

PMComanchePeakPEm Resource

From: Monarque, Stephen
Sent: Sunday, February 21, 2010 2:05 PM
To: John.Only@luminant.com; Donald.Woodlan@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; Magee, Michael
Subject: Comanche Peak RCOL Chapter 2.4.7 - RAI Number 141
Attachments: RAI 4313 (RAI 141).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 or public meeting is needed.

The response to this RAI is due within 36 calendar days of February 21, 2010.

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: 830

Mail Envelope Properties (9C2386A0C0BC584684916F7A0482B6CA0B916BEA0C)

Subject: Comanche Peak RCOL Chapter 2.4.7 - RAI Number 141
Sent Date: 2/21/2010 2:05:00 PM
Received Date: 2/21/2010 2:05:02 PM
From: Monarque, Stephen

Created By: Stephen.Monarque@nrc.gov

Recipients:

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

Tracking Status: None

"Magee, Michael" <Michael.Magee@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

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

Tracking Status: None

"Donald.Woodlan@luminant.com" <Donald.Woodlan@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	671	2/21/2010 2:05:02 PM
RAI 4313 (RAI 141).doc		30202

Options

Priority: Standard

Return Notification: No

Reply Requested: No

Sensitivity: Normal

Expiration Date:

Recipients Received:

Request for Additional Information (RAI) No. 4313 COL Revision 1

RAI Number 141

2/21/2010

Comanche Peak Units 3 and 4
Luminant Generation Company, LLC.
Docket No. 52-034 and 52-035
SRP Section: 02.04.07 - Ice Effects
Application Section: FSAR Section 2.4.7

QUESTIONS for Hydrologic Engineering Branch (RHEB)

02.04.07-4

NUREG-0800, Standard Review Plan (SRP), Section 2.4.7, 'Ice Effects,' establishes criteria that the NRC staff intends to use to evaluate whether an applicant meets the NRC's regulations.

By letter dated October 1, 2009, the NRC staff issued RAI ID 3669 (RAI No. 104) Question Number 14260 (02.04.07-1), in which the NRC staff asked "Provide a discussion of the processes used to determine that the analyses of ice-effects on flood elevations, ice-induced forces, and ice-related impairment of the ultimate heat sink equipment are conservatively bounding."

The applicant responded in document CP-200901564-Log No TXNB-09067- (ML093230704) executed on November 13, 2009, and, in its response, included changes to FSAR Sub-section 2.4.7 in the Updated Tracking Report (UTR) Number 4. The NRC staff has determined that the applicant did not provide a justification for the bounding conservatism of the analysis used in the FSAR. The applicant's response to RAI 3669 (RAI No. 104) Question Number 14260 describes how the plant safety is not threatened by normal occurrences of icing and sub-freezing temperatures. Neither the analysis in the COL application, Part 2 FSAR nor the applicant's response addresses the safety of the plant when icing conditions are extreme or not "characteristic of the region." The applicant's revisions in UTR No. 4 report an estimated maximum potential ice thickness of 7 inches, but does not justify the bounding conservatism of this estimate or how it does or does not affect plant safety.

In order to make its safety determination on the basis of adequate consideration of conservative terms, the NRC staff requests that the applicant justify the bounding conservatism of its icing effect analysis, giving consideration to icing under extreme conditions.

This is supplemental RAI 2.4.7-00-S.