

## NRR-PMDAPEm Resource

---

**From:** Wyman, Stephen  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 23, 2015 6:55 PM  
**To:** Philip.Ballard@duke-energy.com; Bill.Murray@duke-energy.com; Lee.Grzeck@duke-energy.com  
**Cc:** Paul.Guill@duke-energy.com; Devlin-Gill, Stephanie; DiFrancesco, Nicholas  
**Subject:** Brunswick ESEP Clarification Question

Mr. Grzeck,

In follow-up to my phone conversation with Paul Guill today, as part of the NRC review of the Brunswick ESEP report, the staff would appreciate clarification on the following technical item:

The following clarification questions are raised in the context of the NRC evaluation of the ESEP submittals only and licensees' responses will be reviewed by NRC staff only to the extent the use of this information affects the elements and outcomes of the ESEP evaluation. As many licensees have used information from their ongoing SPRA analyses, the current review will not evaluate methods or results as they pertain to the SPRA. They will be reviewed later at the time of SPRA review.

1. Section 5.2 of the ESEP report states: "The ISRS for the ESEP were developed by linearly scaling the existing BSEP ISRS by the ESEP specified maximum ratio of two times the SSE. For the Containment, the A-46 response spectra were used in place of the design basis SSE spectra. For Control Building and Diesel Generator Buildings, the original design basis SSE spectra are used." Since the licensee defined the ESEP RLGM as two times the SSE in Section 5.1 of the ESEP report, the ESEP ISRS should be established as two times the SSE-based ISRS. The licensee should explain why the A-46 spectra, instead of the SSE, are used in developing the ESEP ISRS for the Containment. Also, since the A-46 spectrum comparison to the RLGM at the same control point location was not presented, please provide this information.
2. The results of the screened-out ESEL items for Units 1 and 2 are presented in Attachment B of the ESEP report. However, for two of the items that were screened out (ESEL items 130 and 133 corresponding to DC power supply for EGM control for Units 1 and 2, respectively) no entry was identified in the "HCLPF Capacity" column of the table. Therefore, please provide the HCLPF capacity for these components.
3. Section 7 of the ESEP report identifies ESEL items inaccessible for walkdowns. The licensee provided various ways of dispositioning these items and referred to maintenance and testing schedules, installation drawings, photographic evidence and other ways to account for these items. In order for the staff to assess the current condition or state of the inaccessible items, please address the following:
  - a. If photographic evidence was used as part of the SRT review to safely disposition the inaccessible items, as stated in various instances in Section 7 (i.e. MCC, distribution panels, torus temperature elements, switchgear transformers, etc) please provide dates or range of dates said pictures were taken.
  - b. Motor Control Centers and Distribution Panels, :
    - i. Provide date or range of dates the items were externally inspected
    - ii. Identify other documentation and calculations, as stated in subsection 7.1.2, used in the SRT review
  - c. Switchgear Transformers:
    - i. Identify and provide dates of previous walkdowns, inspections and engineering packages, stated in subsection 7.1.4, used in the SRT review.

An email response will likely be sufficient to support the ESEP report review, however, please be aware that your email response will be made publicly available in ADAMS. A response around July 14, if practicable, would be greatly appreciated to support the planned review schedule.

Please let me or Nick DiFrancesco (at 301-415-1115) know if you would like to schedule a clarification call or have any questions and concerns.

Thanks,  
Steve

**Stephen M. Wyman**  
*USNRC/NRR/JLD/HMB*  
Office: O-13G9 MS: O-13C5  
301-415-3041 (Voice)  
301-415-8333 (Fax)  
[Stephen.Wyman@nrc.gov](mailto:Stephen.Wyman@nrc.gov)

**Hearing Identifier:** NRR\_PMDA  
**Email Number:** 2289

**Mail Envelope Properties** (6389e94bf84c41a39160dd632e2b3754)

**Subject:** Brunswick ESEP Clarification Question  
**Sent Date:** 6/23/2015 6:54:48 PM  
**Received Date:** 6/23/2015 6:54:49 PM  
**From:** Wyman, Stephen

**Created By:** Stephen.Wyman@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**

"Paul.Guill@duke-energy.com" <Paul.Guill@duke-energy.com>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Devlin-Gill, Stephanie" <Stephanie.Devlin-Gill@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"DiFrancesco, Nicholas" <Nicholas.DiFrancesco@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Philip.Ballard@duke-energy.com" <Philip.Ballard@duke-energy.com>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Bill.Murray@duke-energy.com" <Bill.Murray@duke-energy.com>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Lee.Grzeck@duke-energy.com" <Lee.Grzeck@duke-energy.com>  
Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:** HQPWMSMRS02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3937	6/23/2015 6:54:49 PM

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