

PMComanchePeakPEm Resource

From: Monarque, Stephen
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2009 11:25 AM
To: cp34-rai-luminant@mnes-us.com; Diane Yeager; Donald.Woodlan@luminant.com; Eric.Evans@luminant.com; John.Only@luminant.com; joseph tapia; Kazuya Hayashi; Matthew.Weeks@luminant.com; MNES RAI mailbox; Russ Bywater
Cc: Kallan, Paul; ComanchePeakCOL Resource
Subject: Comanche Peak RCOL RAI 19, Section 2.5.5
Attachments: RAI 2930 (RAI 19).doc

The NRC staff has identified that additional information is needed to continue its review of the combined license application. The staff's request for additional information (RAI) is contained in the attachment.

The response to this RAI is due within **35 calendar days** after **July 30, 2009**.

Note: If changes are needed to the safety analysis report, the NRC staff requests that the RAI response include the proposed wording changes.

thank you,

Stephen Monarque
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
NRO/DNRL/NMIP
301-415-1544

Hearing Identifier: ComanchePeak_COL_Public
Email Number: 343

Mail Envelope Properties (3DF2506A7257014AAC5857E5E852DEAC0758E5F1B4)

Subject: Comanche Peak RCOL RAI 19, Section 2.5.5
Sent Date: 7/14/2009 11:25:28 AM
Received Date: 7/14/2009 11:25:28 AM
From: Monarque, Stephen

Created By: Stephen.Monarque@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"Kallan, Paul" <Paul.Kallan@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"ComanchePeakCOL Resource" <ComanchePeakCOL.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"cp34-rai-luminant@mnes-us.com" <cp34-rai-luminant@mnes-us.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Diane Yeager" <diane_yeager@mnes-us.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Donald.Woodlan@luminant.com" <Donald.Woodlan@luminant.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Eric.Evans@luminant.com" <Eric.Evans@luminant.com>
Tracking Status: None
"John.Only@luminant.com" <John.Only@luminant.com>
Tracking Status: None
"joseph tapia" <joseph_tapia@mnes-us.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Kazuya Hayashi" <kazuya_hayashi@mnes-us.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Matthew.Weeks@luminant.com" <Matthew.Weeks@luminant.com>
Tracking Status: None
"MNES RAI mailbox" <cp34-rai@mnes-us.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Russ Bywater" <russell_bywater@mnes-us.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

| Files | Size | Date & Time |
|-----------------------|-------------|------------------------|
| MESSAGE | 574 | 7/14/2009 11:25:28 AM |
| RAI 2930 (RAI 19).doc | 30714 | |

Options

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

Request for Additional Information (RAI) No. 2930

RAI #19

7/14/2009

Comanche Peak Units 3 and 4
Luminant Generation Company, LLC.
Docket No. 52-034 and 52-035
SRP Section: 02.05.05 - Stability of Slopes
Application Section: 2.5.5

QUESTIONS for Geosciences and Geotechnical Engineering Branch 1 (RGS1)

02.05.05-1

NUREG-0800, Standard Review Plan (SRP), Chapter 2.5.5, 'Stability of Slopes,' establishes criteria that the NRC staff intends to use to evaluate whether an applicant meets the NRC's regulations.

FSAR Section 2.5.5.2.5. states that a pseudo-static method was used for the slope stability analysis at the site. The guidance described in SRP 2.5.5.2 specifies that both vertical and horizontal motions be considered in the evaluation of slope stability. Demonstrate how the vertical motion was considered in the slope stability analyses.

02.05.05-2

FSAR Figure 2.5.5-210 presents the static stability analysis for Cross Section E-E'. The slope stability failure surface indicated in this Figure appears to be pushed up above the retaining wall. Indicate whether the Factor of Safety is dependent upon the capacity of the wall. Please provide a description of the design of this wall.

02.05.05-3

NUREG-0800, Standard Review Plan (SRP), Chapter 2.5.5, 'Stability of Slopes,' establishes criteria that the NRC staff intends to use to evaluate whether an applicant meets the NRC's regulations.

FSAR Subsections 2.5.4.1.5 and 2.5.5.1.2 indicate that localized surficial erosion and raveling have occurred in undocumented fill and/or native colluvial soils on the reservoir slopes, and conclude that this is a surficial condition that does not present a significant slope stability hazard to the CPNPP Units 3 and 4 plant sites. Please provide information including (1) to what extent the "localized surficial erosion and raveling" has happened, (2) the technical basis of the applicant's conclusion that there is no significant slope stability hazard, and (3) what, if anything, the applicant intends to do to ensure the maintenance and protection the slope for CPNPP Units 3 and 4. In addition, please explain whether this local erosion and raveling is considered as a factor in the slope stability analyses presented in Subsection 2.5.5.3.