

From: N. Kaly Kalyanam
To: Bryan Miller
Date: 2/12/04 10:51AM
Subject: RAI - TSCR on Relaxation of Ventilation System Heater Surveillance Acceptance Criteria

Bryan,

I am attaching the RAI from the Technical Reviewer on the subject TSCR, TAC No. MC0749.

Let us see if we can have a conference call and resolve these questions. Otherwise, I can send a formal RAI and you can docket the response.

Also, with reference to the EPU,

Rich Lobel would like to obtain a copy of the topical report on the FLOOD3 computer code. Could you please send a copy or provide a reference to a submittal date and docket number. He couldn't find it in ADAMS.

Thanks.

Docket No. 05000 382
Sub: Waterford 3.
RAI — MC0749

Waterford RAI Question

1. In the staff review of the licensees submittal, we were unable to determine what value was used for the power of the heaters in the diesel load calculation EC-E90-006. Please confirm that Calculation EC-E90-006 considered +5 percent tolerance of the subject heaters (i.e. 63 KW, 21 KW, and 10.5 KW). Are there any other loads that may be operating at more than nameplate rated values or at a service factor? The staff is concerned about the cumulative effect of all such loads. How will this additional KW load be captured in the calculation?
2. The submittal stated in the background section that approximately half of the heating coils were replaced due to the shield building ventilation system being declared inoperable on May 22, 2003. Please provide us with the root cause of the change of heating coils resistance of B train SBVS on May 22, 2003? What is the reason that the new coils were able to pass the surveillance test and the old coils which had in the past found to be acceptable were no longer able to pass the surveillance test.

From: Edwin Forrest
To: N. Kaly Kalyanam
Date: 2/12/04 9:53AM
Subject: TAC MC0749 RAI for Waterford -schedule commitment complete

Please submit the attached two RAI's to Waterford. Amar Pal of EEIB is supporting this task and has requested these questions. If a phone conference develops on these questions, Amar should be included.

This completes the RAI schedule commitment.

Ed Forrest
301-415-3755

CC: Amar Pal; Andrzej Drozd; Robert Dennig

Waterford RAI Question

1. In the staff review of the licensees submittal, we were unable to determine what value was used for the power of the heaters in the diesel load calculation EC-E90-006. Please confirm that Calculation EC-E90-006 considered +5 percent tolerance of the subject heaters (i.e. 63 KW, 21 KW, and 10.5 KW). Are there any other loads that may be operating at more than nameplate rated values or at a service factor? The staff is concerned about the cumulative effect of all such loads. How will this additional KW load be captured in the calculation?
2. The submittal stated in the background section that approximately half of the heating coils were replaced due to the shield building ventilation system being declared inoperable on May 22, 2003. Please provide us with the root cause of the change of heating coils resistance of B train SBVS on May 22, 2003? What is the reason that the new coils were able to pass the surveillance test and the old coils which had in the past found to be acceptable were no longer able to pass the surveillance test.