

PMLevyCOLPEm Resource

From: Habib, Donald
Sent: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 3:19 PM
To: PMLevyCOLPEm Resource
Subject: FW: Duke Energy Comments on Levy FSER Chapter 21 - Condensate Return
Attachments: Ch 21.1 Engineering Prop & Technical Review checklist_RCG.docx

From: Waters, David B [mailto:David.Waters2@duke-energy.com]
Sent: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:53 PM
To: Habib, Donald <Donald.Habib@nrc.gov>
Cc: Kitchen, Robert H <Robert.Kitchen@duke-energy.com>; Waters, David B <David.Waters2@duke-energy.com>
Subject: [External_Sender] Duke Energy Comments on Levy FSER Chapter 21 - Condensate Return

Don

As discussed, Duke has the attached comments, mainly editorial, on the subject Levy FSER Chapter. We are forwarding to you as requested so that the NRC can make a determination of the need to revise the indicated portions of the FSER.

Dave Waters – Duke Energy

Hearing Identifier: Levy_County_COL_Public
Email Number: 1331

Mail Envelope Properties (e8d288dd96ce46deb2af5f7f52134771)

Subject: FW: Duke Energy Comments on Levy FSER Chapter 21 - Condensate Return
Sent Date: 5/24/2016 3:19:24 PM
Received Date: 5/24/2016 3:19:25 PM
From: Habib, Donald

Created By: Donald.Habib@nrc.gov

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

Post Office: HQPWMSMRS04.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time	
MESSAGE	639	5/24/2016 3:19:25 PM	
Ch 21.1 Engineering Prop & Technical Review checklist_RCG.docx			26237

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

Checklist for FSER Chapter 21.1

FSER REVIEW FORM

FSER Chapter 21.1

The following review comments are included below:

☒ Technical Review

☐ Licensing Review

☐ Other Review _____

RC Gamberg _____ / _____ 5/23/2016

Lead Reviewer Approval (print name & signature)

Date

Item No.	Comment	Resolution
1	Editorial, Page 21-5, Last paragraph, 2nd sentence, Consider revising to read: "The plant-specific Tier 1 DCD and TS will continue to reflect the approved licensing basis for the applicant and will maintain a level of detail consistent with that which is currently provided elsewhere in Tier 1 of the plant-specific DCD."	
2	Editorial (grammar), Page 21-6, Last sentence of A.3.4 Consider revising to either read: "Therefore, the staff finds that special circumstances required by 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii) for the granting of an exemption from the Tier 1 information and generic TS described above." or "Therefore, the staff finds that special circumstances required by 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii) for the granting of an exemption from the Tier 1 information and generic TS described above exist ."	
3	Editorial, Page 21-7, first full paragraph on page, 1st sentence Consider revising to read: "As described below in the technical evaluation, the changes to the condensate return system (1) ensure the capability of the	

Checklist for FSER Chapter 21.1

FSER Chapter 21.1

The following review comments are included below:

☒ Technical Review

☐ Licensing Review

☐ Other Review _____

RC Gamberg _____ / 5/23/2016

Lead Reviewer Approval (print name & signature)

Date

Item No.	Comment	Resolution
	PRHR HX to maintain the RCS in a safe, stable condition, as described in DCD Chapter 19E, "Shutdown Temperature Evaluation, and (2) to demonstrate the existing non-loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA) analyses in Chapter 15 that credit the PRHR HX remain valid."	
4	Editorial, Page 21-7, Section A.3.6, 2nd sentence, Consider revising to read: "As described below in the technical evaluation, the changes to the condensate return system (1) ensure the capability of the PRHR HX to maintain the RCS in a safe, stable condition, as described in DCD Chapter 19E, "Shutdown Temperature Evaluation," and (2) to demonstrate the existing non-LOCA analyses in Chapter 15 that credit the PRHR HX remain valid.	
5	Editorial, page 21-8, 1st paragraph of B.1, last sentence do we still have outstanding information to be provided in a future revision to the COLA??	
6	Page 21-28, Section B.4, second paragraph, 1st sentence I don't believe that Levy has a "site-specific PRA", so it is misleading to characterize any updates to account for this design change and departure as "results". The insights are	

Checklist for FSER Chapter 21.1

FSER Chapter 21.1

The following review comments are included below:

☒ Technical Review

☐ Licensing Review

☐ Other Review _____

RC Gamberg _____ / _____ 5/23/2016

Lead Reviewer Approval (print name & signature)

Date

Item No.	Comment	Resolution
	generic plant insights, but are "plant specific" since Levy is the first applicant/licensee to "make" this change. Consider revising to read: "The plant-specific PRA results and insights have been updated to account for this design change and departure."	
	End of comments.	