

Stephen Monarque

From: Michael Takacs
Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2008 8:36 AM
To: Donald.Woodlan@luminant.com; John.Conly@luminant.com; joseph_tapia@mnes-us.com
Cc: Stephen Monarque
Subject: Comanche Peak Acceptance Review questions 2.5.2 & 2.5.4

Morning Gentlemen,

As discussed on our conference call from Friday, October 17th, I am forwarding the following questions related to potential acceptance issues for the Comanche Peak COLA.

Please let me know the earliest I can establish a follow-up conference call to discuss your responses.

Comanche Peak Acceptance Review Issues:

Section 2.5.2

Issue 1 - The applicant provided the results of the Site Response Analysis calculations in Subsection 2.5.2.6. However, the subsection lacks the details of the methodology used for the staff to be able to review the procedures. The staff considers this lack of critical information an acceptance issue since the complete documentation is essential for the staff to be able to reach a final conclusion regarding the applicant's findings. (Reference: RG 1.206 C.I.2.5.2.5 *Seismic Wave Transmission Characteristics of the Site*)

Issue 2 - The FSAR does not include vertical GMRS. The subsection 2.5.2.6.1.2 entitled "Vertical GMRS Spectrum" only briefly discusses the vertical GMRS qualitatively, and states that vertical GMRS will be enveloped by the DCD CSDRS. The staff considers this issue an acceptance issue since the FSAR does not provide proper calculations to represent this critical safety parameter. (Reference: RG 1.206 -- C.I.2.5.2.6 *Ground Motion Response Spectrum*)

Section 2.5.4

Issue 1 - The FSAR provides static and dynamic bearing capacity and factors of safety results and states that the dynamic and static bearing capacities have factors of safety of 1.5 and 10, respectively, but no detailed descriptions of calculations are provided to indicate how these determinations were made. (Reg. Guide 1.206 C.I.2.5.4.10 *Static Stability*)

Issue 2 - The methods used for settlement calculations were addressed in the FSAR, but no detailed descriptions and calculations were provided to indicate how values were obtained. (Reg. Guide 1.206 C.I.2.5.4.10 *Static Stability*)

Issue 3 - Liquefaction was addressed, but detailed calculations proving that it will not be anticipated at the site or within the engineered compacted fill was not included. (Reg. Guide 1.206 C.I.2.5.4.8 *Liquefaction Potential*)

Issue 4 - The applicant did not provide soil investigation boring logs data. (Reg. Guide 1.206 C.I.2.5.1.2 *Site Geology*; Reg. Guide 1.132: DETAILED SITE INVESTIGATIONS; 4.5 Logs of Subsurface Investigations)

Mike Takacs
Project Manager, US-APWR Projects Branch
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors
(301) 415-7871