PMSTPCOL PEmails

From: Govan, Tekia
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2010 5:21 PM
To: 'Bense, Richard'
Cc: STPCOL
Subject: Open Items RAIs
Attachments: RAI 4266.doc; RAI 4187.doc; RAI 4186.doc; RAI 4228.doc

Dick,

Please review the attached open items. If you feel we need a conference call to clarify the open item, please contact me within 5 business days. If a conference call is not needed (please send an email).

This open item relates to chapter 2 and is a product of the Phase 2 review.

Tekia V. Govan, Project Manager
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of New Reactors
MS T-6-D48
Washington DC 20555-0001
301-415-6197
Tekia.Govan@nrc.gov

Hearing Identifier: SouthTexas34Public_EX
Email Number: 2008

Mail Envelope Properties (F5A4366DF596BF458646C9D433EA37D727159554C1)

Subject: Open Items RAIs
Sent Date: 1/25/2010 5:21:26 PM
Received Date: 1/25/2010 5:21:26 PM
From: Govan, Tekia

Created By: Tekia.Govan@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"STPCOL" <STP.COL@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"'Bense, Richard'" <rhbense@STPEGS.COM>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	539	1/25/2010 5:21:26 PM
RAI 4266.doc	31738	
RAI 4187.doc	30714	
RAI 4186.doc	30202	
RAI 4228.doc	30202	

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

Request for Additional Information No. 4266 Revision 03

South Texas Project Units 3 and 4
South Texas Project Nuclear Operating Co
Docket No. 52-012 and 52-013
SRP Section: 02.05.01 - Basic Geologic and Seismic Information
Application Section: 2.5S.1

QUESTIONS for Geosciences and Geotechnical Engineering Branch 1 (RGS1)

02.05.01-***

In response to RAI Question 2.5.1-19, you stated that growth fault GMP "is represented as a short north-northwest-trending projection within the STP 3 & 4 FSAR." You also stated that this "perceived" trend "does not represent the trend of the growth fault at depth." This information is in conflict with FSAR Figures 2.5S.1-42, 2.5S.1-43, and 2.5S.1-45 each of which shows fault GMP extending to the northwest through the cooling reservoir in the direction of proposed Units 3 and 4. If the surface projection of fault GMP (in the FSAR figures) does not represent the actual trend of the fault, then the figures are misrepresenting the data and are incorrect. In addition, FSAR Section 2.5S.1.2.4.3 states that fault GMP "trends north-northwest" beneath the cooling reservoir (as revised in the response to RAI 2.5.1-19) which is inconsistent with the RAI response which states that fault GMP actually trends to the west.

(a) Please resolve the inconsistencies between what is printed in FSAR Section 2.5S.1.2.4.3, what is shown in FSAR Figures 2.5S.1-42, 2.5S.1-43, and 2.5S.1-45, and the information provided in response to RAI 2.5.1-19.
(b) Please explain how the seismic reflection profiles used for the STP 1 & 2 UFSAR help "demonstrate that growth fault GMP does not present a hazard for the STP 3 & 4 site" if fault GMP was not even identified in the STP 1 & 2 UFSAR data.

02.05.01-***

In order to fully evaluate the potential for deformation beneath the STP Units 3 and 4 site, please provide a commitment in the FSAR to (1) perform geologic mapping (based on the guidance provided in RG 1.208) of future excavations for safety-related structures, (2) evaluate any geologic features that are encountered, and (3) notify the NRC once any excavations for safety-related structures are open for inspection.

Request for Additional Information No. 4187 Revision 3

South Texas Project Units 3 and 4
South Texas Project Nuclear Operating Co
Docket No. 52-012 and 52-013
SRP Section: 02.03.04 - Short Term Atmospheric Dispersion Estimates for Accident Releases
Application Section: FSAR Sections 2.0 and 2.3S.4

QUESTIONS for Siting and Accident Conseq Branch (RSAC)

02.03.04-***

The response to RAI 02.03.04-9 dated October 29, 2009 states, in part, that Footnote 10 will be added to FSAR Table 2.0-2 stating that:

1.62×10^{-4} s/m^3 is the PAVAN generated Maximum 2-hour 5.0% value at the EAB;
2.74×10^{-4} s/m^3 is the PAVAN generated Maximum 2-hour 0.5% value at the EAB.

Please clarify in Footnote 10 that 1.62×10^{-4} s/m^3 is the PAVAN generated 2-hour <u>5.0% overall site value</u> at the EAB and 2.74×10^{-4} s/m^3 is the PAVAN generated 2-hour <u>0.5% maximum sector value</u> at the EAB.

The response to RAI 02.03.04-9 also states, in part, that Footnote 11 will be added to FSAR Table 2.0-2 stating that:

3.99×10^{-5} s/m^3 is the PAVAN generated Maximum 2-hour 5.0% value at the LPZ;
5.27×10^{-5} s/m^3 is the PAVAN generated Maximum 2-hour 0.5% value at the LPZ.

Likewise, please clarify in Footnote 11 that 3.99×10^{-5} s/m^3 is the PAVAN generated 2-hour <u>5.0% overall site value</u> at the LPZ and 5.27×10^{-5} s/m^3 is the PAVAN generated 2-hour <u>0.5% maximum sector value</u> at the LPZ.

Request for Additional Information No. 4186 Revision 3

South Texas Project Units 3 and 4
South Texas Project Nuclear Operating Co
Docket No. 52-012 and 52-013
SRP Section: 02.03.05 - Long-Term Atmospheric Dispersion Estimates for Routine Releases
Application Section: FSAR 2.3S.5

QUESTIONS for Siting and Accident Conseq Branch (RSAC)

02.03.05-***

The third bullet in Revision 3 to FSAR Section 2.3S.5.2 states that the maximum annual average no decay CHI/Q value for the EAB is 8.1E-06 sec/m^3 in the NW sector at a distance of 0.69 miles. This appears to conflict with the information presented in Revision 3 to FSAR Table 2.3S-27 which shows the maximum no decay CHI/Q value for the EAB is 1.5E-05 sec/m^3 in the NW sector at a distance of 0.52 miles. Please revise the FSAR to address this apparent conflict.

Request for Additional Information No. 4228 Revision 3

South Texas Project Units 3 and 4
South Texas Project Nuclear Operating Co
Docket No. 52-012 and 52-013
SRP Section: 02.04.12 - Groundwater
Application Section: FSAR 2.4.12

QUESTIONS for Hydrologic Engineering Branch (RHEB)

02.04.12-***

Provide a calculation package and a summary of the calculation package supporting conclusions regarding the transport and consequence analyses considering dispersion, advection, radioactive decay, and retardation under fastest flow conditions (e.g., the sensitivity analysis) including both retarded and non-retarded analytes, especially for tritium.