

PMLevyCOLPEm Resource

From: Habib, Donald
Sent: Thursday, May 26, 2016 3:50 PM
To: PMLevyCOLPEm Resource
Subject: FW: Duke Energy Review Comment on Levy FSER Chapter 21, MCR Heat-up

From: Waters, David B [mailto:David.Waters2@duke-energy.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 4:57 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 Review Comment on Levy FSER Chapter 21, MCR Heat-up

Don

The following comment was received from Westinghouse, who we asked to review Chapter 21 of the FSER in addition to our Duke reviewers. The following comment was provided earlier today to Duke:

- P 21-68, First paragraph, suggest revising this paragraph to discuss the margin with respect to human factors. As the statement stands right now, it compares the 101F used in the WBGT temperature calculation with the 110F in Figure 3D-201. Propose revising the discussion to state something like,

“Finally, the applicant revised FSAR Figure 3D-201 to reflect the post-72-hour limits for equipment qualification to 110 °F (43.3 °C) with 35 percent RH at this temperature. This change results in different acceptance criteria for equipment qualification and human performance after 72 hours. ~~Substantial margin (more than 9 °F, or 6 °C) exists between the analysis and FSAR Figure 3D-201, so no effect to the equipment qualification limits is expected.~~ In addition, staff audited an analysis performed by the applicant demonstrating that even in conditions where 101 °F (38.3 °C) outside air was input to the control room for the entirety of the period between 72 hours and 7 days, the limits in FSAR Figure 3D-201 were not exceeded. ~~There is margin in the evaluation because the air is entering the main control room at 101F dry bulb and the dry bulb temperature limit is 103F with a corresponding WBGT Temperature Index of 90F, therefore the equipment qualification and the human factors qualification limits are met by Figure 3D-201.~~”

This comment is provided for the NRC’s consideration and determination if a change to the FSER should be performed.

Dave Waters
Duke Energy Nuclear Development - Licensing NCRH 1459F, 411 Fayetteville Street (PO Box 1551)
Raleigh, NC 27601
919-546-7171
David.Waters2@duke-energy.com

Hearing Identifier: Levy_County_COL_Public
Email Number: 1338

Mail Envelope Properties (4f6e32e26a584f389d073b252ef4c2a7)

Subject: FW: Duke Energy Review Comment on Levy FSER Chapter 21, MCR Heat-up
Sent Date: 5/26/2016 3:50:06 PM
Received Date: 5/26/2016 3:50:10 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	2283	5/26/2016 3:50:10 PM

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