

January 30, 2003

MEMORANDUM TO: File

FROM: Deirdre W. Spaulding, Project Manager, Section 1 */RA/*
Project Directorate III
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2 -
FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION ISSUES DISCUSSED IN PHONE
CONVERSATION (TAC NOS. MB5553 AND MB5554)

The attached questions were transmitted by fax to Ms. Schofield of Point Beach Nuclear Plant in preparation for a telephone call held on January 16, 2003. This memorandum and the attachment do not convey a formal request for information or represent an NRC staff position.

Docket Nos. 50-266 and 50-301

Attachment: Discussion Points

January 30, 2003

MEMORANDUM TO: File

FROM: Deirdre W. Spaulding, Project Manager, Section 1 */RA/*
Project Directorate III
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2 -
FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION ISSUES DISCUSSED IN PHONE
CONVERSATION (TAC NOS. MB5553 AND MB5554)

The attached questions were transmitted by fax to Ms. Schofield of Point Beach Nuclear Plant in preparation for a telephone call held on January 16, 2003. This memorandum and the attachment do not convey a formal request for information or represent an NRC staff position.

Docket Nos. 50-266 and 50-301

Attachment: Discussion Points

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC
PDIII-1 Reading
DSpaulding
RBouling
LRaghavan

ADAMS Accession No. ML030210167

OFFICE	PDIII-1/PM	PDIII-1/LA	PDIII-1/SC
NAME	DSpaulding	RBouling	LRaghavan
DATE	01/30/03	01/29/03	01/30/03

OFFICIAL RECORD ONLY

Discussion Points
Relief Request #3 - MB5553 and MB5554

1. The submittal states, "The original results provided for the RI-ISI analysis are based on the 1996 PRA Update. The last PRA update was done in the summer of 2001, to prepare for the PRA Certification effort. To the degree available, those results are incorporated into this study."

Please elaborate on the last sentence quoted above.

2. The staff review of the original IPE and the WOG review of the latest version of the PRA have identified shortcomings in the treatment of pre-accident human errors. Furthermore, according to your submittal, the WOG reviewers also critiqued the common cause failure analysis performed in the latest version of the PRA. Please elaborate on your claim that the RI-ISI consequence evaluation results would not be impacted once these modeling deficiencies are eliminated.
3. The risk profile of the PBNP has changed significantly relative to the IPE. In the IPE model, the LOCA events were the dominant contributors to CDF. This is not the case for the latest PRA model, which identifies SGTR events as dominant contributors. Please identify design/operation modifications that you credited in the PRA model that are responsible for reducing the importance of LOCA sequences.