

PMSTPCOL PEmails

From: Tai, Tom
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2011 12:27 PM
To: Le, Tuan
Cc: Wunder, George; Tonacci, Mark; Dixon-Herrity, Jennifer; STPCOL
Subject: RE: STP - Weekly Telephone Conference

Tuan,

Let's not try to solve this in e-mail. We'll meet Monday. I just don't understand how and why in the January audit by EMB2 staff, the ECCS spec was considered acceptable, i.e., load combination, stress allowable, and limit .

See you Monday.

Tom Tai
DNRL/NRO
(301) 415-8484
Tom.Tai@NRC.GOV

From: Le, Tuan
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2011 11:20 AM
To: Tai, Tom
Cc: Wunder, George; Tonacci, Mark; Dixon-Herrity, Jennifer; STPCOL
Subject: RE: STP - Weekly Telephone Conference

Tom,

Because ASME Section III Appendix A-8000 is a non-mandatory appendix, it is not a mandatory requirement to be met. ASME provided non-mandatory Appendix A-8000 to be an optional methodology for meeting ASME Section III stress analysis requirements. STP strainer is designed to ASME Section III requirements, but it does not require to meet non-mandatory Appendix A-8000. DCD did not say that applicant has to meet Appendix A-8000, but the strainer design requires to meet ASME Section III requirements that included the stress analysis requirements (load combinations, stress allowable and limits).

/R

Tuan

From: Tai, Tom
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2011 10:42 AM
To: Le, Tuan
Cc: Wunder, George; Tonacci, Mark; Dixon-Herrity, Jennifer; STPCOL
Subject: RE: STP - Weekly Telephone Conference

Tuan,

I'm still a little hazy about your interpretation of DCD commitment to ASME III. I agree the strainer is not a Class 2 component. However, STP is obligated to meet Class 2 requirements because the ABWR DCD said

so and STP IBR. Then how does non-mandatory requirements in ASME become our requirements? Please educate me by showing me clearly where the DCD commits to Appendix A-8000.

I'll meet with you Monday after 10 am.

Tom Tai
DNRL/NRO
(301) 415-8484
Tom.Tai@NRC.GOV

From: Le, Tuan
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2011 10:19 AM
To: Tai, Tom; Dixon-Herrity, Jennifer
Cc: Wunder, George; Tonacci, Mark
Subject: RE: STP - Weekly Telephone Conference

Tom,

The strainer design did not meet the ASME Section III requirements, since the strainer design did not have the acceptable stress analysis of the strainer. Whether or not, the applicant did ASME Section III Appendix A-8000 stress calculation methodology, the strainer design still has to meet the ASME Section III requirements per DCD. ASME Section III Appendix A-8000 is a non-mandatory appendix, it only provided an optional methodology of calculating strainer stresses.

Since the strainer design did not meet ASME Section III requirements by providing acceptable stress analysis, the applicant provided the results of CCI strainer test to determine the safety of strainer design. This is a departure from DCD. I will meet with you next week and discuss more.

/R

Tuan

From: Tai, Tom
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2011 9:38 AM
To: Dixon-Herrity, Jennifer
Cc: Wunder, George; Le, Tuan; Tonacci, Mark
Subject: RE: STP - Weekly Telephone Conference

Jennifer,

I have not seen Tuan yet but I'm sure we'll talk next week.

I'm not convinced STP needs to take a departure from the DCD because requirements in an ASME III non-mandatory appendix are not met. There is no commitment in the DCD that Appendix A-8000 is part of the design/procurement/fabrication requirement. Since STP is willing to include this appendix as part of design (although using DCN is not appropriate), I suggest asking STP to revise the FSAR to include this as supplemental information, i.e., IBR the DCD to meet ASME III, PLUS Appendix A. Tuan can review the test report presented to ACRS if he wants to and revise the 3.9.3 SER.

I believe this is the easiest approach to resolve this. I cannot find this appendix specifically discussed in the DCD nor in 10CFR50.55a. I do not believe we have any regulatory clout to mandate STP.

Regards

Tom Tai
DNRL/NRO
(301) 415-8484
Tom.Tai@NRC.GOV

From: Dixon-Herrity, Jennifer
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 3:25 PM
To: Tai, Tom
Subject: RE: STP - Weekly Telephone Conference

Thank you after the fact – sorry I missed it the first time. On the Strainer issue, I talked to Tuan after the meeting. I really think their best bet is to depart from the DCD in the license – explain that they are conservatively following ASME Code, but that the strainer will not meet that one aspect. He is going to talk to you about the feasibility of that option. Follow that up with a discussion of the test results. Make the test results available for Tuan's review. He writes up the finding in the SE that the departure from that one aspect is acceptable because the testing shows that the strainer will meet its safety function and the it is not required, per the regulations for a non pressure boundary piece of equipment to meet the code, that signing up to meet it is conservative or something along those lines. Putting this in the design spec really does nothing unless they want to include the design spec in the license. The base requirement in the DCD must be met or they need to provide a basis for changing the base requirement. The design spec should reflect the requirements in the DCD/license where the requirements are called for in the regs. Saying they don't have to meet something in the design spec does nothing – it is the license or DCD that have to change. Concern now, based on Tuan's explanation is they signed up to meet the code and they don't.

Jen

From: Tai, Tom
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 12:52 PM
To: Dixon-Herrity, Jennifer
Subject: RE: STP - Weekly Telephone Conference

Please see attached.

In addition (though not on the agenda), NINA said there is an update on the FMCRD/HCU spec.

Tom Tai
DNRL/NRO
(301) 415-8484
Tom.Tai@NRC.GOV

<< Message: STP - November 2, 2011 Telephone Conference >>

From: Dixon-Herrity, Jennifer
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 12:49 PM
To: Tai, Tom
Subject: RE: STP - Weekly Telephone Conference

Tom, do you have a more detailed agenda?

Jen

-----Original Appointment-----

From: Tai, Tom

Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2011 4:11 PM

To: Tai, Tom; Chakrabarti, Samir; Chakravorty, Manas; Le, Tuan; Wong, Yuken; Spicher, Terri; Wu, Cheng-Ih; Dixon-Herrity, Jennifer; Tonacci, Mark; Foster, Rocky; Eudy, Michael; Williams, Stephen; Roach, Edward; Thomas, Brian

Subject: STP - Weekly Telephone Conference

When: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 2:00 PM-4:00 PM (GMT-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).

Where: T-10C02

When: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 2:00 PM-4:00 PM (GMT-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).

Where: T-10C02

Note: The GMT offset above does not reflect daylight saving time adjustments.

~~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*

To All,

This is a reminder that we'll have a conference call with NINA to discuss outstanding items on the STP COL review. I'll prepare a more detailed agenda later.

If you work at home and want to participate on the call, the call-in information is:

Conference Line - 866-803-2146

Pass Code - 7482641

Hearing Identifier: SouthTexas34Public_EX
Email Number: 3168

Mail Envelope Properties (0A64B42AAA8FD4418CE1EB5240A6FED15167680FC5)

Subject: RE: STP - Weekly Telephone Conference
Sent Date: 11/4/2011 12:27:20 PM
Received Date: 11/4/2011 12:27:21 PM
From: Tai, Tom

Created By: Tom.Tai@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"Wunder, George" <George.Wunder@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Tonacci, Mark" <Mark.Tonacci@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Dixon-Herrity, Jennifer" <Jennifer.Dixon-Herrity@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"STPCOL" <STP.COL@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Le, Tuan" <Tuan.Le@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	7391	11/4/2011 12:27:21 PM

Options

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