

**From:** Peter Tam  
**To:** David Distel; David Helker; David Robillard; Thomas Loomis  
**Date:** 9/21/04 3:43PM  
**Subject:** Oyster Creek - Proposed Amendment re. Cycle 20 SLMCPR (TAC MC4205)

Dave:

We are reviewing your 8/27/04 application for amendment. Our reviewer, Veronica Klein, has the following questions she would like to discuss with you. Please call me to set up a conference call:

1. In Attachment 1, Page 1, of your submittal you state: "GNF has generically increased uncertainties used in the SLMCPR analysis to account for the potential impact of control blade shadow corrosion induced bow." Which uncertainties have been "generically increased?" Refer to the licensing topical report that addresss the methodology used to establish the control blade corrosion induced bow. Is Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station experiencing control blade shadow corrosion-induced bow? Did the plant recently experience control blade shadow corrosion induced bow? If Oyster Creek is experiencing control blade corrosion-induced bow, provide sufficient justification for the NRC staff to assess if the associated uncertainties are applicable and acceptable.
2. Table 2b of Attachment 4 shows that the GEXL R-factor uncertainty has increased from 1.6 in Cycle 19 to 2.0 in Cycle 20. Provide an explanation as to why this number increases. Provide sufficient justifications for the NRC staff to assess the adequacy of the proposed R-factor value.
3. Table 1 of Attachment 4 lists GETAB NEDO-1058-A as the methodology used for your power distribution uncertainties. Table 2a in the following page lists both GETAB NEDO-10958-A and Revised NEDC-32601P-A. Which method was used? Provide a tabulation of the uncertainty values used and the corresponding methods the uncertainties are based.
4. On August 24, 2004, GNF submitted a SLMCPR Part 21 Report, "Part 21 Reportable Condition and 60-Day Interim Report; Notification: Non-conservative SLMCPR," [MFN 04-081]." In this report, Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station is listed as one of the plants that requires a 60-Day Interim Report. Provide a discussion of the status of your report. What is the power vs. flow map domain to which Oyster Creek is licensed? State if the SLMCPR reported in this application is the most limiting SLMCPR value for the Cycle. Discuss how it was confirmed that the current value remains bounding for all statepoints, flow conditions in the Oyster Creek licensed operating domain and exposures. Include in your response confirmation that limiting rod pattern in terms of SLMCPR response that would bound Oyster Creek operating rod patterns were used in the SLMCPR calculation. Provide sufficient information for the NRC staff to technically evaluate that the Part 21 reporting issue would lead to higher SLMCPR value for Oyster Creek.
5. State that the SLMCPR calculation for Cycle 20 complies with all the restrictions associated with the NRC-approved SLMCPR licensing methodology. Specifically state that the Oyster Creek cycle-specific SLMCPR calculations adhere to the restrictions identified on Page 3 of NRC's Safety Evaluation relating to the General Electric Licensing Topical Reports NEDC-32601P, NEDC-32694P, and Amendment 25 to NEDE-24011-P-A (March 11, 1999).

**This e-mail aims solely to prepare you and others for the proposed conference call. It does not convey a formal NRC staff position, nor does it formally request for additional information.**

Peter S. Tam, Senior Project Manager  
Project Directorate I-1  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

e-mail: pst@nrc.gov Tel.: 301-415-1451

**CC:** Veronica Klein

**Mail Envelope Properties**

(41508465.F84 : 10 : 20510)

**Subject:** Oyster Creek - Proposed Amendment re. Cycle 20 SLMCPR (**TAC MC4205**)

**Creation Date:** 9/21/04 3:43PM

**From:** Peter Tam

**Created By:** PST@nrc.gov

**Recipients**

David  
distel (David Distel)

**Action**

Transferred

**Date & Time**

09/21/04 03:43PM

owf2\_po.OWFN\_DO  
VMK1 CC (Veronica Klein)

Delivered  
Opened

09/21/04 03:43PM  
09/21/04 04:09PM

exeloncorp.com  
david.helker (David Helker)  
David.Robillard (David Robillard)  
thomas.loomis (Thomas Loomis)

Transferred

09/21/04 03:43PM

**Post Office**

David

**Delivered**

09/21/04 03:43PM

**Route**

INternet:exeloncorp.  
com

exeloncorp.com

**Files**

MESSAGE

**Size**

4668

**Date & Time**

09/21/04 03:43PM

**Options**

**Auto Delete:**

No

**Expiration Date:**

None

<b>Notify Recipients:</b>	Yes
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard
<b>Reply Requested:</b>	No
<b>Return Notification:</b>	None
<b>Concealed Subject:</b>	No
<b>Security:</b>	Standard
<b>To Be Delivered:</b>	Immediate
<b>Status Tracking:</b>	Delivered & Opened