

PMSTPCOL PEmails

From: Wunder, George
Sent: Wednesday, July 07, 2010 12:07 PM
To: STPCOL
Subject: FW: PRESENTATION TO ACRS
Attachments: openitems.doc

From: Wunder, George
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2010 5:39 PM
To: Anand, Raj; Tai, Tom; Govan, Tekia; Foster, Rocky; Eudy, Michael; Joseph, Stacy; Muniz, Adrian; Kallan, Paul; Abeywickrama, Bernadette; Keith, Felicia
Cc: Tonacci, Mark
Subject: PRESENTATION TO ACRS

Ladies and Gentlemen,

This eMail is a bit long, but I think the subject is pretty important. I want to make sure we are all aligned on what action items from the 03/02 ACRS meeting we will be addressing at the 03/18 meeting and who will do the addressing. You can use the attached file as a reference....

First, we need to answer the Chairmain's concern on the Part 21 issue. This has two parts: The specific Part 21 issue in question and the generic handling of Part 21 issues. This is item 1. on the attached file. I understand that Tekia is preparing our response and that Mike will be presenting that response to the Subcommittee. Tekia/Mike, please coordinate with Coley Chappell because I think that the applicant has something to say on this as well. Still, we should be doing most of the presenting on the generic Part 21 issue because the Chairman's question was directed to the staff, not to the applicant.

Second, we were going to address Dr. Armijo's question on the fuel amendment. What, if anything, are we going to present to the ACRS. Do they get a shot at commenting an amendment that changes much of the analysis in Chapters 4 and 15?? Whatever answer we give, we want to make sure that they realize that the fule amendment is separate from the COL issuance and shoud have NO Effect on COL issuance. Again, this is one that Tekia is preparing and Mike is presenting. This is item 6. on the attached file.

Third, we have Dr. Ryan's question on what insights we have regarding the revised GALE code. How are the results from the revised code likely to differ from the resutls from the current code?? Is this likely to pose any problems for the applicant?? This should be addressed by Ed Roach or one of his guys. Perhaps it's more of an applicant question. mike, you might want to get on the phone with Coley and Ed Roach or Bob Kellner and figure out who/how we want to address this. This is item 7. on the attached file.

Fourth, we had a question from Dr. Ryan on comparative doses at operating ABWRs and other BWRs. Mike, can you get with Ed Roach on this?? He should provide the response. Again, probably best to coordinate with Coley. This is item 8. on the attached file.

Fifth, somebody needsd to figure out how we want to address the EDG area temperature change. Please coordinate with STP on how they are going to address the EQ issue. Mike/Adrian, please figure out what we want to say. This is item 13. on the attached file.

Sixth, we need to talk about the underground piping carrying radioactive liquids. Raj, this one is yours. Again, please coordinate with the applicant to determine how we want to address this issue. This is item 16. on the attahced file.

Thanks,

George

Hearing Identifier: SouthTexas34Public_EX
Email Number: 2293

Mail Envelope Properties (DAC719623E968245BD52D0369611110031C97DD69C)

Subject: FW: PRESENTATION TO ACRS
Sent Date: 7/7/2010 12:07:14 PM
Received Date: 7/7/2010 12:07:14 PM
From: Wunder, George

Created By: George.Wunder@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"STPCOL" <STP.COL@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3133	7/7/2010 12:07:14 PM
openitems.doc	32250	

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

1. We have an action item from Dr. Abdel-Khalik on the Part 21 process. He is interested in the specific Part 21 that came up in the Chapter 4 discussion. He is also interested in the general case of how we identify Part 21 issues that affect the ABWR design. How are we sure we have captured and addressed all of them?? This is an issue that we must address at the beginning of our March 18, 2010, meeting. We have only two weeks. This corresponds to items 3. and 4. on your list. This is an **Open Item**. (Tekia)
2. Dr. Bonaca indicated that he might have questions on Chapter 18 (human factors engineering) after he reflected on the presentation. This corresponds to item 16. on your list. **We have no specific follow-up action for ACRS at this time.**
3. Dr. Brown had no specific issues. He indicated that he thought most of his questions would be on Chapter 7 (I&C). This corresponds to item 7. on your list. This will be resolved as part of our presentation on May 20, 2010. **We have no specific follow-up action for ACRS at this time.**
4. Dr. Bley appeared interested in the DAC process. He indicated that he wanted to see how issues of concern to the Committee would be resolved. I am not sure that we have been clear that DAC issues will be closed after the issuance of the COL. This means that the Committee will not be able to track the closure of DAC-related technical issues before they are requested to write a letter on the staff's SER. Perhaps this Friday's DAC presentation to the full Committee will explain the DAC process more clearly. This corresponds to items 12. and 17. on your list. **We have no specific follow-up action for ACRS at this time.**
5. Dr. Stetkar had no specific action items regarding the staff's presentation. He raised a good point about the open item on aging management. This issue will be closed in the staff's final SER with no OIs. **We have no specific follow-up action for ACRS at this time.** (George)
6. Dr. Armijo expressed interest in the fuel related topical reports and the effect of the fuel change on the analyses in Chapters 4 and 15. At the beginning of the next meeting we should tell the Subcommittee what topical reports will be presented to them and when. We should also answer the question of whether or not the amendment will go before them. This correlates to item 1. on your list. This is an **Open Item**.
7. Dr. Ryan had a question regarding the GALE code revision and its effect on the applicant. Do we have any insights on how results from the new GALE code will compare to results from the old GALE code. What impact is this likely to have on the application? He also expressed concern on the effect of revising RGs on the applicant. What happens if we are in the middle of a review and we make significant changes to a RG? How does the applicant deal with this? This corresponds to item 10. on your list. We should address this issue generically. This is an **Open Item**. (Raj/Mike)
8. Dr. Ryan had a question regarding occupational doses received from ABWRs and how they compare to occupational doses at other reactors. Can we get these numbers?? Can we compare ABWR to other Japanese BWRs as well as comparing ABWR to U.S. BWRs?? This is an **Open Item**. (Raj/Mike)

9. Dr. Shack did not have any specific action items related to the staff's presentation.
10. Dr. Silber did not have any specific action items related to the staff's presentation.
11. Dr. Abdel-Khalik had a question regarding the departure that removes the MSIV closure and trip on high radiation. I believe that the response provided by Dinesh Taneja of the I&C branch addressed his concern. This corresponds to item 5. on your list. This is a **Closed Item**.
12. Dr Abdel-Khalik had a concern relative to the feedwater line break accident not being described in Chapter 15. The applicant stated that this accident does not affect Chapter 15 doses and that the entirety of the accident and its effects will be discussed in the presentation on Chapter 6. We believe that this addressed the concern. This corresponds to item 6. on your list. This is a **Closed Item**.
13. Dr. Abdel-Khalik noted that a departure (T1 2.15-2) allowed the EDG space to rise to 60 degrees C. He wanted to know what consideration had been given to occupancy of this space with such high temperatures. If we are tracking this as an open item I believe that it is for the applicant. Please make sure that Dr. Abdel-Khalik wants a follow-up on this. If he does, I can ask the applicant to address this issue when they make their presentation on Chapter 9. If the staff was required to look at this issue under the sRP, I will ask that they include a slide in their presentation of Chapter 9. This correlates to item 2 on your list. This is an **Open Item**.
14. Dr. Abdel Khalik had a question regarding how flow blockage affected the performance of the reactor internal pumps. The applicant clarified that at any time when we would expect flow blockage, the reactor internal pumps would already be de-energized and the ECCS pumps would be working. This corresponds to item 8. on your list. The full presentation on strainers and downstream effects testing will be presented as part of Chapter 6 on May 20, 2010. **We have no specific follow-up action for ACRS at this time.**
15. An issue arose regarding whether or not Chi/Q values were bounded. Jay Lee corrected his presentation and informed the Subcommittee that, although Chi/Q values were not bounded, the associated doses are bounded. This resolved the issue. This corresponds to item 11. on your list. This is a **Closed Item**.
16. Dr. Ryan asked a question regarding underground piping carrying radioactive liquids. Does the piping run through tunnels?? Is it designed for zero leakage?? Is it above or below the water table?? I would like to treat this as an open item to be addressed by the applicant. To the extent that the applicants answer to this question affects the staff's SER as written, I will request the staff to address the issue as well. Do these questions adequately address Dr. Ryan's concerns?? Would this approach resolve the issue?? This corresponds to item 9. on your list. This is an **Open Item**.
17. I understood Dr. Stetkar to say that he had no specific issues that he needed resolved. Could you please check with him?? If he has concerns, could you please be as specific as possible so that we can present the information at the earliest possible date. This is a **Question for the ACRS**.

18. Please provide more specifics on what Dr. Bley would like to see regarding HFE ITAAC validation. This corresponds to item 14. on your list. This is a **Question for the ACRS**.