

PSEGSPeRAIPEm Resource

From: Chowdhury, Prosanta
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2011 8:34 AM
To: 'PSEGRAIResponses@pseg.com'
Cc: PSEGSPeRAIPEm Resource; 'David.Lewis2@pseg.com'; 'James.Mallon@pseg.com'; 'David.Robillard@pseg.com'; Colaccino, Joseph; Silvia, Andrea; Clark, Phyllis; McLellan, Judith; Caverly, Jill; Giacinto, Joseph; Raione, Richard
Subject: PSEG Site ESPA FINAL RAI 27 (eRAI 5712) SRP-02.04.11 (RHEB)
Attachments: PSEG Site ESPA Final RAI 27 (eRAI 5712).pdf

Please find attached RAI 27 for the PSEG Site ESP Application. A draft of the RAI was provided to you on April 29, 2011. You informed via email on May 6, 2011, that you would not need a clarification call involving this specific RAI; however, you needed to verify with your staff whether response to this RAI can be delivered within 30 days, and you informed via email on May 11, 2011, that you would be able to respond to this RAI in 30 days; therefore, we are issuing this RAI as final with no changes made to it.

The schedule we have established for review of your application assumes technically correct and complete responses within 30 calendar days of receipt of RAIs. For any RAIs that cannot be responded to within 30 calendar days, it is expected that a date for receipt of this information will be provided to the staff within the 30-calendar day period so that the staff can assess how this information will impact the published schedule.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Prosanta Chowdhury
Project Manager
EPR Projects Branch
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors
301-415-1647

Hearing Identifier: PSEG_Site_EarlySitePermit_RAI
Email Number: 56

Mail Envelope Properties (320204600EA7B9408FE833FF15E4FF7D57C1CEABF1)

Subject: PSEG Site ESPA FINAL RAI 27 (eRAI 5712) SRP-02.04.11 (RHEB)
Sent Date: 5/11/2011 8:33:50 AM
Received Date: 5/11/2011 8:33:53 AM
From: Chowdhury, Prosanta

Created By: Prosanta.Chowdhury@nrc.gov

Recipients:

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

Tracking Status: None

"David.Lewis2@pseg.com" <David.Lewis2@pseg.com>

Tracking Status: None

"James.Mallon@pseg.com" <James.Mallon@pseg.com>

Tracking Status: None

"David.Robillard@pseg.com" <David.Robillard@pseg.com>

Tracking Status: None

"Colaccino, Joseph" <Joseph.Colaccino@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Silvia, Andrea" <Andrea.Silvia@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Clark, Phyllis" <Phyllis.Clark@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"McLellan, Judith" <Judith.McLellan@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Caverly, Jill" <Jill.Caverly@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Giacinto, Joseph" <Joseph.Giacinto@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Raione, Richard" <Richard.Raione@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"PSEGRAIResponses@pseg.com" <PSEGRAIResponses@pseg.com>

Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1162	5/11/2011 8:33:53 AM
PSEG Site ESPA Final RAI 27 (eRAI 5712).pdf		38407

Options

Priority: Standard

Return Notification: No

Reply Requested: No

Sensitivity: Normal

Expiration Date:

Recipients Received:

Request for Additional Information No. 27

Application Revision 0

FINAL

5/11/2011

PSEG Site ESP
PSEG Power LLC, PSEG Nuclear LLC
Docket No. 52-043
SRP Section: 02.04.11 - Low Water Considerations
Application Section: 2.4.11

QUESTIONS for Hydrologic Engineering Branch (RHEB)

02.04.11-1

NUREG-0800, Standard Review Plan (SRP), Section 2.4.11, 'Low Water Considerations,' establishes guidance that NRC staff use to evaluate whether an application meets the requirements in 10 CFR 100.20(c) and 52.79(a)(1)(iii).

In the PSEG ESP application SSAR section 2.4.11.1, the applicant employs ANS 2.8 as rationale for using 90 % exceedance low-tide for the 22-year record at Reedy Point for low water conditions analyses. ANS 2.8 is not routinely used for analysis of low water conditions.

The staff requests that a detailed explanation of the rationale for using ANS 2.8 be provided and include a discussion of the relevance of using 'reverse' ANS 2.8 analysis of low water. This discussion should include alternative analyses considered and the conceptual model that was used to justify this analysis.