

**RUSSELL J. BELL**  
Senior Director, New Plant Licensing

1201 F Street, NW, Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20004  
P: 202.739.8087  
rjb@nei.org  
nei.org



NUCLEAR ENERGY INSTITUTE

7/10/2013  
78 FR 41436  
①

RECEIVED

2013 AUG -9 PM 12: 24

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

August 9, 2013

Ms. Cindy K. Bladey  
Chief, Rules, Announcements, and Directives Branch (RADB)  
Office of Administration  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555-0001

**Subject:** NEI Comments on Proposed New SRP 19.3, *Regulatory Treatment of Non-Safety Systems (RTNSS) for Passive Advanced Light Water Reactors*, 78 Fed. Reg. 41436; Docket ID NRC-2013-0150

**Project Number: 689**

Dear Ms. Bladey:

On behalf of the nuclear energy industry, the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI)<sup>1</sup> appreciates the opportunity to again provide comments on the subject proposed new section to NUREG-0800, "Standard Review Plan for the Review of Safety Analysis Reports for Nuclear Power Plants: LWR Edition," (SRP) as requested in the subject Federal Register re-noticing.

Per the re-noticing, the NRC seeks public comment on a narrow area of focus related to a revised position on the treatment of the high winds external hazard for certain RTNSS structures, systems, and components (SSCs). According to the FRN, this SRP section reflects the staff's disposition of public comments on the guidance previously provided in Section 19.3, Draft Revision 0, dated October 2012 of NUREG-0800 (ADAMS Accession No. ML12128A405), however a description of each comment and how it has been addressed by the NRC staff was not provided. As such, and because review of the proposed revisions necessitated their consideration within the broader context of SRP 19.3, the attachment reflects comments related to the specific revisions proposed, as well as other recommendations to improve the clarity of this staff review guidance.

In general, we note that the proposed draft does not provide "extensive guidance regarding the RTNSS evaluation of nonsafety-related SSCs and criteria for whether such SSCs meet Criterion 4 of 10 CFR 50.36,

<sup>1</sup> The Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) is the organization responsible for establishing unified industry policy on matters affecting the nuclear energy industry, including the regulatory aspects of generic operational and technical issues. NEI's members include all entities licensed to operate commercial nuclear power plants in the United States, nuclear plant designers, major architect/engineering firms, fuel cycle facilities, nuclear materials licensees, and other organizations and entities involved in the nuclear energy industry.

Ms. Cindy Bladey  
August 9, 2013  
Page 2

paragraph 50.36(c)(2)(ii)(D)," as indicated in the Design-Specific Review Standard for mPower iPWR Design, Section 16.0, "Technical Specifications," which has also been published for comment (78 Fed. Reg. 28258). As noted in the attached comments, we recommend coordinating the finalization of these two related documents such that a gap in guidance is not created.

Additionally, we note that in the area of RTNSS "B" SSC seismic design, the NRC staff did not accept the industry's previous comment, but did take an alternate approach. However, despite the new approach, SRP 19.3 continues to be inconsistent with our understanding of the definition of RTNSS "B" SSCs on Page 19.3-3 and the staff's stated intent in both SECY-94-084 and SECY-95-132.

We believe that incorporation of the comments provided in the attachment to this letter will improve the SRP and will effectively achieve the NRC's stated objectives.

We appreciate the NRC staff's consideration of these comments. If you have any questions concerning this letter or the attached comments, please contact me or Kati Austgen (202.739.8068; kra@nei.org).

Sincerely,



Russell J. Bell

Attachment

c: Mr. Joseph Colaccino, NRO/DARR/APOB, NRC  
Mr. Jonathan DeGange, NRO/DARR/APOB, NRC  
Mr. Mark Caruso, NRO/DSRA/SPRA, NRC  
NRC Document Control Desk

**Industry Comments on proposed new SRP 19.3, *Regulatory Treatment of Non-Safety Systems (RTNSS) for Passive Advanced Light Water Reactors (Re-Notice) – August 9, 2013***

Affected Section	Comment/Basis	Recommendation
1. General/Various	<p>Design-Specific Review Standard for mPower iPWR Design (B&amp;W mPower DSRS) 16.0, "Technical Specifications," (Proposed – For Interim Use and Comment), includes numerous references to RTNSS, including the following concerning TSs for RTNSS systems, structures, and components (SSCs):</p> <p>Section II. Acceptance Criteria, Technical Rationale, Last Paragraph [Page 16.0-11]: "SRP Section 19.3 (Reference 16) provides <u>extensive guidance</u> regarding the RTNSS evaluation of nonsafety-related SSCs and criteria for whether such SSCs meet Criterion 4 of 10 CFR 50.36, paragraph 50.36(c)(2)(ii)(D)." [Emphasis Added]</p> <p>Contrary to the above statement, it is considered that Draft SRP 19.3 does not provide "extensive guidance" relative to the evaluation of RTNSS SSCs for the potential inclusion in TS pursuant 10 CFR 50.36.</p>	<p>Revise Draft SRP 19.3 to include additional guidance relative to the interface between the results of the RTNSS evaluation and the review of the TSs; and/or</p> <p>Delete the term "extensive" from the B&amp;W mPower DSRS 16.0, Section II. Acceptance Criteria, Technical Rationale, Last Paragraph [Page 16.0-11].</p>
2. Section I. Areas of Review, Criterion B, Page 19.3-3	The text of criterion B should be simplified/clarified.	<p>Recommend revising for clarity as follows:</p> <p>"B. SSC functions relied on to ensure long-term safety (the period beginning 72 hours after a design basis <u>or seismic</u> event and lasting the following 4 days) <del>and to address seismic events.</del>"</p>

Affected Section	Comment/Basis	Recommendation
3. Section I. Areas of Review, Criterion C, Page 19.3-3	The text of criterion C should be clarified.	<p>Recommend replacing "and" with "or" for clarity, as follows:</p> <p>"C. SSC functions relied on under power-operating and shutdown conditions to meet the Commission goals of a core damage frequency (CDF) of less than <math>1 \times 10^{-4}</math> each reactor year <u>or</u> <del>and</del> a large release frequency (LRF) of less than <math>1 \times 10^{-6}</math> each reactor year."</p>
4. Section I. Areas of Review, Page 19.3-5, third paragraph.	This paragraph introduces the term "Availability Controls Manual (ACM)." The industry is familiar with a Technical Requirements Manual (TRM) which is formatted similar to Technical Specifications. Specifically, for example, at Vogtle 3 and 4, the Availability Controls for RTNSS equipment have been relocated to a TRM. The SRP should consider adding TRM in addition to ACM, or replacing ACM with TRM.	<p>Recommend revising for clarity to acknowledge that an Availability Controls Manual (ACM) may be created similar to a Technical Requirements Manual (TRM) and that applicants may choose to include availability controls within a single TRM rather than create a separate ACM.</p> <p>See also, comment #8.</p>
5. Section II. Acceptance Criteria, Area of Review-Augmented Design Standards, Item 2, Page 19.3-7	Onsite mobile equipment may or may not be required in the post 72-hour period. Suggest clarification to reflect this possibility.	<p>Revise item 2 to clarify as follows:</p> <p>"The staff will verify that the applicant has met the following acceptance criterion: RTNSS "B" SSCs and supporting equipment will be readily available for connection. <del>Use of onsite</del> <u>If</u> equipment and supplies, including mobile equipment, <del>is</del> <u>are</u> required in the 4 day post 72-hour period, <u>they must be located onsite</u>. Offsite equipment and supplies may be relied upon after the seventh day following an accident."</p>

Affected Section	Comment/Basis	Recommendation
6. Section II. Acceptance Criteria, Area of Review- Augmented Design Standards, Item 2, Page 19.3-7	<p>Item 2 states that RTNSS "B" SSCs and supporting equipment will be "readily available" for connection.</p> <p>"Readily available" is subject to large interpretations, from a simple operator action, to calling out maintenance personnel to hook up the equipment. It is recommend that a more specific expectation be provided, such as actions that an operating crew (simple operator actions) could take <u>without</u> other support personnel from a warehouse (e.g., craft/technician) to obtain and connect the equipment. "Readily available" should consider alignment or hook-up time. If it is a complicated alignment, one would need to start early such that the equipment is ready to use at 72 hours. Resources may not be available during the first three days following a major event.</p>	Revise to clarify that "readily available" means expected to be available after 72 hours.
7. Section II. Acceptance Criteria, Area of Review- Augmented Design Standards, Item 4, Page 19.3-8	Application of RGs 1.76 and 1.221 to choose design basis wind speeds for RTNSS SSCs, per item 4, could lead to these systems being treated as safety-related via GDC 2, which is referenced in these RGs. The October 2012 draft version of SRP 19.3 specified Category 5 hurricane wind speeds, which is a lower wind speed threshold than if one were to choose design basis wind speeds via the aforementioned RGs and GDC 2.	Clarify the implications of applying RGs 1.76 and 1.221 for choosing wind speeds and the application of GDC 2 for RTNSS SSCs.
8. Section II. Acceptance Criteria, Area of Review – Regulatory Treatment of SSCs in the RTNSS Program, Item 3, Page 19.3-8	Consider changing "ACM" to "TRM" per response to comment #4.	Revise as needed per response to comment #4.