

## PMComanchePeakPEm Resource

---

**From:** Monarque, Stephen  
**Sent:** Monday, July 27, 2009 4:34 PM  
**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:** ComanchePeakCOL Resource  
**Subject:** Comanche Peak RCOL RAI 23 - Section 8.3  
**Attachments:** RAI 2581 (RAI 23).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 42 **calendar days** of **July 27, 2009**.

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

thanks,

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

**Hearing Identifier:** ComanchePeak\_COL\_Public  
**Email Number:** 355

**Mail Envelope Properties** (3DF2506A7257014AAC5857E5E852DEAC07591AFE83)

**Subject:** Comanche Peak RCOL RAI 23 - Section 8.3  
**Sent Date:** 7/27/2009 4:34:17 PM  
**Received Date:** 7/27/2009 4:34:23 PM  
**From:** Monarque, Stephen

**Created By:** Stephen.Monarque@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**

"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.Conly@luminant.com" <John.Conly@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

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	568	7/27/2009 4:34:23 PM
RAI 2581 (RAI 23).doc	31738	

**Options**

**Priority:** Standard

**Return Notification:** No

**Reply Requested:** No

**Sensitivity:** Normal

**Expiration Date:**

**Recipients Received:**

Request for Additional Information (RAI) No. 2581

RAI # 23

7/27/2009

Comanche Peak Units 3 and 4  
Luminant Generation Company, LLC.  
Docket No. 52-034 and 52-035  
SRP Section: 08.03.01 - AC Power Systems (Onsite)  
Application Section: 8.3.1

QUESTIONS for Electrical Engineering Branch (EEB)

08.03.01-1

The regulatory basis for this question is discussed in Regulatory Guide 1.9, "Application and Testing of Safety-Related Diesel Generators in Nuclear Power Plants," Revision 4, March 2007 and NUREG-0800, Standard Review Plan, Chapter 8.3.1, "AC Power Systems (ONSITE)."

FSAR Table 8.3.1-4R, Electrical Load Distribution - Class 1E [gas turbine generator] GTG Loading, shows the addition of two Essential Service Water Pump Cooling Tower Fans on each of the four buses. Additionally, the Table shows a reduction of the kW load on each of the gas turbine generators from the Essential Service Water Pumps and the Motor Control Centers. These changes result in a slight net increase of the total load on the gas turbine generators.

- (1) Please explain the reason for the load reductions, in consideration of the slight net increase of the total load.
- (2) Indicate whether the GTG design is such that at no time during the loading sequence will the frequency decrease be less than 95 percent of nominal, nor the voltage decrease be less than 75 percent of nominal, as specified in Regulatory Guide 1.9.
- (3) Explain why the rating of the two GTGs affected by the load changes is not increased.
- (4) Lastly, describe the controls that will be put in place to assure that design changes and the addition of manual loads will not cause the continuous emergency generator rating to be exceeded.