

PMComanchePeakPEm Resource

From: Monarque, Stephen
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2010 12:45 PM
To: ComanchePeakCOL Resource
Subject: FW: 2010-01-07 Luminant call on section 2.3

From: Donald.Woodlan@luminant.com [mailto:Donald.Woodlan@luminant.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 13, 2010 9:31 AM
To: Magee, Michael
Cc: Monarque, Stephen; joseph_tapia@mnes-us.com; Matthew.Weeks@luminant.com; John.Only@luminant.com; Eric.Evans@luminant.com
Subject: RE: 2010-01-07 Luminant call on section 2.3

Mike,

We believe we have identified the problem that led to the bad set of data provided most recently to the NRC (we had cleaned up the data as we said we would but some of that work was undone when we converted to the RG format). We also believe we will be ready soon to provide a new set of data.

I would like to suggest a face-to-face visit with the reviewer with the data in hand to confirm that the new set is responsive to his needs. We believe that we can support such a visit on 1/21/10 in the am. Please let me know what you think of this idea. We want to get it right and avoid future iterations on this matter.

Donald R. Woodlan

Manager, Nuclear Regulatory Affairs

Luminant Power

254-897-6887

From: Magee, Michael [mailto:Michael.Magee@nrc.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 07, 2010 4:34 PM
To: Woodlan, Don
Cc: Monarque, Stephen; ComanchePeakCOL Resource
Subject: 2010-01-07 Luminant call on section 2.3

Don,

We would like to have a conference call next week to discuss the below points from the reviewers -

According to the response provided in RAI 3557,

The raw data was screened using the criteria recommended in NUREG-0917 to flag suspect data. A manual review of the screened data was subsequently conducted to accept or reject data flagged by the screening process. In some cases where temperature data was found to be bad, it was replaced using data from a redundant device on the primary tower. A total of 2440 hours of data out of 43,824 were identified and rejected based on the screening and review process. The resulting set of edited data was subsequently used in the COL analyses presented in FSAR Subsections 2.3.4 and 2.3.5.

The response to RAI 3557 also stated that the "filtered meteorological data for the year 2001-2004 and 2006, provided in RG 1.23, Rev 1 format as a composite file...will be provided." The NRC staff received this data in the stated format.

It is in the staff's opinion, however, that the data provided is not the filtered meteorological data as stated in the RAI response. It is in the staff's opinion that this is the same dataset (or very similar) that was submitted in May 2009 in the response to RAI 2584.

The staff has found multiple data points in the recently submitted meteorological dataset that it feels to be erroneous. These data points were stated in RAI 3557, which noted in part, "Hours 0900 through 1200 on day 269 of 2002, all report a temperature of -28.7 degrees C. Another example is the 60-meter wind direction remaining nearly constant from the north for an approximately 1850-hour period from November 5, 2003 to January 20, 2004." These same apparent erroneous data, noted in RAI 3557, are in the dataset that was recently provided. The staff has found other similar errors in each year of the meteorological dataset, however, for the sake of brevity, they are not mentioned here.

A complete and validated final meteorological dataset is necessary for the NRC staff to continue the safety review of FSAR Chapter 2.3.

The staff is requesting that Luminant provide the **filtered meteorological dataset**, in RG 1.23 Rev. 1 format, that reflects the screening criteria listed in the responses to RAI 2584 and RAI 3557. Based on our understanding of the response to RAI 3557, as given above, it is the **filtered meteorological dataset** that was used to prepare meteorological data for the analyses conducted in FSAR Sections 2.3.4 and 2.3.5.

Please let me know when you and your team would be available for a call. I know we've discussed this before, but there seems to be a disconnect somewhere and we are not closing the gap.

Thanks,

Mike
6988

Confidentiality Notice: This email message, including any attachments, contains or may contain confidential information intended only for the addressee. If you are not an intended recipient of this message, be advised that any reading, dissemination, forwarding, printing, copying or other use of this message or its attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply message and delete this email message and any attachments from your system.

Hearing Identifier: ComanchePeak_COL_Public
Email Number: 795

Mail Envelope Properties (9C2386A0C0BC584684916F7A0482B6CA0B7A45DDE8)

Subject: FW: 2010-01-07 Luminant call on section 2.3
Sent Date: 1/17/2010 12:44:56 PM
Received Date: 1/17/2010 12:44:59 PM
From: Monarque, Stephen

Created By: Stephen.Monarque@nrc.gov

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

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4653	1/17/2010 12:44:59 PM

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