

PMSTPCOL PEmails

From: STPCOL
Sent: Thursday, March 27, 2008 2:24 PM
To: PMSTPCOL PEmails
Subject: FW: 3/27/08 Call with STPNOC Regarding RG 1.82

-----Original Message-----

From: Mark Tonacci
Sent: Thursday, March 27, 2008 12:57 PM
To: Hanry Wagage
Cc: STPCOL; George Wunder
Subject: RE: 3/27/08 Call with STPNOC Regarding RG 1.82

Hanry,

Thank you for your edits on the meeting summary. By copy of this email it is going into the hearing file.

Mark

Meeting Summary

A telephone call was held at 8 am on 3/27/08 with representatives of STPNOC regarding Regulatory Guide 1.82 revision 3 (Water Sources for Long-Term Recirculation Cooling Following a Loss-of-Coolant Accident). The purpose of the call was to ensure understanding of revision 3 for boiling water reactors. Attendees included:

Mark Tonacci and Hanry Wagage (NRC)

William Mookhoek and other representatives of STPNOC

Toshiba, on behalf of STPNOC

Sergeant Lundy, on behalf of STPNOC

The NRC stated that the initial COLA application cited a topical report that was based on revision 2 but the NRC would be using the current revision 3 in our reviews when they restarted. Some significant differences between the revisions included the need to address chemical and downstream effects and this was applicable for boiling water reactors. The staff also mentioned that guidance was available in a public document: DRAFT GUIDANCE FOR REVIEW OF FINAL LICENSEE RESPONSES TO GENERIC LETTER 2004-02, "POTENTIAL IMPACT OF DEBRIS BLOCKAGE ON EMERGENCY RECIRCULATION DURING DESIGN BASIS ACCIDENTS AT PRESSURIZED-WATER REACTORS" (ML072600425).

Toshiba representatives asked if the staff had experience in reviewing BWR suction strainers against revision 3. The staff responded that we have not yet reviewed a BWR suction strainer design against revision 3.

Toshiba representatives confirmed that section 2.3.1.8 of the Reg Guide was the appropriate section and asked if the chemical effects were for PWRs only and did not need to be considered for BWR. The staff

responded that the requirements are applicable to BWRs in that they must address the chemical effects or show that there were no chemical effects.

STPNOC representatives asked if any submittals to the NRC have addressed chemical effects for BWRs or PWRs. The staff responded that yes, there has been testing for PWRs to demonstrate the chemical effects. STPNOC asked if this was done under an owner's group effort. The staff stated strainer vendors did prototype testing of strainers for debris including chemical surrogates.

STPNOC stated they want to ensure that when chemical effects testing is done that the conditions are properly identified. This may require more dialogue in the future with the staff.

This concluded the telephone call at approximately 8:30 am.

Hearing Identifier: SouthTexas34Public_EX
Email Number: 1

Mail Envelope Properties (C56E360E9D804F4B95BC673F886381E70A90252691)

Subject: FW: 3/27/08 Call with STPNOC Regarding RG 1.82
Sent Date: 3/27/2008 2:23:34 PM
Received Date: 3/27/2008 2:23:35 PM
From: STPCOL

Created By: STP.COL@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"PMSTPCOL PEmails" <PMSTPCOL.PEmails@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2761	3/27/2008 2:23:35 PM

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received: