PSEG Nuclear LLC
P.O. Box 236, Hancocks Bridge, New Jersey 08038-0236

DEC 2 7 2001
LRN 01-0437
LCR H00-009

PSEG
Nuclear LLC

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Document Control Desk
Washington, DC 20555

Gentlemen:

REQUEST FOR CHANGE TO TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS REQUIREMENTS
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION
EMERGENCY CORE COOLING SYSTEMS SURVEILLANCE
HOPE CREEK GENERATING STATION
FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-57
DOCKET NO. 50-354

On January 8, 2001, PSEG Nuclear LLC submitted a request for a revision to the Technical Specifications (TS) to reduce the surveillance test values for the core spray flow in Section 4.5.1.b.1 for the Hope Creek Generating Station (HC). The information contained in this letter documents our response to questions raised by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Hope Creek Project Manager, Mr. Richard Ennis, during a telephone call on December 26, 2001. In accordance with 10CFR50.91(b)(1), a copy of this submittal has been sent to the State of New Jersey.

Should you have any questions regarding this request, please contact Mr. John Nagle at 856-339-3171.

Sincerely,

Gabor Salamon
Nuclear Safety and Licensing Manager

Attachment

A001

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on 12/27/01

Gabor Salamon
Nuclear Safety and Licensing Manager

C: Mr. H. Miller, Administrator – Region I
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, PA 19406

Mr. R. Ennis, Project Manager-Hope Creek
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
One White Flint North
Mail Stop 08B1
11555 Rockville Pike
Rockville, MD 20852

USNRC Senior Resident Inspector (X24)

Mr. K. Tosch, Manager IV
Bureau of Nuclear Engineering
PO Box 415
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Document Control Desk
LR-N01-0437
Attachment

HOPE CREEK GENERATING STATION
FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-57
DOCKET NO. 50-354
REVISIONS TO THE TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS (TS)

The following information was discussed in the Dec 27, 2001 telephone call:

	Current	Proposed
Core Spray Flow to Reactor Vessel (This is the design-basis core spray flow delivered to the reactor vessel that is demonstrated by meeting the Technical Specification (TS) 4.5.1.b.1 minimum acceptable flow requirement during surveillance testing)	6350 gpm	6150 gpm
Core Spray Flow to Fuel (This is the flow value, assumed in the Appendix K LOCA analysis, that is delivered to the fuel based on the TS 4.5.1.b.1 surveillance testing meeting the minimum acceptable flow value minus 100 gpm assumed for core shroud bypass flow)	6250 gpm	6050 gpm
Bounding Value (This was the flow value provided by PSEG to the fuel vendors to use as a bounding value to generate core spray pump curves to assess the impact of the revised mechanical calculations on the existing LOCA analysis. Since the 6058 gpm value was a preliminary PSEG design engineering number at the time the value was provided to General Electric (GE) and Westinghouse (W), the fuel vendors used conservatively lower flow values in generating the pump curves.)	N/A	6058 gpm
Fuel Vendor Degraded Core Spray Flow To Fuel Curves (These curves (shown in 2/6/01 submittal) were used by GE and W to evaluate the impact on the existing LOCA analysis. Curves were generated with flow values less than 6000 gpm at 105 psid for conservatism)	N/A	< 6000 gpm at 105 psid

After the change is implemented, if the surveillance testing meets the new acceptance criteria of 6150 gpm, this means that at least 6050 gpm will actually be delivered to the fuel (i.e., meets the core spray flow assumed in the LOCA analysis). UFSAR Table 6.3-2 (Significant Input Variables Used in LOCA Analysis) will be revised to indicate that minimum Core Spray flow is 6050 gpm at 105 psid.

The fuel vendors have determined the impact on the existing LOCA analysis by using the degraded pump curves. Although specific values are not shown on the curves (in the 2/6/01 submittal), it can clearly be seen that the flow value on each curve at a head equivalent to 105 psid (105 psid $\approx$ 242 ft H2O) is less than 6000 gpm (i.e., less than 6000 gpm is needed for acceptable ECCS performance based on fuel vendors evaluation and at least 6050 gpm will actually be delivered to fuel if TS acceptance criteria is met).