

## PMSummerColpEM Resource

---

**From:** Sebrosky, Joseph  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 19, 2011 1:23 PM  
**To:** MONROE, AMY; GILES, JULIE M  
**Cc:** PMSummerColpEM Resource; Habib, Donald; Jackson, Christopher  
**Subject:** request for phone call to discuss draft wet bulb letter.

Amy and Julie,

Can you let me know if you can support a call tomorrow morning or Thursday morning to address the issues below. Please note that this email is going to be made publicly available since it contains observations from the staff on draft material. I also intend to write a quick summary of any phone call we have to discuss the issue and make this summary publicly available.

Sincerely,

Joe Sebrosky

---

**From:** Jackson, Christopher  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 19, 2011 11:37 AM  
**To:** McKirgan, John  
**Subject:** FW: DRAFT Wet bulb letter (2).doc

John,

I have looked over all the information provided by Joe and here are my recommendations.

- I agree with Joe that this should be submitted under oath and affirmation as a voluntary submittal.
- I agree with Joe that the current SER does not need to be revised.
- I am not very happy with the applicants statement. It seems unnecessarily vague and cryptic. I think a more definitive statement is needed.

Here is what they say [in draft] ...

These updates have been verified to not invalidate the conclusions or justifications discussed in the VCSNS Units 2 and 3 FSAR, Departure VCS DEP 2.0-2 and Exemption 3 of the VCSNS Combined License Application (COLA), related to the maximum safety wet bulb (non-coincident) air temperature.

The FSAR states the following ..

The peak containment pressure at the maximum safety wet bulb temperature of 87.3 F for the VCSNS Units 2 and 3 site is bounded by the results of the current AP1000 analysis.

The odd qualifier in the FSAR regarding the 'current' AP1000 analysis makes the does 'not invalidate' statement even more vague. Also why not state the conclusion as a fact rather than using the passive voice. The 'updates have been verified.' It just seems odd.

To me, a much stronger statement could and should be made. I suggest something like the following ...

Each of the analyses that were discussed in the VCSNS Units 2 and 3 FSAR, Departure VCS DEP 2.0-2 and Exemption 3 of the VCSNS Combined License Application (COLA), related to the maximum safety wet bulb (non-coincident) air temperature were reviewed to ensure the AP1000 analysis remain bounding in

consideration of the AP1000 DCD Revision 19 changes. In each case the AP1000 DCD Revision 19 changes either had no effect on the analysis or the revised DCD Rev 19 analysis continue to bound the VCSNS condition.

Please let me know what you think. Perhaps we can discuss with the applicant.  
CJ

---

**From:** Sebrosky, Joseph  
**Sent:** Friday, July 15, 2011 4:46 AM  
**To:** Jackson, Christopher; McKirgan, John  
**Cc:** Habib, Donald; SummerCOL Resource  
**Subject:** FW: DRAFT Wet bulb letter (2).doc

John and Chris,

Attached is a draft of a letter from SCE&G regarding the DCD containment pressure recalculation affect on Summer's wet bulb temperature exemption. Please let me know if you have any comments on the attached. Based on your comments I intend to do the following:

- Provide any feedback that you may have on the letter to the applicant before they formally transmit the letter
- Because we are evaluating the draft letter, I will make the attached email an official agency record that is publicly available
- I have already communicated to SCE&G that they should issue the attached under oath. This would allow us to treat it as a "voluntary submittal," place it in the erai database as such and reference it in the Summer SER if we choose to do this.
- If it is OK with you I will enter the letter in the erai database as a voluntary submittal. This will assign an RAI number to the submittal and allow us to track the issue. For example based on your input, I could eventually status the rai as issue resolved/closed.

Therefore, can you let me know if you have any comments on the attached or the approach outlined above. I will leave it up to you as to whether or not an adjustment is made to the SER. I don't think one will need to be made, because if asked we can say that we have a statement from the applicant regarding containment pressure and that we evaluated this statement and determined that no changes to the SER were needed.

Thanks,

Joe

---

**From:** MONROE, AMY [<mailto:AMONROE@scana.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 14, 2011 4:40 PM  
**To:** Sebrosky, Joseph  
**Subject:** FW: DRAFT Wet bulb letter (2).doc

Joe,  
Here is a draft of the subject letter for review and comment. Currently, we do not have Ron signing it under oath, because he has signed the application revision under oath, and we felt it was repetitive. If you feel otherwise, please let me know.  
Thanks!  
Amy



**Hearing Identifier:** VCSummer\_COL\_Public  
**Email Number:** 356

**Mail Envelope Properties** (36CF286628C20846A68047F2463233093E8BD3FCCF)

**Subject:** request for phone call to discuss draft wet bulb letter.  
**Sent Date:** 7/19/2011 1:22:58 PM  
**Received Date:** 7/19/2011 1:23:01 PM  
**From:** Sebrosky, Joseph

**Created By:** Joseph.Sebrosky@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**

"PMSummerColpEM Resource" <PMSummerColpEM.Resource@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Habib, Donald" <Donald.Habib@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Jackson, Christopher" <Christopher.Jackson@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"MONROE, AMY" <AMONROE@scana.com>  
Tracking Status: None  
"GILES, JULIE M" <JMGILES@scana.com>  
Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:** HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	4814	7/19/2011 1:23:01 PM

**Options**

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