

DCS MS-016

NOV 19 1982

BSheron
BMann

DISTRIBUTION
✓ Docket File
Local PDR
ORB #3 Rdg
D.Eisenhut
JHeltemes
RAClark
PKreutzer (3)
OELD
NSIC
E.L. Jordan
J.M.Taylor (1)
ACRS (10)
TColburn
Gray File

Docket Nos. 50-266

Mr. C. W. Fay
Assistant Vice President
Wisconsin Electric Power Company
231 West Michigan Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201

Dear Mr. Fay:

In conducting our review of your September 17, 1982 request relating to reduced thermal design flow for the Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, we have determined that we will need additional information identified in the enclosure to continue our review.

In order for us to maintain our review schedule, your response is requested by November 25, 1982. The information requested in the enclosure has been previously telecopied to members of your staff. This letter constitutes our formal request for this information.

The reporting and/or recordkeeping requirements contained in this letter affect fewer than ten respondents; therefore, OMB clearance is not required under P. L. 96-511.

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

Sincerely,

Original signed by:
Robert A. Clark, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #3
Division of Licensing

Enclosure:
Request for Additional
Information

cc w/enclosure

See next page

8211300086 821119
PDR ADOCK 05000266
P PDR

OFFICE	DL:ORB#3	DL:ORB#3	DL:ORB#3				
SURNAME	PMKreutzer	TColburn:dd	RAClark				
DATE	11/18/82	11/19/82	11/19/82				

Wisconsin Electric Power Company

cc:

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

USNRC Resident Inspectors Office
6612 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

Joseph Mann Library
1516 Sixteenth Street
Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

Mr. Glenn A. Reed, Manager
Nuclear Operations
Wisconsin Electric Power Company
Point Beach Nuclear Plant
6610 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

Mr. Gordon Blaha
- Town Chairman
Town of Two Creeks
Route 3
Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

Ms. Kathleen M. Falk
General Counsel
Wisconsin's Environmental Decade
114 N. Carroll Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53703

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Federal Activities Branch
Region V Office
ATTN: Regional Radiation
Representative
230 S. Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Chairman
Public Service Commission of Wisconsin
Hills Farms State Office Building
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

Regional Administrator
Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Region III
Office of Executive Director for Operations
799 Roosevelt Road
Glen Ellyn, Illinois 60137

POINT BEACH 1 PROPOSED TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CHANGES

RELATING TO REDUCED TDF

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

1. LOCA Analysis

Your response of October 15, 1982, to our request for justification for not performing a new LOCA calculation of peak clad temperature (PCT) under the conditions of 95% thermal design flow (TDF), 91% power and 24% steam generator tube plugging (SGTP), does not demonstrate that the acceptance criteria for the LOCA analysis are met. We require that you perform a new calculation of PCT for the above conditions, for the following reasons:

- (1) Your response indicated utilization of an F_0 of 2.52 while your previous LOCA analyses assumed F_0 of 2.32. A sensitivity analysis was used to correct PCT for the higher F_0 . We do not consider this to be adequate.
- (2) Addition of 60°F to the estimated PCT of 2128°F to correct for upper plenum injection raises PCT to within 12°F of the 2200°F limit.

Since the error band of the sensitivity analyses may be considerably larger than 12°F, we require performance of a rigorous calculation for PCT.

- (3) In addition, we have the following questions and comments:

- (a) Your response assumes linearity of the effects of changes in power level, % SGTP, etc. (e.g. bottom of page 2 in your October 15, 1982 response). You also superimpose sensitivity analyses. This requires justification.
- (b) Clarify your statement in the top paragraph of page 3, which now appears to indicate that a drop in TDF will result in a lowered PCT.

We also question your statement that a 4°F drop in T_{in} results in a 6°F drop in PCT.

- (c) Clarify your statement on page 3, item 3., which indicates that the effect of reduction of TDF is not quantifiable using sensitivity analyses.
- (d) In Table 1 you show PCT elevation to be 6.0' for cases 1 & 3, and 7.5' for case 2. The rupture node can be expected to be 6' elevation. Use of the 7.5' elevation for case 2 appears inconsistent, and the cases are thus not directly comparable.

2. Steam Line Break (SLB)

Your September 17, 1982 submittal states that the initial shutdown margin is 2.77% for all cases, whereas Figures 4 through 8 of your submittal indicate the initial reactivity to be 0 for all SLB accidents, except for the "steam break equivalent to one steam generator safety valve" which indicates an initial reactivity of -2.0%. Please clarify this discrepancy.

The Point Beach FSAR SLB analyses all assume an initial reactivity of -2.77%, as depicted in Figures 14.2.5 - 3 through 14.2.5-9. We consider that this may be a more conservative assumption for the SLB initial condition. Therefore, please justify the assumption regarding initial reactivity for the large SLB analyses in your September 17, 1982, submittal, assuming Figures 4 through 8 correctly depict the reactivity transient (i.e initial reactivity = 0).