

**From:** "BOYD, DENNIS W" <DBOYD@entergy.com>  
**To:** "Thomas Alexion" <TWA@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** 6/3/03 3:40PM  
**Subject:** RE: CONTAINMENT SPRAY SYSTEM SURVEILLANCES LICENSE AMENDMENT REQUEST

Tom,

I recommend a phone call so we can discuss Sarah's question. We need some clarification.

This proposed change is consistent with the change we have already made to other ANO-2 technical specifications, e.g., ECCS (SR 4.5.2.b), Emergency Feedwater (SR 4.7.1.2), Service Water (SR 4.7.3.1.a), etc. These specs already contain the proposed wording and do not require short-interval verification of valves that are locked, sealed or otherwise secured in position. The SR is intended to ensure verification of valve positions in the main flow path that could be inadvertently repositioned. It is not likely that inadvertent repositioning could occur with regard to valves that are locked, sealed, or otherwise secured. The proposed wording of the change regarding verification of valves in the flow path of the containment spray system is identical to that approved by the NRC in Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF) 45 and, subsequently, NUREG-1432.

A system such as the containment spray system communicates directly with the containment atmosphere/sump; therefore, it contains valves that are required to be secured in the OPEN position to assure flow is directed to the containment atmosphere/sump. The valves secured in the CLOSED position normally do not communicate with the RCS or the containment atmosphere, but prevent flow from being diverted away (i.e., flowing through an alternate flow path) from the main system flow path. Such alternate paths typically contain dual isolation valves both secured in the closed position. In the case of the LPSI system alternate flow path, a single isolation valve is provided. This is acceptable because the LPSI system receives an ESF actuation which will result in flow into the RCS/containment sump. Both of these options are designed to decrease the likelihood that required system flow could be diverted from the main flow path. Therefore, it is not necessary to evaluate such alternate flow paths or the inventory that may be lost through them. It appears at first glance that the reviewer's question is beyond our design basis.

If you prefer to wait to have a phone call until you receive input from your other reviewers, that is fine with us.

Dennis

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Thomas Alexion [mailto:TWA@nrc.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 30, 2003 9:40 AM  
**To:** BOYD, DENNIS W  
**Subject:** CONTAINMENT SPRAY SYSTEM SURVEILLANCES LICENSE AMENDMENT REQUEST

Dennis,

See the attached request for additional information.

Tom

**Mail Envelope Properties (3EDCF987.C5E : 10 : 3166)**

**Subject:** RE: CONTAINMENT SPRAY SYSTEM SURVEILLANCES  
LICENSE AMENDMENT REQUEST  
**Creation Date:** 6/3/03 3:39PM  
**From:** "BOYD, DENNIS W" <DBOYD@entergy.com>  
**Created By:** DBOYD@entergy.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
owf4\_po.OWFN\_DO  
TWA (Thomas Alexion)

**Post Office**  
owf4\_po.OWFN\_DO

**Route**  
nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	2540	06/03/03 03:39PM
Part.001	5751	
Mime.822	9714	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**Reply Requested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard