po.OWFN_DO	04/25/01 04:29PM	INternet nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3559	04/25/01 04:29PM

**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