

June 18, 2001

MEMORANDUM TO: Richard P. Correia, Acting Chief, Section 1
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Timothy G. Colburn, Senior Project Manager, Section 1 /RA/
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FAXED TO THE
LICENSEE RE: TMI-1 LICENSING ACTION EMERGENCY
FEEDWATER TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CHANGE
(TAC NO. MB0691)

The technical review staff e-mailed the enclosed questions to me regarding the staff's review of the licensee's application dated December 6, 2000. I have faxed them to the licensee. These questions will be discussed with the licensee during an upcoming conference call on or about June 14, 2001, prior to initiating a formal request for additional information, in order to determine whether the information has been previously placed on the docket. These questions will then be formally transmitted to the licensee.

Docket No. 50-289

Attachment: Questions Faxed to the Licensee

MEMORANDUM TO: Richard P. Correia, Acting Chief, Section 1
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

June 18, 2001

FROM: Timothy G. Colburn, Senior Project Manager, Section 1 /RA/
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FAXED TO THE
LICENSEE RE: TMI-1 LICENSING ACTION EMERGENCY
FEEDWATER TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CHANGE
(TAC NO. MB0691)

The technical review staff e-mailed the enclosed questions to me regarding the staff's review of the licensee's application dated December 6, 2000. I have faxed them to the licensee. These questions will be discussed with the licensee during an upcoming conference call on or about June 14, 2001, prior to initiating a formal request for additional information, in order to determine whether the information has been previously placed on the docket. These questions will then be formally transmitted to the licensee.

Docket No. 50-289

Attachment: Questions Faxed to the Licensee

DISTRIBUTION:

Non-Public PDI-1 R/F EAdensam
MO'Brien TColburn

Accession Number: ML011630417

OFFICE	PDI-1/PM	PDI-1/LA	PDI-1/SC(A)
NAME	TColburn	TClark for MO'Brien	RCorreia
DATE	6/18/01	6/15/01	6 / 18 /01

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

REVIEW QUESTIONS FAXED TO THE LICENSEE RE: TMI-1 EFW TS CHANGE
(TAC MB0691)

1. The licensee's basis for the CST (condensate storage tank) volume is not clear. The criteria stems from the TMI Action Plan requirements (perhaps from NUREG-0660, Task II.E.1.1.a(3)). The criteria does include the ability to cool the plant down to the point where the DHR system can be used, which is typically 250 °F. Also, TMI FSAR reflects the ability to bring the RCS temperature down to 250 °F, using one CST. The TS Bases change request appears to contradict the FSAR with respect to the minimum amount of water in the CST required by TS 3.4.1.1.c. and the number of hours of decay heat removal provided by the CST with steam being discharged to the atmosphere.
2. Proposed TS 3.4.1.1.a (3), as well as the existing TS, would be inappropriate if insufficient EFW capability exists to remove decay heat. In this situation, the plant would be vulnerable to a loss of power event and the STS would require that immediate action be taken to restore the decay heat removal capability before initiating a plant shutdown.
3. Proposed TS 3.4.1.1.a (4)(b) is a significant relaxation from what was originally approved, and the proposed change has not been adequately justified. A dedicated operator in the immediate vicinity of the closed manual flow path isolation valves who is in direct communication with the control room is the appropriate requirement for this situation. The licensee needs to better research and understand the basis for this requirement.
4. With respect to TS 3.4.1.1.a (4)(b), why is it necessary to allow more than one EFW pump to be inoperable at a time for surveillance testing?
5. Proposed TS 3.4.1.1.a does not adequately address inoperability of one of the steam supplies to the turbine-driven EFW pump and concurrent inoperability of a motor-driven EFW pump or turbine-driven EFW pump.
6. Proposed TS 3.4.1.1.a does not include an AOT for both an inoperable flow path and an inoperable motor-driven or turbine-driven EFW pump.
7. Existing TS 4.9.1.1 does not include provisions for delaying testing of the turbine-driven EFW pump until sufficient steam generator pressure is available. What is the licensee's practice in this regard?
8. The licensee may want to examine the proposed TS change that was proposed by Entergy for Waterford 3 (letter dated May 22, 2001), and pursue a similar approach.