

PMBelCOL PEmails

From: Joseph Sebrosky
Sent: Thursday, October 23, 2008 10:22 AM
To: PMBelCOL PEmails
Cc: Stephanie Coffin; Charles Cox; Mark Melnicoff; Christian Araguas; Manny Comar; Seshagiri Tammara; Ravindra Joshi
Subject: Summary of 10/22/08 phone call with TVA to discuss 2.2.3 draft RAIs
Attachments: draft 2.2.3 followon rais.doc

On October 22, 2008, NRC staff (Joe Sebrosky, Charles Cox, Seshagiri Tammara, Mark Melnicoff, and Christian Araguas) participated in a telephone conference call with TVA representatives and observers (see below) regarding the staff's detailed review of the Bellefonte Units 3 and 4 COL application. The purpose of the call was to discuss the attached draft RAIs associated with standard review plan section 2.2.3.

At the conclusion of the call there was agreement that the 2nd and 3rd question in the attached document would be sent to TVA unrevised. Regarding the first question in the attached it was determined that it would be a topic of discussion for an upcoming AP1000 design center working group (DCWG) meeting. The staff agreed not to issue this question until after the AP1000 DCWG meeting to allow it to make any adjustments to the RAI as a result of the meeting (including not issuing the RAI).

TVA believed that the review of the hazards posed by on-site chemicals was resolved during the revision 15 review of the AP1000 design control document and that the question was therefore not appropriate. The staff and TVA noted that similar questions have been asked during the Vogtle and Harris combined license application review. The staff did not agree with TVA that the issue was completely resolved during the revision 15 review of the AP1000 design control document, and stated that it believed that the COL applicant should address the issue because it relates to a COL action item. In addition, the staff indicated that if it could be an issue that the staff would pursue through the 10 CFR 52.63 process.

E. Grant – NuStart
F. Redwanz - NuStart
F. Kenney – NuStart
R. Ely – NuStart
A. Aughtman - SNC
W. Sparkman – SNC
J. Hessler - SNC
J. Giles – SCEG
K. Karcher - Progress
J. Archer - Progress
B. Burdett - Progress
S. Adams - WEC

Hearing Identifier: Bellefonte_COL_Public_EX
Email Number: 1154

Mail Envelope Properties (C4A4C9A16294FB4CBA5A36312D05FFAC0AC44C37F8)

Subject: Summary of 10/22/08 phone call with TVA to discuss 2.2.3 draft RAls
Sent Date: 10/23/2008 10:21:53 AM
Received Date: 10/23/2008 10:21:55 AM
From: Joseph Sebrosky

Created By: Joseph.Sebrosky@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"Stephanie Coffin" <Stephanie.Coffin@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Charles Cox" <Charles.Cox@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Mark Melnicoff" <Mark.Melnicoff@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Christian Araguas" <Christian.Araguas@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Manny Comar" <Manny.Comar@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Seshagiri Tammara" <Seshagiri.Tammara@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Ravindra Joshi" <Ravindra.Joshi@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"PMBelCOL PEmails" <PMBelCOL.PEmails@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1931	10/23/2008 10:21:55 AM
draft 2.2.3 followon rais.doc	29178	

Options

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

**Bellefonte Units 3 and 4
Tennessee Valley Authority
Docket No. 52-014 and 52-015
SRP Section: 02.02.03 - Evaluation of Potential Accidents
Application Section: SRP 2.2.3
Sent to TVA on 10/17/08**

QUESTIONS from Siting and Accident Conseq Branch (RSAC)

ERAI 1480, 02.02.03-***

RG 1.206 provides guidance regarding the information that is needed to ensure potential hazards in the site vicinity are identified and evaluated to meet the siting criteria in 10 CFR 100.20 and 10 CFR 100.21. Westinghouse furnished a detailed/revised standard chemicals list used for AP1000 design to Vogtle (SCOLA) which deviates from the original AP1000 DCD Table 6.4-1. BLN (RCOLA) needs to provide a discussion in FSAR Section 2.2.3.1.1 that could be used as standard information in SCOLAs of how these chemicals and any additional site specific chemicals used, along with quantities and locations stored onsite for BLN units 3 & 4, were analyzed for potential control room habitability impacts.

02.02.03-***

RG 1.206 provides guidance regarding the information that is needed to ensure potential hazards in the site vicinity are identified and evaluated to meet the siting criteria in 10 CFR 100.20 and 10 CFR 100.21. The IDLH concentrations of gasoline (300 ppm, 1227 mg/cu.m), ammonia (300 ppm, 209 mg/cu.m), propylene oxide (400 ppm, 949 mg/cu.m) are lower than the applicant's screening criteria. Justify the use of the screening criteria with higher than IDLH concentrations and how they relate to control room habitability. In addition, based on the applicant's provided information (Tables 2.2-215 and 2.2-216), chemicals with IDLH concentrations considered for barge transport, styrene (2978 mg/cu.m), ethanol (6209 mg/cu.m), sodium hydroxide (10 mg/cu.m), pose a concern for control room habitability. The staff's independent analysis shows that the concentrations of these chemicals exceed the respective IDLH concentrations at the intake of the control room. Provide a basis for why these chemicals do not pose a potential control room habitability issue.

02.02.03-***

RG 1.206 provides guidance regarding the information that is needed to ensure potential hazards in the site vicinity are identified and evaluated to meet the siting criteria in 10 CFR 100.20 and 10 CFR 100.21. The NRC staff's confirmatory analysis of chemicals for potential flammable vapor cloud (delayed ignition) resulted in only styrene concentration exceeding Lower Explosive Limit (LEL) concentration at BLN site, which differs from the applicant's analysis. Please clarify the analysis performed for styrene by including ALOHA inputs used for scenarios considering rupture sizes addressed and entire contents released instantaneously.