REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR: 8603100101 DOC. DATE: 86/02/28 NOTARIZED: NO DOCKET #
FACIL: 50-263 Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant, Northern States 05000263
AUTH. NAME AUTHOR AFFILIATION
MUSOLF, D. Northern States Power Co.
RECIP. NAME RECIPIENT AFFILIATION
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Director (post 851125

SUBJECT: Provides addl info re mod of vacuum breakers on Mark I containment, per 860116 request. Chugging source rate used in CDI Rept 84-3 identical to methodology used in evaluation & detailed in response to NRC Question 5.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: A001D COPIES RECEIVED: LTR 1 ENCL Ø SIZE: 2
TITLE: OR Submittal: General Distribution

NOTES:

	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME		COPIES LTTR	COPIES ENCL	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME		COPIES LTTR	COPIES ENCL
	BWR ADTS		1	0	BWR PD1 PD	01	5	5
	BWR EB		1	1	BWR EICSB		1	1
	BWR FOB		1	1	AULUCK, R		1	1
	BWR PSB		1	1	BWR RSB		1	1
INTERNAL:	ADM/LFMB		1	0	ELD/HDS1		1	0
	~~NRR/DHFT/TSCB~~		1	1	NRR/ORAS		1	0
	REG FILE	04	1	1	RGN3		1	1
EXTERNAL:	24X		1	1	EG&G BRUSKE, S		1	1
	LPDR	03	1	1	NRC PDR	02	1	1
	NSIC	05	1	1				

add: NRR BWR ADTS
NRR DSRO PIR
NRR Long. W
NRR/TAMB

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTTR ~~23~~ 27 ENCL ~~19~~ Ø

Northern States Power Company

414 Nicollet Mall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401
Telephone (612) 330-5500

February 28, 1986

Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

MONTICELLO NUCLEAR GENERATING PLANT
DOCKET NO. 50-263 LICENSE NO. DPR-22

Additional Information Related to the
Modification of Vacuum Breakers on Mark I Containment

The purpose of this letter is to respond to a request for additional information contained in a letter dated January 16, 1986 from Mr John A Zwolinski, Director, BWR Project Directorate #1, Division of BWR Licensing, USNRC.

The following information is provided as requested:

1. Is the chugging source rate used in the Monticello evaluation the same as the one developed in CDI Report #84-3? If not the same, provide the chugging source rate with the supporting justification.

Response
Yes. The methodology followed in CDI Report No. 84-3 is identical to the methodology used in the Monticello evaluation (Reference 1) and detailed in response to question 5 from the NRC (Reference 2).

2. Did the Monticello calculation apply the 1.07 load factor to account for the uncertainty in calculating the underpressure (Section IV of the staff's generic evaluation)?

Response
A load factor used to assure conservative prediction of the underpressure and detailed in response to question 2 from the NRC (Reference 2), was applied to the Monticello evaluation (Reference 1). The load factor used in the plant unique evaluation was 1.06 and yields a conservative prediction of the underpressure.

A001
1/0

Add: NRR BWR ADTS
NRR DSRO DIR
NRR Long, W
NRR/TAMB

3. Have the Monticello calculations used the drywell model which results in the most conservative prediction (Section V of the generic evaluation)?

Response
Yes. Drywell modeling was examined in response to question 6 from the NRC (reference 2). For the Monticello evaluation (Reference 1), the capacitance model results in a more conservative forcing function, and was therefore used.

References:

1. "Mark I Wetwell to Drywell Differential Pressure Load and Vacuum Breaker Response for the Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant," Revision 0, Continuum Dynamics, Inc., Technical Note No. 84-21, January, 1985.

2. "Response to NRC Request for Additional Information on Mark I Containment Program Wetwell to Drywell Vacuum Breaker Load Methodology," Revision 0, Continuum Dynamics, Inc., Technical Note No. 84-11, October, 1984.

Please contact us if you have any questions related to the information we have provided.

David Musolf
Manager Nuclear Support Services

c: NRR Project Manager, NRC
Resident Inspector, NRC
Regional Administrator, Region III, NRC
G Charnoff