

April 27, 2005

MEMORANDUM TO: John A. Nakoski, Chief, Section 1
Project Directorate II
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Christopher Gratton, Sr. Project Manager, Section 1 /RA/
Project Directorate II
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: VOGTLE ELECTRIC GENERATING STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2 -
FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION OF DRAFT REQUEST FOR
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (TAC NOS. MC2762 AND MC2763)

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff transmitted the attached facsimile containing questions to Mr. Jack Stringfellow of the Southern Nuclear Operating Company on February 1, 2005. The questions supported a conference call with the licensee held on February 15, 2005, regarding the licensee's submittal dated April 26, 2005. The licensee's application proposed to revise Technical Specification Limiting Condition for Operation 3.7.9, "Ultimate Heat Sink." During the conference call, the NRC staff and the licensee agreed that the information requested in Question 3 was available in the application, therefore, a response to this question was not necessary. This memorandum and the attached questions do not convey or represent an NRC staff position regarding the licensee's request.

Docket Nos. 50-424 and 50-425

Attachment: Draft Request for Additional Information sent February 1, 2005

April 27, 2005

MEMORANDUM TO: John A. Nakoski, Chief, Section 1
Project Directorate II
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Christopher Gratton, Sr. Project Manager, Section 1 /RA/
Project Directorate II
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: VOGTLE ELECTRIC GENERATING STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2 -
FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION OF DRAFT REQUEST FOR
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (TAC NOS. MC2762 AND MC2763)

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff transmitted the attached facsimile containing questions to Mr. Jack Stringfellow of the Southern Nuclear Operating Company on February 1, 2005. The questions supported a conference call with the licensee held on February 15, 2005, regarding the licensee's submittal dated April 26, 2005. The licensee's application proposed to revise Technical Specification Limiting Condition for Operation 3.7.9, "Ultimate Heat Sink." During the conference call, the NRC staff and the licensee agreed that the information requested in Question 3 was available in the application, therefore, a response to this question was not necessary. This memorandum and the attached questions do not convey or represent an NRC staff position regarding the licensee's request.

Docket Nos. 50-424 and 50-425

Attachment: Draft Request for Additional Information sent February 1, 2005

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC	RidsOgcRp	CHawes (Hard Copy)
PDII-1 R/F	RidsNrrPMCGratton	JTatum
RidsNrrDlpmLpdii (EHackett)	RidsNrrPMSMonarque	HWagage
RidsNrrDlpmLpdii1 (JNakoski)	RidsNrrDlpmDpr	
RidsAcrsAcnwMailCenter	RidsRgn2MailCenter (Widmann)	

ADAMS Accession Number: ML051170003

NRR-106

OFFICE	PM/PDII-1	LA/PDII-1
NAME	CGratton	CHawes
DATE	04/27/05	04/27/05

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DRAFT
REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
LICENSE AMENDMENT REQUEST
ULTIMATE HEAT SINK
SOUTHERN NUCLEAR OPERATING COMPANY
HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2
DOCKET NOS. 50-321 AND 50-366

1. NRC Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation's Office Instruction No., LIC-101, "License Amendment Review Procedures," Revision 3, dated February 9, 2004, instructs the staff to include a regulatory evaluation section in the safety evaluation on license amendment requests (LARs) and the industry has agreed to provide this information in LARs. (See the Nuclear Energy Institute issued white paper entitled "Standard Format for Operating License Amendment Requests from Commercial Reactor Licensees," dated August 24, 2001 (ADAMS Accession No.: ML013390222)). The licensee's LAR does not have a regulatory evaluation section for the NRC staff's review and consideration. Please provide a regulatory evaluation section for review by the NRC staff.
2. The Southern Nuclear Operating Company's (SNC's) LAR does not provide sufficient technical basis for supporting operation of the nuclear service cooling water (NSCW) system with (1) one fan out-of-service or (2) one fan out-of-service and one fan lost with loss of offsite power due to tornado. Using Marley cooling tower performance curves, the SNC determined that the ambient wet-bulb temperatures that are necessary to support cooling for normal operation, shutdown, and emergency operations at the above conditions were 67 and 63 EF, respectively. Provide the cooling tower performance curves and assumptions used in determining the above values for the NRC staff review.
3. Enclosure 1 to the SNC's LAR states the following:

The capacity of the cooling tower with one less fan cell will provide sufficient cooling capacity to satisfy all normal and accident conditions. This assumes that the plant maintenance operation does not prevent natural draft through the non-operating fan and that the tower water distribution system remains intact.

Please confirm that the above assumptions will be reflected in the Technical Specifications Bases.
4. Surveillance Requirement, SR 3.7.9.5, states that "Verify ambient wet-bulb temperature # 63 EF when one NSCW tower fan is out-of-service and daily high temperature (dry-bulb) is forecasted to be > 48 EF" at a frequency of 24 hours. What is the basis for selecting the dry-bulb temperature limit of 48 EF? Explain how measurement uncertainties are accounted during surveillance.
5. NRC Generic Letter (GL) 96-06, "Assurance of Equipment Operability and Containment Integrity During Design-basis Accident Conditions," dated September 30, 1996, requested all licensees to determine if containment air cooler cooling water systems are susceptible to either waterhammer or two-phase flow conditions during postulated

accident conditions. What is the impact of the requested changes on the Vogtle's GL 96-06 evaluation?