

From: Lawrence Burkhart
To: Brian Sepelak
Date: 12/4/01 7:23AM
Subject: QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION (DECREASE IN DECAY TIME AMENDMENT REQUEST)

Please see attached questions regarding your submittal dated October 29, 2001 (LAR 1A-281/2A-152). Please let me know when you would like to discuss these questions with the NRC staff).

1. Section 9.1.3.2 of the Unit 2 UFSAR states that the emergency makeup water supply to the spent fuel pool (SFP) is the service water system via Seismic Category 1 piping. In the table in your submittal showing the SFP makeup system flow rates, the flow rate for service water is “neglected” and the “Time Required to Place In-Service” is “N/A.” This implies that the service water system is not a viable source of makeup water to the SFP. Additionally, in UFSAR Section 9.1.3.3, “Safety Evaluation,” you take credit for the service water system as the Seismic Category I source of makeup water to the SFP in the event of the loss of fuel pool cooling. Please explain the apparent differences between the Unit 2 UFSAR and your submittal. Additionally, the Unit 2 UFSAR states that to provide service water makeup to the SFP requires the manual operation of several locked shut valves. Will the higher ambient room temperatures due to the higher SFP temperatures affect the ability of operators to perform the actions required to supply the SFP with makeup water?
2. What administrative controls are in place to preclude you from entering a planned offload with a worst case single failure of the SFP cooling system?
3. The safety evaluation in Section 9.5.3.1, “Operational Situations - Spent Fuel Pool Water Temperature Increase,” of the Unit 1 UFSAR discusses providing emergency cooling water to the SFP heat exchangers in the case of a loss of component cooling water. The source of the emergency cooling water is the fire protection system. The evaluation also discusses the installation of a temporary hoses and pump in the case of a pipe failure or loss of both pumps. What is the impact of the proposed reduction in decay time on these evaluations?
4. Part of the design basis for the SFP cooling systems as described in the Unit 1 and Unit 2 UFSARs is to permit the unrestricted access to the working area both in and around the SFP. What impact, if any, is there on the ability of operators to access the working areas around the SFP due to the increased SFP temperatures described in your submittal?

Mail Envelope Properties (3C0CC05A.537 : 6 : 21370)

Subject: QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION (DECREASE IN DECAY TIME
AMENDMENT REQUEST)

Creation Date: 12/4/01 7:23AM

From: Lawrence Burkhart

Created By: LJB@nrc.gov

Recipients

firstenergycorp.com

sepelakb (Brian Sepelak)

Post Office

firstenergycorp.com

Route

internet

Files

RAI.wpd

MESSAGE

Size

5350

631

Date & Time

11/29/01 02:34PM

12/04/01 07:23AM

Options

Expiration Date:

None

Priority:

Standard

Reply Requested:

No

Return Notification:

None

Concealed Subject:

No

Security:

Standard