

July 27, 2001

MEMORANDUM TO: James W. Clifford, Chief, Section 2  
Project Directorate I  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Richard B. Ennis, Project Manager, Section 2     **/RA/**  
Project Directorate I  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: HOPE CREEK GENERATING STATION, FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION,  
ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED IN AN UPCOMING CONFERENCE CALL  
(TAC NO. MB1970)

The attached information was transmitted by facsimile on July 26, 2001, to Mr. John Nagle of PSEG Nuclear LLC (PSEG or the licensee). This information was transmitted to facilitate a upcoming conference call in order to clarify the licensee's license change request dated May 17, 2001, and as followup to a public meeting that was held on July 18, 2001, regarding the licensee's submittal. The proposed amendment would revise the Hope Creek Generating Station Technical Specifications to permit an increase in the allowable leak rate for the main steam isolation valves (MSIVs) and to delete the MSIV Sealing System. These changes are based on the use of an alternate source term and the guidance provided in Regulatory Guide 1.183, "Alternate Radiological Source Terms for Evaluating Design Basis Accidents at Nuclear Power Reactors.". This memorandum and the attachment do not convey or represent an NRC staff position regarding the licensee's request.

Docket No. 50-354

Attachment: Issues for Discussion in Upcoming Telephone Conference

July 27, 2001

MEMORANDUM TO: James W. Clifford, Chief, Section 2  
Project Directorate I  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Richard B. Ennis, Project Manager, Section 2     /RA/  
Project Directorate I  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: HOPE CREEK GENERATING STATION, FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION,  
ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED IN AN UPCOMING CONFERENCE CALL  
(TAC NO. MB1970)

The attached information was transmitted by facsimile on July 26, 2001, to Mr. John Nagle of PSEG Nuclear LLC (PSEG or the licensee). This information was transmitted to facilitate a upcoming conference call in order to clarify the licensee's license change request dated May 17, 2001, and as followup to a public meeting that was held on July 18, 2001, regarding the licensee's submittal. The proposed amendment would revise the Hope Creek Generating Station Technical Specifications to permit an increase in the allowable leak rate for the main steam isolation valves (MSIVs) and to delete the MSIV Sealing System. These changes are based on the use of an alternate source term and the guidance provided in Regulatory Guide 1.183, "Alternate Radiological Source Terms for Evaluating Design Basis Accidents at Nuclear Power Reactors.". This memorandum and the attachment do not convey or represent an NRC staff position regarding the licensee's request.

Docket No. 50-354

Attachment: Issues for Discussion in Upcoming Telephone Conference

DISTRIBUTION

PUBLIC                   LBrown  
JClifford               JLee  
REnnis  
PDI-2 Reading

DOCUMENT NAME: C:\Program Files\Adobe\Acrobat 4.0\PDF Output\mem02 mb1970.wpd  
Accession No. ML012080314

OFFICE	PDI-2/PM
NAME	REnnis
DATE	7/26/01

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Issues for Discussion in Upcoming Telephone Conference  
Related to PSEG License Change Request H01-002, dated May 17, 2001  
Hope Creek Generating Station  
Increase in Allowable MSIV Leakage Rate and Elimination of MSIV Sealing System  
(TAC NO. MB1970)

The page number reference noted in each of the following discussion items pertains to the slide presentation handout that was provided by PSEG at a public meeting with the NRC on July 18, 2001. The public meeting was held to discuss PSEG's license change request referenced above.

- 1) Page 15 - PSEG notes that the turbine building roof vents are further from the control room air intake than the louver panel from which effluent is assumed to leak. However, the release from the louver panel is assumed to be a diffuse release, whereas the release from the vent might be considered as a point source and thus, for the same distance, the calculated relative concentration ( $X/Q$ ) values for the vent would probably be higher. Have comparative calculations been made to demonstrate that the  $X/Q$  value for a release from a vent is lower than for the louver panel for the Hope Creek configuration because the vent is adequately far away?
- 2) Page 16 - It is stated that ARCON96 calculations were based upon plant north which a comparison showed resulted in higher  $X/Q$  values than using true north. Are wind directions based upon true or plant north in all calculations and is the release configuration grid that is based upon both true north and plant north or, for any single set of calculations, are all directions based upon either true north or plant north?
- 3) Page 17 - The assumed area width and height should both be divided by 6 to determine the initial diffusion coefficients when using the diffuse source option of the ARCON96 code rather than by 4.3 and 2. Therefore, the  $X/Q$  values for the assumed release from the louver panel should be recalculated and dose calculations revised appropriately.
- 4) Page 18 - Is the wake area mentioned on page 18 the wake of equipment within the buildings or the turbine building wake with respect to the environment?