LevyCountyRAIsPEm Resource

From: Anderson, Brian
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2009 8:59 AM
To: LevyCountyRAIsPEm Resource
Subject: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION LETTER NO. 060 RELATED TO SRP SECTION 2.3.3 FOR THE LEVY COUNTY UNITS 1 AND 2 COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION
Attachments: LNP-RAI-LTR-060.doc

Importance: High

Hearing Identifier: Levy_County_COL_eRAIs
Email Number: 62

Mail Envelope Properties (CB87FC66F95637428C5E0D066E756B6FC040781F91)

Subject: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION LETTER NO. 060 RELATED TO SRP SECTION 2.3.3 FOR THE LEVY COUNTY UNITS 1 AND 2 COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION
Sent Date: 6/24/2009 8:59:03 AM
Received Date: 6/24/2009 8:59:04 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	8	6/24/2009 8:59:04 AM
LNP-RAI-LTR-060.doc	53754	

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. 060 RELATED TO SRP SECTION 2.3.3 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. 3011

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. 3011

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	06/11/09	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: 02.03.03 - Onsite Meteorological Measurements Programs
Application Section: On-Site Meteorological Measurement Program

QUESTIONS for Siting and Accident Conseq Branch (RSAC)

02.03.03-5

NUREG-0800, Section 2.3.3(III)(1)(a)(2), states, in part, that sensors should be located at least 10 obstruction heights away from the obstruction to minimize influence. Regulatory Guide 1.23 includes trees as one of these possible obstructions.

The response to NRC RAI 02.03.02-1 (March 3, 2009) stated that " Progress Energy believes that the very low wind speeds observed at the 10-meter level are attributable to the height of the surrounding forest canopy, and its corresponding influence on wind speeds at the 10-meter elevation." This statement suggests that the distance from the meteorological tower to the forest canopy is less than 10 times the height of the canopy.

Please explain how the siting of the meteorological tower, in relation to nearby obstructions, adheres to NUREG-0800 and Regulatory Guide 1.23.