

From: [Guzman, Richard](#)
To: ["Darling, Theresa H"](#)
Subject: NMP2 EPU EMCB Supplemental Request for Additional Information (TAC No. ME1476)
Date: Friday, April 08, 2011 7:55:59 PM

Theresa,

As discussed during today's conference call, I'm providing you a list of the additional questions from the technical staff supporting the mechanical and civil engineering review – shown below.

The staff has identified these additional information needs in review of the supplemental information provided in your April 16, 2010, RAI Letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML101120658). The staff requests you provide a response to these questions within 30 days of the date of this message. Please let me know if you have any issues with this proposed schedule.

Thanks,

Rich Guzman
Sr. Project Manager
NRR/DORL
US NRC
301-415-1030
Richard.Guzman@nrc.gov

SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (RAI)

NINE MILE POINT NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT NO.2 (NMP2)

EXTENDED POWER UPRATE (EPU)

LICENSE AMENDMENT REQUEST (LAR)

NINE MILE POINT NUCLEAR STATION, LLC (NMPNS)

DOCKET NO. 50-410

TAC NO. ME1476

NMP2-EMCB-RAI-14

1. The licensee's response to EMCB-RAI-14 states that the current licensed thermal power (CLTP) analysis applied a stress index different than the one described in the code of record (1974 ASME Section III) in two instances where higher than allowable stresses occurred, and that the revised stress index was taken from the 1989 ASME code edition. Please provide a discussion of the acceptability of the use of a revised stress index based on a later code edition (1989) instead of the use of the 1974 ASME code of record to produce extended power uprate (EPU) stresses lower than allowable. Quantitatively show the equation where the revised

index is used and how does it differ from the original stress index.

NMP2-EMCB-RAI-16 and NMP2 Power Uprate Safety Analysis Report (PUSAR) Tables (Section 2.2)

2. Provide an example(s) to quantitatively demonstrate how the scaling factor of 5.1 in PUSAR tables 2.2-2a and 2.2-2b are derived.
3. Provide an explanation for terms K, H, Mt and M used in PUSAR Tables 2.2-3d, 2.2-3e, 2.2-4c.

NMP2-EMCB-RAI-21

4. Please revise response to EMCB-RAI-21, as appropriate, to show whether any piping modifications are required due to the EPU and provide a list of the modifications along with its schedule of completion.

NMP2-EMCB-RAI-22

5. The licensee's response to EMCB-RAI-22 indicates that EPU comparisons are made to original licensed thermal power (OLTP) temperatures and pressure, and also refers to OLTP stresses. Please clarify whether the response meant to make reference to CLTP and not OLTP. In addition, the licensee's response to RAI-22 (page 21 of 34) states that for feedwater (FW) supports, "total OLTP loads calculated are higher than EPU and are bounding." Table 2.2-4d though, clearly shows that current support total loads are less than the EPU loads, and therefore, are not bounding. Please clarify whether the response meant to say that EPU pipe support total loads are within the pipe support capacity loads, and, are therefore acceptable.