

TERA



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

June 22, 1979

Docket Nos. 50-266  
and 50-301

Mr. Sol Burstein  
Wisconsin Electric Power Company  
231 West Michigan Street  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201

Dear Mr. Burstein:

In conducting our review of your September 21, 1978 request relating to changes to the non-radiological environmental monitoring Technical Specifications for Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units No. 1 and 2, we have determined that we will need the additional information identified in the enclosure to continue the review.

In order for us to maintain our review schedule, your response is requested within 60 days of your receipt of this letter. Three signed originals and forty copies are required.

Please contact us if you have any questions concerning this request.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "A. Schwencer".

A. Schwencer, Chief  
Operating Reactors Branch #1  
Division of Operating Reactors

Enclosure:  
Request for  
Additional Information

cc: w/enclosure  
See next page

7908060542

(5)

416 011

P

Mr. Sol Burstein  
Wisconsin Electric Power Company

- 2 -

June 22, 1979

cc: Mr. Bruce Churchill, Esquire  
Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge  
1800 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

Document Department  
University of Wisconsin  
Stevens Point Library  
Stevens Point, Wisconsin 54481

Mr. Glen Reed, Manager  
Nuclear Power Division  
Point Beach Nuclear Plant  
Wisconsin Electric Power Company  
231 West Michigan Street  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 43201

416 012

Request For Additional Information  
Point Beach Nuclear Plant  
Proposed Environmental Technical Specification Changes

1. NRC learned through the State of Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources that WEPCO plans to redesign and modify the offshore intake crib for the purposes of alleviating icing problems. Our review of the five-year operational monitoring program conducted at Point Beach will include an evaluation of the planned modifications. NRC will need the following information relevant to the intake modifications to complete the review:
  - (a) Detailed plans and design information on the new intake crib, to include drawings, differences from the present intake crib, and the estimated intake velocities under normal and maximum water withdrawal conditions.
  - (b) The schedule of construction activities at the intake crib.
  - (c) The basis for changing the intake crib design and operation, along with an assessment of the impacts associated with construction and operation of the new crib.
  - (d) A description of the monitoring programs which will be undertaken to assess the impacts of construction and operation of the new crib.
  
2. Examination of the impingement data at Point Beach revealed that large specimens of several fish species have been impinged, some on a regular basis. Specimens as large as a 31 inch, 13.75 pound lake trout have been recorded in impingement samples. This is puzzling in view of the fact that the offshore intake crib

supposedly is designed with 1 3/16" x 2" bar grating on the intake ports to prevent large fish and debris from entering the structure. Discussions with Wisconsin DNR revealed that this phenomena is probably the result of large spaces between the rocks in the intake crib. This design and impingement impact potential is not specified in the FES and apparently is an unreviewed item by NRC. This design would appear to defeat the purpose of the bar gratings. In order to complete the analysis of the five-year operational monitoring program, NRC will need the following information:

- (a) A description of the intake crib structure to include the sizes and extent of the spaces between the rocks through which large fishes pass and subsequently become impinged.
- (b) An analysis of the extent to which impingement would be reduced by plugging the spaces between the rocks and therefore, withdrawing water only through the bar grated intake ports.

3. During the first year of impingement monitoring (1973) WEPCO recognized that collecting impingement samples with a 3/4 inch mesh sluiceway basket allowed many impinged small fishes to pass through the basket unrecorded. This was due to the smaller mesh size (3/8 inch) of the traveling screens which caught small fishes. This discrepancy in sampling techniques was recognized by licensee early in the five-year program and by NRC which requested the use of a 3/8 inch mesh sluiceway basket for sampling impinged fishes. A 3/8 inch mesh basket was not used on a full-time basis until the fifth and final year of impingement sampling. As a result, the first four years of sampling could have greatly underestimated the true impingement of fishes at Point Beach.

In a letter dated October 14, 1976 from WEPCO to NRC, licensee committed to adjust the first four years of impingement data to estimate what impingement losses would have been if the proper mesh size (3/8 inch) collection basket had been used. Licensee also committed to provide this analysis in the five year summary report which was submitted to NRC in 1978. The report did not contain the analysis. Therefore provide the statistical adjustment of the first four years of impingement data, as requested by NRC.

4. During the five-year study period, some species of cisco (Coregonus) considered to be endangered within Wisconsin were captured by gill net at Point Beach. In response to inquiries by NRC, licensee stated that it was probable that the fishes had been misidentified. In a letter dated August 19, 1976 from WEPCO to NRC, licensee stated that the misidentification problem would be rectified and that all cisco of questionable identity from both impingement samples and lake samples would be verified by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. However, the results of the 1976-1977 sampling program reported 3 coregonids collected by seine and an estimated 442 impinged, all identified only to the genus level as in previous annual reports. Provide the requested information on the identification of the coregonids captured by seine and impingement during 1976-77.
5. In view of items 1,2, and 3 above, indicate why intake and lake sampling should not be continued in order to provide accurate and quantitative data on the impacts of water withdrawal to Lake Michigan fishes in the Point Beach area.