CCNPP3COLA PEmails

From: Steckel, James
Sent: Thursday, December 30, 2010 8:04 AM
To: Brown, David
Cc: CCNPP3COL Resource
Subject: FW: EPR wetbulb vs C. Cliffs
Attachments: DRAFT Response to U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 256, FSAR Ch 2, Question 02.03.01-14; Response to U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 256, FSAR Ch 2, Supplement 8

Dave,

FYI, here is information on EPR RAI 02.03.01-14(3) concerning 81°F zero percent exceedance non-coincident wet bulb air temperature as a site parameter.

Jim

James Steckel
Project Manager
NRC EPR Projects Branch
301 415-1026
james.steckel@nrc.gov

From: Hearn, Peter
Sent: Wednesday, December 22, 2010 8:39 AM
To: Tesfaye, Getachew; Steckel, James
Subject: FW: EPR wetbulb vs C. Cliffs

FYI

From: Harvey, Brad
Sent: Monday, December 20, 2010 7:52 AM
To: Wheeler, Larry; Eul, Ryan
Cc: Segala, John; Lee, Samuel; Hearn, Peter; Patel, Jay; Brown, David
Subject: RE: EPR wetbulb vs C. Cliffs

Larry/Ryan:

Just wanted to let you know that AREVA has postponed providing their formal response to EPR RAI 02.03.01-14(3) (Consider deleting the 81 °F zero percent exceedance non-coincident wet bulb air temperature as a site parameter) until Jan 27, 2011.

Brad
415-4118

From: Harvey, Brad
Sent: Wednesday, November 10, 2010 4:48 PM
To: Wheeler, Larry
Cc: Segala, John; Tesfaye, Getachew; Eul, Ryan; Lee, Samuel; Hearn, Peter; Patel, Jay
Subject: RE: EPR wetbulb vs C. Cliffs

Larry et al:

Here is a draft response from AREVA. They are proposing not deleting the 81 °F zero percent exceedance non-coincident wet bulb air temperature as a site parameter because it "is an important meteorological design input for establishing cooling tower performance for the U.S. EPR design basis accident."

Just because the 81 °F wet bulb temperature is a design input does not mean it must be a site parameter. Also, I think that we may be comparing "apples and oranges" because maybe the 81 °F wet bulb temperature design input shouldn't be compared to the zero percent exceedance wet bulb site characteristic value, which is the highest "hourly" value ever observed at the site.

I still believe the 81 °F zero percent exceedance non-coincident wet bulb air temperature should be deleted as a site parameter.

Your thoughts?

Brad
415-4118

From: Wheeler, Larry
Sent: Tuesday, November 09, 2010 4:51 PM
To: Harvey, Brad
Cc: Segala, John; Tesfaye, Getachew; Eul, Ryan; Lee, Samuel; Hearn, Peter
Subject: RE: EPR wetbulb vs C. Cliffs

Brad:

Thanks- John Segala was asking me again on this.

I am not sure the Chapter 9 PM has been following this issue and if the wet bulb gets changed at the DCD, Chapter 9 may have to be extended and the ESWS cooling tower for UHS may have to go thru more design changes.

Larry

From: Harvey, Brad
Sent: Tuesday, November 09, 2010 4:31 PM
To: Wheeler, Larry
Cc: Brown, David; Eul, Ryan; Lee, Samuel; Segala, John
Subject: RE:

We are already doing this – please see attached email.

From: Wheeler, Larry
Sent: Tuesday, November 09, 2010 4:20 PM
To: Segala, John
Cc: Harvey, Brad; Brown, David; Eul, Ryan; Lee, Samuel
Subject: FW:

FYI - at some point we need to engage project with why the DCD does not bound the "R".

From: Wheeler, Larry
Sent: Thursday, October 28, 2010 8:41 AM
To: Eul, Ryan
Cc: Segala, John; Lee, Samuel; Harvey, Brad; Brown, David
Subject: FW:

Ryan:

FYI - Guess we need to take as closer look at this and ask AREVA why their design cert is not bounding. It would make sense that the design cert should cover this new wet bulb temp going from 81 WB to 85 WB since Calvert is the "R" plant.

From: Brown, David
Sent: Thursday, October 28, 2010 8:33 AM
To: Wheeler, Larry; Li, Chang
Cc: Steckel, James; Lee, Samuel; Segala, John
Subject:

Larry and Chang,

From EPM, I see that you are the SRP Sec. 9.2 reviewers for the Calvert Cliffs RCOLA. I just wanted to be sure that you were aware of a proposed change to CCNPP3 FSAR Section 9.2.1 that Unistar provided in August. This is in regards to a departure from the DCD temperature site parameters for the design of the ultimate heat sink. The accession number for the attached RAI response is ML102360342.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

David D. Brown, CHP
Acting Branch Chief
Siting and Accident Consequences Branch
Division of Site and Environmental Reviews
Office of New Reactors
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
11545 Rockville Pike, Mail Stop T-7F27
Rockville, MD 20852-2738
301-415-6116
David.Brown@nrc.gov

Hearing Identifier: CalvertCliffs_Unit3Cola_Public_EX
Email Number: 1820

Mail Envelope Properties (AF843158D8D87443918BD3AA953ABF781C8991EC7D)

Subject: FW: EPR wetbulb vs C. Cliffs
Sent Date: 12/30/2010 8:04:08 AM
Received Date: 12/30/2010 8:04:11 AM
From: Steckel, James

Created By: James.Steckel@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"CCNPP3COL Resource" <CCNPP3COL.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Brown, David" <David.Brown@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	4580	12/30/2010 8:04:11 AM
DRAFT Response to 02.03.01-14	U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 256, FSAR Ch 2, Question 342878	
Response to	U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 256, FSAR Ch 2, Supplement 8 55420	

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