



**PSEG**

Public Service Electric and Gas Company P.O. Box 236 Hancocks Bridge, New Jersey 08038

Nuclear Department

January 2, 1985

Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
7920 Norfolk Avenue  
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Attention: Mr. Steven A. Varga, Chief  
Operating Reactors Branch, No. 1

Dear Mr. Varga:

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATED  
TO ASYMMETRIC LOCA LOADS SUBMITTAL  
SALEM GENERATING STATION  
UNIT NO. 1  
DOCKET NO. 50-272

In your letter dated May 21, 1984, you requested additional information regarding the plant-specific asymmetric LOCA loads analysis for Salem Unit 1.

As a result of telephone conversations on November 8, 1984, with Mr. R. Bosnak and Mr. J. Rajan of the Mechanical Engineering Branch, we are submitting the information required to close out this concern for Salem Unit 1. The subject concern has been previously closed out for Salem Unit 2 in Supplement No. 4 to the Safety Evaluation Report dated April 18, 1980, as we pointed out in our letter, dated August 31, 1984.

Although the asymmetric LOCA load evaluation analyses contained in our letters dated March 6, 1979, March 29, 1979 and January 8, 1980, were transmitted under the Salem Unit 2 Docket 50-311, all the information is equally applicable to Unit 1, Docket 50-272. The Westinghouse analysis of the RCS piping and supports, Westinghouse Report SD-107 "Structural Analysis of Reactor Coolant Loop/Support System for Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit No. 1 and No. 2", is common to both units. The RCS piping layout, component and supports are identical for both units with the following exceptions:

The Energy People

8501080001 850102  
PDR ADOCK 05000272  
P PDR

*A030*  
*1/10*

1. The rod patterns are different.
2. The flow hole patterns in the lower reactor internals baffle barrel region formers are different.
3. Unit 1 is licensed for 3338 MWT and Unit 2 is licensed for 3423 MWT.

These differences are minor and are bound by the analyses presented in our previous transmittals and in Westinghouse Report.

All containment structures are identical for both the units. The analyses presented in our previous transmittals for subcompartment pressurization transients are equally valid for Units 1 and 2.

Accordingly, we request that the asymmetric LOCA loads issue be closed for Salem Unit 1.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,



E. A. Liden  
Manager - Nuclear  
Licensing and Regulation

C Mr. Donald C. Fischer  
Licensing Project Manager

Mr. James Linville  
Senior Resident Inspector