

June 20, 2003

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, Senior Project Manager, Section 2     /RA/  
Project Directorate I  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: MILLSTONE POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 2,  
FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION, ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED IN AN  
UPCOMING CONFERENCE CALL (TAC NO. MB6108)

The attached information was transmitted by facsimile on June 19, 2003, to Mr. Ravi Joshi of Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc. (the licensee). This information was transmitted to facilitate a upcoming conference call in order to clarify the licensee's amendment request dated August 14, 2002, as supplemented on March 11, May 16, and May 23, 2003. The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications related to reactivity control systems, power distribution limits, and special test exceptions.

This memorandum and the attachment do not convey a formal request for information or represent an NRC staff position.

Docket No. 50-336

Attachment: Issues for Discussion in Upcoming Telephone Conference

June 20, 2003

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, Senior Project Manager, Section 2 /RA/  
Project Directorate I  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: MILLSTONE POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 2,  
FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION, ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED IN AN  
UPCOMING CONFERENCE CALL (TAC NO. MB6108)

The attached information was transmitted by facsimile on June 19, 2003, to Mr. Ravi Joshi of Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc. (the licensee). This information was transmitted to facilitate a upcoming conference call in order to clarify the licensee's amendment request dated August 14, 2002, as supplemented on March 11, May 16, and May 23, 2003. The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications related to reactivity control systems, power distribution limits, and special test exceptions.

This memorandum and the attachment do not convey a formal request for information or represent an NRC staff position.

Docket No. 50-336

Attachment: Issues for Discussion in Upcoming Telephone Conference

DISTRIBUTION

PUBLIC

PDI-2 Reading

JClifford

REnnis

SPeters

KKavanagh

ACCESSION NO.: ML031710030

OFFICE	PDI-2/PM
NAME	REnnis
DATE	6/19/03

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION IN UPCOMING TELEPHONE CONFERENCE  
REGARDING PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS  
REACTIVITY CONTROL SYSTEMS, POWER DISTRIBUTION LIMITS, AND  
SPECIAL TEST EXCEPTIONS  
MILLSTONE POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 2  
DOCKET NO. 50-336

By letter dated August 14, 2002, as supplemented on March 11, May 16, and May 23, 2003, Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc. (DNC or the licensee), submitted a proposed amendment to the Technical Specifications (TSs) for Millstone Power Station, Unit No. 2 (MP2). The proposed amendment would revise the MP2 TSs related to reactivity control systems, power distribution limits, and special test exceptions.

The NRC staff has reviewed the information the licensee provided that supports the proposed TS changes and would like to discuss the following issue to clarify the submittal dated May 23, 2003:

1. Your response to question 5 indicates that you relate the proposed TS 3.2.4 Action b.1 completion time for determining the peaking factor  $F_r^T$  to the time to recover from the events that could initiate a  $T_q$  shift greater than 0.10. You state that these events are dropped or misaligned CEAs. Your current TSs allow 2 hours to restore alignment following these CEA events.

However, per your proposed TS 3.1.3.1, Action A and your current TS 3.1.3.1.d and TS 3.1.3.1.e, you take action within 1 hour to reduce the consequences of increased peaking factors caused by the misaligned rod (i.e., reducing thermal power level). Since you take actions within 1 hour to eliminate problems with the peaking factors (i.e.,  $F_r^T$ ) in your TSs, isn't it more logical to relate your time to check the peaking factor  $F_r^T$  to the 1 hour in your CEA misalignment TSs? Furthermore, as mentioned in your response, NUREG-1432 allows for 1 hour to determine this value. NUREG-1432 also states that the 1 hour provides sufficient time for the operator to evaluate this factor.

ATTACHMENT