

From: BURFORD, FRANCIS G [FBURFOR@entergy.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2011 2:35 PM
To: Wang, Alan
Cc: BURFORD, FRANCIS G; MILLAR, DANA; BROADBENT, GREGORY E; ANDERSON, KENNETH
Subject: FW: peer check, please

The information below provides a summary of the evaluation we had mentioned in our conversation with SCVB (Ahsan). If he has any questions, please let us know.

Thanks
Jerry

From: BROADBENT, GREGORY E
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2011 10:50 AM
To: BURFORD, FRANCIS G
Cc: ANDERSON, KENNETH; THORNTON, THOMAS W
Subject: RE: peer check, please

Thanks Kenny.

Jerry, below is what we suggest you transmit to the NRC regarding Pa.
- Greg

An evaluation was performed to confirm that leakage test results based on the former Pa would still be expected to satisfy the appropriate acceptance criteria when tested at the new higher Pa. Basically, the leakage was scaled by a factor of 1.134 based on the relationship of the leakage rate to the square root of the pressure. A review of the testing results at GGNS demonstrates that substantial margin exists between the extrapolated results and the relevant acceptance criteria. All the increased leakage rates were found to comply with the current Tech Spec requirements that include margin to La. Thus, adequate margin is still available for the higher test pressure. A summary of key results from that presentation is presented below.

Test	Units	Measured @ 11.5 psig	Predicted @14.8 psig	Limit	Basis for Limit
Type A	wt%/day	0.210	0.238	0.5115	0.75La per Tech Spec SR 3.6.1.1.1
Type B+C	wt%/day	0.160	0.182	0.4092	0.6La per Tech Spec SR 3.6.1.1.1
Type A+B+C	wt%/day	0.370	0.420	0.682	La per Tech Spec SR 3.6.1.1.1
MSIV (Worst-Case MSL)	scfh	76.7	87.0	100	Tech Spec SR 3.6.1.3.8
MSIVs (All MSLs)	scfh	166.3	188.6	250	Tech Spec SR 3.6.1.3.8