

PMLevyCOLPEm Resource

From: Anderson, Brian
Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2009 10:08 AM
To: robert.kitchen@pgnmail.com; david.waters@pgnmail.com; tillie.wilkins@pgnmail.com;
PMLevyCOLPEm Resource
Subject: DRAFT - RAI 3010 - SRP section 2.3.1 - Levy County Units 1 and 2 Combined License
Application
Attachments: LNP Draft RAI 3010 - 2.3.1.doc
Importance: High

Attached is a draft RAI related to SRP section 2.3.1 for the Levy County Units 1 and 2 Combined License Application. Please let me know if you would like to schedule a conference call to discuss this RAI.

Thank you,
Brian

Brian Anderson
301-415-9967
Lead Project Manager, AP1000 Projects Branch 1
Office of New Reactors
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Hearing Identifier: Levy_County_COL_Public
Email Number: 192

Mail Envelope Properties (CB87FC66F95637428C5E0D066E756B6FC0406CA478)

Subject: DRAFT - RAI 3010 - SRP section 2.3.1 - Levy County Units 1 and 2 Combined
License Application
Sent Date: 6/17/2009 10:08:12 AM
Received Date: 6/17/2009 10:08:14 AM
From: Anderson, Brian

Created By: Brian.Anderson@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"robert.kitchen@pgnmail.com" <robert.kitchen@pgnmail.com>

Tracking Status: None

"david.waters@pgnmail.com" <david.waters@pgnmail.com>

Tracking Status: None

"tillie.wilkins@pgnmail.com" <tillie.wilkins@pgnmail.com>

Tracking Status: None

"PMLevyCOLPEm Resource" <PMLevyCOLPEm.Resource@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	393	6/17/2009 10:08:14 AM
LNP Draft RAI 3010 - 2.3.1.doc	32762	

Options

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

Request for Additional Information No. 3010
Levy County, Units 1 and 2
Progress Energy Florida, Inc.
Docket No. 52-029 and 52-030
SRP Section: 02.03.01 - Regional Climatology
Application Section: Regional Climatology

QUESTIONS for Siting and Accident Conseq Branch (RSAC)

02.03.01-***

This RAI is in regards to the last two paragraphs in FSAR Section 2.3.1.2.2.

The term "sustained wind speeds" is used to describe the peak observed wind speeds. The National Weather Service defines the term sustained wind as, "Wind speed determined by averaging observed values over a two-minute period." FSAR Table 2.3.1-202 lists these values as Fastest Mile/Peak Gust Speed (mph), with a footnote explaining that these are the higher of either a 3-second or 5-second gust.

Please explain this apparent discrepancy in using the term "sustained wind speeds" to describe the peak observed wind speeds and make any necessary changes to FSAR Section 2.3.1.2.2.

02.03.01-***

Address, in FSAR Section 2.3.1, the extreme frozen winter precipitation event and extreme liquid winter precipitation event as site characteristics in accordance with the Interim Staff Guidance (ISG) DC/COL-ISG-07, "Interim Staff Guidance on Assessment of Normal and Extreme Winter Precipitation Loads on the Roofs of Seismic Category I Structures" (ML081990438) and provide a discussion for the site characteristic values chosen, or explain why such an analysis is not necessary.

02.03.01-***

FSAR Table 2.3.1-202 (Sheet 2 of 3) labels a parameter as both fastest mile and peak gust. The fastest mile wind speed is defined as the fastest speed, in miles per hour, of any "mile" of wind. The peak gust is defined as the highest "instantaneous" wind speed recorded at a station during a specified period.

The fastest mile wind speed is generally slower than the peak wind gust and can be converted by using the Durst Curve in Figure C6-4 of ASCE/SEI 5-07.

Please clarify which of these wind speeds is being used in FSAR Table 2.3.1-202 and make any necessary changes to the FSAR.

02.03.01-***

Please correct the typo in FSAR Table 2.3.1-207 provided in response to NRC RAI 02.03.01-9 (March 4, 2009). The 30-day average wet bulb temperature for Tallahassee currently reads 248 degrees Celsius.

02.03.01-***

SRP 2.3.1 Acceptance Criteria #2 states, in part, the applicability of severe weather phenomena data to represent site conditions during the expected period of reactor operation should be substantiated. SRP 2.3.1 Review Procedure #3 states, in part, that current literature on possible changes in the weather in the site region should be reviewed to be confident that the methods used to predict weather extremes are reasonable.

Please include in FSAR Section 2.3.1.3, "Effects of Global Climate Change on Regional Climatology", a brief discussion on the potential effects of global climate change on the future regional conditions near the site or explain why such a discussion is not necessary. Include in any such discussion any proposed site characteristics that may be altered or affected due to the potential of climate change.

DRAFT