

PMComanchePeakPEm Resource

From: Monarque, Stephen
Sent: Sunday, August 12, 2012 2:15 PM
To: ComanchePeakCOL Resource
Subject: FW: RAI 237-6166 (Comanche Peak 10.4)

Importance: High

From: Kallan, Paul
Sent: Monday, August 06, 2012 8:52 AM
To: Woodlan, Don
Cc: Monarque, Stephen; Makar, Gregory
Subject: FW: RAI 237-6166 (Comanche Peak 10.4)
Importance: High

Don,

Here is some feedback on RAI 6166. We were waiting on MHI to decide on a couple of issues. As staff is pointing out in the email, there are now some inconsistencies that we would like Comanche Peak to discuss. I would like to set up a call with MHI and staff sometime this week if possible.

Regards,

Paul

From: Makar, Gregory
Sent: Monday, August 06, 2012 7:44 AM
To: Kallan, Paul
Cc: Terao, David; Ciocco, Jeff
Subject: RE: RAI 237-6166 (Comanche Peak 10.4)

Paul,

Thank you for asking about the status of our review of the steam generator blowdown system for Comanche Peak 3&4. Last month we revised our SER input for the corresponding DCD review based on changes MHI made in Rev. 3. On Friday I looked briefly at Rev.3 of the Comanche Peak FSAR. There are some potential inconsistencies now between the DCD and COL FSAR. Here are the two examples I noted:

1. In Rev. 3 of the DCD, MHI eliminated some containment isolation signals and explained the basis in an RAI response (flash tank pressure and water level). In the site-specific portion of the system (startup SG blowdown system), the startup SG flash tank pressure and water level signals are still listed as containment isolation signals. I'm not sure why this would be different than the standard portion of the system.
2. Table 10.4.8-1R of the Comanche Peak FSAR corresponds to Table 10.4.8-1 in the DCD. MHI made substantial changes to DCD Table 10.4.8-1 in response to our RAIs. For example, they said that some of the parameters listed in the table as "design" parameters are actually "operating" parameters, but I believe that was too recent for Rev. 3 of the Comanche Peak FSAR. So the DCD table is inconsistent with the COLA table.

I think it would be worthwhile to hear Luminant's plans on these matters rather than going straight to the RAIs, if that's an option.

Thanks,
Greg

Hearing Identifier: ComanchePeak_COL_Public
Email Number: 1726

Mail Envelope Properties (9C2386A0C0BC584684916F7A0482B6CA8C5BE7A2C6)

Subject: FW: RAI 237-6166 (Comanche Peak 10.4)
Sent Date: 8/12/2012 2:14:37 PM
Received Date: 8/12/2012 2:14:37 PM
From: Monarque, Stephen

Created By: Stephen.Monarque@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"ComanchePeakCOL Resource" <ComanchePeakCOL.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2166	8/12/2012 2:14:37 PM

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