HarrisRAIsPEm Resource

From: Manny Comar
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2008 3:10 PM
To: HarrisRAIsPEm Resource
Subject: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION LETTER NO. 002 RELATED TO SRP SECTION 02.03.03 FOR THE HARRIS UNITS 2 AND 3 COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION
Attachments: HAR-RAI-LTR-002.doc

Hearing Identifier: HarrisCOL_eRAIs
Email Number: 2

Mail Envelope Properties (3AF7DEF82ADA8944AD8247B7ED7FD651698152583C)

Subject: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION LETTER NO. 002 RELATED TO SRP SECTION 02.03.03 FOR THE HARRIS UNITS 2 AND 3 COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION
Sent Date: 8/12/2008 3:10:00 PM
Received Date: 8/12/2008 3:10:01 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	8	8/12/2008 3:10:01 PM
HAR-RAI-LTR-002.doc	55290	

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

August 12, 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. 002 RELATED TO SRP SECTION 02.03.03 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. 493

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

Shearon Harris
Progress Energy Carolinas, Inc.
Docket No. 52-022 and 52-023

SRP Section: 02.03.03 - Onsite Meteorological Measurements Programs
Application Section: 2.3.3

QUESTIONS from Siting and Accident Consequences Branch (RSAC)

QUESTIONS

02.03.03-1
During the staff's pre-application readiness assessment visit, the staff noted the presence of trees in certain sectors within a distance of less than 10-times their height to the meteorological tower. The 10-times height criteria is discussed in Regulatory Guide 1.23, Rev. 1. The applicant's onsite staff noted that the trees were to be trimmed to meet this criteria. Please confirm that any trees surrounding the tower will not adversely influence the onsite meteorological measurements.

02.03.03-2
Please provide the maximum width of the proposed cooling towers. This information is necessary for the staff to confirm that the meteorological measurements will not be adversely affected from the proposed cooling towers.

02.03.03-3
In accordance with Regulatory Guide 1.206, please include a section in FSAR Section 2.3.3 that summarizes the deviations from Regulatory Guide 1.23, Rev. 1, and provides adequate justification, or justify another alternative.

02.03.03-4
Regulatory Guide 1.23 states that moisture measurements height(s) should be representative of water-vapor release and for natural draft cooling towers, atmospheric moisture measurements may be made at the highest measurement level on the meteorological tower. Please clarify how the pre-operational and operational onsite meteorological program complies with this criteria, or justify why meeting the guidance criteria is not necessary.

02.03.03-5
Please state in FSAR Section 2.3.3 how often the guyed wires, as part of the guyed tower, and tower anchors are inspected.

02.03.03-6
Please provide the digital sampling rate of meteorological data as part of the preoperational and operational onsite meteorological measurements program.

02.03.03-7
Please clarify whether the first bullet on FSAR Page 2.3-29 should read “daily and monthly averages”.

02.03.03-8
Regulatory Guide 1.206, Section C.I.2.3.3 states that a COL applicant should describe both the preoperational and operational programs for meteorological measurements at the site. It further states that Regulatory Guide 1.23 contains guidance on acceptable onsite meteorological programs and any deviations from the guidance provided should be indentified and justified. Currently, FSAR Section 2.3.3 doesn’t differentiate from the preoperational and planned operational meteorological programs. Please describe the aspects of both programs separately as part of FSAR Section 2.3.3, or justify describing the programs jointly.

02.03.03-9
FSAR Section 2.3.2 states that dual measurements of wind speed are being taken to compare scalar and vector averaging techniques. Please provide any initial results of this review to the staff.

02.03.03-10
FSAR Section 2.3.3.1.5 states that an off-site meteorological consultant retrieves the meteorological data from the datalogger on a daily basis (except weekends and holidays) and reviews data for potential problems and compares the data with nearby Raleigh-Durham data for consistency. In light of this data review procedure, please clarify how almost five years of onsite data from August 2001 through late 2006 could be collected with a change in the wind speed sampling rate and averaging technique going unnoticed, resulting in data that is considered unrepresentative of expected site conditions.