From: Raj Anand
To: <internet:wemookhoek@stpegs.com>
Date: 12/12/2007 3:38:08 PM
Subject: Identification of Potential Site Hazards, Sections 2.1.2-2.2.2
cc: <internet:gtgibson@stpegs.com>,"Michael Gartman" <MRG1@nrc.gov>,"Mark Tonacci" <MET@nrc.gov>,"George Wunder" <GFW@nrc.gov>

Bill,
As discussed in a telephone call on December 12, 2007, I am providing you with the identified issues concerning Identification of Potential Site Hazards in Sections 2.1.2-2.2.2. We can discuss these issues in a teleconference between the NRC staff and the STP, at your convenience. The NRC staff attempted to get clarification from STP on the following four questions pertaining to the FSAR Sections. Since these were not directly concerned to acceptance review issues, it was agreed to defer them until the actual COLA review is being performed. As the COLA review is initiated, these identified issues should be clarified at the beginning of the review thus reducing formal RAIs while expediting review process.

1. COLA 2.2S.3.1.2.1

This section addresses only gasoline as the potential for forming a flammable vapor cloud capable of delayed ignition and explosion, although it is implied that other hazardous chemicals are analyzed. What other chemicals were considered and what was the basis for selection of gasoline for analysis ?
(The RG 1.206 Appendix C, Section C.I.2.2.3, page C.III.1-20, Postulation of Potential Accidents)

2. COLA Section 2.2S.3.1.1 (Explosions) and 2.2S.3.1.4(Fire)

The RG 1.206 Appendix C, Section C.I.2.2.3, page C.III.1-20, Postulation of Potential Accidents, the applicant should determine the potential accidents to be considered as a design-basis accident (DBA) and identify the potential effects of those accidents on the nuclear plant . Was an explosion of a gasoline truck on FM521 considered as a potential accident? This explosion could have the potential for knocking down the redundant power transmission lines that have only 100 ft separation distance, and triggering loss of offsite power.

3. COLA 2.2S3.1.3

For toxic chemical concentrations it is noted that the ALOHA model is used to calculate the control room concentrations shown in Table 2.2S-11. However, the standard ALOHA model does not normally calculate control room concentrations ? Please explain what the values are in the column titled " control room" of Table 2.2S-11.

4. COLA 2.2S.3.1.1

The minimum safe distance shown in Table 2.2S-9 are said to be based on TNT equivalency method using RG 1.91 methodology. But they seem to be much smaller than generally expected. Please explain how these values were obtained.

Thanks,
Raj

Hearing Identifier: SouthTexas34Public
Email Number: 45

Mail Envelope Properties (4790A5AC.HQGWDO01.TWGWPO02.200.2000016.1.2F450F.1)

Subject: Identification of Potential Site Hazards, Sections 2.1.2-2.2.2
Creation Date: 12/12/2007 3:38:08 PM
From: Raj Anand

Created By: RKA@nrc.gov

Recipients
<internet:gtgibson@stpegs.com>
"Michael Gartman" <MRG1@nrc.gov>
"Mark Tonacci" <MET@nrc.gov>
"George Wunder" <GFW@nrc.gov>
<internet:wemookhoek@stpegs.com>

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2382	12/12/2007 3:38:08 PM

Options
Priority: Standard
Reply Requested: No
Return Notification:
Send Receipt/Notify when Opened
None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard