

## PMLevyCOLPEm Resource

---

**From:** Habib, Donald  
**Sent:** Monday, May 11, 2015 1:13 PM  
**To:** Kitchen, Robert (Robert.Kitchen@duke-energy.com)  
**Subject:** Revised Question List for September 23 AP1000 Subcommittee Meeting

Bob –

Below is the [revised list](#) from ACRS.

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

The following refers to the document entitled, “ACRS Interaction for Levy/Condensate Return – List of Topics/Questions for Pending Meeting” As we discussed at the informal meeting on May 8, I have noted each “Topic/Question”, as to whether it should be addressed in the half-day meeting scheduled for the afternoon of September 23.

### Testing and Analysis Section

The following Topic/Question is presumably no longer relevant, given the revised analyses which have recently been submitted by WEC to staff for review:

1. Why do different models of system performance provide different results?

The following Topic/Questions are expected to be part of the September 23 presentation concerning the modified analyses and the resulting modifications:

2. How do we know that the model(s) used for heat transfer for uncovered tubes is accurate?
4. Additional plots/analyses
  - 4.a. Temperature vs. time for various condensate return rates
  - 4.b. Containment response vs. time
  - 4.c. System performance before design change
5. Using Chapter 15 design-basis analysis assumptions, will operation of the passive RHR system establish reactor coolant system temperature and pressure conditions that allow transition to long-term residual heat removal cooling at 72 hours using the RTNSS systems?

The following Topic/Questions are intended to establish the consequence of not having identified the need for modifications. As such, they need to be addressed separate from other information being presented.

- 3.a. Does the certified design, before modifications, achieve 420F and maintain stable cooling for 72 hours using Chapter 15 assumptions?
- 3.b. What if there is no change?

### Process and Quality Assurance Section

The following Topic/Question should be addressed briefly as part of the September 23 presentation:

1. Why WEC is doing the design change?

The following Topic/Questions are not essential to the September 23 presentation and should be deferred in the interest of time, or because they have become part of the ongoing vendor inspection process:

- 2.a.How did WEC handle discovery of the erroneous assumption...
- 2.b.What are the lessons-learned from the discovery...
- 3.What is the basis for determining the error to not be a Part 21 substantial safety hazard?
- 4.What oversight does Duke provide over the AP1000 vendor, WEC?
- 5.What oversight has the staff had over WEC and Duke Appendix B programs...
- 6.What is the root cause, extent of condition, and lessons learned for not addressing this issue earlier?
- 7.What is the DCD update process?

#### Policy Section

The three questions in this section need to be addressed by staff, if time permits, because the answers are relevant to the significance the ACRS must assign to its review.

- 1.a.What is the meaning of “safety design basis”?
- 1.b.How does the meaning related to the design change?
- 2.How is GDC 34 applied for this review?

The following refers to the document entitled “Follow-Up Items”

- 1.Duke’s role in oversight of WEC? Do not include in September 23 meeting scope.
- 2.Explain use of different passive RHR models resulting in different outcomes. This question should no longer be relevant and should not be included in the September 23 scope.
- 3.Explain the DCD update process and oversight of WEC. Do not include in September 23 meeting scope.
- 4.a.Clarify the different phrases “Design Basis”, “Licensing Basis” and “Safety Design Basis”. Include in September 23 presentation, as discussed above.
- 4.b.Is getting down to 420F in 36 hours part of the safety requirements? Include in September 23 presentation, as discussed above.

**Hearing Identifier:** Levy\_County\_COL\_Public  
**Email Number:** 1273

**Mail Envelope Properties** (E3D0DF334F617344BE38EB00C881B1B302232C5300FC)

**Subject:** Revised Question List for September 23 AP1000 Subcommittee Meeting  
**Sent Date:** 5/11/2015 1:12:31 PM  
**Received Date:** 5/11/2015 1:12:32 PM  
**From:** Habib, Donald

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

**Recipients:**  
"Kitchen, Robert (Robert.Kitchen@duke-energy.com)" <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	3900	5/11/2015 1:12:32 PM

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