

October 23, 2006

MEMORANDUM TO: Daniel S. Collins, Chief
Plant Licensing Branch III-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Thomas J. Wengert, Project Manager/**RA**/
Plant Licensing Branch III-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT NO 1 - DRAFT
REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (RAI), REGARDING THE
DESIGN REQUIREMENTS FOR TORNADO MISSILE PROTECTION
(TAC MC5661)

The attached draft RAI was transmitted by facsimile on September 18, 2006, to Mr. Tej Chowdhary of the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station in preparation for an upcoming conference call. Review of the RAI would allow the licensee to identify areas where clarification may be needed, as well as determine and agree upon a schedule for responding to the RAI. This memorandum and its attachment do not convey a formal request for information or represent a Nuclear Regulatory Commission position.

Docket No. 50-346

Attachment: As stated

CONTACT: T. Wengert, NRR
301-415-4037

October 23, 2006

MEMORANDUM TO: Daniel S. Collins, Chief
Plant Licensing Branch III-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Thomas J. Wengert, Project Manager/**RA**/
Plant Licensing Branch III-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT NO 1 - DRAFT
REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (RAI), REGARDING THE
DESIGN REQUIREMENTS FOR TORNADO MISSILE PROTECTION
(TAC MC5661)

The attached draft RAI was transmitted by facsimile on September 18, 2006, to Mr. Tej Chowdhary of the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station in preparation for an upcoming conference call. Review of the RAI would allow the licensee to identify areas where clarification may be needed, as well as determine and agree upon a schedule for responding to the RAI. This memorandum and its attachment do not convey a formal request for information or represent a Nuclear Regulatory Commission position.

Docket No. 50-346

Attachment: As stated

CONTACT: T. Wengert, NRR
301-415-4037

Distribution:
PUBLIC
LPL3-2 R/F
RidsNrrDorLpl3-2
RidsNrrPMTWengert

Accession No:ML062620445

Office	LPL3-2/PM	LPL3-2/BC
Name	TWengert	DCollins
Date	10/20/06	10/23/06

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DRAFT

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
DAVIS BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 1 (DBNPS)
LICENSE AMENDMENT APPLICATION TO CHANGE DESIGN
REQUIREMENTS FOR TORNADO MISSILE PROTECTION (TAC NO. MC5661)
DOCKET No. 50-346

On September 13, 2006 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff held a telecon with the FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company (FENOC) to discuss FENOC's July 24, 2006 responses (ML062070158) to the NRC's Request for Additional Information (RAI) concerning FENOC's license amendment application dated January 11, 2005 (ML050140276) to change the design requirements for tornado missile protection for the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1 (DBNPS). During the telecon, the NRC technical staff requested the licensee to provide additional clarifications concerning its application of the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) "Tornado Missile Risk Evaluation Methodology" (TORMIS) model in support of the license amendment request. [Note: Question #6 was clarified via telecon between NRC and FENOC on October 3, 2006.]

In order for the NRC staff to complete its review of the licensee's amendment request, the NRC staff requests that the licensee provide responses to the following questions.

1. Explain how utilizing a tornado frequency of 4.25E-04 per year instead of the USAR frequency of 6.3E-04 per year is appropriate for a site-specific modeling approach.
2. Regarding the selection of wind field parameters such that the ratio of near ground wind velocity to velocity at 33 feet elevation (V_0/V_{33}) is equal to a value of 0.82: confirm whether this is a variable or fixed value in the model.
3. Describe how variance reduction parameters are used in the modeling and explain why the parameters are appropriate.
4. Explain why the number of tornado simulations and histories included in the modeling is adequate.
5. Provide additional clarification on how area ratioing was performed and explain how it is conservative and appropriate for use in the model.
6. Confirm that the complete missile spectrum, incorporated as a manual input in the TORMIS code, was used in the EPRI TORMIS evaluation (as opposed to the default value which uses only 6 or 7 NRC missiles).

DRAFT