

AUG 01 1975

DISTRIBUTION

✓ Docket  
ORB#2 Reading  
Attorney, OELD  
NRC PDR  
OI&E (3)  
Local PDR  
NDube  
BJones (4)  
JMcGough  
JSaltzman  
RMDiggs  
BCBuckley  
DLZiemann  
SKari  
WOMiller

BScharf (15)  
TJCarter  
PCollins  
SVarga  
CHebron  
ACRS (14)  
AESteen  
Deisenhot  
bcc: JRBuchanan  
TBAbarnathy

Docket No. 50-263

Northern States Power Company  
ATTN: Mr. L. O. Mayer  
Director of Nuclear Support  
Services  
414 Nicollet Mall  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401

Gentlemen:

By our letter dated July 15, 1975, we forwarded you a copy of our Notice of Proposed Issuance of an Amendment to Facility License No. DPR-22 relating to suppression pool water temperature limits for the Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant. Some copies of the proposed Technical Specifications did not include page 161. Enclosed is a copy of page 161, in case it was omitted from your copy.

Sincerely,

*Original signed by*  
Dennis L. Ziemann

Dennis L. Ziemann, Chief  
Operating Reactors Branch #2  
Division of Reactor Licensing

Enclosure:  
Proposed Tech Spec  
Page 161

cc w/enclosure:  
See next page

*DLZ*

OFFICE →	RL:ORB#2 <i>RMD</i>	RL:ORB# 2 <i>BCB</i>	RL:ORB#2		
SURNAME →	RMDiggs:tc	BCBuckley	DLZiemann		
DATE →	7/31/75	7/31/75	8/1/75		

cc w/enclosure:

Arthur Renquist, Esquire  
Vice President - Law  
Northern States Power Company  
414 Nicollet Mall  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401

Gerald Charnoff  
Shaw, Pittman, Potts &  
Trowbridge  
910 - 17th Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20006

Howard J. Vogel, Esquire  
Legal Counsel  
2750 Dean Parkway  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55416

Steve Gadler  
2120 Carter Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

Mr. Daniel L. Ficker  
Assistant City Attorney  
638 City Hall  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55102

Mr. Kenneth Dzugan  
Environmental Planning  
Consultant  
St. Paul City Planning  
421 Wabasha Street  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55102

Sandra S. Gardebring  
Special Assistant Attorney General  
Counsel for Minnesota Pollution  
Control Agency  
1935 W. County Road B2  
Roseville, Minnesota 55113

Anthony Z. Roisman, Esquire  
Berlin, Roisman and Kessler  
1712 N Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

The Environmental Conservation  
Library  
Minneapolis Public Library  
300 Nicollet Mall  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401

Mr. D. S. Douglas, Auditor  
Wright County Board of Commissioners  
Buffalo, Minnesota 55313

Warren R. Lawson, M. D.  
Secretary and Executive Officer  
State Department of Health  
University Campus  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55440

Mr. Gary Williams  
Federal Activities Branch  
Environmental Protection Agency  
230 South Dearborn Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Bases:

4.7 A. Primary Containment

The water in the suppression chamber is used only for cooling in the event of an accident; i.e., it is not used for normal operation; therefore, a weekly check of the temperature and volume is adequate to assure that adequate heat removal capability is present. For additional margin, these will be checked once per day.

The interiors of the drywell and suppression chamber are painted to prevent rusting. The inspection of the paint during each major refueling outage, approximately once per year, assures the paint is intact and is not deteriorating. Experience with this type of paint indicates that the inspection interval is adequate.

Because of the large volume and thermal capacity of the suppression pool, the volume and temperature normally changes very slowly and monitoring these parameters daily is sufficient to establish any temperature trends. By requiring the suppression pool temperature to be continually monitored and frequently logged during periods of significant heat addition, the temperature trends will be closely followed so that appropriate action can be taken. The requirement for an external visual examination following any event where potentially high loadings could occur provides assurance that no significant damage was encountered. Particular attention should be focused on structural discontinuities in the vicinity of the relief valve discharge since these are expected to be the points of highest stress. Visual inspection of the suppression chamber including water line regions each refueling outage is adequate to detect any changes in the suppression chamber structures.

The primary containment preoperational test pressures are based upon the calculated primary containment pressure response in the event of a loss of coolant accident. The peak drywell pressure would be about 41 psig, which would rapidly reduce to 25 psig within 10 seconds following the pipe break. Following the pipe break, the suppression chamber pressure rises to 25 psig within 10 seconds, equalizes with drywell pressure and thereafter rapidly decays with the drywell pressure decay. See Section 5.2.3 FSAR.

The design pressure of the drywell and absorption chamber is 56 psig. See Section 5.2.3 FSAR. The design leak rate is 0.5%/day at a pressure of 56 psig. As indicated above, the pressure response of the drywell and suppression chamber following an accident would be the same after about 10 seconds. Based on the calculated containment pressure response discussed above, the primary containment preoperational test pressures were chosen. Also, based on the primary containment pressure response and the fact that the drywell and suppression chamber function as a unit, the primary containment will be tested as a unit rather than the individual components separately.