

PMComanchePeakPEm Resource

From: Monarque, Stephen
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2010 5:08 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 181
Attachments: RAI 5099 (RAI 181).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 October 19, 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: 1122

Mail Envelope Properties (9C2386A0C0BC584684916F7A0482B6CA1A8A0ED37D)

Subject: Comanche Peak RCOL Chapter 14, Section 14.3.7 - RAI Number 181
Sent Date: 10/19/2010 5:07:51 PM
Received Date: 10/19/2010 5:07:49 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	646	10/19/2010 5:07:49 PM
RAI 5099 (RAI 181).docx	19887	

Options

Priority: Standard

Return Notification: No

Reply Requested: No

Sensitivity: Normal

Expiration Date:

Recipients Received:

Request for Additional Information (RAI) No. 5099 COLA, Revision 1

RAI Number 181

10/19/2010

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.3-1, Item 5.a

QUESTIONS for Technical Specification Branch (CTSB)

14.03.07-33

Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant COLA, Part 10, ITAAC Items 5a and 5b in Table A.3-1.

The NRC staff requested the applicant to revise or delete ITAAC 5a in RAI Number 82 (3366), RAI question 14.03.07-17 (13282) because (1) the walls, referred to in ITAAC Item 4 in Table A.3-1, could have the appropriate thickness to decrease the water seepage to zero, and (2) an analysis may be required in addition to the inspection to determine the appropriate thickness of the flood barriers to decrease the seepage to a certain value. If the water seepage is decreased to zero due to the walls in ITAAC Item 4, it does not seem that there would be a need for Item 5a and its flood barriers. The staff requested the applicant revise ITAAC 5b in RAI Number 82 (3366), RAI question 14.03.07-18 (13283) to define the flood protection features. The applicant, in its response, revised ITAAC Items 5.a and 5.b to indicate that the flood barriers are installed consistent with the design bases for flood protection. Inspections are used for both ITAAC to verify the existence of reports that indicate that the flood barriers are installed correctly. The staff agreed in part with the applicant's response for both of these ITAAC in that the exact locations and physicality of the flood barriers can be identified in reports similarly to figures and tables, but not that the inspection for these ITAAC is for the existence of those reports, instead of the as-built installations to verify the locations and integrity of the flood barriers. The staff requests that the applicant revise these ITAAC to indicate that the inspections will be of the as- installed flood barriers and not for the existence of the respective reports.