

From: George Wunder
To: <STP_COL@nrc.gov>
Date: 3/3/2008 9:12:40 AM
Subject: Fwd: RE: STP Acceptance Review Question on FSAR Chapter 2

>>> "Gibson, Gregory T" <gtgibson@STPEGS.COM> 10/15/2007 11:51 AM >>>
Mark,

Thanks for the questions and we will await George's calendaring them...

Yet, I am a bit confused and would appreciate your patience and understanding...

On the first question, since 2.3S1.3.4 does make a statement that snow loading isn't relevant, isn't any further question about that an RAI (not a sufficiency question)... seems to me it would indeed be something to ask later on ?

On the second question, since 2.3.4 does provide the X/Q estimates, isn't any question about their derivations an RAI (not a sufficiency question)...

I guess what I was expecting for a sufficiency question was something like (made up example) - the SRP 2.3.4 paragraph 6 states that the applicant will include the specific release and receptor distances, directions and elevations; however, this information appears to be missing from Section 2.3.4 or its associated Tables and Figures - is it missing or is it contained elsewhere?

Without the specific linkage, it isn't possible to determine if we are answering RAIs or if we have a sufficiency question....

Thanks... looking forward to the call...

Greg Gibson
Manager, Regulatory Affairs
South Texas Project, Units 3 & 4
Tel: 361-972-4626
Cell: 979-665-2400
BlackBerry: 361-403-4143

From: Mark Tonacci [<mailto:MET@nrc.gov>]
Sent: Monday, October 15, 2007 10:26 AM
To: Gibson, Gregory T
Cc: Barbara Whitaker; George Wunder; R Brad Harvey
Subject: STP Acceptance Review Question on FSAR Chapter 2

Greg - these are two acceptance review questions that have come up from our Chapter 2 review. I would like to discuss these at the next available phone call, probably this Thursday afternoon. George will be handling the schedule for which questions are addressed which days. If there are straightforward answers to these questions, feel free to email back to me.

1. FSAR Section 2.3S.1.3.4
. The applicant states that the evaluation of normal or extreme live snow loads is not warranted because of relative infrequent snowfall

events. As a minimum, the applicant should consider defining the maximum regional recorded snowfall event (e.g., 10.5 inches in Danevang) as the 100-year snowpack value.

. The applicant has not provided the weight of the 48-hour probable maximum precipitation for the site vicinity for use in determining the weight of snow and ice on the roof of each safety-related structure.

2. FSAR Section: 2.3.4 SHORT-TERM ATMOSPHERIC DISPERSION ESTIMATES FOR ACCIDENT RELEASES

. Not enough information is provided (e.g., release and receptor distances, directions, elevations) to allow the staff to perform its own confirmatory calculations.

Mark Tonacci
Senior Project Manager
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of New Reactors
Division of New Reactor Licensing
301-415-4045

Hearing Identifier: SouthTexas34Public
Email Number: 63

Mail Envelope Properties (47D7ED5F.HQGWDO01.TWGWPO02.200.2000008.1.2A743E.1)

Subject: Fwd: RE: STP Acceptance Review Question on FSAR Chapter 2
Creation Date: 3/3/2008 9:12:40 AM
From: George Wunder

Created By: GFW@nrc.gov

Recipients
<STP_COL@nrc.gov>

Post Office
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01

Route
nrc.gov

Files
MESSAGE

Size
3042

Date & Time
3/3/2008 9:12:40 AM

Options

Priority: Standard
Reply Requested: No
Return Notification: None
None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard