From: BICE, DAVID B [DBICE@entergy.com]
Sent: Monday, May 02, 2011 2:41 PM
To: Kalyanam, Kaly
Subject: FW: AST

Kaly,

I and my Safety Analysis Engineer have completed review of the SE and have the following comments. I don't know that we need the SE changed (items 1 and 2 we could change in our internal electronic versions just so future document searches would show up "hits" on the document based on the correct numbers). The 3rd item is more difficult to determine whether a revised SE would be appropriate or not. Please let me know what the reviewer(s) think.

dave

1) last paragraph of section 3.3.7 contains 2 errors: (1) the unfiltered inleakage assumed in the analyses is 250 cfm, not 82 cfm as reported. However, 250 cfm is correctly identified in the tables at the end of the SE. (Note: 82 cfm is the unfiltered inleakage assumed in the ANO-1 AST analyses.) and (2) the maximum measured unfiltered inleakage was 30 cfm, not 61 cfm as reported. (Note: 61 cfm was the unfiltered inleakage assumed in the ANO-2 TID analyses performed to support power uprate.)
2) Section 3.1, Current TS 3.4.8/SR 4.4.8.1 – The “current” DEX value is 1200 uCi/gm, not 3200. The revised SR correctly identifies 3100 as the limit.
3) Section 3.3.6.2.1.2 is seems extraneous (may have been accidentally cut and pasted from some other section); This section deals with Control Rod ejection only. No ESF recirculation leakage has been assumed. Nor does RG 1.183 require any such leakage be assumed following a control rod ejection accident. The containment spray system has not been credited in this event and therefore there is nothing to drive iodines into the pool, other than retention of non-volatile species in the portion of leaking reactor coolant that does not flash. Any iodines then assumed to be in the sump would not be available for direct release to the environment through containment leakage. Additionally, the dose contribution from any sump iodines via ESF leakage would be further reduced by at least a factor of 10 (conservatively assumed flashing fraction). Thus, the analyses, as performed, are conservative and meet the regulatory criteria.