BellBendCOLPEm Resource

From: Canova, Michael
Sent: Monday, November 30, 2009 8:23 AM
To: 'Sgarro, Rocco R'; 'BBNPP@pplweb.com'; 'Freels, James'; 'melanie.Frailer@unistarnuclear.com'; 'Jacqueline.bell@unistarnuclear.com'
Cc: Giacinto, Joseph; Jennings, Jason; BellBendCOL Resource
Subject: Summary of Call on Request for Information (RAI) No. 19. Question 02.04.03-1, Subpart 2
Attachments: 11-2-09 Call Notes.doc

Attached is the summary of the telephone conference with the staff on this topic, November 2, 2009.

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: 456

Mail Envelope Properties (77BCCD26C6050B42A72FE3939CF492ED155EEE59AE)

Subject: Summary of Call on Request for Information (RAI) No. 19. Question 02.04.03-1, Subpart 2
Sent Date: 11/30/2009 8:23:27 AM
Received Date: 11/30/2009 8:23:28 AM
From: Canova, Michael

Created By: Michael.Canova@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"Giacinto, Joseph" <Joseph.Giacinto@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Jennings, Jason" <Jason.Jennings@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"BellBendCOL Resource" <BellBendCOL.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"'Sgarro, Rocco R'" <rrsgarro@pplweb.com>
Tracking Status: None
"'BBNPP@pplweb.com'" <BBNPP@pplweb.com>
Tracking Status: None
"'Freels, James'" <James.Freels@unistarnuclear.com>
Tracking Status: None
"'melanie.Frailer@unistarnuclear.com'" <melanie.Frailer@unistarnuclear.com>
Tracking Status: None
"'Jacqueline.bell@unistarnuclear.com'" <Jacqueline.bell@unistarnuclear.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	298	11/30/2009 8:23:28 AM
11-2-09 Call Notes.doc	41978	

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

Telcon Topic:
PPL Request for Clarification
Re: RAI 19, Question 02.04.03-1, Subpart 2

Date: 11/2/09

NRC Attendees: Mike Canova, Terry (Ted) Johnson (RHEB Contract SME), Joe Giacinto, RHEB

PPL Attendees Jim Freels (UNE), Dave Sullivan, John Kirkwood, Federico Perdomo

Rizzo Assoc: Femida Mesania

S&L: Bob Hameetman, Steve Taylor, Dan Barton, Davel Wallner, Paul Martincluch, Many Presburger, Brian Chook

In order for the staff to determine flow profiles for the site drainage ditches, the applicant was requested to provide calculations and analyses of peak water levels expected to occur in the various drainage ditches that surround the power block area.

S&L requested clarification as to how the staff believed the Postulated Maximum Flood (PMF) should be factored into the calculations and analysis requested by this question.

Staff responded that the ponded water level behind any potential blockages (such as culverts or ditches) should be included along with other flow profiles, depending on the circumstances. Staff recommends placing particular emphasis on the access road impacts (based on the staff's understanding of the original site). PPL should be aware that some flows could be super-critical. The vehicle barrier system could create significant impacts on flows over and along roads.

To a staff question about the impending changes and the availability of a revised detailed site drawing, PPL/UNE responded that the revised plot plan is scheduled for January 2010.

Regarding the PMF for the North Branch Susquehanna River (NBSR), the staff indicated that the emphasis should be to calculate the PMF rather than the maximum credible flood (which is not considered to be the PMF). Staff indicated that the maximum credible flood may not be as conservative as the PMF, in this case. The staff suggested that the PMF magnitudes provided in Reg. Guide 1.59, figure B.6, could possibly be used as one acceptable method. The staff also indicated that performing a study of regional PMFs, such as those techniques outlined in the the Cabot Performance Materials Slag Pile report (below), could be used to estimate the PMF..

For determining the NBSR river level, the staff suggested that rather than interpolating between river gauge stations, it would likely be more representative to estimate the water level of the river at the site based cross-sections & conveyances near the site.

The staff suggested review of the Army Corps of Engineers HEC-RAS study done for FEMA to determine if the study has a sufficient number and spacing of cross-sections such that a cross-section near the site could be used. If the cross-sections do not have the needed vertical extent, they could be extended by using the contours from a USGS topographic map.

A general question was put out regarding how the original PMF for SSES was computed. Although blindly adopting the information and PMF water level from that analysis is not considered

acceptable, the staff indicated that it is likely that the methodology used appears to be conservative and could possibly be acceptable.

The staff indicated to PPL that a recent analysis that might provide some insight into generalized PMF determinations for streams in Pennsylvania could be the analysis associated with the Decommissioning of the Cabot Performance Materials Slag Pile, Reading PA, Docket 40-9027.