

PMComanchePeakPEm Resource

From: Monarque, Stephen
Sent: Friday, September 25, 2009 3:32 PM
To: Donald.Woodlan@luminant.com; John.Conly@luminant.com; cp34-rai-luminant@mnes-us.com; Diane Yeager; Eric.Evans@luminant.com; joseph tapia; Kazuya Hayashi; Matthew.Weeks@luminant.com; MNES RAI mailbox; Russ Bywater
Cc: ComanchePeakCOL Resource; Otto, Ngola
Subject: Comanche Peak RCOL Section 14.3.7 - RAI # 82
Attachments: RAI 3366 (RAI 82).doc

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

The response to this RAI is due within 42 calendar days of September 25, 2009.

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

thanks,

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

Hearing Identifier: ComanchePeak_COL_Public
Email Number: 636

Mail Envelope Properties (9C2386A0C0BC584684916F7A0482B6CA0BB15A)

Subject: Comanche Peak RCOL Section 14.3.7 - RAI # 82
Sent Date: 9/25/2009 3:32:14 PM
Received Date: 9/25/2009 3:32:19 PM
From: Monarque, Stephen

Created By: Stephen.Monarque@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"ComanchePeakCOL Resource" <ComanchePeakCOL.Resource@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Otto, Ngola" <Ngola.Otto@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Donald.Woodlan@luminant.com" <Donald.Woodlan@luminant.com>

Tracking Status: None

"John.Only@luminant.com" <John.Only@luminant.com>

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

"Eric.Evans@luminant.com" <Eric.Evans@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	649	9/25/2009 3:32:19 PM
RAI 3366 (RAI 82).doc	39418	

Options

Priority: Standard

Return Notification: No

Reply Requested: No

Sensitivity: Normal

Expiration Date:

Recipients Received:

Request for Additional Information (RAI) No. 3366

RAI 82

9/25/2009

Comanche Peak Units 3 and 4
Luminant Generation Company, LLC.
Docket No. 52-034 and 52-035

SRP Section: 14.03.07 - Plant Systems - Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria
Application Section: Part 10, Tables A.1-1, A.2-1, & A.3-1

QUESTIONS for Technical Specification Branch (CTSB)

14.03.07-13

Part 10 - Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria (ITAAC) and Proposed License Conditions

Appendix A.1, ITAAC Item 6.a in Table A.1-1

There is a reference in Acceptance Criteria (AC) to equipment in Table A.1-2. Why are the ultimate heat sink (UHS) basin blowdown control valves in that table not categorized per their respective Class 1E divisions? The regulatory basis for these comments is 10 CFR 50.70 and 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion III, Design Control.

14.03.07-14

Part 10 - ITAAC and Proposed License Conditions

Appendix A.1, ITAAC Item 14 in Table A.1-1

Why does the AC not indicate the pumps for which net positive suction head (NPSH) available exceeds required NPSH? The AC should be sufficiently specific to allow the design requirement in the Design Commitment to be met.

The regulatory basis for these comments is 10 CFR 50.70 and 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion III, Design Control.

14.03.07-15

Part 10 - ITAAC and Proposed License Conditions

Appendix A.2, ITAAC Item 4 in Table A.2-1

Why do the Design Commitment and AC refer to the "proper" environmental conditions within the respective room instead of a value that can be measured? This ITAAC should refer to value or a table where the values are listed so that this ITAAC can be performed and completed.

The regulatory basis for these comments is 10 CFR 50.70 and 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion III, Design Control.

14.03.07-16

Part 10 - ITAAC and Proposed License Conditions

Appendix A.2, ITAAC Item 5.a in Table A.2-1

Why does the AC not refer to the "UHS ESW [essential service water] pump house ventilation system exhaust fans and unit heaters" similarly to what is stated in the Design Commitment?

The regulatory basis for these comments is 10 CFR 50.70 and 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion III, Design Control.

14.03.07-17

Part 10 - ITAAC and Proposed License Conditions

Appendix A.3, ITAAC Items 4 and 5a in Table A.3-1

If the walls referred to in Item 4 have the appropriate thickness to decrease water seepage to zero, why is there a need for Item 5a and its flood barriers. It would seem appropriate for each of these ITAAC to determine how much seepage is eliminated by each of them.

The regulatory basis for these comments is 10 CFR 50.70 and 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion III, Design Control.

14.03.07-18

Part 10 - ITAAC and Proposed License Conditions

Appendix A.3, ITAAC Items 5b and 6 in Table A.3-1

What are the flood protection features referred to in these ITAAC? It would seem appropriate for these ITAAC to define what those flood protection features are.

The regulatory basis for these comments is 10 CFR 50.70 and 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion III, Design Control.

14.03.07-19

Part 10 - ITAAC and Proposed License Conditions

Appendix A.3, ITAAC Item 8 in Table A.3-1

What are the hour ratings of the rated components used to protect penetrations and openings against fire? These hour ratings should be stated in the AC.

The regulatory basis for these comments is 10 CFR 50.70 and 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion III, Design Control.

14.03.07-20

Part 10 - ITAAC and Proposed License Conditions

Appendix A.3, ITAAC Item 9 in Table A.3-1

It appears that words are missing. Would inspections be appropriate in addition to the analysis to verify that the referred to structures were as-built in accordance with the analysis and the design?

The regulatory basis for these comments is 10 CFR 50.70 and 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion III, Design Control.