NORTHEAST UTILITIES
NU

P.O. BOX 270
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06101
(203) 666-6911

July 31, 1978

Docket No. 50-336

Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Attn: Mr. R. Reid, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #4
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

References: (1) W. G. Counsil letter to R. Reid dated July 17, 1978.
(2) W. G. Counsil letter to R. Reid dated June 6, 1978.
(3) E. J. Brunner letter to D. C. Switzer dated September 13, 1976.
(4) D. C. Switzer letter to R. Reid dated March 14, 1978.
(5) E. C. McCabe letter to D. C. Switzer dated April 6, 1978.

Gentlemen:

Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 2
Loads Near Spent Fuel, Neutron Shielding, and Containment Leak Rate Testing

In Reference (1), Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (NNECO) provided the requested information concerning the control of heavy loads near spent fuel. However, due to a collating error, it appears that page one of the attachment, responding to items one through three, was not included. Please find the responses to those items on the attached page.

In Reference (2), NNECO provided preliminary information regarding the proposed neutron shield design. In that letter, NNECO inadvertently neglected to address 10CFR170 considerations. NNECO had previously reviewed the proposal pursuant to the requirements of 10CFR170, and had determined that no fee was required. This basis for this determination is that the Reference (2) material is merely the continuation of an issue initiated prior to the effective date of 10CFR170.

In Reference (3), Inspection Item 76-14-1 discusses a discrepancy between the Millstone Unit No. 2 Technical Specifications and the literal requirements of 10CFR50, Appendix J, concerning Type B and C containment leak rate testing. To resolve this item, NNECO proposed a change to the Technical Specifications in Reference (4). Following inspector review of the change request, unresolved item 76-14-1 was reported as closed in Reference (5). Since that time, however, the Staff has verbally indicated that the proposed Technical Specification is

overly restrictive and that the leak rate testing requirements as they are currently written adequately address the intent of Appendix J. Therefore, NNECO hereby withdraws this change request, with the understanding that this withdrawal will not result in any further action in this matter by the Office of Inspection and Enforcement.

Very truly yours,

NORTHEAST NUCLEAR ENERGY COMPANY

W. G. Counsil
Vice President

Attachment

Item 1

Provide a diagram which illustrates the physical relation between the reactor core, the fuel transfer canal, the spent fuel storage pool and the set down, receiving or storage areas for any heavy loads moved on the refueling floor.

Response 1

This information is provided in FSAR Figures 1.2-6, 9.8-2, and 9.8-3.

Item 2

Provide a list of all objects that are required to be moved over the reactor core (during refueling), or the spent fuel storage pool. For each object listed, provide its approximate weight and size, a diagram of the movement path utilized (including carrying height) and the frequency of movement.

Response 2

During refueling operation, administrative controls prevent movement of equipment which weighs more than a fuel bundle and CEA (approximately 1400 pounds) over either the spent fuel pool or reactor vessel. These precautions are noted in steps 4.6 and 4.13 of attached operating procedure 2209A, Refuel Operations (see Attachment 2). During the refuel operations, the only loads suspended over the irradiated fuel in either locations were the fuel and CEA's moved in the fuel shuffle and special tools used for CEA guide tube sleeving. The list of objects includes:

Fuel Assembly: 8" x 8" x 157", 1280 pounds
CEA: 161" long, 195/299 pounds (single/dual)
Fuel Handling Tool: 31' long, 365 pounds
Guide Tube Sleeving Tools: < 100 pounds

Item 3

What are the dimensions and weights of the spent fuel casks that are or will be used at your facility?

Response 3

The purchase specifications have not been formulated for the spent fuel casks which will be used at this facility. Cask drop analyses have assumed a cask 19 feet long, 8 feet in diameter, and weighing 200,000 pounds (see FSAR, Section 5.4.3.1.9).

Item 4

Identify any heavy load or cask drop analyses performed to date for your facility. Provide a copy of all such analyses not previously submitted to the NRC Staff.