

September 9, 2004

Mrs. Mary G. Korsnick
Vice President R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant
R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, LLC
1503 Lake Road
Ontario, NY 14519

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING
BULLETIN 2003-01, "POTENTIAL IMPACT OF DEBRIS BLOCKAGE ON
EMERGENCY SUMP RECIRCULATION AT PRESSURIZED-WATER
REACTORS" (TAC NO. MB9578)

Dear Mrs. Korsnick:

By letter dated August 8, 2003, you provided the 60-day response to NRC Bulletin 2003-01 for the R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant. The Bulletin requested you to either (1) state that the emergency core cooling system (ECCS) and containment spray system (CSS) recirculation functions have been analyzed with respect to the potentially adverse post-accident debris blockage effects identified in the Bulletin and are in compliance with all existing applicable regulatory requirements, or (2) describe any interim compensatory measures that have been implemented or that will be implemented to reduce the interim risk associated with potentially degraded or nonconforming ECCS and CSS recirculation functions until an evaluation to determine compliance is complete.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff has reviewed the information and based on our review, we have determined that additional information is required in order for the staff to complete its review. Enclosed is the NRC staff's request for additional information (RAI). This RAI was discussed with your staff on September 7, 2004, and it was agreed that your response would be provided 60 days from the date of this letter.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Robert Clark, Project Manager, Section 1
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-244

Enclosure: RAI

cc w/encl: See next page

September 9, 2004

Mrs. Mary G. Korsnick
Vice President R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant
R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, LLC
1503 Lake Road
Ontario, NY 14519

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING
BULLETIN 2003-01, "POTENTIAL IMPACT OF DEBRIS BLOCKAGE ON
EMERGENCY SUMP RECIRCULATION AT PRESSURIZED-WATER
REACTORS" (TAC NO. MB9578)

Dear Mrs. Korsnick:

By letter dated August 8, 2003, you provided the 60-day response to NRC Bulletin 2003-01 for the R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant. The Bulletin requested you to either (1) state that the emergency core cooling system (ECCS) and containment spray system (CSS) recirculation functions have been analyzed with respect to the potentially adverse post-accident debris blockage effects identified in the Bulletin and are in compliance with all existing applicable regulatory requirements, or (2) describe any interim compensatory measures that have been implemented or that will be implemented to reduce the interim risk associated with potentially degraded or nonconforming ECCS and CSS recirculation functions until an evaluation to determine compliance is complete.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff has reviewed the information and based on our review, we have determined that additional information is required in order for the staff to complete its review. Enclosed is the NRC staff's request for additional information (RAI). This RAI was discussed with your staff on September 7, 2004, and it was agreed that your response would be provided 60 days from the date of this letter.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Robert Clark, Project Manager, Section 1
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-244

Enclosure: RAI

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC	PDI-1 R/F	RLaufer	SLittle	RClark	ACRS
OGC	LWhitney	AWang	MKowal	DSolorio	GMatakas, RI
JHannon					

Accession Number: ML042530018

OFFICE	PDI-1\PM	DSSA/SPLB	PDI-1\SC
NAME	RClark	JHannon	RLaufer
DATE	09/8/04	08/12/04	09/8/04

Official Record Copy

R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant

cc:

Mr. Michael J. Wallace
President
R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, LLC
c/o Constellation Energy
750 East Pratt Street
Baltimore, MD 21202

Mr. John M. Heffley
Senior Vice President and
Chief Nuclear Officer
Constellation Generation Group
1997 Annapolis Exchange Parkway
Suite 500
Annapolis, MD 21401

Kenneth Kolaczyk, Sr. Resident Inspector
R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1503 Lake Road
Ontario, NY 14519

Regional Administrator, Region I
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, PA 19406

Peter R. Smith, President
New York State Energy, Research,
and Development Authority
17 Columbia Circle
Albany, NY 12203-6399

James M. Petro, r., Esquire
Counsel
Constellation Energy
750 East Pratt Street, 5th Floor
Baltimore, MD 21202

Charles Donaldson, Esquire
Assistant Attorney General
New York Department of Law
120 Broadway
New York, NY 10271

Daniel F. Stenger
Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll, LLP
601 13th Street, N.W., Suite 1000 South
Washington, DC 20005

Ms. Thelma Wideman, Director
Wayne County Emergency Management
Office
Wayne County Emergency Operations
Center
7336 Route 31
Lyons, NY 14489

Ms. Mary Louise Meisenzahl
Administrator, Monroe County
Office of Emergency Preparedness
1190 Scottsville Road, Suite 200
Rochester, NY 14624

Mr. Paul Eddy
New York State Department of
Public Service
3 Empire State Plaza, 10th Floor
Albany, NY 12223

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

R. E. GINNA NUCLEAR POWER PLANT

BULLETIN 200301, "POTENTIAL IMPACT OF DEBRIS BLOCKAGE ON EMERGENCY SUMP RECIRCULATION AT PRESSURIZED WATER REACTORS"

By letter dated August 8, 2003, the former licensee, Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation (RG&E), provided the 60-day response to NRC Bulletin 2003-01 for the R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant. The Bulletin requested RG&E to either (1) state that the emergency core cooling system (ECCS) and containment spray system (CSS) recirculation functions have been analyzed with respect to the potentially adverse post-accident debris blockage effects identified in the Bulletin and are in compliance with all existing applicable regulatory requirements, or (2) describe any interim compensatory measures that have been implemented or that will be implemented to reduce the interim risk associated with potentially degraded or nonconforming ECCS and CSS recirculation functions until an evaluation to determine compliance is complete. The staff has completed its preliminary review of your response and has determined it needs the following additional information to complete our review:

1. On page 2 of Attachment 1 of your Bulletin 2003-02 response, you discussed, among other operator lesson plan areas, operator responses to sump blockage. Specifically, a new step being added to the emergency operating procedures (EOP) ES-1.3, "Transfer to Cold Leg Recirculation," which states "If blockage is indicated reduce flow to minimum for decay heat removal and consult with the Technical Support Center (TSC) for further actions." On page 3 of Attachment 1 of your Bulletin 2003-02 response, you state that this reduction in flow is consistent with ECA-1.1 "Loss of Emergency Coolant Recirculation," and that "EOP ES-1.3 includes instruction to transition to ECA-1.1 in the event recirculation capability is lost." However, your response does not completely discuss the response actions the operators are instructed to take in the event of sump clogging and loss of ECCS recirculation capability. Please provide a detailed discussion of these ECA-1.1 response actions.
2. On page 4 of Attachment 1 of your Bulletin 2003-01 response you state that "After the generic Westinghouse Owners Group [WOG] guidance is approved and issued, RG&E will evaluate which changes (if any) are appropriate to Ginna Station's configuration. This activity is scheduled to be completed by October 31, 2004. After completion of the applicability evaluation, RG&E will provide the NRC Staff a detailed implementation schedule or inform the Staff if it has been determined that no additional changes are required. The WOG has developed operational guidance in response to Bulletin 2003-01 for Westinghouse and CE type pressurized water reactors (PWRs). Please provide a discussion of your plans to consider implementing this new WOG guidance. Include a discussion of the WOG recommended compensatory measures that have been or will be implemented at your plant, and the evaluations or analyses performed to determine which of the WOG recommended changes are acceptable at your plant. Provide technical justification for those WOG recommended compensatory measures not being implemented by your plant. Also include a detailed discussion of the procedures being modified, the operator training being implemented, and your schedule for implementing these compensatory measures.

3. NRC Bulletin 2003-01 provides possible interim compensatory measures licensees could consider to reduce risks associated with sump clogging. In addition to those compensatory measures listed in Bulletin 2003-01, licensees may also consider implementing unique or plant-specific compensatory measures, as applicable. Please discuss any possible unique or plant-specific compensatory measures you considered for implementation at your plant. Include a basis for rejecting any of these additional considered measures.