PMSTPCOL PEmails

From: Ballinger, Amy [aballinger@STPEGS.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, November 10, 2009 5:32 PM
To: Muniz, Adrian; Dyer, Linda; Wunder, George; Tonacci, Mark; Eudy, Michael; Plisco, Loren; Anand, Raj; Foster, Rocky; Joseph, Stacy; Govan, Tekia; Tai, Tom
Subject: Responses to Request for Additional Information
Attachments: U7-C-STP-NRC-0900193 R02.pdf; U7-C-STP-NRC-090200.pdf

Good afternoon,

Attached, please find a courtesy copy of the letters answering the NRC staff questions related to Cola Part 2, Tier to Sections 8.3.1 and 05.03.02-2. The official copies were mailed today according to the letter addressee list. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Amy Ballinger
STP Units 3 & 4
Licensing Specialist
Phone: (361)972-4644
Fax: (361) 972-4751

Hearing Identifier: SouthTexas34Public_EX
Email Number: 1860

Mail Envelope Properties (C7F098E3C31A0141A02043F0B8E656EE2563212E26)

Subject: Responses to Request for Additional Information
Sent Date: 11/10/2009 5:32:03 PM
Received Date: 11/10/2009 5:32:28 PM
From: Ballinger, Amy

Created By: aballinger@STPEGS.COM

Recipients:
"Muniz, Adrian" <Adrian.Muniz@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Dyer, Linda" <lcdyer@STPEGS.COM>
Tracking Status: None
"Wunder, George" <George.Wunder@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Tonacci, Mark" <Mark.Tonacci@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Eudy, Michael" <Michael.Eudy@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Plisco, Loren" <Loren.Plisco@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Anand, Raj" <Raj.Anand@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Foster, Rocky" <Rocky.Foster@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Joseph, Stacy" <Stacy.Joseph@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Govan, Tekia" <Tekia.Govan@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Tai, Tom" <Tom.Tai@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: exgmb1.CORP.STPEGS.NET

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	410	11/10/2009 5:32:28 PM
U7-C-STP-NRC-0900193 R02.pdf	790619	
U7-C-STP-NRC-090200.pdf	537487	

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

Nuclear Operating Company

South Texas Project Electric Generating Station P.O. Box 289 Wadsworth, Texas 77483

November 10, 2009
U7-C-STP-NRC-090193

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Attention: Document Control Desk
One White Flint North
11555 Rockville Pike
Rockville, MD 20852-2738

South Texas Project
Units 3 and 4
Docket Nos. 52-012 and 52-013
Responses to Request for Additional Information

Attached are responses to NRC staff questions in Request for Additional Information (RAI) letter 280, related to COLA Part 2, Tier 2, Section 8.3.1, "AC Power Systems." This letter provides the complete response to RAI letter 280.

Attachments 1 and 2 provide the responses to the following NRC staff questions:

08.03.01-13 08.03.01-14

There are no new commitments in this letter.

If you have any questions regarding these responses, please contact me at (361) 972-7136, or Bill Mookhoek at (361) 972-7274.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on 11/10/09

Scott Head
Manager, Regulatory Affairs
South Texas Project Units 3 & 4

rhb

Attachments:
1. RAI 08.03.01-13
2. RAI 08.03.01-14

STI 32568199

cc: w/o attachments and enclosure except*

(paper copy)

Director, Office of New Reactors
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
One White Flint North
11555 Rockville Pike
Rockville, MD 20852-2738

Regional Administrator, Region IV
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 400
Arlington, Texas 76011-8064

Kathy C. Perkins, RN, MBA
Assistant Commissioner
Division for Regulatory Services
Texas Department of State Health Services
P. O. Box 149347
Austin, Texas 78714-9347

Alice Hamilton Rogers, P.E.
Inspection Unit Manager
Texas Department of State Health Services
P. O. Box 149347
Austin, Texas 78714-9347

C. M. Canady
City of Austin
Electric Utility Department
721 Barton Springs Road
Austin, TX 78704

*Steven P. Frantz, Esquire
A. H. Gutterman, Esquire
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington D.C. 20004

*George F. Wunder
*Adrian Muniz
Two White Flint North
11545 Rockville Pike
Rockville, MD 20852

(electronic copy)

*George Wunder
*Adrian Muniz

Loren R. Plisco
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Steve Winn
Eddy Daniels
Joseph Kiwak
Nuclear Innovation North America

Jon C. Wood, Esquire
Cox Smith Matthews

J. J. Nesrsta
R. K. Temple
Kevin Pollo
L. D. Blaylock
CPS Energy

RAI 08.03.01-13

Question:

In response to RAI 08.03.01-10 pertaining to periodic testing of isolation devices, the applicant stated that Class 1E to non-Class 1E isolation devices are safety related and, as such, they would be covered by FSAR subsection 8.3.4.30. This subsection indicates that the applicant would develop procedure(s) for the periodic testing of all Class 1E electrical systems and equipment in accordance with surveillance and test requirements of Section 7 of IEEE 308. The applicant, however, appeared to imply that they would not perform periodic testing of isolation devices in Instrumentation and Control Circuits. STP reached this conclusion on the basis that IEEE Standard 384, Section 7.2.1, does not specifically include a requirement for periodic testing of isolation devices in instrumentation and control (I&C) circuits and that the Standard only requires that "the capability of a device to perform its isolation function shall be demonstrated by qualification tests."

However, the test requirement in Section 7.2.2.1 (not 7.2.1) of IEEE 384-1992 is only intended to confirm the isolation capability of the isolation device. Appendix B, Criterion XI, Test Control, states, in part: "A test program shall be established to assure that all testing required to demonstrate that structures, systems, and components will perform satisfactorily in service is identified and performed in accordance with written test procedures which incorporate the requirements and acceptance limits contained in applicable design documents. The test program shall include, as appropriate, proof tests prior to installation, preoperational tests, and operational tests during nuclear power plant or fuel reprocessing plant operation, of structures, systems, and components." This requirement makes no distinction between electrical and I&C components. The continuous capability of electrical devices to perform their safety function is also discussed in IEEE 308, Section 6.4, which does not exclude isolation devices in the statement that, "Tests shall be performed at scheduled intervals to detect within practical limits the deterioration of the equipment toward an unacceptable condition." Test intervals should be developed based on the guidance of IEEE 338, Section 6.5.

Based on the above, confirm that isolation devices in I&C circuits will be included in the STP periodic test program. Isolation devices include those components used to isolate redundant Class 1E circuit as well as safety-related circuits from non-safety related ones. If the isolation devices in I&C circuits are not included in the STP periodic test program, discuss how it can be assured that these devices will continue to perform their isolation function throughout the life of the plant.

Response:

IEEE 384, Section 7.2.2.1, addresses general requirements for I&C isolation devices. It includes a requirement that the capability of the device to perform its isolation function be demonstrated by qualification testing. The response to RAI 08.03.01-10 stated that the capability of I&C devices to perform their isolation function will be demonstrated by qualification tests.

In addition, the response to RAI 08.03.01-10 states, "The standard does not include a requirement to periodically test isolation devices for instrumentation and control circuits". IEEE 384, Section 7.2.2.1 does not address periodic testing requirements for I&C isolation devices.

I&C devices performing isolation functions will be included in the STP periodic test program and will be tested at vendor-recommended intervals in accordance with vendor-approved test practices. However, it is likely that the isolation devices may not require testing, or may not be required to be tested in a manner similar to a power device. In cases where isolation devices are not required to have periodic testing, the IEEE 384 qualification test is sufficient to demonstrate the capability of the isolation function.

As stated in FSAR section 19B.3.2, "the inspection and test program for fiber optic type isolators used between safety-related and non safety-related systems will be established prior to fuel loading. If other types of isolators are used (e.g., those subject to electrical leakage due to maximum credible electrical faults), the required testing, inspection and replacement guidance will be developed prior to fuel loading (COM 19B-1)."

No COLA revisions are required as a result of this response.

RAI 08.03.01-14

Question:

In RAI 08.03.01-12, the staff requested that the applicant discuss the effect of the temperature increase from 50°C to 60°C on (1) DG performance (DG rating, effects on electronic components associated DG control system, etc.), (2) Cable ampacity, (3) mild environment equipment qualification, and (4) operation of other equipment in the room if any. In their response to the staff questions, the applicant failed to address DG performance in the proposed ambient temperature.

The applicant is requested to discuss any derating that will be required if the temperature of the inlet air to the diesel is increased from 50°C to 60°C and if the generator is required to operate in an ambient temperature of 60°C. Also if a derating of the diesel and generator is required, discuss the impact of such derating on the diesel generator loading, both transient and steady-state.

Response:

As identified in the response to RAI 08.03.01-12, the safety-related equipment to be installed in the DG room is being specified and procured to be suitable for the DG room environmental conditions. As the temperature limit of 60°C has been specified as the design limit, no derating will need to be applied, and as such there will be no impact on performance in the proposed ambient temperature.

Based on DCD Tier 2, Section 9.5.8.2 and 9.5.8.3, the diesel engine combustion air intake is taken from outside the reactor building; therefore, the increase in DG room temperature from 50°C to 60°C indicated in STP DEP T1 2.15-2 does not impact DG intake air temperature.

As the generator is within the diesel room, the generator will be in an environment with a maximum design temperature of 60°C. Again, the generator is a part of the diesel equipment which is being specified and procured to the 60°C temperature requirement; as such there will be no derating required.

As discussed above, there is no derating of the engine or generator. As such, there is no impact on the diesel generator loading.

No COLA revision is required as a result of this response.

Nuclear Operating Company

South Texas Project Electric Generating Station 4000 Avenue F – Suite A Bay City, Texas 77414

November 10, 2009
U7-C-STP-NRC-090200

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Attention: Document Control Desk
One White Flint North
11555 Rockville Pike
Rockville MD 20852-2738

South Texas Project
Units 3 and 4
Docket Nos. 52-012 and 52-013
Supplemental Response to Request for Additional Information

Attached is a supplemental response to an NRC staff question included in Request for Additional Information (RAI) letter number 224 related to Combined License Application (COLA) Part 2, Tier 2, Section 5.3.

The attachment supplements the response to the RAI question listed below:

RAI 05.03.02-2

There are no commitments in this letter.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (361) 972-7136, or Bill Mookhoek at (361) 972-7274.

STI 32573186

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on 11/10/09

Scott Head
Manager, Regulatory Affairs
South Texas Project Units 3 & 4

gsc

Attachment:

Question 05.03.02-2 Supplement

cc: w/o attachment except*
(paper copy)

Director, Office of New Reactors
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
One White Flint North
11555 Rockville Pike
Rockville, MD 20852-2738

Regional Administrator, Region IV
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 400
Arlington, Texas 76011-8064

Kathy C. Perkins, RN, MBA
Assistant Commissioner
Division for Regulatory Services
Texas Department of State Health Services
P. O. Box 149347
Austin, Texas 78714-9347

Alice Hamilton Rogers, P.E.
Inspections Unit Manager
Texas Department of State Health Services
P.O. Box 149347
Austin, TX 87814-9347

C. M. Canady
City of Austin
Electric Utility Department
721 Barton Springs Road
Austin, TX 78704

*Steven P. Frantz, Esquire
A. H. Gutterman, Esquire
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington D.C. 20004

*George F. Wunder
*Tekia Govan
Two White Flint North
11545 Rockville Pike
Rockville, MD 20852

(electronic copy)

*George Wunder
*Tekia Govan
Loren R. Plisco
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Steve Winn
Eddy Daniels
Joseph Kiwak
Nuclear Innovation North America

Jon C. Wood, Esquire
Cox Smith Matthews

J. J. Nesrsta
R. K. Temple
Kevin Pollo
L. D. Blaylock
CPS Energy

RAI 05.03.02-2

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTION

During a telephone conference with the NRC Staff on October 19, 2009, STPNOC agreed to supplement the initial response to RAI 05.03.02-2 with additional information regarding the design comparison between the STP 3 & 4 reactor pressure vessels (RPVs) and the reference Japanese RPV for which interim stress analysis information was provided to develop the Pressure and Temperature Limits Report (PTLR) for the STP 3 & 4 RPVs. STPNOC also agreed to provide the schedule for completing the stress analysis of the STP 3 & 4 RPVs using the ANSYS computer code.

RESPONSE:

The specifications for the STP 3 & 4 reactor pressure vessels (RPVs) are basically the same as the specifications for the reference Japanese RPV. One difference is the thickness of the RPV bottom head, which is 253 mm nominal (250 mm minimum) for the reference Japanese vessel and 268 mm nominal (265 mm minimum) for STP 3 & 4. The stresses associated with the bottom head are not among the most limiting stresses and the additional thickness is not expected to result in a higher stress for this component.

One other difference involves the design and material codes applied to each vessel. The ASME material code is specified for the STP 3 & 4 RPVs, while the Japanese code and standard (MITI501) was applied to the design of the reference Japanese ABWR RPV. Stress analysis results are expected to be similar; however, small differences might occur due to the use of the different codes.

The actual finite element stress analysis of the STP 3 & 4 RPVs using ANSYS is being performed as the STP 3 vessel is being built. The draft stress analysis reports for each nozzle and for each portion of the RPV are being completed separately, as the components are being built. These draft stress analysis reports are expected to be issued for internal review in early 2010. Review and Professional Engineer signoff of these reports will be completed by the end of 2010. These stress analysis results from ANSYS are expected to be very similar to the results presented in the STP 3 & 4 PTLR, Rev. 0.

No COLA changes are required as a result of this RAI response.