

## PMLevyCOLPEm Resource

---

**From:** Habib, Donald  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 27, 2015 7:51 AM  
**To:** Kitchen, Robert  
**Subject:** RE: Levy/Lee Public Meeting

Bob –

For item #2, below, following is additional clarification of what the staff's concern:

AP1000 Design Control Document Page 6.3-22 contains this description:

During a LOCA, steam vented from the reactor coolant system condenses on the containment shell and drains down the shell to the polar crane girder or internal stiffener where it is drained via downspouts to the IRWST. Steam that condenses below the internal stiffener drains down the shell and is collected in a gutter near the operating deck elevation. It is very unlikely that debris generated by a LOCA can reach the downspouts or the gutter because of their locations. Each downspout inlet is covered with a coarse screen that prevents larger debris from entering the downspout. The gutter is covered with a trash rack which prevents larger debris from clogging the gutter or entering the IRWST through the two 4-inch drain pipes. The inorganic zinc coating applied to the inside surface of the containment shell is safety - Service Level I, and will stay in place and will not detach.

Please clarify what sources of debris were considered relevant to (a) the PGC, (b) the internal stiffener, and (c) the gutter? While the downspout *piping* was sized to accommodate blockage of one of the screens, it's less obvious why blockage of one screen would not increase the likelihood of blockage of other screens at the same level. This would increase the importance of common-cause blockage of the downspout screens if there were a credible source of debris.

Don Habib  
Levy COL Review, Lead Project Manager  
NRO/DNRL, Licensing Branch 4  
301-415-1035

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

**From:** Kitchen, Robert [mailto:Robert.Kitchen@duke-energy.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 26, 2015 4:24 PM  
**To:** Kitchen, Robert; Habib, Donald; Steve Franzone (Steve.Franzone@FPL.com); Waters, David; Thornton, James R; Cross-Dial, Andrea; Hughes, Brian; Jennifer Meneely (meneelje@westinghouse.com)  
**Subject:** Levy/Lee Public Meeting  
**When:** Wednesday, May 27, 2015 2:00 PM-3:00 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).  
**Where:** 888-396-1392 (passcode: 63876)

Call will be to provide feedback to NRC audit question on condensate return.

1. Why doesn't Levy May 5, 2015 submittal correct use of term "indefinitely" shown in DCD pages 6.3-2 and 6.3-7?
2. What is justification for no common cause failure due to screen plugging?

Also, NRC would like any feedback re audit question re possible error in figures that was discussed on audit call Friday, 5/22.

**Hearing Identifier:** Levy\_County\_COL\_Public  
**Email Number:** 1279

**Mail Envelope Properties** (E3D0DF334F617344BE38EB00C881B1B30224AC3D9A4F)

**Subject:** RE: Levy/Lee Public Meeting  
**Sent Date:** 5/27/2015 7:50:37 AM  
**Received Date:** 5/27/2015 7:50:39 AM  
**From:** Habib, Donald

**Created By:** Donald.Habib@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**  
"Kitchen, Robert" <Robert.Kitchen@duke-energy.com>  
Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:** HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	2522	5/27/2015 7:50:39 AM

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