

February 4, 2003

MEMORANDUM TO: William H. Ruland, Director
Project Directorate IV
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Brian Benney, Project Manager, Section 2 **/RA by A. Wang for B.Benney/**
Project Directorate IV
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF MEETING HELD ON JANUARY 22, 2003, WITH
GE NUCLEAR ENERGY (GENE)

The NRC staff participated in a closed meeting with GENE on January 22, 2003. The meeting was closed due to the proprietary nature of the issues. The purpose of the meeting was to resolve issues with the constant pressure power uprate (CPPU) licensing topical report (LTR).

The staff and GENE discussed acceptable wording for the portions of the LTR and the safety evaluation. The agreed-upon wording to be included in the staff's letter is contained in Attachment 1. The various restrictions and limitations imposed by the staff to the use of the CPPU LTR are included in Attachment 2.

An attendance list is provided in Attachment 3.

Project No. 710

Attachments: 1. Cover Letter Wording
2. Restrictions and Limitations Imposed by the Staff
3. Attendance List

cc w/attachment: See next page

February 4, 2003

MEMORANDUM TO: William H. Ruland, Director
Project Directorate IV
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Brian Benney, Project Manager, Section 2 /RA by A. Wang for B. Benney/
Project Directorate IV
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF MEETING HELD ON JANUARY 22, 2003, WITH
GE NUCLEAR ENERGY (GENE)

The NRC staff participated in a closed meeting with GENE on January 22, 2003. The meeting was closed due to the proprietary nature of the issues. The purpose of the meeting was to resolve issues with the constant pressure power uprate (CPPU) licensing topical report (LTR).

The staff and GENE discussed acceptable wording for the portions of the LTR and the safety evaluation. The agreed-upon wording to be included in the staff's letter is contained in Attachment 1. The various restrictions and limitations imposed by the staff to the use of the CPPU LTR are included in Attachment 2.

An attendance list is provided in Attachment 3.

Project No. 710

Attachments: 1. Cover Letter Wording
2. Restrictions and Limitations Imposed by the Staff
3. Attendance List

cc w/attachment: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC

PDIV-2 Reading

RidsNrrDlpm (JZwolinski /TMarsh)

RidsNrrDlpmLpdiv (WRuland)

RidsNrrPMBBenney

RidsNrrPMAWang

RidsNrrLAEPeyton

RidsOgcMailCenter

RidsAcrcAcnwMailCenter

MKotzalas

RCaruso

ZAbdullahi

JWermiel

ML030210406

PKG: ML 030360395

ADAMS Accession No.: ML030603363

NRC-001

OFFICE	PDIV-2/PM	PDIV-2/LA	PDIV-2/SC
NAME	BBenney:rkb	EPeyton	SDembek
DATE	2/4/03	2/4/03	2/4/03

DOCUMENT NAME: C:\ORPCheckout\FileNET\ML030360363.wpd

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

ATTACHMENT 1

COVER LETTER WORDING

Licensees proposing to reference the CPPU LTR as a basis for a power uprate license amendment request and proposing to obtain a license amendment to incorporate one or more of the plant changes mentioned in the 7 restrictions applicable to the CPPU LTR must first request and obtain [a license amendment for the associated change] in accordance with the CPPU LTR. Licensees proposing to utilize fuel designs other than GE 14 fuel may not reference the CPPU LTR as a basis for their power uprate since the CPPU LTR process applies only to GE fuel and GE accident analysis methods. However, such licensees may reference the CPPU LTR for areas other than those involving reactor systems and fuel issues which are not impacted by the fuel design. Licensees should afford the staff sufficient time to complete its review of all associated licensing basis changes prior to submittal or request for the implementation of the power uprate when referencing the CPPU LTR.

ATTACHMENT 2

RESTRICTIONS AND LIMITATIONS IMPOSED BY THE STAFF

- A. The CPPU approach generically disposes, defers to the standard reload or fuel introduction process, simplifies, or limits some of the safety analyses and system performance evaluations used to support operation at the higher power level. Licensees proposing to reference this topical report as a basis for a power uprate license amendment request, and proposing to obtain a license amendment to incorporate one or more of the plant changes listed below must first request and obtain approval for the associated change prior to the start of the staff review of the power uprate request that references this topical report.
- B. The CPPU analyses and evaluations provided in the plant specific submittal will be performed consistent with the intended licensing basis of the plant as it will operate after implementation of the power uprate, including all previously submitted and approved license amendment requests. The CPPU operating map is an extension of the current ARTS/MELLLA or MEOD operating map. Therefore, this report is applicable only to plants that are licensed, at the time that the CPPU application is submitted, to operate with the ARTS/MELLLA or MEOD operational margin improvement option. A typical power/flow map showing the CPPU change in applicable operating conditions is shown on Figure 1-1.
- C. Changes to the plant licensing and design basis necessary to support the licensing of the power uprate will be reported and justified in a plant specific power uprate submittal. The plant specific submittal will include changes to the analysis basis methodology identified in References 1 and 2, unless this methodology is revised by this report. Applicable new methods that are approved by the NRC independent of this LTR may be used after they are approved by the staff. Any new methods that a licensee wishes to implement concurrent with the CPPU approach may cause the NRC staff, at their sole discretion, to determine that the generic disposition of any analysis or evaluation in this LTR is no longer valid, or that the scope of the submitted plant specific evaluations is inadequate, and may require the submittal of substantial additional supporting analyses and evaluations during the review of that application, which may substantially extend the review scope and schedule.
- D. For those analyses and evaluations that are generically dispositioned in this report, the plant specific PUSAR is only required to provide the basis for the generic dispositions and confirm the applicability of these generic dispositions for the specific plant application. However, if any plant seeks concurrent implementation of a power uprate and the excluded plant changes listed above, the NRC staff may, at their sole discretion, determine that the generic disposition of any analysis or evaluation in this LTR is no longer valid, and may require the submittal of substantial additional supporting analyses and evaluations during the review of that application.

- E. The sections in this topical report that are related to reactor systems and fuel performance are not applicable to, and cannot be referenced by, any plant that (1) has not already introduced GE14 fuel or a subsequent GNF fuel product, or (2) does not intend to use approved GE analytical methods to perform the reload analyses-of-record supporting plant operation at the uprated power level.
- F. However, if any plant seeks concurrent implementation of a power uprate and the excluded plant changes described in Section 1.0, the NRC staff may, at their sole discretion, determine that the generic disposition of any analysis or evaluation in this LTR is no longer valid, and may require the submittal of substantial additional supporting analyses and evaluations during the review of that application.
- G. However, if any plant seeks concurrent implementation of a power uprate and the excluded plant changes listed above, the NRC staff may, at their sole discretion, determine that the generic disposition of any analysis or evaluation in this LTR is no longer valid, or that the scope of the submitted plant specific evaluations is inadequate, and may require the submittal of substantial additional supporting analyses and evaluations during the review of that application.

ATTACHMENT 3

MEETING ATTENDEES

MEETING WITH GE NUCLEAR ENERGY REGARDING CPPU SUBMITTAL

JANUARY 22, 2003

GENERAL ELECTRIC

J. Klapproth
G. Stramback

NRC

S. Dembek
B. Benney
R. Caruso
Z. Abdullahi
J. Wermiel

GE Nuclear Energy

Project No. 710

cc:

Mr. George B. Stramback
Regulatory Services Project Manager
GE Nuclear Energy
175 Curtner Avenue
San Jose, CA 95125

Mr. Charles M. Vaughan, Manager
Facility Licensing
Global Nuclear Fuel
P.O. Box 780
Wilmington, NC 28402

Mr. Glen A. Watford, Manager
Nuclear Fuel Engineering
Global Nuclear Fuel
P.O. Box 780
Wilmington, NC 28402