

March 16, 2004

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 FOR ISSUES DISCUSSED IN TELEPHONE
CONFERENCE (TAC NOS. M96852 AND M96853)

The attachment was transmitted by fax to Ms. Lisa Schofield, the Nuclear Management Company, LLC, in preparation for a telephone conference. This memorandum and the attachment do not convey a formal request for information or represent a Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff position.

Docket Nos. 50-266 and 50-301

Attachment: Discussion Points

March 16, 2004

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 FOR ISSUES DISCUSSED IN TELEPHONE
CONFERENCE (TAC NOS. M96852 AND M96853)

The attachment was transmitted by fax to Ms. Lisa Schofield, the Nuclear Management Company, LLC, in preparation for a telephone conference. This memorandum and the attachment do not convey a formal request for information or represent a Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff position.

Docket Nos. 50-266 and 50-301

Attachment: Discussion Points

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC
PDIII-1 Reading
LRaghavan
DSpaulding
THarris

ADAMS Accession No. ML040700457

OFFICE	PDIII-1/PM	PDIII-1/LA	PDIII-1/SC
NAME	DSpaulding	THarris	JStang for LRaghavan
DATE	03/15/04	03/12/04	03/16/04

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Point Beach 1 and 2
Submittal dated November 3, 2003
Generic Letter 96-06
TACs M96852 and M96853

1. The October 12, 2000, response to request for additional information (RAI) Item 6, indicates that: "Several plant modifications have been implemented (and more are in progress) to enhance the reliability of automatic isolation of nonessential service water loads during limiting accidents...." However, the July 30, 2002, response to this same item does not include any discussion of these modifications. Please provide a complete response to RAI Item 6 for both waterhammer and for two-phase flow, and indicate to what extent all planned modifications have been completed along with schedules for completing any remaining modifications (as applicable).
2. Because the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff is relying on the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) methodology as a means to judge the acceptability of the waterhammer analysis that was performed for the Point Beach units, a risk assessment similar to the one that was performed by EPRI (EPRI letter dated February 1, 2002) is required. The EPRI letter is included in the EPRI reports, in an Appendix that contains EPRI correspondence.

ATTACHMENT