

## BellBendCOLPEm Resource

---

**From:** Canova, Michael  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 16, 2009 8:04 AM  
**To:** 'Sgarro, Rocco R'; 'BBNPP@pplweb.com'; 'jennifer.mcqueeney@unistarnuclear.com'; Freels, James  
**Cc:** BellBendCOL Resource; Weisman, Robert; Colaccino, Joseph; Miernicki, Michael; Kleeh, Edmund; Laura, Richard  
**Subject:** Bell Bend COLA - Draft Request for Information No. 49 (RAI No.49)- CTSB - 3367  
**Attachments:** Letter 49 - RAI 3367 CTSB.doc

Attached is DRAFT RAI No. 49 for the Bell Bend COL Application. You have ten working days to review this request and to decide whether you need a conference call to discuss it. Please notify me of your decision in this regard.

After the call, or after ten days, the RAI will be finalized and sent to you. You will then have 30 days to respond. These durations are factored into your review schedule. If additional time is required to respond, please inform me of your proposed schedule to respond at your earliest opportunity.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

*Michael A. Canova*

Project Manager - Bell Bend COL Application

Docket 52-039

EPR Project Branch

Division of New Reactor Licensing

Office of New Reactors

301-415-0737

**Hearing Identifier:** BellBend\_COL\_Public  
**Email Number:** 330

**Mail Envelope Properties** (D9892A42664D3D4690E88C2F48D7C08E210E5B0772)

**Subject:** Bell Bend COLA - Draft Request for Information No. 49 (RAI No.49)- CTSB - 3367  
**Sent Date:** 9/16/2009 8:03:42 AM  
**Received Date:** 9/16/2009 8:03:39 AM  
**From:** Canova, Michael  
**Created By:** Michael.Canova@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**

"BellBendCOL Resource" <BellBendCOL.Resource@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Weisman, Robert" <Robert.Weisman@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Colaccino, Joseph" <Joseph.Colaccino@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Miernicki, Michael" <Michael.Miernicki@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Kleeh, Edmund" <Edmund.Kleeh@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Laura, Richard" <Richard.Laura@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Sgarro, Rocco R" <rrsgarro@pplweb.com>  
Tracking Status: None  
"BBNPP@pplweb.com" <BBNPP@pplweb.com>  
Tracking Status: None  
"jennifer.mcqueeney@unistarnuclear.com" <jennifer.mcqueeney@unistarnuclear.com>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Freels, James" <James.Freels@unistarnuclear.com>  
Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:** HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	786	9/16/2009 8:03:39 AM
Letter 49 - RAI 3367 CTSB.doc		35322

**Options**

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

Request for Additional Information No. 49

DRAFT

9/16/2009

Bell Bend  
PPL Bell Bend LLC.  
Docket No. 52-039

SRP Section: 14.03.07 - Plant Systems - Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria  
Application Section: Part 10 - Tables 2.4-1 through 2.4-27

QUESTIONS for Technical Specification Branch (CTSB)

14.03.07-1

ITAAC Item 3a in Table 2.4-2 of BBNPP Application, Part 10

What is the fire protection hour rating of the penetration seals in sub-step 3 for this ITAAC? The penetration seals have no hour ratings as do other equipment. This RAI question is also applicable to the following ITAAC:

ITAAC Item 4a.6 in Table 2.4-7 of BBNPP Application, Part 10

14.03.07-2

ITAAC Items 3, 4, and 5 in Table 2.4-4 of BBNPP Application, Part 10

Items 3 and 4 perform analyses on the as-designed components, and Item 5 performs an inspection on the as-built duct banks and pipes. Please identify why there is no analysis of the as-built duct banks and pipes to ensure they can withstand design basis loads. This RAI question is also applicable to the following ITAAC in regard to them requiring an analysis in addition to the required inspection.

ITAAC Item 2 in Table 2.4-5

ITAAC Items 6 and 7 in Table 2.4-19 of BBNPP Application, Part 10

14.03.07-3

General Comment

The terms components, equipment, and piping are used throughout Part 10 of this application. Have definitions been developed for each of these terms? Are those definitions in line with the definitions developed for the EPR certified design? Are the ITAAC tables in Part 10 in agreement with the proper definitions of those terms?

14.03.07-4

ITAAC Item 1 in Table 2.4-7 of BBNPP Application, Part 10

The term contiguous is used in the Commitment Wording and AC of this ITAAC. Clarify to avoid confusion in the use of the term "contiguous." This RAI question is also applicable to any other ITAAC in Part 10 that use the term contiguous.

14.03.07-5

ITAAC Item 2 in Table 2.4-18 of BBNPP Application, Part 10

The Acceptance Criteria (AC) states that the ventilation system maintains the temperature within a range that supports operation of equipment within the Fire Protection Building. What is that range in quantitative terms?

14.03.07-6

ITAAC Item 14 in Table 2.4-19 of BBNPP Application, Part 10

The AC refers to a minimum required flow through the bar screens. What is the range of that minimum required flow in quantitative terms?

14.03.07-7

ITAAC Item 20 in Table 2.4-19 of BBNPP Application, Part 10

Revise the AC to be as detailed as the Commitment Wording since the words in the AC determine whether the design requirement stated in the Commitment Wording is met.

14.03.07-8

ITAAC Item 3 in Table 2.4-21 of BBNPP Application, Part 10

Why does the Inspection, Tests or Analysis (ITA) for ITAAC 3b only refer to inspections of equipment instead of equipment and piping?

14.03.07-9

ITAAC Item 2 in Table 2.4-24 of BBNPP Application, Part 10

Why is there no inspection performed to determine whether the circuits sized per the analysis are the actual circuits installed? This inspection would be of the ratings of the equipment not their location.

14.03.07-10

ITAAC Item 3 in Table 2.4-24 of BBNPP Application, Part 10

Why does this ITAAC not have an analysis to size the circuits from emergency auxiliary transformers (EATs) to the four Emergency Power Supply System divisions? If the ITAAC is only to verify the connection of the EATs to the emergency buses then state that. But if the ITAAC is also being used to state that the connections from the EATs to those emergency buses are sized correctly, then it would seem that an analysis would be appropriate to determine the correct ratings of those circuits.