



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

November 7, 1980

Docket No. 50-312

Mr. J. J. Mattimoe
Assistant General Manager and
Chief Engineer
Sacramento Municipal Utility District
6201 S Street
P. O. Box 15830
Sacramento, California 95813

Dear Mr. Mattimoe:

SUBJECT: PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 70; FLUX TO FLOW RATIO CHANGES
Reference: J. J. Mattimoe letter to R. W. Reid, dated August 11, 1980

The enclosure to this letter contains information that is relevant to our evaluation of the above subject Technical Specifications change requested by SMUD. In order to complete our review, you are requested to provide us with clarifications or confirmations on each of the items, as appropriate.

Should you have any questions, please contact your NRC Project Manager.

Sincerely,

Robert W. Reid, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #4
Division of Licensing

Enclosure:
Request for Additional
Information

cc w/enclosure:
See next page

8011200051

P

15 NRC
DISTRIBUTION SERVICES
BRANCH

1980 NOV 13 AM 10 39

RECEIVED DISTRIBUTION
SERVICES UNIT

Sacramento Municipal Utility
District

- 1 -

cc w/enclosure(s):

David S. Kaplan, Secretary and
General Counsel
6201 S Street
P. O. Box 15830
Sacramento, California 95813

Sacramento County
Board of Supervisors
827 7th Street, Room 424
Sacramento, California 95814

Business and Municipal Department
Sacramento City-County Library
828 I Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Director, Criteria and Standards
Division
Office of Radiation Programs (ANR-460)
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D. C. 20460

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region IX Office
ATTN: EIS COORDINATOR
215 Fremont Street
San Francisco, California 94111

Mr. Robert B. Borsum
Babcock & Wilcox
Nuclear Power Generation Division
Suite 420, 7735 Old Georgetown Road
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Thomas Baxter, Esq.
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge
1800 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Herbert H. Brown, Esq.
Lawrence Coe Lanpher, Esq.
Hill, Christopher and Phillips, P.C.
1900 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Helen Hubbard
P. O. Box 63
Sunol, California 94586

Christopher Ellison, Esq.
Dian Grueuich, Esq.
California Energy Commission
1111 Howe Avenue
Sacramento, California 95825

Ms. Eleanor Schwartz
California State Office
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, S.E., Rm. 201
Washington, D. C. 20003

Docketing and Service Section
Office of the Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Resident Inspector
P. O. Box 48
Fair Oaks, California 95628

Dr. Richard F. Cole
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Mr. Frederick J. Shon
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Elizabeth S. Bowers, Esq.
Chairman, Atomic Safety and
Licensing Board Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Mr. Michael R. Eaton
Energy Issues Coordinator
Sierra Club Legislative Office
1107 9th Street, Room 1020
Sacramento, California 95814

Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Sacramento Municipal Utility
District

- 2 -

Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal
Board Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

California Department of Health
ATTN: Chief, Environmental
Radiation Control Unit
Radiological Health Section
714 P Street, Room 498
Sacramento, California 95814

CONFIRMATION AND CLARIFICATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 70

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

1. The value of flow measurement uncertainty was indicated to be $\pm 2.5\%$, derived from studies of the Toledo prototype. Confirm that the uncertainty figure of $\pm 2.5\%$ is applicable to the existing Rancho Seco piping and instrumentation configuration considering the recent RCS flow transmitter snubber modifications that increase instrument sensitivity.
2. Minimum RCS flow required by Tech Specs is 387,600 gpm. If your flow instrumentation indicated 387,600 gpm flow, is actual flow 387,600 gpm, or conceivably 2.5% less? If actual flow is conceivably 2.5% less, how do you ensure that the Tech Spec limit is not violated?
3.
 - a) Confirm that the original ESAR analysis and the original Cycle 4 analysis that concluded the DNBR margin was 10.2% was based upon a 100% design flow of 369,600 gpm.
 - b) Confirm that the analysis in support of the requested P/F - 1.08 Tech Spec change used the minimum flow value of 387,710 gpm (or 387,600 gpm) to determine that the new DNBR margin is $>10\%$.
4. Confirm that the DNBR margin of $>10\%$ from 3b above exists for the following flow transients:
 - a) four pump coastdown
 - b) locked RCP rotor

If the DNBR margin of $>10\%$ from 3b above does not exist for the locked RCP rotor transient, what is the DNBR margin for the transient?