

NRR-PMDAPEm Resource

From: Wyman, Stephen
Sent: Thursday, April 14, 2016 2:20 PM
To: Williams, Lisa L.
Cc: Candelario, Luisette
Subject: Columbia Generating Station ESEP Clarification Questions

Tracking:	Recipient	Delivery
	Williams, Lisa L.	
	Candelario, Luisette	Delivered: 4/14/2016 2:20 PM

Ms. Williams,

In follow-up to our phone call today, as part of the NRC review of the Columbia ESEP report, the staff would appreciate clarification on the following technical items:

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. Although the licensee did not outline a Phase 3 core cooling strategy in their ESEP submittal, the Columbia OIP, dated February 28, 2013 states the license plans to establish shutdown cooling by using NSRC equipment to repower Residual Heat Removal (RHR) and provide Service Water (SW) flow. Many Phase 3 components appear to be missing from the ESEL, including RHR pumps and valves, SW valves, and any electrical components necessary to connect the NSRC generator. Please add the components and support equipment necessary to meet the Phase 3 core cooling strategy to the ESEL and provide results per the ESEP guidance (e.g., HCLPF analysis results), or provide a justification for why they are not included on the ESEL (e.g., if the licensee can continue Phase 2 strategies indefinitely using NSRC equipment).
2. The licensee credits automatic realignment of RCIC suction from CST to SP; however, the CST and CST flowpath to RCIC are not credited or seismically robust. In the event that the CST remains intact, but the CST flowpath fails closed (or restricted), the automatic realignment on low CST level may not occur. Please clarify the plant's response in the event that the automatic realignment does not occur.

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 May 5th, if practicable, would be greatly appreciated to support the planned review schedule.

Please let me know if you have any questions or 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

Hearing Identifier: NRR_PMDA
Email Number: 2779

Mail Envelope Properties (Stephen.Wyman@nrc.gov20160414141900)

Subject: Columbia Generating Station ESEP Clarification Questions
Sent Date: 4/14/2016 2:19:57 PM
Received Date: 4/14/2016 2:19:00 PM
From: Wyman, Stephen

Created By: Stephen.Wyman@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"Candelario, Luisette" <Luisette.Candelario@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status:: Response: Delivered : 4/14/2016 2:20:00 PM
"Williams, Lisa L." <llwilliams@energy-northwest.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office:

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2451	4/14/2016 2:19:00 PM

Options

Priority: Standard
Return Notification: Yes
Reply Requested: Yes
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received: