



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

May 11, 2010

Mr. Samuel L. Belcher
Vice President Nine Mile Point
Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, LLC
P.O. Box 63
Lycoming, NY 13093

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING NINE MILE POINT
NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT NO. 2-RE: THE LICENSE AMENDMENT REQUEST
FOR EXTENDED POWER UPRATE OPERATION-REACTOR SYSTEMS REVIEW
(TAC NO. ME1476)

Dear Mr. Belcher:

By letter dated May 27, 2009, as supplemented on August 28, 2009, December 23, 2009, February 19, 2010, and April 16, 2010, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, LLC, submitted for Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff review and approval, a proposed license amendment requesting an increase in the maximum steady-state power level from 3467 megawatts thermal (MWt) to 3988 MWt for Nine Mile Point Unit No. 2 extended power uprate operation.

The NRC staff is reviewing the information provided in that letter and has determined that additional information is needed to support its review. Enclosed is the NRC staffs request for additional information (RAI). The RAI was discussed with your staff on May 5, 2010, and it was agreed that your response would be provided by June 4, 2010.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Richard V. Guzman".

Richard V. Guzman, Senior Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch I-1
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-410

Enclosure:
As stated

cc w/encl: Distribution via Listserv

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (RAI)

NINE MILE POINT NUCLEAR STATION, LLC

NINE MILE POINT, UNIT NO. 2 (NMP2)

LICENSE AMENDMENT REQUEST RE: EXTENDED POWER UPRATE (EPU)

DOCKET NO. 50-410

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff is reviewing the Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, LLC (NMPNS or the licensee) license amendment request (LAR) application dated May 27, 2009 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML091610103), as supplemented on August 28, 2009 (ML092460550), December 23, 2009 (ML100190072), February 19, 2010 (ML100550599), and April 16, 2010 (ML101120658). The NRC staff has determined that additional information requested below will be needed to support its review.

Reactor Systems

1. In response to RAI D6 in your letter dated February 19, 2010, you state that, "[t]here are no Boraflex racks in use at NMP2." Are there Boraflex racks still present in Unit 2 pool? If so, what controls are in place to ensure that fuel bundles will not be placed in Boraflex racks? Are there Boraflex racks still present in Unit 1 pool? If so, what controls are in place to ensure that fuel will not be loaded in Unit 1 Boraflex racks? If these scenarios are not credible, explain why.
2. In response to RAI D8, you simply provided a list of parameters. Provide the bounding values used in the analysis to be compared to the nominal values for EPU reactor conditions.
3. In response to RAI D8, you state, "process includes studies on a number of "extreme lattice" designs to satisfy the spent fuel storage rack eigenvalue criteria." What are the key parameter values that define the "extreme" lattices? How many lattices were considered? What criteria did you use for the selection of the design basis lattice?
4. Who performed the current depletion and criticality analyses (GE, Holtec, NETCO, etc.)?
5. What Monte Carlo code and version did you use? Where is the validation documented? Did you identify and address any validation gaps (e.g., non-uranium actinides, fission products, significant materials missing from the validation set, significant materials present in the validation set that are not in the analysis models, neutron energy spectra variation, etc.)?
6. What specific uncertainty components are covered by the "Uncertainties" in Table 2.8-12 of NEDC-33351P, Rev. 0, "Safety Analysis Report for Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit 2 Constant Pressure Power Uprate?"

7. Describe your depletion uncertainty treatment approach.
8. For the tolerance analysis, what specific uncertainty components were considered? How were they varied? What was the total delta K associated with the tolerances?
9. Table 2.8-12 of NEDC-33351P includes the code bias. What other biases were considered (e.g., variation in fuel pool temperature, etc.)?

May 11, 2010

Mr. Samuel L. Belcher
Vice President Nine Mile Point
Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, LLC
P.O. Box 63
Lycoming, NY 13093

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING NINE MILE POINT
NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT NO. 2 – RE: THE LICENSE AMENDMENT REQUEST
FOR EXTENDED POWER UPRATE OPERATION – REACTOR SYSTEMS
REVIEW (TAC NO. ME1476)

Dear Mr. Belcher:

By letter dated May 27, 2009, as supplemented on August 28, 2009, December 23, 2009, February 19, 2010, and April 16, 2010, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, LLC, submitted for Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff review and approval, a proposed license amendment requesting an increase in the maximum steady-state power level from 3467 megawatts thermal (MWt) to 3988 MWt for Nine Mile Point Unit No. 2 extended power uprate operation.

The NRC staff is reviewing the information provided in that letter and has determined that additional information is needed to support its review. Enclosed is the NRC staff's request for additional information (RAI). The RAI was discussed with your staff on May 5, 2010, and it was agreed that your response would be provided by June 4, 2010.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Richard V. Guzman, Senior Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch I-1
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-410

Enclosure:
As stated

cc w/encl: Distribution via Listserv

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC	RidsNrrPMNineMilePoint	RidsNrrLASLittle	RidsNrrDorLpl1-1
LPLI-1 R/F	RidsOGCRp	RidsRgn1MailCenter	RidsNrrDssSrx
RidsNrrAcrcsAcnw&mMailCenter			

ADAMS Accession No.: ML101250424

OFFICE	LPL1-1/PM	LPL1-1/LA	SRXB/BC	LPL1-1/BC
NAME	RGuzman	SLittle	AUises	NSalgado JBoska for
DATE	5/10/10	5/10/10	5/10/10	5/11/10

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY