November 1, 1996

Distribution
Docket File CJackson
PUBLIC JHannon
PD3-1 Reading ACRS
JRoe JCaldwell, RIII
OGC EAdensam (E)
BElliot TCollins
KWichman BJorgensen, RIII

Mr. Robert E. Link, Vice President
Nuclear Power Department
Wisconsin Electric Power Company
231 West Michigan Street, Room P379
Milwaukee, WI 53201

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CHANGE REQUEST 194, "LOW-TEMPERATURE OVERPRESSURE PROTECTION SYSTEM" AND REQUEST FOR EXEMPTION FROM THE REQUIREMENTS OF 10 CFR 50.60 - POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2 (TAC NOS. M96571, M96572, M96166 & M96167)

Dear Mr. Link:

We have received your July 1, 1996, request for exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 50.60 and your September 19, 1996 exigent Technical Specification (TS) change request 194 which proposes changing the TS for the low-temperature, overpressure protection system (LTOP). During the review, the staff determined that additional information was required. Enclosed is the request for additional information (RAI). Please provide your response to these questions by November 11, 1996, if you desire to use the proposed TS during restart from your current outage scheduled for early December. If you have any questions, please contact me at (301) 415-1380.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:

John N. Hannon, Project Director
Project Directorate III-1
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-266
and 50-301

Enclosure: RAI

cc w/encl: See next page
DOCUMENT NAME: G:\WPDOCS\PTBEACH\PTB96571.RAI

DF01

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without enclosures "E" = Copy with enclosures "N" = No copy

OFFICE	PD31:PM	E	PD31:LA	E	PD31:PD		
NAME	LGundrum		CJamerson		JHannon		
DATE	10/01/96		10/ 1 /96		10/ /96		

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Mr. Robert E. Link, Vice President
Wisconsin Electric Power Company

Point Beach Nuclear Plant
Unit Nos. 1 and 2

cc:

Ernest L. Blake, Jr.
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge
2300 N Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037

Mr. Scott A. Patulski, General Manager
Point Beach Nuclear Plant
Wisconsin Electric Power Company
6610 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

Mr. Ken Duveneck
Town Chairman
Town of Two Creeks
13017 State Highway 42
Mishicot, Wisconsin 54228

Chairman
Public Service Commission
of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7854
Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7854

Regional Administrator, Region III
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
801 Warrenville Road
Lisle, Illinois 60532-4351

Resident Inspector's Office
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
6612 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

Ms. Sarah Jenkins
Electric Division
Public Service Commission of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7854
Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7854

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
POINT BEACH EXIGENT TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CHANGE REQUEST 194
LOW TEMPERATURE OVERPRESSURE PROTECTION SYSTEM
AND REQUEST FOR EXEMPTION FROM THE
REQUIREMENTS OF 10 CFR 50.60

1. Why does operation with administrative controls on one reactor coolant pump (RCP) increase the likelihood of spurious actuation of a power-operated relief valve (PORV)? Is one RCP sufficient to provide adequate pressure to the RCP seals? Why does operation with administrative controls on two RCPs increase the likehood of spurious actuation of a PORV? Are pressure surges associated with RCP start included in the evaluation of the expected pressure at the core midplane of 63 pisg higher than the pressure at the pressure sensing points.

2. No instrument uncertainty (pressure or temperature) is accounted for in the low-temperature overpressure (LTOP) setpoints or limits. Be sure to include a discussion of the effects of temperature uncertainty on the enable temperature, bolt-up temperature, and RCP lockout temperature.

3. Does the instrument bias discussed on sheet 2 of the calculation include the static elevation pressure bias in addition to the dynamic effects of the RCPs running? Additionally, there is some effect of having one or more residual heat removal (RHR) pumps running, please provide your evaluation of the effects of running RHR pumps. There is no discussion justifying that the pressure bias values chosen for Point Beach are conservative. Please provide the basis for choosing the values used. For example, are the values generic or plant specific and what assumptions were made?

4. The Westinghouse methodology that is being used to verify the setpoints is not provided. Has the methodology been used in a topical report? If so, please provide the report number and date of the safety evaluation. If not, please provide the methodology used to calculate the pressure overshoot for both the mass and energy addition transients. Additionally, for these calculations please provide the basis for the selection of inputs (i.e., initial reactor coolant system temperature, pressure, steam generator surface area, injection flow rate, PORV flow area, inlet and outlet piping geometries, flow resistances, time delays in valve response and actuation logic) to assure the results will be conservative or limiting.

   For the energy addition transient please provide greater detail why the two cases analyzed (100°F at 300psi with one RCP initially running and 250°F at 300psi with one RCP initially running) will bound all the different combinations of initial temperature, pressure and operating pumps.

5. In the determination of the new enable temperature, NRC Branch Technical Position RSB 5-2 is incorrectly referenced by stating that,

$$T_{enable} = RT_{NDT} + 90°F.$$

   The Branch Technical Position actually defines the enable temperature as the water temperature corresponding to a metal temperature of at least RT_{NDT} + 90°F at the beltline location (¼t or ¾t). Please evaluate and account for the temperature difference between the RCS water and the (¼t or ¾t) weld location.

ENCLOSURE

6. The maximum allowable pressure is calculated for four different temperatures, 70°F, 100°F, 120°F, and 250°F, however, the steady state pressure vs. temperature curves contained in TS figures 15.3.1-1 and 2 do not appear to correspond to the same values. If this is the case, please describe where these two different sets of limit curves originate. Additionally, a new enable temperature is calculated for this submittal, please describe why the limit curves are also not re-calculated.