

May 3, 2002

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

FROM: Daniel S. Collins, Project Manager, Section 1 /RA/  
Project Directorate I  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: BEAVER VALLEY POWER STATION, UNIT NOS 1 AND 2, DRAFT  
REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (RAI), REGARDING  
LICENSEE'S RESPONSE TO NRC BULLETIN 2002-01 (TAC NOS.  
MB4526 AND MB4527)

The attached draft RAI was transmitted by facsimile on April 23, 2002, to Mr. John Maracek of FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company in preparation for a conference call. Review of the RAI would allow the licensee to determine and agree upon a schedule to respond to the RAI. This memorandum and the attachment do not convey a formal request for information or represent a Nuclear Regulatory Commission position.

Docket Nos. 50-334 and 50-412

Attachment: As stated

Contact: D. Collins, NRR  
301-415-1427

May 3, 2002

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

FROM: Daniel S. Collins, Project Manager, Section 1 /RA/  
Project Directorate I  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: BEAVER VALLEY POWER STATION, UNIT NOS 1 AND 2, DRAFT  
REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (RAI), REGARDING  
LICENSEE'S RESPONSE TO NRC BULLETIN 2002-01 (TAC NOS.  
MB4526 AND MB4527)

The attached draft RAI was transmitted by facsimile on April 23, 2002, to Mr. John Maracek of FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company in preparation for a conference call. Review of the RAI would allow the licensee to determine and agree upon a schedule to respond to the RAI. This memorandum and the attachment do not convey a formal request for information or represent a Nuclear Regulatory Commission position.

Docket Nos. 50-334 and 50-412

Attachment: As stated

Contact: D. Collins, NRR  
301-415-1427

DISTRIBUTION

Public  
PDI-I R/F  
D. Collins  
M. O'Brien (hardcopy)

Accession No.: ML021260329

Office	PM:PDI-1	LA:PDI-2
Name	DCollins	MO'Brien
Date	5/3/02	5/3/02

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

# DRAFT

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION  
RELATED TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NOS. DPR-66 AND NPF-73  
NRC BULLETIN 2002-01, REACTOR PRESSURE VESSEL HEAD DEGRADATION  
AND REACTOR COOLANT PRESSURE BOUNDARY INTEGRITY  
BEAVER VALLEY POWER STATION UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2  
DOCKET NOS.: 50-334 AND 50-412

The NRC staff has been reviewing FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company's (FENOC's) letters dated October 31, 2001 (L-01-136), March 28, 2002 (L-02-021), April 1, 2002 (L-02-032), and April 19, 2002 (L-02-040) which were submitted in response to NRC Bulletins 2001-01 and 2002-01. In order to evaluate the acceptability of FENOC's responses to the Bulletins, the NRC staff has determined that answers to the following questions are required.

1. Has there been any abnormal fouling of the radiation monitor filter paper over the last several cycles?
2. For unit 1, a conoseal leak near penetration 59 occurred. Historical records indicate that the boric acid residue was removed from the head. During the September 2001 inspection, there was accumulation of boric acid residue near the base of the penetration; however, it was not attributed to a leaking nozzle because of the pattern of the residue/deposits and the previous history of leakage in this area. Given more recent information from inspections at other plants, discuss the possibility that the residue/deposits, were a result of a leaking nozzle.
3. For unit 1, boric acid residue/deposits were left on the head. Discuss the extent of these regions. For example, clarify if the bare metal of the head can be seen through the deposits or whether there is any significant ( $> 1 \text{ in}^2$ ) area that is obscured.
4. Were all known leaks repaired during the last Unit 1 and Unit 2 refueling outages so as to preclude the possibility of wetting of the deposits.
5. For penetration 65 in Unit 1, discuss the possibility that the leakage from above could have "washed away" any evidence of a leak coming from a crack in nozzle 65.
6. Discuss your plans for removing the boric acid deposits from the Unit 1 head.
7. Discuss your schedule for providing the results of your evaluations for determining the scope of the next Unit 2 reactor vessel head inspection.

DRAFT

Attachment