



GPU Nuclear Corporation

Post Office Box 388
Route 9 South
Forked River, New Jersey 08731-0388
609 971-4000
Writer's Direct Dial Number:

June 13, 1984

Dennis M. Crutchfield, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #5
Division of Licensing
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear Mr. Crutchfield:

Subject: Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station
Docket No. 50-219
Spent Fuel Pool Expansion - Additional Information

Enclosed are responses to questions forwarded to me by your letter of March 26, 1984 concerning GPU Nuclear's request to expand the capacity of the spent fuel pool.

Very truly yours,

Peter B. Fiedler
Vice President & Director
Oyster Creek

PBF:SD:dsm
Enclosure

cc: Dr. Thomas E. Murley, Administrator
Region I
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
631 Park Avenue
King of Prussia, PA 19406

NRC Resident Inspector
Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station
Forked River, NJ 08731

8406190368 840613
PDR ADOCK 05000219
P PDR

Acc 1
11/1

ATTACHMENT

Question #1 Will there be any construction activity beyond the area originally disturbed for station construction? Indicate on a site plan the new areas to be so disturbed. Describe the characteristics of the area proposed for disturbance.

Answer #1 The capacity expansion of the spent fuel pool will not involve any construction activity beyond the area originally disturbed for station construction.

Question #2 Give the size of the work force required for the fuel pool expansion effort. Compare this to the size of the work force for a typical scheduled maintenance outage. Give the duration of the fuel pool work effort. Compare to duration of typical scheduled outage.

Answer #2 The work force required to remove the old storage racks and install the new racks will consist of about ten (10) men and will take about three (3) months to complete. Scheduled maintenance/refueling outages cannot be classified as typical. Each maintenance/refueling outage varies in size depending on the scheduled work load. The present maintenance/refueling outage averages approximately 800 workers onsite during normal work periods and is scheduled to last approximately eighteen (18) months.

Question #3 Give the design heat removal rate for the present fuel pool system when filled to capacity as currently designed and when filled under the proposed reracking design. Give the total heat removal rate for all nuclear service water systems under present and revised conditions. Give total rate of heat discharge from the station to surface water bodies under present conditions and under conditions which would prevail with the newly designed racks filled to capacity.

Answer #3 Section 3 of the NRC safety evaluation for the issuance of Amendment 22 to the Oyster Creek Technical Specifications dated March 30, 1977 discusses the heat removal rates of spent fuel pool cooling system. The conclusion reached in the environmental impact statement of the same submittal remains valid ... "compared to the existing heat load on the Reactor Building and Turbine Building Closed Cooling Water System and the total heat rejected to Barnegat Bay by the once-through circulating water system, the small heat load from the Spent Fuel Pool Cooling System (attributable to the longer storage of additional spent fuel) will be negligible."

Question #4 Describe any changes in chemical usage and discharge associated with the fuel pool expansion. Indicate what changes will be needed in the NPDES Permit or other EPA or state approvals or certificates as a result of the fuel pool expansion.

Answer #4 There will not be any changes in chemical usage and discharge associated with the fuel pool expansion. The fuel pool expansion is licensed by the NRC and therefore, does not affect the NPDES Permit, other EPA or state approvals or certificates.