## PMComanchePeakPEm Resource

**From:** Monarque, Stephen
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 22, 2011 1:54 PM
**To:** John.Conly@luminant.com; Donald.Woodlan@luminant.com; 'cp34-rai-luminant@mnes-us.com'; Eric.Evans@luminant.com; joseph tapia; 'Kazuya Hayashi'; Matthew.Weeks@luminant.com; 'Russ Bywater'; MNES RAI mailbox (cp34-rai-luminant@mnes-us.com)
**Cc:** ComanchePeakCOL Resource; Kallan, Paul
**Subject:** Comanche Peak RCOL Chapter 9 - Section 9.2.5 - RAI Number 241
**Attachments:** RAI 6173 (RAI 241).docx

The NRC staff has identified that additional information is needed to continue its review of the combined license application. The NRC staff's request for additional information (RAI) is contained in the attachment. Luminant is requested to inform the NRC staff if a conference call is needed.

The response to this RAI is due within 35 calendar days of **November 22, 2011.**

Note: The NRC staff requests that the RAI response include any proposed changes to the FSAR.

thanks,

Stephen Monarque
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
NRO/DNRL/NMIP
301-415-1544

**Hearing Identifier:** ComanchePeak_COL_Public
**Email Number:** 1567

**Mail Envelope Properties** (9C2386A0C0BC584684916F7A0482B6CA4E5BE6DC05)

**Subject:** Comanche Peak RCOL Chapter 9 - Section 9.2.5 - RAI Number 241
**Sent Date:** 11/22/2011 1:53:40 PM
**Received Date:** 11/22/2011 1:53:43 PM
**From:** Monarque, Stephen

**Created By:** Stephen.Monarque@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**
"ComanchePeakCOL Resource" <ComanchePeakCOL.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Kallan, Paul" <Paul.Kallan@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"John.Conly@luminant.com" <John.Conly@luminant.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Donald.Woodlan@luminant.com" <Donald.Woodlan@luminant.com>
Tracking Status: None
"'cp34-rai-luminant@mnes-us.com'" <cp34-rai-luminant@mnes-us.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Eric.Evans@luminant.com" <Eric.Evans@luminant.com>
Tracking Status: None
"joseph tapia" <joseph_tapia@mnes-us.com>
Tracking Status: None
"'Kazuya Hayashi'" <kazuya_hayashi@mnes-us.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Matthew.Weeks@luminant.com" <Matthew.Weeks@luminant.com>
Tracking Status: None
"'Russ Bywater'" <russell_bywater@mnes-us.com>
Tracking Status: None
"MNES RAI mailbox (cp34-rai-luminant@mnes-us.com)" <cp34-rai-luminant@mnes-us.com>
Tracking Status: None

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

| **Files** | **Size** | **Date & Time** |
|---|---|---|
| MESSAGE | 611 | 11/22/2011 1:53:43 PM |
| RAI 6173 (RAI 241).docx | 24444 | |

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

Request for Additional Information (RAI) No. 6173, COLA Revision 2

RAI Letter Number 241

11/22/2011

Comanche Peak Units 3 and 4
Luminant Generation Company, LLC.
Docket No. 52-034 and 52-035
SRP Section: 09.02.05 - Ultimate Heat Sink
Application Section: 9.2.5

QUESTIONS for Balance of Plant Branch 1 (SBPA)

09.02.05-17

NRC regulations 10 CFR 50.36(c)(2)(ii) states that a technical specification limiting condition for operation of a nuclear reactor must be established for each item meeting one or more of the following criteria … (C) Criterion 3. A structure, system, or component that is part of the primary success path and which functions or actuates to mitigate a design basis accident or transient that either assumes the failure of or presents a challenge to the integrity of a fission product barrier.

Luminant plans to use mechanical draft cooling towers (MDCT) at Comanche Peak, Units 3 and 4 for its ultimate heat sink (UHS). Regulatory Position 4 from Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.27 (1976), "Ultimate Heat Sink for Nuclear Power Plants," states, in part, that the technical specifications for the plant should include provisions for actions to be taken in the event that conditions threaten partial loss of the capability of the UHS. Thus, the staff needs assurance that the assumptions used to calculate the UHS cooling capability bound actual conditions.

There are already surveillance requirements in TS 3.7.9 for the UHS cooling tower basin water temperature (SR 3.7.9.2) and level (SR 3.7.9.1). For a MDCT, wet bulb (WB) temperature dictates the cooling tower's heat removal capacity. The higher the ambient WB temperature, the worse the cooling performance of the tower. A higher WB temperature than previously analyzed would threaten the cooling capability of the MDCT UHS. Thus, if RG 1.27 is followed, plants that use MDCTs for their UHS should incorporate an ambient WB temperature surveillance requirement in their TS.

For the Comanche Peak (CP) COL FSAR – Revision 2, the variable "wet bulb" is found in several locations as shown below:

· CP FSAR Section 9.2.5.1, "Design Bases," states that the UHS is designed in accordance with Regulatory Guide 1.27 with inventory sufficient to provide cooling for at least 30 days following an accident, with no makeup water. The performance of the UHS is based upon 30 years of site-specific historical wet bulb temperature conditions.

· CP FSAR 9.2.5.2.3, "System Performance," states that the wet bulb design temperature was selected to be 80°F based on 30 years (1977-2006) of climatological data obtained from National Climatic Data Center /National

Oceanic & Atmospheric Administrator for Dallas/ Fort Worth International Airport Station in accordance with RG 1.27. The worst 30 day period based on the above climatological data was between June 1, 1998 and June 30, 1998, with an average wet bulb temperature of 78.0°F. A 2°F recirculation penalty was added to the maximum average wet bulb temperature was added to the maximum average wet bulb temperature.

The 83° F wet bulb temperature site characteristic value shown in the COLA FSAR Table 2.0-1R corresponds to the 0% exceedance value (two consecutive hourly peak temperatures on July 12, 1995, at 1500 hours and 1600 hours). The 0% exceedance criterion is an historical limit which excludes peaks of less than two hours. The 83° F wet bulb temperature is used to establish the cooling tower basin water temperature surveillance requirements.

· CP FSAR 9.2.5.2.1, "General Description," states that the cooling towers are designed for the following conditions: water flow of 12,000 gpm, hot (inlet) water temperature of 128° F, cold (outlet) water temperature of 95° F, ambient wet bulb temperature of 80° F, and DBA design heat load of $196.00 \times 10^6$ Btu/hr.

· CP FSAR 9.2.5.3, "Safety Evaluation," states that during normal power operation, the UHS basin water temperature is expected to be below 93° F under the worst-case ambient condition (i.e. wet bulb temperature of 83° F based on the 0% annual exceedance value). At the initiation of the LOOP event, each basin contains approximately 3.12 million gallons of water (minimum required is 2.80 million gallons per Technical Specification 3.7.9). The heat load peaks (196 million Btu/hr/train) four hours into the accident and then decreases continuously. The heat load is approximately 81 million Btu/hr/train at 24 hours into the accident. Cooling tower water discharge at 95° F and at a flow rate of 12,000 gpm mixing with the large quantity of basin water increases the basin water temperature (initially below 93° F). The basin water temperature increases until an equilibrium is reached. However, since the cooling tower is designed for 95° F discharge water at a peak heat load of 196 million Btu/hr, the basin water temperature will not exceed 95° F. LOCA peak heat loads are less than the safe shutdown peak heat loads. Thus, the safe shutdown analysis bounds the LOCA case.

· CP FSAR Table 9.2.5-3R, "Ultimate Heat Sink Design Data," states that the design wet bulb temperature is 80° F.

Since the ambient WB temperature greatly influences the heat removal capacity and efficiency of the MDCT and may simultaneously affects all four trains of the UHS, which is used to protect fission product barriers:

a. Describe in the COLA FSAR the condition of the UHS that would exist if the ambient WB temperature exceeds the UHS design basis 80° F and 0% exceedance (historic maximum 2-hour) 83° F WB temperatures.

b. Describe in the CP TS bases the UHS WB temperature margins.

c. Create a Comanche Peak (CP) TS surveillance (and associated TS Bases) for ambient WB temperature as it relates to cooling tower performance. Also,

describe in the CP TS how ambient WB is to be measured and on what frequency.

Or, provide justification for why the TS surveillance requirements for UHS water temperature and level alone provide assurance, in accordance with RG 1.27, that if the ambient WB is exceeded, the UHS is still able to perform its intended heat removal function.