December 13, 1999

MEMORANDUM TO: File Center

FROM: Richard B. Ennis, Project Manager, Section 2 ORIG SIGNED BY:
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: HOPE CREEK GENERATING STATION, FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION, ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED IN AN UPCOMING CONFERENCE CALL, (TAC NO. MA4471)

The attached information was transmitted by facsimile on December 13, 1999, to Mr. James Priest of Public Service Electric & Gas Company (PSE&G or the licensee). This information was transmitted to facilitate an upcoming conference call in order to clarify the licensee's submittal dated October 15, 1999, which provided PSE&G's response to an NRC request for additional information regarding PSE&G's license change request to increase the allowable main steam isolation valve (MSIV) leak rate and delete the MSIV sealing system for the Hope Creek Generating Station. This memorandum and the attachment do not convey a formal request for information or represent an NRC staff position.

Docket No. 50-354

Attachment: Issues for Discussion in Upcoming Telephone Conference

DISTRIBUTION
File Center
PUBLIC
JClifford
REnnis
ALee
PDI-2 Reading

OFFICE	PDI-2/PM
NAME	REnnis RBE
DATE	12/13/99

DFO1

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY
DOCUMENT NAME: G:\PDI-2\Hope Creek\mem2a4471.wpd

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

December 13, 1999

MEMORANDUM TO: File Center

FROM: Richard B. Ennis, Project Manager, Section 2
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: HOPE CREEK GENERATING STATION, FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION, ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED IN AN UPCOMING CONFERENCE CALL, (TAC NO. MA4471)

The attached information was transmitted by facsimile on December 13, 1999, to Mr. James Priest of Public Service Electric & Gas Company (PSE&G or the licensee). This information was transmitted to facilitate an upcoming conference call in order to clarify the licensee's submittal dated October 15, 1999, which provided PSE&G's response to an NRC request for additional information regarding PSE&G's license change request to increase the allowable main steam isolation valve (MSIV) leak rate and delete the MSIV sealing system for the Hope Creek Generating Station. This memorandum and the attachment do not convey a formal request for information or represent an NRC staff position.

Docket No. 50-354

Attachment: Issues for Discussion in Upcoming Telephone Conference

Issues for Discussion in Upcoming Telephone Conference
Related to PSE&G Submittal dated October 15, 1999

1. In Figures 3-1 through 3-3 of EQE's November 12, 1998 report (Attachment 4 to your December 28, 1998 letter), the size and dimension comparisons were made between the Hope Creek condenser and condensers at the earthquake experience database sites of Ormond Beach and Moss Landing. However, as shown in Figures 3-5 and 3-6, to demonstrate the adequacy of the Hope Creek condenser anchorage, you used condenser anchorages at the sites of El Centro and Moss Landing. Explain why you choose different sets of database sites for different aspects of condenser comparison. Also, in Question #9 of the staff's request for additional information (RAI) of July 1, 1999, the staff requested that you provide the Ormond Beach response spectrum. You responded by stating that the Ormond Beach spectra were not used to demonstrate the anchorage adequacy of the Hope Creek condenser. Explain why you used Ormond Beach's dimensional data without providing, and justifying the validity of, its associated response spectra.

   In addition to the above, the staff is concerned about the lack of sufficient earthquake experience condenser data provided by EQE, Inc. In its March 3, 1999 safety evaluation of the BWROG topical report, NEDC-31858P, Revision 2, September 1993, the staff stated that at the present time, there is no standard, endorsed by NRC, that provides guidance for determining what constitutes an acceptable number of earthquake recordings that should be provided by licensees that utilize the BWROG methodology. Therefore, individual licensees are responsible for ensuring the sufficiency of the earthquake experience data to be submitted for staff review. Based on the above, you are requested to provide sufficient earthquake experience condenser data for staff review. If sufficient data is not provided for the condenser, the NRC may require that the condenser be analytically evaluated against all the pertinent operating and design loadings, in accordance with the plant's design basis methodology and criteria.

2. In responding to Question #10 of the above stated RAI, you stated that the response spectrum of Moss Landing and Valley Steam power plants bound the Hope Creek design SSE spectra in the low and high frequencies of interest. By examining the spectral curves provided in Enclosure 2 to your response, the staff noted, however, that the Valley Steam spectrum is exceeded by the Hope Creek spectrum in a frequency range from around 6 to 21 Hz. Also, the Moss Landing spectrum is exceeded by the Hope Creek spectrum in a frequency range from around 4.2 to 13 Hz. Since the above frequency ranges are considered significant, please provide your justification for the validity of these two sites as viable database sites for Hope Creek.

3. Table 4-3 of EQE's November 12, 1998 report provides earthquake experience piping data from Valley Steam Plant Units 1 & 2 and El Centro Steam Plant. In view of Question #2 above, the staff questions the validity of the piping data provided from the Valley Steam Plant. Similar to Question #1 above, the staff also questions the sufficiency of the piping data that you provided to envelop the Hope Creek ALT pathway piping. In addition, provide the justification for not including piping larger than 4 inches in diameter in the above table.

Attachment