LevyCountyRAIsPEm Resource

From: Anderson, Brian
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2009 8:55 AM
To: LevyCountyRAIsPEm Resource
Subject: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION LETTER NO. 059 RELATED TO SRP SECTION 2.3.1 FOR THE LEVY COUNTY UNITS 1 AND 2 COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION
Attachments: LNP-RAI-LTR-059.doc

Importance: High

Hearing Identifier: Levy_County_COL_eRAIs
Email Number: 61

Mail Envelope Properties (CB87FC66F95637428C5E0D066E756B6FC040781F85)

Subject: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION LETTER NO. 059 RELATED TO SRP SECTION 2.3.1 FOR THE LEVY COUNTY UNITS 1 AND 2 COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION
Sent Date: 6/24/2009 8:54:44 AM
Received Date: 6/24/2009 8:54:45 AM
From: Anderson, Brian

Created By: Brian.Anderson@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"LevyCountyRAIsPEm Resource" <LevyCountyRAIsPEm.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	3	6/24/2009 8:54:45 AM
LNP-RAI-LTR-059.doc	57850	

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

June 24, 2009

Mr. Garry Miller
General Manager, Nuclear Plant Development
Progress Energy Florida, Inc.
PO Box 1551
411 Fayetteville Street Mall
Raleigh, NC 27602

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION LETTER NO. 059 RELATED TO SRP SECTION 2.3.1 FOR THE LEVY COUNTY NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 and 2 COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION

Dear Mr. Miller:

By letter dated July 28, 2008, as supplemented by a letter dated September 12, 2008, Progress Energy Florida, Inc. submitted its application to the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) for a combined license (COL) for two AP1000 advanced 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 301-415-9967.

Sincerely,

/**RA**/

Brian C. Anderson, Lead Project Manager
AP1000 Projects Branch 1
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors

Docket Nos. 52-029
52-030

eRAI Tracking No. 3010

Enclosure:
Request for Additional Information

If you have any questions or comments concerning this matter, you may contact me at 301-415-9967.

Sincerely,

/**RA**/

Brian C. Anderson, Lead Project Manager
AP1000 Projects Branch 1
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors

Docket Nos. 52-029
52-030

eRAI Tracking No. 3010

Enclosure:
Request for Additional Information

Distribution:

Public	SCoffin	TSimms	KQuinlan
RidsNroDnrlNwe1	JSebrosky	SGoetz	
RidsNroLAKGoldstein	BHughes	SHaggerty	
RidsOgcMailCenter	MComar	JMartin	
RidsAcrsAcnw_MailCenter	CPatel	BAnderson	
RidsRgn2MailCenter	RJoshi	CLauron	

NRO-002

OFFICE	RSAC/BC	NWE1/PM	OGC	NWE1/L-PM
NAME	CLauron *	BAnderson *	JMartin*	BAnderson*
DATE	06/08/09	06/10/09	06/17/09	06/24/09

*Approval captured electronically in the electronic RAI system.

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Request for Additional Information
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)

02.03.01-12

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 or 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.

02.03.01-13

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.

02.03.01-14

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.

02.03.01-15

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.

02.03.01-16

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.