

Mr. J. J. Kelly, Manager  
B&W Owners Group Services  
Framatome Technologies, Inc.  
P.O. Box 10935  
Lynchburg, VA 24506-0935

October 26, 1999

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION - FRAMATOME TOPICAL  
REPORT BAW-2241P, REVISION 1, "FLUENCE AND UNCERTAINTY  
ANALYSIS" (TAC NO. M98962)

Dear Mr. Kelly:

By letter dated April 30, 1999, Framatome Technology, Inc., requested a review of the subject topical report. We have reviewed the report and determined that we need additional information in order to complete our review. Please respond to the enclosed request for additional information.

These questions were discussed with Mr. J. Worsham of your staff. As was agreed, please provide a response to these questions by November 15, 1999. Note that if you can answer some of the questions earlier, that would further expedite the staff's review. If you have any questions concerning our review, please contact me at (301) 415-1321.

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY:  
Stewart Bailey, Project Manager, Section 2  
Project Directorate III  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Project No. 693

Enclosure: Request for Additional Information

cc w/encl:  
Mr. Michael Schoppman  
Licensing Manager  
Framatome Technologies, Inc.  
1700 Rockville Pike, Suite 525  
Rockville, MD 20852-1631

DISTRIBUTION:

Central Files  
PUBLIC  
PDIV-2 Reading  
SRichards  
JWermiel  
OGC  
ACRS

99-188

REC FILE CENTER COPY

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\PDIV-2\B&W\OG\RAI98962

To receive a copy of this document, indicate "C" in the box							
OFFICE	PDIII-2/PM	C	PDIV-2/LA	C	C:SRXB*	PDIV-2/SC	
NAME	SBailey <i>SB</i>		EPeyton <i>ESP</i>		JWermiel	SDembek <i>SD</i>	
DATE	10/26/99		10/25/99		8/5/99	10/26/99	

\*concur by memo dated August 5, 1999

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DFOB

PDV PROJ 693

## REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

### TOPICAL REPORT BAW-2241P, REVISION 1

#### "FLUENCE AND UNCERTAINTY ANALYSIS"

1. Were the calculations and measurements (including the processing required to convert the measured activities to reaction rates) used in determining the Westinghouse Power Company (W) and Combustion Engineering (CE) data base calculated to measured ratios (C/Ms) performed by FTI using the methods described in the topical report? If not, provide justification for assuming this data constitutes a single population and can be combined to determine an overall C/M bias and calculational uncertainty.
2. Were any FTI evaluations of W or CE dosimetry excluded from the BAW-2241P data base and, if so, provide justification for excluding this data.
3. Provide the method and basis used for determining the values of  $\sigma_{CM}$ (Population | DF = 38) in Tables E-3 and E-4. What is the basis for assuming the W data is one sample out of the 39 plants in the FTI data base?
4. How do the C/M values of the five selected W plants compare with the C/M values for the other plants in the W data base of Reference 1 in the submittal? In view of the C/M difference between the five selected plants and the W data base average, provide justification for using the C/M value based on the five plants.
5. What is the effect on the bias and uncertainty calculation of eliminating the seven (of twenty-seven) B&W capsule/cavity measurements from the FTI uncertainty analysis (p. E-34, paragraph 3)? How is this effect accommodated in the methodology?
6. Was the energy-dependent bias used in the FTI methodology applied to the Virginia Power calculations of Table E-5 and, if not, discuss the applicability of these results to the FTI methodology.
7. In view of the substantially reduced calculational uncertainty associated with the CE plants, provide justification for including this data in the FTI data base. How is it assured that the inclusion of the CE plants in the FTI data base does not result in a reduction in the calculational uncertainty applied to the W and B&W plants?
8. Why are the  $\sigma_{CM}$  values for the W and CE plants of Tables E-3 and E-4 different than the values given in Table E-6?

9. There are certain plant features (e.g., vessel thickness, presence of a thermal shield and capsule location) that can have a unique effect on the C/M ratios and require a separate uncertainty analysis. Provide justification for concluding that plants with these types of features do not have to be analyzed separately.