

April 18, 2001

MEMORANDUM TO: James W. Clifford, Chief, Section 2
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Richard B. Ennis, Project Manager, Section 2 **/RA/**
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. MB0955)

The attached information was transmitted by facsimile on April 16, 2001, to Mr. John Nagle of PSEG Nuclear LLC (the licensee). This information was transmitted to facilitate a upcoming conference call in order to determine an appropriate response time for the attached set of questions associated with the licensee's submittal dated January 8, 2001, as supplemented on February 6, 2001. In the submittal, the licensee requested a revision to the Hope Creek Generating Station (HCGS) Technical Specifications to reduce the acceptable surveillance test values for core spray flow. This memorandum and the attachment do not convey or represent an NRC staff position regarding the licensee's request.

Docket No. 50-354

Attachment: Issues for Discussion in Upcoming Telephone Conference

April 18, 2001

MEMORANDUM TO: James W. Clifford, Chief, Section 2
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Richard B. Ennis, Project Manager, Section 2 **/RA/**
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. MB0955)

The attached information was transmitted by facsimile on April 16, 2001, to Mr. John Nagle of PSEG Nuclear LLC (the licensee). This information was transmitted to facilitate a upcoming conference call in order to determine an appropriate response time for the attached set of questions associated with the licensee's submittal dated January 8, 2001, as supplemented on February 6, 2001. In the submittal, the licensee requested a revision to the Hope Creek Generating Station (HCGS) Technical Specifications to reduce the acceptable surveillance test values for core spray flow. This memorandum and the attachment do not convey or represent an NRC staff position regarding the licensee's request.

Docket No. 50-354

Attachment: Issues for Discussion in Upcoming Telephone Conference

DISTRIBUTION

PUBLIC
JClifford
REnnis
ZAbdullahi
PDI-2 Reading

DOCUMENT NAME: C:\mem mb0955.wpd

Accession No. ML011080540

| | |
|--------|----------|
| OFFICE | PDI-2/PM |
| NAME | REnnis |
| DATE | 4/16/01 |

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Issues for Discussion in Upcoming Telephone Conference
Related to PSEG License Change Request H00-009
Hope Creek Generating Station (HCGS)
Core Spray Flow Surveillance Requirements

1. Evaluate the impact of the degraded core spray (CS) flow on the HCGS Emergency Core Cooling System - Loss of Coolant Accident (ECCS-LOCA) analysis based on the uprated condition (proposed by your license change request LCR H00-05 dated December 1, 2000) using NRC-approved methodology. (i.e., 104.2 percent of the uprated power and 105 percent core flow).
2. In your submittal dated February 6, 2001, Attachment 2 discusses the methodology used to determine the impact of the degraded CS delivery on the results and conclusions of the ECCS performance analysis. As stated in Attachment 2, the first step in the methodology is to identify the portions of the analysis that are sensitive to changes in CS delivery. The analysis section of Attachment 2 discussed the small break LOCA (SBLOCA) and large break LOCA (LBLOCA) portions of the ECCS analysis. Provide a discussion on the impact of the degraded CS flow on a SBLOCA with the High Pressure Coolant Injection (HPCI) system unavailable.
3. In your submittal dated January 8, 2001, the "Background" section of Attachment 1 states that the CS system operating margin was significantly reduced based on the new pump acceptance criteria. Expand on the difference in your past and new pump acceptance criteria. Also explain if the CS pumps are degraded and whether the pumps can provide the minimum rated flow (or flows specified in the pump characteristic curve) assumed in the ECCS-LOCA analyses.