PMSTPCOL PEmails

From: Joseph, Stacy
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2009 4:33 PM
To: STPCOL
Subject: FW: DRAFT RAI Related to SRP Section 6.2
Attachments: RAI 3207.doc

-----Original Message-----
From: Joseph, Stacy
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2009 4:32 PM
To: 'Tomkins, James'
Subject: DRAFT RAI Related to SRP Section 6.2

Jim,

Please review the attached DRAFT RAI related to SRP Section 6.2 within 5 working days. Please let me know if a telecon is needed in order to clarify these RAIs. I believe there is one RAI remaining related to Chapter 6 that I need to send you. We are working with OGC to revise the RAI.

Thank you,

Stacy

Hearing Identifier: SouthTexas34Public_EX
Email Number: 1606

Mail Envelope Properties (CEEA97CC21430049B821E684512F6E5ECA55D4F2B1)

Subject: FW: DRAFT RAI Related to SRP Section 6.2
Sent Date: 8/20/2009 4:32:50 PM
Received Date: 8/20/2009 4:32:51 PM
From: Joseph, Stacy

Created By: Stacy.Joseph@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"STPCOL" <STP.COL@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	495	8/20/2009 4:32:51 PM
RAI 3207.doc	28226	

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

Request for Additional Information No. 3207 Revision 2

South Texas Project Units 3 and 4
South Texas Project Nuclear Operating Co
Docket No. 52-012 and 52-013
SRP Section: 06.02.02 - Containment Heat Removal Systems
Application Section: 6C

QUESTIONS for Reactor System, Nuclear Performance and Code Review (SRSB)

06.02.02-***

Section 6C.1 of the STP FSAR Rev 2 states that the ABWR Design has committed to following the guidance provided in Regulatory Guide 1.82 Rev. 3 and the Utility Resolution Guide NEDO-32686. In the STP FSAR Section 6C.3, the applicant stated: "If required, downstream effects of material predicted to pass through the suction strainers will be evaluated in accordance with RG 1.82".

In RAI Question 06.02.02-1, the staff requested that STP describe how they will address the additional issues identified in RG 1.82 Rev 3 (including downstream effects). In STP response letter U7-C-STP-NRC-090038 (ML091270491), STP stated that an evaluation of downstream effects on fuel will be included in a future license amendment for fuel. During the June 30 – July 1 2009 audit of the STP suction strainers, STP stated that they planned to revise this approach. Please provide the following or describe how you plan to address the following items related to downstream fuel effects in the STP FSAR:

1) Provide an evaluation of the effects of debris that passes through the ECCS pumps suction strainer during long term cooling. Quantify the effects of downstream debris flow. Show what analyses have been completed or will be completed for debris in the core, and within valves or other restricting components, including fuel bundle debris filters. The debris may include chemical products, latent debris, or insulation that has passed through the suppression pool debris strainers. In this analysis, report the thermal conductivity and thickness of potential chemical products and debris on fuel rods and the increase in fuel rod temperature due to deposition and blockage in the core.

2) Report the change in the core flow with bounding blockages of valves and other components.

(a) Submit the flow blockage calculation results for the reactor fuel used in STP showing the critical power as a function of percent strainer blockage. Identify the percent blockage the fuel elements will experience at full power and what the effect on MCPR/PCT would be. Provide a figure showing CPR vs. fuel channel orifice flow area.

(b) Provide a list of assumptions made in the calculation of MCPR/PCT vs. % flow blockage.