

PMComanchePeakPEm Resource

From: Monarque, Stephen
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2010 2:01 PM
To: John.Only@luminant.com; Donald.Woodlan@luminant.com; cp34-rai-luminant@mnes-us.com; Diane Yeager; Eric.Evans@luminant.com; joseph tapia; Kazuya Hayashi; Matthew.Weeks@luminant.com; MNES RAI mailbox; Russ Bywater
Cc: ComanchePeakCOL Resource; Takacs, Michael
Subject: Comanche Peak RCOL Chapter 13.3 - RAI Number 134
Attachments: RAI 4224 (RAI 134).doc

The NRC staff has identified that additional information is needed to continue its review of the combined license application. The NRC staff's request for additional information (RAI) is contained in the attachment. Luminant is requested to inform the NRC staff if a conference call is needed.

The response to this RAI is due within 35 calendar days of January 25, 2010.

Note: If changes are needed to the safety analysis report, the NRC staff requests that the RAI response include the proposed changes.

thanks,

Stephen Monarque
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
NRO/DNRL/NMIP
301-415-1544

Hearing Identifier: ComanchePeak_COL_Public
Email Number: 802

Mail Envelope Properties (9C2386A0C0BC584684916F7A0482B6CA0B7A4E12C5)

Subject: Comanche Peak RCOL Chapter 13.3 - RAI Number 134
Sent Date: 1/25/2010 2:01:11 PM
Received Date: 1/25/2010 2:01:24 PM
From: Monarque, Stephen

Created By: Stephen.Monarque@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"ComanchePeakCOL Resource" <ComanchePeakCOL.Resource@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Takacs, Michael" <Michael.Takacs@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"John.Only@luminant.com" <John.Only@luminant.com>

Tracking Status: None

"Donald.Woodlan@luminant.com" <Donald.Woodlan@luminant.com>

Tracking Status: None

"cp34-rai-luminant@mnes-us.com" <cp34-rai-luminant@mnes-us.com>

Tracking Status: None

"Diane Yeager" <diane_yeager@mnes-us.com>

Tracking Status: None

"Eric.Evans@luminant.com" <Eric.Evans@luminant.com>

Tracking Status: None

"joseph tapia" <joseph_tapia@mnes-us.com>

Tracking Status: None

"Kazuya Hayashi" <kazuya_hayashi@mnes-us.com>

Tracking Status: None

"Matthew.Weeks@luminant.com" <Matthew.Weeks@luminant.com>

Tracking Status: None

"MNES RAI mailbox" <cp34-rai@mnes-us.com>

Tracking Status: None

"Russ Bywater" <russell_bywater@mnes-us.com>

Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	652	1/25/2010 2:01:24 PM
RAI 4224 (RAI 134).doc		37882

Options

Priority: Standard

Return Notification: No

Reply Requested: No

Sensitivity: Normal

Expiration Date:

Recipients Received:

Request for Additional Information (RA) No. 4224 COLA, Revision 1

RAI Number 134

1/25/2010

Comanche Peak Units 3 and 4
Luminant Generation Company, LLC.
Docket No. 52-034 and 52-035
SRP Section: 13.03 - Emergency Planning
Application Section: Part 5: Emergency Planning

QUESTIONS for Licensing and Inspection Branch (NSIR/DPR/LIB) (EP)

13.03-30

Open Item 13.03-01: Subject: Demand Estimation, Permanent Residents
[Basis: 10 CFR 50 Appendix E (IV); Appendix 4 to NUREG-0654 Section II.A]
Acceptance Criteria: NUREG-0800, Standard Review Plan, Section 13.3, "Emergency Planning," Requirements A and H; Acceptance Criterion 11

In response to RAI 13.03-19.B, the applicant explained that zone specific growth rates were multiplied by 15/7 in order to compute a growth factor to 2015 from the 2007 population estimate. However, the applicant did not explain in the response why a factor of 15/7 was selected to compute the 2015 population. Explain why a 15/7 factor was used to compute the 2015 population.

13.03-31

Open Item 13.03-02: Subject: Demand Estimation, Transient Populations
[Basis: 10 CFR 50 Appendix E (IV); Appendix 4 to NUREG-0654 Sections II.B]
Acceptance Criteria: NUREG-0800, Standard Review Plan, Section 13.3, "Emergency Planning," Requirements A and H; Acceptance Criterion 11

In response to RAI 13.03-20.C, the applicant agreed that the Fourth of July Celebration will be added as a special events scenario. The applicant's response also provided the specific textual changes that will be made to the evacuation time estimate (ETE) text and tables in an updated ETE Report. However, the applicant did not provide updated Tables 7-1A through 7-1D, "Time to Clear the Indicated Area of [X] Percent of the Affected Population." Provide updated Tables 7-1A through 7-1D showing the addition of Scenario 13. Update the ETE accordingly.

13.03-32

Open Item 13.03-03: Subject: Demand Estimation, Special Facility Population
[Basis: 10 CFR 50 Appendix E (IV); Appendix 4 to NUREG-0654 Sections II.C]
Acceptance Criteria: NUREG-0800, Standard Review Plan, Section 13.3, "Emergency Planning," Requirements A and H; Acceptance Criterion 11

In response to RAI 13.03-21.A, the applicant stated that capacity populations and transportation requirements for individual institutions are provided in Table 1 and included as Attachment 13.03-21A. However, Table 1 was not included in the applicant's response. Provide Table 1.

13.03-33

Open Item 13.03-04: Subject: Demand Estimation, Special Facility Population
[Basis: 10 CFR 50 Appendix E (IV); Appendix 4 to NUREG-0654 Sections II.C.
Acceptance Criteria: NUREG-0800, Standard Review Plan, Section 13.3, "Emergency Planning," Requirements A and H; Acceptance Criterion 11]

In response to RAI 13.03-21.A, the applicant stated that requirements of Section II.C of Appendix 4 of NUREG-0654 were met by using census populations for individual special facilities. However, Section IV.B of Appendix 4 of NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1 refers to special facilities and identifies that peak capacities shall be considered. Update the ETE Report for special facilities using peak capacity population values.

13.03-34

Open Item 13.03-05: Subject: ETE Methodology
[Basis: 10 CFR 50 Appendix E (IV); Appendix 4 to NUREG-0654 Section I.C]
Acceptance Criteria: NUREG-0800, Standard Review Plan, Section 13.3, "Emergency Planning," Requirements A and H; Acceptance Criterion 11

In response to RAI 13.03-18.B, the applicant stated that no allowance is made for traffic control operations. The applicant also made reference to their RAI 13.03-18.A response which states, in part, that at traffic control point locations, the allocation of traffic signal green time is adjusted to balance the competing traffic volumes on major and minor routes. Provide clarification regarding allowances given that engineers adjust traffic signal green time. Update the ETE Report accordingly.

13.03-35

Open Item 13.03-06: Subject: ETE Methodology

[Basis: 10 CFR 50 Appendix E (IV). Appendix 4 to NUREG-0654 Section I.C]

Acceptance Criteria: NUREG-0800, Standard Review Plan, Section 13.3, "Emergency Planning," Requirements A and H; Acceptance Criterion 11

In response to RAI 13.03-18.D, the applicant stated that if traffic control points in the county plans were implemented, the ETE may be less than predicted in the study. The response further discusses that no credit is taken for improved traffic operations where traffic personnel are located. However, as described in the response to RAI 13.03-18.A, the applicant adjusted the allocation of green time so that it balances the competing traffic volumes as a means to consider traffic control. Therefore, the applicant is requested to clarify whether or not it intends to take credit for traffic control based on the manner in which the analyst adjusts green time at intersections at which traffic control is present.

13.03-36

Open Item 13.03-07: Subject: Analysis of Evacuation Times, Methodology, Special Facilities

[Basis: 10 CFR 50 Appendix E (IV); Appendix 4 to NUREG-0654 Section IV.B]

Acceptance Criteria: NUREG-0800, Standard Review Plan, Section 13.3, "Emergency Planning," Requirements A and H; Acceptance Criterion 11

In response to RAI 13.03-27.B, the applicant provided Table 1, "Ambulance Resources," which summarized the ambulance resources and their respective mobilization times. In part, Table 1 indicated that there were 35 ambulances available for evacuating the special needs population. However, in response to RAI 13.03-21.A, the applicant stated that an additional 11 ambulances would be needed to support peak capacities at special facilities. It appears that the need for an additional 11 ambulances would exceed the number of ambulances available. Discuss the effect on the ETE if a second wave of ambulance runs is necessary, or if additional ambulances are used from other sources besides those listed in Table 1. Update the ETE accordingly.