

PMTurkeyCOLPEm Resource

From: Comar, Manny
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2012 10:16 AM
To: TurkeyCOL Resource
Subject: FW: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION LTR. No: 47 RELATED TO SRP 02.04.06 PROBABLE MAXIMUM TSUNAMI FLOODING FOR THE TURKEY POINT UNITS 6 AND 7 COL APPLICATION
Attachments: Turkey Point RAI LTR 047.pdf

From: Hughes, Brian
Sent: Thursday, December 22, 2011 7:49 AM
To: Steve.Franzone@fpl.com
Cc: Comar, Manny
Subject: FW: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION LTR. No: 47 RELATED TO SRP 02.04.06 PROBABLE MAXIMUM TSUNAMI FLOODING FOR THE TURKEY POINT UNITS 6 AND 7 COL APPLICATION

Steve,
Per Manny Comar's request attached find RAI Letter number 047.

Respectfully,

Brian Hughes
Senior Project Manager
NRO/DNRL/NWE1
US NRC
301-415-6582

From: Comar, Manny
Sent: Wednesday, December 21, 2011 3:34 PM
To: Hughes, Brian
Subject: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION LTR. No: 47 RELATED TO SRP 02.04.06 PROBABLE MAXIMUM TSUNAMI FLOODING FOR THE TURKEY POINT UNITS 6 AND 7 COL APPLICATION

Attached is the RAI letter No. 47 related to SRP Section 02.04.06 Probable maximum Tsunami Flooding for the Turkey Point Units 6 and 7 Combined License Application.

The Accession number is [ML11355A169](#)

If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me. Thanks

Manny Comar
Senior Project Manager
NRO/DNRL/NWE1
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
301-415-3863
<mailto:manny.comar@nrc.gov>

Hearing Identifier: TurkeyPoint_COL_Public
Email Number: 518

Mail Envelope Properties (377CB97DD54F0F4FAAC7E9FD88BCA6D0806FBBDC04)

Subject: FW: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION LTR. No: 47 RELATED TO
SRP 02.04.06 PROBABLE MAXIMUM TSUNAMI FLOODING FOR THE TURKEY POINT UNITS 6
AND 7 COL APPLICATION

Sent Date: 1/4/2012 10:15:35 AM

Received Date: 1/4/2012 10:15:41 AM

From: Comar, Manny

Created By: Manny.Comar@nrc.gov

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

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1230	1/4/2012 10:15:41 AM
Turkey Point RAI LTR 047.pdf	103662	

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

TurkeyPointRAIsPEm Resource

From: Comar, Manny
Sent: Wednesday, December 21, 2011 9:23 AM
To: TurkeyPointRAIsPEm Resource
Subject: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION LTR. No: 47 RELATED TO SRP 02.04.06
PROBABLE MAXIMUM TSUNAMI FLOODING FOR THE TURKEY POINT UNITS 6 AND 7
COL APPLICATION
Attachments: PTN-RAI-LTR-047.doc

Hearing Identifier: TurkeyPoint_COL_eRAIs
Email Number: 54

Mail Envelope Properties (377CB97DD54F0F4FAAC7E9FD88BCA6D0806FB41956)

Subject: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION LTR. No: 47 RELATED TO SRP
02.04.06 PROBABLE MAXIMUM TSUNAMI FLOODING FOR THE TURKEY POINT UNITS 6 AND 7
COL APPLICATION

Sent Date: 12/21/2011 9:22:39 AM

Received Date: 12/21/2011 9:22:40 AM

From: Comar, Manny

Created By: Manny.Comar@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"TurkeyPointRAIsPEm Resource" <TurkeyPointRAIsPEm.Resource@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	8	12/21/2011 9:22:40 AM
PTN-RAI-LTR-047.doc	57850	

Options

Priority: Standard

Return Notification: No

Reply Requested: No

Sensitivity: Normal

Expiration Date:

Recipients Received:

December 21, 2011

Mano K. Nazar
Senior Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer
Florida Power & Light Company
Mail Stop NNP/JB
700 Universe Blvd
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION LETTER NO. 047 RELATED
TO SRP SECTION 02.04.06 PROBABLE MAXIMUM TSUNAMI FLOODING
FOR THE TURKEY POINT NUCLEAR PLANT UNITS 6 AND 7 COMBINED
LICENSE APPLICATION

Dear Mr. Nazar:

By letter dated June 30, 2009, as supplemented by letters dated August 7, 2009, September 3, 2010 and December 21, 2010, Florida Power and Light submitted its application to the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) for a combined license (COL) for two AP1000 advanced passive pressurized water reactors pursuant to 10 CFR Part 52. The NRC staff is performing a detailed review of this application to enable the staff to reach a conclusion on the safety of the proposed application.

The NRC staff has identified that additional information is needed to continue portions of the review. The staff's request for additional information (RAI) is contained in the enclosure to this letter.

To support the review schedule, you are requested to respond within 30 days of the date of this letter. If you are unable to provide a response within 30 days, please state when you will be able to provide the response. In the event the response submitted is incomplete, please indicate in the response when the complete response will be provided. If changes are needed to the final safety analysis report, the staff requests that the RAI response include the proposed wording changes. Your response should also indicate whether any of the information provided is to be withheld as exempt from public disclosure pursuant to 10 CFR 2.390.

If you have any questions or comments concerning this matter, you may contact me at 301-415-3863 or manny.comar@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Manny Comar, Lead Project Manager
AP1000 Projects Branch 1
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors

Docket Nos. 52-040
52-041

Enclosure:
Request for Additional Information

CC: see next page

If you have any questions or comments concerning this matter, you may contact me at 301-415-3863 or manny.comar@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Manny Comar, Lead Project Manager
AP1000 Projects Branch 1
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors

Docket Nos. 52-040
52-041
eRAI Tracking No. 6225

Enclosure:
Request for Additional Information

Distribution:

Public	BWeisman	BHughes
RidsNroDnrlNwe1	JSebosky	MComar
RidsNroLAKGoldstein	DMcGovern	TGalletta
RidsOgcMailCenter	BAnderson	RJoshi
RidsAcrcAcnwMailCenter	SPrice	HJones
RidsRgn2MailCenter	DHabib	GHatchett
AMinarik	MTonacci	

NRO-002

OFFICE	RHMB/BC	LB4/PM	LB4/L-PM
NAME	GHatchett*	MComar*	MComar*
DATE	12/2/11	12/15/11	12/21//11

*Approval captured electronically in the electronic RAI system.

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Request for Additional Information No. 6225

12/21/2011

Turkey Point Units 6 and 7

Florida P and L

Docket No. 52-040 and 52-041

SRP Section: 02.04.06 - Probable Maximum Tsunami Flooding

Application Section: Section 02.04.06

QUESTIONS from Hydrological and Meteorology Branch (RHMB)

02.04.06-7

To meet the requirements of GDC 2, 10 CFR 52.17, and 10 CFR Part 100, FPL should provide an assessment of the Probable Maximum Tsunami (PMT) for the proposed site. Section C.I.2.4.6.3 of Regulatory Guide 1.206 (RG 1.206) provides specific guidance with respect to the source characteristics needed to determine the PMT. Provide justification that triggering conditions for submarine mass failures in the Florida Straits are not currently present. If triggering and pre-conditioning factors/loading conditions such as those that caused the Miocene debris flows and likely Pleistocene-age failures at the western end of the Florida Straits (Holmes, 1985; Twichell and others, 1993) cannot be determined, explain whether potential submarine mass failures can be conservatively excluded. If such failures are considered, discuss how inclusion of this source affects PMT water levels at the site.

References

- Holmes, C.W., 1985, Accretion of the South Florida Platform, Late Quaternary development: American Association of Petroleum Geologists Bulletin, v. 69, p. 149-160.
- Twichell, D.C., Valentine, P.C., and Parson, L.M., 1993, Slope failure of carbonate sediment on the West Florida Slope, *in* Schwab, W.C., Lee, H.J., and Twichell, D.C., eds., Submarine Landslides: Selected Studies in the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone: U.S. Geological Survey Bulletin 2002, p. 69-78.

02.04.06-8

To meet the requirements of GDC 2, 10 CFR 52.17, and 10 CFR Part 100, FPL should provide an assessment of the Probable Maximum Tsunami (PMT) for the proposed site. Section C.I.2.4.6.3 of Regulatory Guide 1.206 (RG 1.206) provides specific guidance with respect to the source characteristics needed to determine the PMT. Provide justification that source parameters for the Cape Fear landslide from Hornbach et al. (2007) are conservative, with regard to not only the upper part of the landslide, but also the downslope region of failure. If the source parameters for this potential PMT source are revised, discuss how the revised source affects PMT water levels at the site.