

HarrisRAIsPEm Resource

From: Manny Comar
Sent: Friday, August 01, 2008 1:40 PM
To: HarrisRAIsPEm Resource
Subject: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION LETTER NO. 001 RELATED TO SRP SECTION 02.03.02 FOR THE HARRIS UNITS 2 AND 3 COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION
Attachments: HAR-RAI-LTR-001.doc

Hearing Identifier: HarrisCOL_eRAIs
Email Number: 1

Mail Envelope Properties (3AF7DEF82ADA8944AD8247B7ED7FD651697A99DAF1)

Subject: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION LETTER NO. 001 RELATED TO SRP SECTION 02.03.02 FOR THE HARRIS UNITS 2 AND 3 COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION
Sent Date: 8/1/2008 1:39:45 PM
Received Date: 8/1/2008 1:39:49 PM
From: Manny Comar

Created By: Manny.Comar@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"HarrisRAIsPEm Resource" <HarrisRAIsPEm.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3	8/1/2008 1:39:49 PM
HAR-RAI-LTR-001.doc	53242	

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

August 01, 2008

James Scarola
Senior Vice President and
Chief Nuclear Officer
PO Box 1551
411 Fayetteville Street Mall
Raleigh NC 27602

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION LETTER NO. 001 RELATED TO
SRP SECTION 02.03.02 FOR THE HARRIS UNITS 2 AND 3 COMBINED
LICENSE APPLICATION

Dear Mr. Scarola:

By letter dated February 18, 2008, Progress Energy submitted its application to the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) for a combined license (COL) for two AP1000 advance passive pressurized water reactors pursuant to 10 CFR Part 52. The NRC staff is performing a detailed review of this application to enable the staff to reach a conclusion on the safety of the proposed application.

The NRC staff has identified that additional information is needed to continue portions of the review. The staff's request for additional information (RAI) is contained in the enclosure to this letter.

To support the review schedule, you are requested to respond within 30 days of the date of this letter. If changes are needed to the final safety analysis report, the staff requests that the RAI response include the proposed wording changes.

If you have any questions or comments concerning this matter, you may contact me at 301-415-3863.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Manny Comar, Lead Project Manager
AP1000 Projects Branch 1
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors

Docket Nos. 52-022
52-023

Enclosure:
Request for Additional Information

CC: see next page

If you have any questions or comments concerning this matter, you may contact me at 301-415-3863.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Manny Comar, Lead Project Manager
AP1000 Projects Branch 1
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors

Docket Nos. 52-022
52-023
ERAI Tracking No. 492

Enclosure:
Request for Additional Information

Distribution:

Public	JHoch	BHughes
RidsNroDnrlNwe1	SCoffin	MComar
RidsNroLAKGoldstein	TSimms	CCox
RidsOgcMailCenter	BAnderson	RJoshi
RidsAcrsAcnwMailCenter	RidsNroDnrlNwe2	SBrock
RidsRgn2MailCenter		

NRO-002

OFFICE	RSAC/BC	NWE1/PM	OGC	NWE1/L-PM
NAME	CCox*	MComar*	SBrock*	MComar*
DATE	6/17/08	7/11/08	7/11/08	7/31/08

*Approval captured electronically in the electronic RAI system.

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Request for Additional Information No. 492 Revision 0
Shearon Harris
Progress Energy Carolinas, Inc.
Docket No. 52-022 and 52-023
SRP Section: 02.03.02 - Local Meteorology
Application Section: 2.3.2

QUESTIONS from Siting and Accident Conseq Branch (RSAC)

02.03.02-1

As shown in FSAR Table 2.3.2-214, during the data period of record from March 1, 1994 through February 28, 1999, there were 986 hours of calm wind speeds reported. Based on the hourly data submitted, the staff found 2365 hours with a wind speed of 0.5 meters per second (m/s), 1431 hours with a wind speed of 0.4 m/s, 652 hours with a wind speed of 0.3 m/s, 363 hours with a wind speed of 0.2 m/s, 96 hours with a wind speed of 0.1 m/s, and 11 hours of 0.0 m/s. Given the lowest wind speed category of 1 - 3 miles per hour (mph), as specified in the joint frequency distributions provided, the staff found the number of hours with a wind speed below 1 mph (0.45 m/s) equal to 2553 hours. Please explain the basis for the 986 hours of calm wind speed reported in the FSAR.

02.03.02-2

The Charlotte February mean daily minimum temperature listed in FSAR Table 2.3.2-255 appears to be incorrect. Based on the stated reference, "National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) National Climatic Data Center (NCDC), Local Climatological Data, Annual Summary with Comparative Data, 2005 Annual Summary for Charlotte, North Carolina," the temperature value listed should be 33.5 °F, not 3.5 °F. Please clarify this discrepancy.

02.03.02-3

Please consider including FSAR Section 2.3.2.1.3, Dew-Point Temperature, as part of the atmospheric moisture discussion, as presented in FSAR Section 2.3.2.1.4 or justify why it is not needed.

02.03.02-4

It appears to the staff that the units for the 1994 - 1999 precipitation data, as presented in FSAR Table 2.3.2-260, are incorrect. This data may be listed in centimeters instead of inches. Please ensure the precipitation amounts presented in FSAR Table 2.3.2-260 are given in inches.

02.03.02-5

FSAR Section 2.3.2.1.7 states that an assessment of atmospheric stability distributions from 1976 - 1978 and 1994 - 1999 onsite data would be expected to yield similar distributions. Attachment 1 shows a comparison of these distributions based on data presented in the FSAR. Please explain the differences in stability class frequency between the two onsite datasets.

02.03.02-6

Please discuss the potential for plume trapping or recirculation during accidental and routine releases since the proposed plant will lie in a shallow basin, as shown in FSAR Figures 2.3.2-216 through 2.3.2-219.

02.03.02-7

Please include a discussion in FSAR Section 2.3.2.2.1 on the potential impact on atmospheric dispersion when the Main Reservoir is colder than the surrounding land and air.

02.03.02-8

FSAR Section 2.3.2.2.2 states that ice formation on structures is not expected to occur if the structure is lower than half the cooling tower height. Please provide a basis for this statement (i.e., an appropriate reference or stated engineering judgment).