LeeRAIsPEm Resource

From: Hughes, Brian
Sent: Sunday, November 01, 2009 11:52 AM
To: LeeRAIsPEm Resource
Subject: RAI Letter No. 82 Related to SRP 02.03.02 for the W.S. Lee units 1& 2 COLA
Attachments: LEE-RAI-LTR-082.doc

Brian Hughes
Senior Project Manager
NRO/DNRL/NWE1
US NRC
301-415-6582

Hearing Identifier: Lee_COL_RAI
Email Number: 100

Mail Envelope Properties (3D388D66E29B124A910BAC867C3A359D3F2435D8FD)

Subject: RAI Letter No. 82 Related to SRP 02.03.02 for the W.S. Lee units 1& 2 COLA
Sent Date: 11/1/2009 11:51:47 AM
Received Date: 11/1/2009 11:51:48 AM
From: Hughes, Brian

Created By: Brian.Hughes@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"LeeRAIsPEm Resource" <LeeRAIsPEm.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	103	11/1/2009 11:51:48 AM
LEE-RAI-LTR-082.doc	57338	

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

November 1, 2009

Mr. Peter S. Hastings, P.E.
Licensing Manager, Nuclear Plant Development
Duke Energy
526 South Church Street
Charlotte, NC 28201-1006

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION LETTER NO. 082 RELATED TO SRP 02.03.02 FOR THE WILLIAM STATES LEE III UNITS 1 AND 2 COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION

Dear Mr. Hastings:

By letter dated December 12, 2007, as supplemented by letters dated January 28, 2008, February 6, 2008 and February 8, 2008, Duke Energy submitted its application to the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) for a combined license (COL) for two AP1000 advance passive pressurized water reactors pursuant to 10 CFR Part 52. The NRC staff is performing a detailed review of this application to enable the staff to reach a conclusion on the safety of the proposed application.

The NRC staff has identified that additional information is needed to continue portions of the review. The staff's request for additional information (RAI) is contained in the enclosure to this letter.

To support the review schedule, you are requested to respond within 30 days of the date of this letter. If changes are needed to the final safety analysis report, the staff requests that the RAI response include the proposed wording changes.

If you have any questions or comments concerning this matter, you may contact me at 301-415-6582.

Sincerely,

/**RA**/

Brian Hughes, Senior Project Manager
AP1000 Projects Branch 1
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors

Docket Nos. 52-018
52-019

Enclosure:
Request for Additional Information

CC: see next page

P.Hastings

If you have any questions or comments concerning this matter, you may contact me at 301-415-6582.

Sincerely,

/**RA**/

Brian Hughes, Senior Project Manager
AP1000 Projects Branch 1
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors

Docket Nos. 52-018
52-019

eRAI Tracking No. 3800

Enclosure:
Request for Additional Information

Distribution:

Public	BAnderson	
RidsNroDnrlNwe1	CLauron	JBielecki
RidsNroLAKGoldstein	BHughes	RidsOgcMailCenter
RidsAcrsAcnwMailCenter	RidsRgn2MailCenter	RidsNroDnrlNwe2
TGalletta		

NRO-002

OFFICE	RSAC/BC	RSAC	NWE1/L-PM
NAME	CLauron*	TGalletta*	BHughes*
DATE	09/23/09	09/23/09	10/29/09

*Approval captured electronically in the electronic RAI system.

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Request for Additional Information No. 3800

10/29/2009

William States Lee III, Units 1 and 2
Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC
Docket No. 52-018 and 52-019
SRP Section: 02.03.02 - Local Meteorology
Application Section: 2.3.2

QUESTIONS for Siting and Accident Consequence Branch (RSAC)

02.03.02-11

This is a follow-up to WLS RAI 2.3.2-04.

10 CFR 52.79(a)(1)(iii) states that COL applicants must identify the meteorological characteristics of the proposed site with appropriate consideration of the most severe of the natural phenomena that have been historically reported for the site and surrounding area and with sufficient margin for the limited accuracy, quantity, and period of time in which the historic data have been accumulated

Provide the maximum safety dry-bulb and wet bulb site characteristics based on the higher of either historic or 100-year return period values.

(a) The maximum safety and minimum safety air temperature values found in FSAR Site Characteristics Table 2.0-201 do not appear to use the more conservative/bounding 100-year return period values found in FSAR Table 2.3-293. The 0% exceedance values presented as Lee Site Characteristics are generated from a limited (31-year) data set. Temperatures based on 100-year return period are considered by the staff to provide sufficient margin for the limited accuracy, quantity, and period of time in which the historical data have been accumulated per the regulation.

Please revise FSAR Table 2.0-201 to reflect the more bounding 100-year return period values, or provide additional justification in FSAR Subsection 2.3.2.2 why the higher values were not chosen.

(b) Additionally, the staff's analysis of the 100-year return period coincident wet bulb temperature value was considerably warmer than the value shown in FSAR Table 2.3-293. Please consider a more conservative method for the calculation of this temperature, or provide a justification and explanation for the current analysis in the FSAR. Ensure consistency with between FSAR Tables and related text when providing your response.