

PMSTPCOL PEmails

From: Tai, Tom
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2012 10:25 AM
To: Price, John E
Cc: STPCOL
Subject: RE: STP Review Guide Comments R2.docx
Attachments: STP Review Guide Comments R2.docx

John,

Attached is the latest summary list of comments/questions. The only change is the addition of the last item that Samir asked several weeks ago: review of the recent Information Notice 11-20.

Please replace the previous version with this.

Regards

Tom Tai
DNRL/NRO
(301) 415-8484
Tom.Tai@NRC.GOV

From: Tai, Tom
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2012 11:07 AM
To: 'Price, John E'
Cc: STPCOL
Subject: STP Review Guide Comments R2.docx

John,

Attached for your use is a summary list of the comments/questions we have on the reviewer's guide (advanced copy of Rev 7). Please share with S&L and we can discuss during upcoming Wednesday calls for either concurrence/acceptance, or clarification, or plan to resolve during the February 27 audit.

Regards

Tom Tai
(301) 415-8484

Hearing Identifier: SouthTexas34Public_EX
Email Number: 3282

Mail Envelope Properties (0A64B42AAA8FD4418CE1EB5240A6FED160DF182906)

Subject: RE: STP Review Guide Comments R2.docx
Sent Date: 2/6/2012 10:24:48 AM
Received Date: 2/6/2012 10:24:50 AM
From: Tai, Tom

Created By: Tom.Tai@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"STPCOL" <STP.COL@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Price, John E" <jeprice@STPEGS.COM>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	859	2/6/2012 10:24:50 AM
STP Review Guide Comments R2.docx		33723

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

Comments on 3.7

1. Page 3.7-3, Paragraph 3.7.2.8, Third Bullet: Seismic input motions for all II/I structural design should be included in the FSAR by reference to Figures including the Service Building (SB).
2. Page 3.7-4, Bulleted Items: Seismic input motions for all II/I stability evaluation should be included in the FSAR by reference to Figures including SB and TB.

Comments on 3A

1. Page 3A-8, Paragraph 3A.21: Provide some discussion of why the confirmatory SSSI analyses performed for inter building soil pressure using SM is adequate (i.e., why Fig. 3A-301 & 302 acceptable). 3H.10 should specifically address this issue for standard plant structures.

Comments on 3C

1. Page 3C-1, Paragraph 3C.1: Other structures e.g., DGFOSV and DGFOT should be included in addition to UHC/RSW Tunnel

Comments on 3H

1. Page 3H-4, First Line: Delete "it" in this sentence.
2. Page 3H-7, Fourth Bullet from the Bottom: Would the criteria for II/I evaluation include Hurricane?
3. Page 3H-7, Second Bullet from the Bottom: Is the resulting SSE response spectra (which includes the effect of nearby structures) defined at the foundation level or the free surface? Conflict with 3H.3.5.3
4. Page 3H-8, Second Sentence: Delete "a" (editorial).
5. Page 3H-9, Paragraph 3H.3.4.1: May need to include Hurricane RG
6. Page 3H-10, Paragraph 3H.3.4.3: What is the pour temperature and normal operating temperature band? How are they factored in the design? How are changes in ambient temperature considered for design of other structures? UHS specifies range of ambient temperature.
7. Table 3H.3-2: We need to have some explanation of first vertical mode frequency of 2.60 Hz being so different from other modes.
8. Page 3H-17, Paragraph 3H.5.3: The heading of this paragraph indicates it includes "Seismic Category I Tunnels." Specify which Category I tunnels?
9. Page 3H-19, Paragraph 3H.6.2: Would the Table 3H.9-1 include identification of Hurricane load?
10. Page 3H-34, Item b: This paragraph references Figure 3H.6-3 which does not exist.
11. Page 3H-36, Paragraph 3H.6.5.1.3: This section does not include all site-specific Category I structures.
12. Page 3H-45, Paragraph 3H.6.5.2.12: Editorial. Revise the sentence.

13. Page 3H-49, Eleventh Bullet from the top: From the Figures, seismic demand at some locations appears to exceed design value. These increases need to be addressed in the FSAR.
14. Page 3H-51, Second Paragraph: This paragraph discusses the method for obtaining envelope of the seismic acceleration for structural design. We need a summary discussion of addressing the DNFSB issue relative to margin analysis here or referencing to appropriate sections where margin analysis was discussed.
15. Page 3H-52, Fourth Bullet from the bottom: Surcharge pressure is indicated as 300 psf. This is not consistent with a surcharge pressure defined later as 500 psf on Page 3H-54.
16. Page 3H-56, Paragraph 3H.6.6.3.2: Need discuss how DNFSB issue was addressed for beam and column design in the FSAR
17. Page 3H-58, Paragraph 3H.6.7: Concerning establishing the input motion for DGFOVS SSI analysis, there is no discussion as to how DNFSB issue was addressed.
18. Page 3H-68, Paragraph 3H.7.3: Figure reference 3H.6-221 may not be the correct reference.
19. Page 3H-79, First Paragraph: FSAR needs to discuss why amplified input is still OK in view of DNFSB issue.
20. Page 3H-80, Second Paragraph: why only +30% and also not -30%?
21. Page 3H-84, Paragraph 3H.10: FSAR should have basis of why use of amplified input spectra (based on SM) is still acceptable in view of DNFSB issue for DGFOT and DGFOVS.
22. Paragraph 3H.10 Page 3H-85: Under the four bullets in discussion of "SSI Soil Pressure used in Structural Design" provide the reference Figure numbers where these information is provided. In addition for RSW Piping Tunnel, clarify if the SSI soil pressure is based on amplified input which accounted for DNFSB issue?
23. Page 3H-85, Last Three Bullets from the bottom: Need to conclude in the FSAR that because DM or MSM acceleration was used for these buildings no further evaluation is necessary.

Other Comments

1. The FSAR does not have plans and sections of the various structures with dimensions of major elements. Also, many of the Figures are not properly labeled to uniquely identify them. Also, it is difficult to identify from the FSAR the locations of many reinforcement zones included in the FSAR. All FSAR Figures need to be reviewed to ensure they are properly labeled. PLI 153 did not appear to capture the issue.
2. FSAR Fig.3H.1-4 and 3A-301 appear to refer to the lateral seismic soil pressure comparison for RB North wall. They appear to look different.
3. Section 3H.6.4.3.1.4 Lateral Soil Pressure (H): Not clear why seismic soil pressure Figures are referred here. Also refer to Section 3H.6.4.3.3.3, Lateral Soil Pressures Including the Effects of SSE (H'). These two sections refer to different Figures for design UHS/RSW Pump

House. The FSAR should clearly describe the various lateral soil pressure diagrams for all structures with explanations, as necessary, of how the soil pressures are developed and used.

4. The driving lateral pressure diagrams for the RSWT and DGFOSV were not found in the FSAR.

5. Any exceedances of design lateral pressures by the SSSI pressures should be addressed. For example, lateral pressures for RSW piping tunnel resulting from the SSI analysis "Soil Separated Case" show a pronounced peak between 22ft and 24ft depth that exceeds the design pressure of the East and West walls by a factor of two (Figs. 3H.6-212 and 213). Figs. 3H.6-213 through 217 do not have the design pressures shown. It is not clear how the design pressures compare with these pressures.

6. Stability Evaluation:

The FSAR does not describe how stability evaluations for the various category I structures were performed. Fig 3H.6-137 shows the various components considered in the evaluations, and refers to Section 2.5S.4.10.5 for computation of E_s . Please clarify the various components of driving and resisting pressures used (e.g., soil dynamic surcharge pressure).

Stability evaluation (Section 3H.6.6.5) for each structure should describe how the three direction seismic forces were considered in the evaluation, and if not considered, the reason for it.

7. DGFOT Stability Evaluation

FSAR Table 3H.7-2, Note (3) states that calculated safety factors consider full passive pressure. Development of full passive pressure may induce significant displacement of the tunnel locally. Such displacement may potentially induce bending along the length of tunnel. Please confirm if this was considered in design. Though not as significant, RSW Tunnel also should consider this.