

**From:** David Bessette  
**To:** Charles.L.Kling@us.westinghouse.com; James Kim  
**Date:** 8/30/05 12:14PM  
**Subject:** Re: Clarification of review comments

>>> <Charles.L.Kling@us.westinghouse.com> 08/30/05 12:01 PM >>>  
Jim/Dave -

Thank you for the quick and detailed review of the IRIS Test topical. We fully understand most of the questions and will be able to provide responses to the questions at the upcoming 09/27 meeting with you.

I would like to confirm our interpretation of the scope of the review and a few of the questions.

A number of the sections were not reviewed (i.e., "Sections 5.1, 5.2.2, 5.2.3, 5.2.6, 5.2.7, 5.3.1, 5.3.3, 5.3.4, and 5.3.7."). We are assuming that since these tests are essentially for basic design and/or plant operation, they do not have a high safety significance and do not need to be reviewed by the NRC at this time.

I believe that is basically correct. I read through them and had no particular comments, other than the testing program seemed appropriate. However, these sections do not fall in my purview.

Although Questions 17 and 18 do not specify a report section, they appear to address Section 5.4.

Sorry about that. #17 referred to Section 5.4.1 and #18 to 5.4.2

The PIRT questions are under the heading of WCAP-16392-P, although the text appears to refer to a review of the PIRT report (i.e., WCAP-16318-P). Was WCAP-16318-P briefly reviewed to generate these questions?

Yes, that is correct.

Thank you for  
any clarification.

Regards,

Chuck

"James Kim" <JSK@nrc.gov>

08/25/2005 09:45 AM

To: <Charles.L.Kling@us.westinghouse.com>

cc: "Laura Dudes" <LAD@nrc.gov>, "Tolani Owusu" <TEO@nrc.gov>

Subject: Re: IRIS Test Plan Review Meeting

Security Level:? Internal

Chuck,

Attached is Mr. Bessette's review comments on WCAP-16392-P from the thermal hydraulic perspective in support of the upcoming meeting on September 27.

Thanks  
Jim Kim

>>> <[Charles.L.Kling@us.westinghouse.com](mailto:Charles.L.Kling@us.westinghouse.com)> 08/23/05 2:31 PM >>>

Jim/Dave -

Right now 09/27 is acceptable for Westinghouse.

We would appreciate any draft comments ahead of time.

I do not think the meeting will be longer than 2-3 hours.

A late morning or early afternoon start would be preferable to accommodate our travel plans.

I will let you know if we have to make any changes.

Regards,

Chuck

CC: [carellmd@westinghouse.com](mailto:carellmd@westinghouse.com); [conwayle@westinghouse.com](mailto:conwayle@westinghouse.com);  
[Frederick.L.Carpentino@us.westinghouse.com](mailto:Frederick.L.Carpentino@us.westinghouse.com); Laura Dudes; [OrianiL@westinghouse.com](mailto:OrianiL@westinghouse.com)

**Mail Envelope Properties (431485CA.536 : 13 : 9148)**

**Subject:** Re: Clarification of review comments  
**Creation Date:** 8/30/05 12:14PM  
**From:** David Bessette

**Created By:** DEB@nrc.gov

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

OWGWPO02.HQGWDO01  
JSK (James Kim)

nrc.gov

owf4\_po.OWFN\_DO  
LAD CC (Laura Dudes)

us.westinghouse.com

Charles.L.Kling (Charles.L.Kling@us.westi)  
Frederick.L.Carpentino CC (Frederick.L.Car

westinghouse.com

carellmd CC (carellmd@westinghouse.com)  
conwayle CC (conwayle@westinghouse.com)  
OrianiL CC (OrianiL@westinghouse.com)

**Post Office**

OWGWPO02.HQGWDO01  
owf4\_po.OWFN\_DO

**Route**

nrc.gov  
nrc.gov  
us.westinghouse.com  
westinghouse.com

**Files**

MESSAGE

**Size**

5835

**Date & Time**

08/30/05 12:14PM

**Options**

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

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