

From: Poole, Justin
Sent: Thursday, June 11, 2009 4:51 PM
To: 'Flentje, Fritzie'; COSTEDIO, JAMES
Subject: Draft RAI questions regarding the SFP amendment

Fritzie,

I know that we already plan to talk about some clarifying questions that the reviewer has on the spent fuel pool amendment but below are additional questions that will be formally sent out as RAIs. Whether the those other questions end up together in the letter with these, we will discuss during our call sometime next week possibly.

This e-mail aims solely to prepare you and others for the proposed conference call. It does not convey a formal NRC staff position, and it does not formally request for additional information.

Justin C. Poole
Project Manager
NRR/DORL/LPL3-1
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
(301)415-2048
email: Justin.Poole@nrc.gov
~~~~~

## DRAFT

### **Regarding licensee letter dated, May 22, 2009:**

re: Question 1 Code Validation:

- a) Table 1 of RAI1 response does not include any spectral parameters (e.g., EALF, H/U) to show how the validation is applicable to the Point Beach analysis. Figure 1 of RAI1 response provides the H/U range for the validation but does not show how it compares to the Point Beach analysis. What are the H/U values for the system analyzed for Point Beach?
- b) Figure 1 shows a large range of H/U that is not supported by benchmarks. How is this justified?
- c) How did you conclude that the Figure 1 "data is well distributed and no trend is apparent as a function of H/U?" Did you use any quantitative methods such as the regression analysis?

re: Question 2 Tolerance and Uncertainty Calculations:

- a) What enrichment value was the enrichment reactivity uncertainty based on?

### **Regarding licensee letter dated, September 19, 2008:**

re: Question 1:

a) For each storage configuration, what burnup value was the burnup reactivity uncertainty based on?

re: Question 4:

a) Please provide a quantitative justification to demonstrate that power suppression assemblies do not result in a more reactive assembly.

**New:**

Question 1 (Interface analysis):

a) Please justify how the k-eff comparison is valid when the interface model assumes radial leakage and the individual storage models consider no radial leakage (i.e. repeating 2x2 array).

b) Please show that placing a more reactive storage configuration (e.g., 1-out-of-4 Fresh 5% no IFBA) next to a less reactive storage configuration (e.g. All-cell) will not lead to unacceptable increase in reactivity of the less reactive storage configuration (e.g. All-cell).

DRAFT