

PMComanchePeakPEm Resource

From: Monarque, Stephen
Sent: Thursday, September 02, 2010 4:27 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; Otto, Ngola
Subject: Comanche Peak RCOL Chapter 14, Section 14.3.7 - RAI Number 174
Attachments: RAI 5004 (RAI 174).docx

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 is needed.

The response to this RAI is due within **35** calendar days of September 2, 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: 1031

Mail Envelope Properties (9C2386A0C0BC584684916F7A0482B6CA18FF355F45)

Subject: Comanche Peak RCOL Chapter 14, Section 14.3.7 - RAI Number 174
Sent Date: 9/2/2010 4:26:40 PM
Received Date: 9/2/2010 4:26:57 PM
From: Monarque, Stephen

Created By: Stephen.Monarque@nrc.gov

Recipients:

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

Tracking Status: None

"Otto, Ngola" <Ngola.Otto@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	647	9/2/2010 4:26:57 PM
RAI 5004 (RAI 174).docx	23752	

Options

Priority: Standard

Return Notification: No

Reply Requested: No

Sensitivity: Normal

Expiration Date:

Recipients Received:

Request for Additional Information (RAI) No. 5004, COLA Revision 1

RAI Number 174

9/2/2010

Comanche Peak Units 3 and 4
Luminant Generation Company, LLC.
Docket No. 52-034 and 52-035

SRP Section: 14.03.07 - Plant Systems - Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria
Application Section: Part 10, Table A.1-1, Item 7

QUESTIONS for Technical Specification Branch (CTSB)

14.03.07-29

The regulatory basis for this question is 10 CFR 50.70 and 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion III, Design Control.

Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria (ITAAC) Item 7 in Table A.1-1

In a previous RAI question (RAI Number 81 (3293), Question 14.03.07-5 (13063)), the staff stated that the phrase "heat removal capability transferred design heat load" referred to in the Design Commitment and AC was confusing, and requested the applicant to: (1) indicate what system removes the design heat load from the Emergency Service Water System (ESWS), (2) indicate that that system has the heat removal capability to transfer the design heat load from the ESWS, and (3) revise the nebulous term "adequate" referred to in both the Design Commitment and the AC. The applicant in its response addressed the changes requested by revising the (a) Design Commitment to state that the Ultimate Heat Sink (UHS) components referred to in Table A.1-2 are capable of removing the maximum heat load transferred from the ESWS, (b) Inspections, tests, analyses (ITA) by performing an inspection for the existence of a report, and (c) the AC by continuing to refer to "adequate" heat removal capability of the UHS from ESWS while maintaining a UHS outlet temperature of 95 degrees Fahrenheit. The staff does not agree that the applicant has fully addressed its requested changes. The staff requests the applicant to make these further changes: (i) the ITA should be the performance of "tests and analyses" not the performance of an "inspection" to determine the heat removal capability of the UHS, and (ii) the AC should be changed to state that analyses and/or test reports exist and conclude that the UHS removes the maximum design heat load of the ESWS while maintaining an outlet temperature of 95 degrees Fahrenheit without using the term "adequate" to refer its heat removal capability.