

**From:** "Harrison, James (PS, NE, Contractor)" <James.Harrison@gene.GE.com>  
**To:** Joseph Donoghue <JED1@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Tue, Apr 9, 2002 12:35 PM  
**Subject:** Generic Disposition Logic

Hi Joe:

Per your request I have summarized our conversation regarding the misunderstanding for Generic dispositions that fail to be confirmed for a specific plant. (ie, the plant specific/reload wording)

While our discussion was more verbose, I tried to focus on the simplest way to describe the logic.

Thanks, Jim H

Section 1.1.1 defines Generic assessments as follows:

Generic assessments are those safety evaluations that can be dispositioned for a group or all BWR plants by:

- A bounding analysis for the limiting conditions,
- Demonstrating that there is a negligible effect due to CPPU, or
- Demonstrating that the required plant cycle specific reload analyses are sufficient and appropriate for establishing the CPPU licensing basis.

Whenever a generically dispositioned subject cannot be confirmed for a specific plant, a plant specific evaluation will be provided in the power uprate SAR. This logic applies for each of the three sub-categories of "generic" assessments. There are no exceptions.

The approved reload analysis process (GESTAR) does not change as a result of the CPPU approach. The same scope of GESTAR evaluations and analyses that were performed for reloads before a constant pressure uprate will continue to be performed after a constant pressure uprate. In addition, the fuel related evaluations that are dispositioned on a generic basis (addressed by the standard reload scope) are demonstrated in the CLTR to be insensitive to the changes in a constant pressure power uprate (i.e., the changes are comparable to those observed from cycle to cycle).

**CC:** "George B. Stramback (PS, NE) (E-mail)" <george.stramback@gene.GE.com>, "Israel Nir (E-mail)" <Israel.Nir@gene.GE.com>