



**Wisconsin Electric** POWER COMPANY  
231 W. MICHIGAN, P.O. BOX 2046, MILWAUKEE, WI 53201

March 11, 1980

Mr. Harold R. Denton, Director  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation  
U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
Washington, D. C. 20555

Attention: Mr. A. Schwencer, Chief  
Operating Reactors Branch 1

Gentlemen:

DOCKET 50-301  
POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT 2  
CYCLE 7 RELOAD

The refueling shutdown at the end of Unit 2, Cycle 6, is planned to commence in early April 1980 at a cycle burnup of about 10,000 MWD/T; within a range of -1,000 to +100 MWD/T. Startup of Cycle 7 is expected to occur in early May 1980. This letter is to advise you of our plans regarding the Unit 2, Cycle 7 reload core.

The Unit 2, Cycle 7 reload core is designed to operate under current nominal design parameters, Technical Specifications and related bases, and current setpoints such that:

1. Core characteristics will be less limiting than previously reviewed and accepted; or
2. For those postulated accidents presented in the Final Facility Description and Safety Analysis Report (FFDSAR) which could be affected by the reload core, re-evaluation has demonstrated that the results of the postulated events are within allowable limits. Based on the Westinghouse Reload Safety Evaluation Report (RSER) for Unit 2, Cycle 7 and discussions with Westinghouse, safety evaluations were performed by our Nuclear Projects Office and our Point Beach Plant Supervisory Staff pursuant to the requirements of 10 CFR 50.59(a) and 10 CFR 50.59(b).

The reload fuel mechanical and thermal-hydraulic design for the Cycle 7 reload core is unchanged from that of previously reviewed and accepted reload designs. The reload core meets the

Acc 5/10

March 11, 1980

$F_{OX}^T$  limit of less than 2.32 which is consistent with previous reload nuclear designs. The current  $F_{\Delta H}^N$  limit of less than 1.58, and penalties for rod bow, ensure that the DNB ratio will not be less than 1.30.

In accordance with past practice, the reload safety evaluation relied on previously reviewed and accepted analyses reported in the FFDSAR and in earlier reload cycle RSERs. A review was made of the core characteristics to determine those parameters affecting the postulated accident analyses reported in the FFDSAR. In all cases it was found that the effects can be accommodated within the conservatism of the initial assumptions used in the previous applicable safety analyses and, thus, the conclusions presented in the FFDSAR remain valid.

The reload safety evaluation demonstrated that Technical Specification changes are not required for operation of Unit 2 at full rated power during Cycle 7. It was also demonstrated that unreviewed safety questions, as defined by 10 CFR 50.59, are not involved and, therefore, application for an amendment to the Unit 2 operating license is not required.

Verification of the core design will, of course, be performed by means of the standard startup physics tests normally performed at the start of each cycle. The rod bank exchange method of performing rod worth measurements will be used for the Unit 2, Cycle 7 startup physics tests.

Our letter of January 31, 1980, requested that the November 2, 1979 license amendment request for Technical Specification Change No. 60 be reviewed to permit operation of Unit 2 at either 2,000 or 2,250 psia primary system pressure. The foregoing, based on the Westinghouse RSER, covers operation at either primary system pressure, consistent with the information presented in the November 2, 1979 letter and subsequent correspondence on the subject. Pending approval of Technical Specification Change No. 60 for Unit 2, as requested in our letter of January 31, 1980, operation of Unit 2 will be at 2,250 psia primary system pressure.

Very truly yours,

C. W. Fay, Director  
Nuclear Power Department