

PMLevyCOLPEm Resource

From: Habib, Donald
Sent: Thursday, May 26, 2016 3:51 PM
To: PMLevyCOLPEm Resource
Subject: FW: Duke Energy Comments on Levy FSER, Sections 2.0 through 2.4
Attachments: FSER Comment Form chapter 2_0 thru 2_4.doc

From: Waters, David B [mailto:David.Waters2@duke-energy.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 26, 2016 7:40 AM
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, Sections 2.0 through 2.4

Don

The attached review comments are being provided, for your consideration and disposition as necessary, by our review team on the subject portion of the FSER.

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: 1339

Mail Envelope Properties (26a33949cfa94d6a90a6012faa30539c)

Subject: FW: Duke Energy Comments on Levy FSER, Sections 2.0 through 2.4
Sent Date: 5/26/2016 3:50:36 PM
Received Date: 5/26/2016 3:50:37 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	755	5/26/2016 3:50:37 PM
FSER Comment Form chapter 2_0 thru 2_4.doc		78262

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

FSER REVIEW FORM

Item No.	Comment	Resolution
Section 2.0	No Comments. All ASER Comments are addressed. No Proprietary or Sensitive Information. No new licensing conditions.	
Section 2.1.1.3	<p>The following comment was not added to the FSER:</p> <p>In AFSEER Section 2.1.1.3 Regulatory Basis, the end of second bullet under the third paragraph, should be amended to add the following: In particular, 10 CFR 100.20(a), and 10 CFR 100.21 require that population density and use characteristics of the site environs, including the exclusion area, low-population zone, and population center distance, be considered in determining the acceptability of a site for a stationary power reactor.</p> <p>This change is recommended to provide a more complete reference to the regulatory requirements of 10 CFR 100.20 and 100.21.</p>	
Section 2.1.1.4	<p>Within the second to last paragraph in Section 2.1.1.4 Technical Evaluation the following change is recommended:</p> <p>capitalize the 'U' and 'T' in universal transverse Mercator.</p>	
Section 2.1.2.4 and 2.1.3.4	<p>The first paragraph in Section 2.1.2.4 and 2.1.3.4 Technical Evaluation references footnote 1; however, there is no footnote 1 at the bottom of the page or within Section 2.1</p>	
Section 2.1	<p>No technical flaws. No proprietary flaws. No new license conditions.</p>	

Item No.	Comment	Resolution
Section 2.2.3.1	<p>The following comment was not added to the FSER:</p> <p>In AFSER Section 2.2.3.1 <i>Introduction</i>, it is recommended that the following be added as a new second paragraph to fulfill additional requirements under 10 CFR 100.20(b):</p> <p>The scope of the review also includes the evaluation of man-made site hazards that have been identified as design-basis accidents with respect to safety-related structures, systems, and components (SSCs).</p>	
Section 2.2.3.4	<p>The first paragraph in Section 2.2.3.4 Technical Evaluation references footnote 1; however, there is no footnote 1 at the bottom of the page or within Section 2.2</p>	
Section 2.2	<p>No technical flaws. No proprietary flaws. No new license conditions.</p>	
Section 2.3.3.4.1.4	<p>Recommend deleting the first phase of the last paragraph 'Pending this update to the FSAR' of Section 2.3.3.4.1.4</p>	
Section 2.3.4.4.1.2	<p>Recommend adding section number to the heading:</p> <p>2.3.4.4.1.2 Control Room Dispersion Estimates</p>	
Section 2.3	<p>No technical flaws. No proprietary flaws. No new license conditions.</p>	

Item No.	Comment	Resolution
Section 2.4.1.4. 1	<p>Second to last paragraph, second sentence within NCR Staff's Technical Evaluation states:</p> <p>The applicant confirmed that its use of the term MSL in the FSAR is equivalent to NGVD29.</p> <p>Based on the FSAR the MSL can be converted to NGVD29 using the following expression:</p> <p>Elev ft. NGVD29 = X ft. msl - 0.893</p> <p>Therefore recommend stating the MSL datum can be converted into NGVD29 datum verses stating the terms are equivalent.</p>	