



NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION / 300 ERIE BOULEVARD WEST, SYRACUSE, N.Y. 13202 / TELEPHONE (315) 474-1511

April 3, 1984  
(NMP2L 0023)

Mr. R. W. Starostecki, Director  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Region I  
Division of Project and Resident Programs  
631 Park Avenue  
King of Prussia, PA 19406

Re: Nine Mile Point Unit 2  
Docket No. 50-410

Dear Mr. Starostecki:

Enclosed is a final report in accordance with 10CFR50.55(e) for the problem concerning hydrostatic uplift pressure in the reactor building mat design (55(e) - 84-04). This problem was reported via telecon to S. Collins of your staff on January 30, 1984 and followed by an interim report on February 29, 1984.

Very truly yours,

*C. V. Mangan*

C. V. Mangan  
Vice President  
Nuclear Engineering & Licensing

CVM/TL:ja  
Enclosure  
xc: Director of Inspection and Enforcement  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555

R. A. Gramm, Resident Inspector

8404260187 840403  
PDR ADDCK 05000410  
S PDR

11  
IE 27

NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION  
NINE MILE POINT - UNIT 2  
DOCKET NO. 50-410

Final Report for a Problem  
Concerning Reactor Building  
Mat Design  
(55(e) - 84-04)

Description of the Problem

The reactor building mat design did not consider hydrostatic uplift pressure because at the time it was believed that this pressure would not exist due to the mat drainage system. However, during final design verification of the mat, it was concluded that since the drainage pumps are non-Category I, the hydrostatic uplift pressure should be included in the mat design.

Analysis of Safety Implications

Our review of the reactor building mat design indicates that the stresses in the mat for load combination(s) that includes hydrostatic uplift pressure would still remain within allowable limits, and the minimum factors of safety against overturning, sliding and flotation given in Final Safety Analysis Report Section 3.8.5.5 would also be met. Therefore, if this problem were to have remained uncorrected, it would not have adversely affected the safety of operation of the plant. As a result, the criteria for reportability under 10CFR50.55(e) have not been met.