Maria Korsnick
Site Vice President

R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, LLC
1503 Lake Road
Ontario, New York 14519-9364
585.771.3494
585.771.3943 Fax
maria.korsnick@constellation.com

Constellation Energy
Generation Group

March 3, 2006

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

ATTENTION: Document Control Desk

SUBJECT: **R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant**
Docket No. 50-244

Response to Requests for Additional Information Regarding Topics Discussed on Conference Calls

By letter dated July 7, 2005, as supplemented by letters dated August 15 and September 30, 2005, R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, LLC (Ginna LLC) submitted an application requesting authorization to increase the maximum steady-state thermal power level at the R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant from 1520 megawatts thermal (MWt) to 1775 MWt.

The purpose of this letter is to provide formal documentation of any outstanding requests received to date as well as our response. Our responses are contained in Attachments 1 and 2.

Attachment 1 contains the question and answer from a February 7, 2006 question regarding ECCS NPSH.

Attachment 2 contains the question and answer from a February 7, 2006 question regarding Operator Response to Feed Line Break in Intermediate Building.

The responses do not include any new regulatory commitments.

If you have any questions, please contact George Wrobel at (585) 771-3535 or george.wrobel@constellation.com.

Very truly yours,

Mary G. Korsnick

Mary G. Korsnick

A001

1001514

STATE OF NEW YORK :
: **TO WIT:**
COUNTY OF WAYNE :

I, Mary G. Korsnick, being duly sworn, state that I am Vice President – R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, LLC (Ginna LLC), and that I am duly authorized to execute and file this response on behalf of Ginna LLC. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the statements contained in this document are true and correct. To the extent that these statements are not based on my personal knowledge, they are based upon information provided by other Ginna LLC employees and/or consultants. Such information has been reviewed in accordance with company practice and I believe it to be reliable.

Mary G. Korsnick

Subscribed and sworn before me, a Notary Public in and for the State of New York and County of MONROE, this 3 day of March, 2006.

WITNESS my Hand and Notarial Seal: Sharon L Miller
Notary Public

My Commission Expires:

SHARON L. MILLER
Notary Public, State of New York
Registration No. 01MI6017755
Monroe County
Commission Expires December 21, 2006

Attachments

Cc: S. J. Collins, NRC
P. D. Milano, NRC
Resident Inspector, NRC

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

Mr. Paul Eddy
NYS Department of Public Service
3 Empire State Plaza, 10th Floor
Albany, NY 12223-1350

ATTACHMENT 1
QUESTION AND ANSWER FROM FEBRUARY 7, 2006 REGARDING ECCS NPSH

NRC Question #1:

Is the licensing basis for EPU ECCS and containment spray pump NPSH calculations still contained in the Ginna response to GL 97-04 (Letter to NRC dated January 6, 1998)?

Ginna Response:

The licensing basis for the Ginna EPU ECCS and containment spray pump NPSH calculations has been updated since the Ginna response to GL 97-04 (Letter to NRC dated January 6, 1998). Ginna has implemented a change in the manner in which the RHR discharge throttle valves are operated in the ECCS system. The valves are permanently throttled to avoid the need for operator action to position the valves post-LOCA. A revised analysis has been completed to support this new throttle position. This change has been made to address an identified concern related to reducing operator dose post-LOCA. The UFSAR will be updated to reference the new analysis.

These activities are not affected by EPU. The analyses for EPU assumed a reduced level of ECCS flow, which provided adequate core cooling during the injection phase while reducing the required NPSH during the recirculation phase, as compared to the pre-EPU analysis.

ATTACHMENT 2
QUESTION AND ANSWER FROM FEBRUARY 7, 2006 REGARDING OPERATOR RESPONSE TO FEED LINE BREAK IN INTERMEDIATE BUILDING

NRC Question #1:

In their submittal, section 2.8.5.2.4. (Feedwater system pipe breaks inside and outside containment), the licensee presumes that AFW is started at time 891.8 seconds into their most limiting event.

Specifically, table 2.8.5.2.4-1 mentions this. Since their analysis starts the event at 20 seconds and the protection system trips the reactor 1.8 seconds after that, this means the operators have 870 seconds to restore the required AFW flow.

Is it reasonable to presume the operators can restore the required AFW flow within 870 seconds?

Ginna Response

Ginna will assure that Standby Auxiliary Feed Water (SAFW) flow is delivered within 870 seconds as required by the Feed Line Break safety analysis by optimizing the emergency procedures, training on the procedures and verifying the procedures using the simulator prior to implementing the EPU. The emergency procedures will be optimized by relocating certain verification steps in E-0 to an attachment where they can be performed independently. The SAFW flow initiation step in FR-H.1 will also be relocated to an earlier step which will further reduce the time to SAFW flow initiation. These emergency procedures will be verified using operating crews on the plant simulator. As part of this simulator training the time line will be verified to meet safety analysis assumptions. These results will be documented prior to startup from the 2006 refueling outage and escalation to the uprated power level.