

May 28, 2002

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

FROM: Eric M. Thomas, Project Manager, Section 1 /RA/
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FAXED TO THE
LICENSEE RE: SUSQUEHANNA STEAM ELECTRIC STATION,
UNITS 1 AND 2, ELIMINATION OF AUTOMATIC HIGH PRESSURE
COOLANT INJECTION PUMP SUCTION TRANSFER TO THE
SUPPRESSION POOL (TAC NOS. MB2190 & MB2191)

Attached is a list of questions received by e-mail from the technical review staff regarding the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff's review of the licensee's application dated June 8, 2001. The attached questions were faxed to the licensee on May 22, 2002, as a follow-up to the licensee's May 7, 2002, response to the staff's request for additional information (RAI) dated December 18, 2001. This is the second set of clarifying questions that has been generated by the staff regarding the licensee's RAI response. The questions were discussed during a conference call between the licensee and NRC staff on May 22, 2002. The licensee's answers to these questions will allow the technical staff to move forward with its review. This memo documents the NRC staff's clarifying questions in lieu of issuing another formal RAI.

Docket Nos. 50-387 and 50-388

Attachment: As stated

CONTACT: Eric M. Thomas, NRR
(301) 415-3780

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

FROM: Eric M. Thomas, Project Manager, Section 1 /RA/
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FAXED TO THE
LICENSEE RE: SUSQUEHANNA STEAM ELECTRIC STATION,
UNITS 1 AND 2, ELIMINATION OF AUTOMATIC HIGH PRESSURE
COOLANT INJECTION PUMP SUCTION TRANSFER TO THE
SUPPRESSION POOL (TAC NOS. MB2190 & MB2191)

Attached is a list of questions received by e-mail from the technical review staff regarding the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff's review of the licensee's application dated June 8, 2001. The attached questions were faxed to the licensee on May 22, 2002, as a follow-up to the licensee's May 7, 2002, response to the staff's request for additional information (RAI) dated December 18, 2001. This is the second set of clarifying questions that has been generated by the staff regarding the licensee's RAI response. The questions were discussed during a conference call between the licensee and NRC staff on May 22, 2002. The licensee's answers to these questions will allow the technical staff to move forward with its review. This memo documents the NRC staff's clarifying questions in lieu of issuing another formal RAI.

Docket Nos. 50-387 and 50-388

Attachment: As stated

CONTACT: Eric M. Thomas, NRR
(301) 415-3780

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC SRichards EThomas T. Colburn
PDI-1 R/F RLaufer MO'Brien

Accession No.: ML021480349

OFFICE	PDI-1/LA	PDI-1/PM	PDI-1/SC
NAME	MO'Brien	EThomas	PTam for RLaufer
DATE	5/23/02	5/23/02	5/28/02

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Background:

The following list of followup questions was generated by the reactor systems technical staff to clarify information from the licensee's RAI response of May 7, 2002, and the licensee's response to a list of questions faxed by the technical staff on May 16, 2002. These questions were discussed with the licensee during a conference call on May 22, 2002.

Questions:

1. Has the fuel bundle channel metal mass been considered for your stored energy calculation?
2. Please explain how the recirculation line liquid volume is added into the downcomer volume. What are the justifications?
3. The heat discharged from the vessel wall and vessel internal metal mass is added into the decay heat as part of the fuel rod heat source. This introduces a lag for the heat transfer. Please provide justifications and metal mass temperature history versus system T_{sat} in the final calculations.
4. The time to reach 25 ft in the suppression pool has been calculated for a 0.04 ft² break. Why does it take a longer time than th 0.0375 ft² break? Please run a sensitivity case using a 0.06 ft² break size as well.