

From: Don Johnson
To: Dylanne Duvigneaud
Date: 4/6/05 10:25AM
Subject: Re: Cooper - EP Change Information

Hi Dylanne.

Sorry, I just got around to reviewing the information today. I have an additional question based upon my review:

DOES THE EXISTING MPF KAMAN READOUT AND/OR ALARM IN THE CONTROL ROOM? AND IF SO, DOES THE PROPOSED CAM REPLACEMENT DO LIKEWISE? PLEASE PROVIDE TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION FOR THE CHANGE IF THE PROPOSED CAM DOES NOT PROVIDE THE SAME REMOTE ALARM(S) AND INDICATION(S) AS THE EXISTING KAMAN.

Thanks!

Don A. Johnson
NSIR/DPR/EPD
301-415-4040

>>> Dylanne Duvigneaud 3/29/2005 4:51:16 PM >>>

Don - Attached is the information you requested for the Cooper EP change. Please let me know if the information is adequate. If not, I can set up another phone call with the licensee. Thanks.

DyLanne Duvigneaud
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Licensing Project Management
Project Engineer
301-415-4010

Mail Envelope Properties (4253F16E.CDA : 9 : 11612)

Subject: Re: Cooper - EP Change Information
Creation Date: 4/6/05 10:25AM
From: Don Johnson

Created By: DAJ3@nrc.gov

Recipients

nrc.gov

OWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

DDD (Dylanne Duvigneaud)

Post Office

OWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

Route

nrc.gov

Files

MESSAGE

Size

1839

Date & Time

04/06/05 10:25AM

Options

Expiration Date: None

Priority: Standard

Reply Requested: No

Return Notification:

Send Mail Receipt when Opened

Concealed Subject: No

Security: Standard

From: "Sumpter, James R. [Jim]" <jrsumpt@nppd.com>
To: "Dylanne Duvigneaud" <DDD@nrc.gov>
Date: 4/14/05 4:59PM
Subject: RE: Re: Cooper - EP Change

In response to Don Johnson's question -

In the Operating License Change Request (OLCR) #2000-02, on Page 1, in the section discussing adding the Multi-Purpose Facility (MPF) to Table D3.2.3-1 of the ODAM, the statement is made, "It is prudent, however, that this building effluent be treated with the same degree of rigor with respect to particulates and iodines as the other gaseous effluent pathways". The "rigor" referred to in this statement concerns treating the particulates and iodines in Table D3.2.3-1 with the same rigor as they are treated in other effluent pathways. In this table, all the release paths such as Reactor Building Vent, Elevated Release Point, Augmented Radwaste Building Vent and Turbine Building Vent have similar sample types for iodines and particulates, i.e., Charcoal Sample, Particulate Sample and Composite Particulate Sample. Therefore, the same sample types were provided in the MPF for particulates and iodines.

The sample types at points other than the MPF were not alarmed. The MPF particulate and gaseous effluent were tied to the same annunciator and alarmed. The reason for this is provided as described on Page XII-2-8 of the USAR (attached). The MPF was originally designed to permit the long-term storage of low level radioactive waste. The perceived potential for gaseous and particulate releases, if long term storage of low level waste were to be incorporated into the MPF building, resulted in the establishment of the alarm in question. Since there are no plans currently or in the foreseeable future to use the MPF for long term storage of low level waste, alarms are no longer necessary.

James R. Sumpter
Senior Staff Engineer - Licensing
Phone: 402-825-5663
Pager: 402-943-0919

-----Original Message-----

From: Dylanne Duvigneaud [mailto:DDD@nrc.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, April 06, 2005 10:01 AM
To: Vanderkamp, David W.; Sumpter, James R. [Jim]
Subject: Fwd: Re: Cooper - EP Change

Dave, Jim - The reviewer has one more question regarding Cooper's EP change submittal (attachment). Let me know if you have any questions.

DyLanne Duvigneaud
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Licensing Project Management
Project Engineer
301-415-4010

Mail Envelope Properties (425ED98B.B18 : 15 : 2840)

Subject: RE: Re: Cooper - EP Change
Creation Date: 4/14/05 3:34PM
From: "Sumpter, James R. [Jim]" <jrsumpt@nppd.com>

Created By: jrsumpt@nppd.com

Recipients

nrc.gov
OWGWPO01.HQGWDO01
DDD (Dylanne Duvigneaud)

Post Office

OWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

Route

nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2222	04/14/05 03:34PM
Untitled.PDF	51131	
Mime.822	73790	

Options

Expiration Date: None
Priority: Standard
Reply Requested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard

From: "Sumpter, James R. [Jim]" <jrsumpt@nppd.com>
To: <DDD@nrc.gov>
Date: 5/2/05 9:48AM
Subject: FW: Re: Cooper - EP Change

In a conversation with Don Johnson this morning, I indicated that the following change will be made to the USAR once NRC approval is received for the change to the Emergency Plan referenced in the letter from Nebraska Public Power District to the NRC dated January 28, 2005 (NLS2005006).

Chapter XII, Section 2.2.9, the following sentence will be added at the end of this section:

"There are no plans currently or in the foreseeable future for long term storage of low level waste in the MPF".

James R. Sumpter
Senior Staff Engineer - Licensing
Phone: 402-825-5663
Pager: 402-943-0919

-----Original Message-----

From: Sumpter, James R. [Jim]
Sent: Thursday, April 14, 2005 2:35 PM
To: 'Dylanne Duvigneaud'
Subject: RE: Re: Cooper - EP Change

In response to Don Johnson's question -

In the Operating License Change Request (OLCR) #2000-02, on Page 1, in the section discussing adding the Multi-Purpose Facility (MPF) to Table D3.2.3-1 of the ODA, the statement is made, "It is prudent, however, that this building effluent be treated with the same degree of rigor with respect to particulates and iodines as the other gaseous effluent pathways". The "rigor" referred to in this statement concerns treating the particulates and iodines in Table D3.2.3-1 with the same rigor as they are treated in other effluent pathways. In this table, all the release paths such as Reactor Building Vent, Elevated Release Point, Augmented Radwaste Building Vent and Turbine Building Vent have similar sample types for iodines and particulates, i.e., Charcoal Sample, Particulate Sample and Composite Particulate Sample. Therefore, the same sample types were provided in the MPF for particulates and iodines.

The sample types at points other than the MPF were not alarmed. The MPF particulate and gaseous effluent were tied to the same annunciator and alarmed. The reason for this is provided as described on Page XII-2-8 of the USAR (attached). The MPF was originally designed to permit the long-term storage of low level radioactive waste. The perceived potential for gaseous and particulate releases, if long term storage of low level waste were to be incorporated into the MPF building, resulted in the establishment of the alarm in question. Since there are no plans currently or in the foreseeable future to use the MPF for long term storage of low level waste, alarms are no longer necessary.

James R. Sumpter
Senior Staff Engineer - Licensing
Phone: 402-825-5663
Pager: 402-943-0919

-----Original Message-----

From: Dylanne Duvigneaud [mailto:DDD@nrc.gov]

Sent: Wednesday, April 06, 2005 10:01 AM
To: Vanderkamp, David W.; Sumpter, James R. [Jim]
Subject: Fwd: Re: Cooper - EP Change

Dave, Jim - The reviewer has one more question regarding Cooper's EP change submittal (attachment).
Let me know if you have any questions.

DyLanne Duvigneaud
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Licensing Project Management
Project Engineer
301-415-4010

Mail Envelope Properties (42762F9B.99E : 0 : 31134)

Subject: FW: Re: Cooper - EP Change
Creation Date: 5/2/05 9:47AM
From: "Sumpter, James R. [Jim]" <jrsumpt@nppd.com>
Created By: jrsumpt@nppd.com

Recipients

nrc.gov
OWGWPO01.HQGWDO01
DDD (Dylanne Duvigneaud)

Post Office

OWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

Route

nrc.gov

Files

	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2974	05/02/05 09:47AM
Untitled.PDF	51131	
Mime.822	74568	

Options

Expiration Date: None
Priority: Standard
Reply Requested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard