

OCT 19 1979

DISTRIBUTION:

NRC PDR IE (3)
 Local PDR WRussell
 Docket File ← TERA
 LWR #3 File
 DVassallo bcc: NSIC
 DRoss TIC
 SVarga ACRS (16)
 FWilliams
 OParr
 ADromerick
 MRushbrook (w/extra copies)
 RMattson
 SHanauer
 JKnight
 RTedesco
 RDeYoung
 VMoore
 MErnst
 RDenise
 ELD

Docket No. 50-311

Mr. R. L. Mittl, General Manager
 Licensing and Environment
 Engineering and Construction Department
 Public Service Electric and Gas Company
 80 Park Place
 Newark, New Jersey 07101

Dear Mr. Mittl:

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR THE REVIEW OF THE
 SALEM UNIT 2 FINAL SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT (FSAR)

As a result of our continuing review of the Salem FSAR, we find that we need additional information to complete our evaluation. The specific information required is listed in the enclosure.

Please inform us after receipt of this letter, of your schedule for providing the information described in the enclosure.

Sincerely,

Original signed by
 A. W. Dromerick

Olan D. Parr, Chief
 Light Water Reactors, Branch No. 3
 Division of Project Management

Enclosure:
 As Stated

cc: See Next Page

APP
3

60

OFFICE →	DPM:LWR #3	DPM:LWR #3			
SURNAME →	ADromerick:mec	ADromerick			
DATE →	10/18/79	10/18/79			7910290397

Mr. R. L. Mittl, General Manager
Licensing and Environment
Engineering and Construction Department
Public Service Electric and Gas Company
80 Park Place
Newark, New Jersey 07101

cc: Richard Fryling, Jr., Esq.
Assistant General Counsel
Public Service Electric & Gas Company
80 Park Place
Newark, New Jersey 07100

Mark Wetterhahn, Esq.
Conner, Moore & Cober
1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1050
Washington, D.C. 20006

Mr. Leif J. Norrholm
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region I
Drawer I
Hancocks Bridge, New Jersey 08038

ENCLOSURE

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
SALEM NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNIT 2
DOCKET NO. 50-311

NPSH REQUIREMENTS FOR RHR PUMPS DURING RECIRCULATION MODE

In a related concern about Salem, Unit 2, sump design the staff has estimated the head loss across the existing sump screen to be about 5.5 feet which disagree with the 2.0 feet assumed in your analysis. The staff estimate was for a "two pump operating" case, however. Considering this, and the possibility that a "worst case" alignment may have changed with the installation of flow restrictors, describe any design alterations to reduce the sump screen head loss, and discuss why the current NPSH analysis is applicable for the worst case alignment.