

From: Christian Araguas
To: "Amy G. Aughtman" <agaughtm@southernco.com>
Date: 1/14/2008 4:48:40 PM
Subject: Fwd: RE: 01/11/2008 Request for Additional Information Letter No.10Southern Nuclear Operating
cc: <JTDAVIS@southernco.com>

Amy,

This was a mistake. The .pdf files should have been sent out instead of the ADAMS file. In any event, you can use the ADAMS ML# to look up the file on our public website or you can just use the attached .pdf file. Sorry for the confusion.

Christian

Hearing Identifier: Vogtle_Public
Email Number: 783

Mail Envelope Properties (47A71853.HQGWDO01.TWGWPO04.200.2000007.1.EFCDD.1)

Subject: Fwd: RE: 01/11/2008 Request for Additional Information Letter
No.10Southern Nuclear Operating
Creation Date: 1/14/2008 4:48:40 PM
From: Christian Araguas

Created By: CJA2@nrc.gov

Recipients

<JTDAVIS@southernco.com>
"Amy G. Aughtman" <agaughtm@southernco.com>

Post Office

TWGWPO04.HQGWDO01

Route

nrc.gov

Files

Size

Date & Time

MESSAGE

265

1/14/2008 4:48:40 PM

RE: 01/11/2008 Request for Additional Information Letter No.10Southern Nuclear Operating
2/4/2008 1:51:15 PM

RAI Letter 10.pdf

134514

2/4/2008 1:51:15 PM

Options

Priority: Standard
Reply Requested: No
Return Notification: None
None

Concealed Subject:

No

Security:

Standard

January 11, 2008

Mr. J. A. "Buzz" Miller, Senior Vice President
Nuclear Development
Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc.
40 Inverness Center Parkway
P.O. Box 1295
Birmingham, AL 35201

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION LETTER NO. 10 – SOUTHERN
NUCLEAR OPERATING COMPANY EARLY SITE PERMIT APPLICATION FOR
THE VOGTLE ESP SITE

Dear Mr. Miller:

By letter dated August 14, 2006, Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc. (SNC) submitted an application for an early site permit (ESP) for the Vogtle ESP site. Subsequently, SNC submitted changes to the Vogtle ESP application by letters dated September 13, 2006, November 13, 2006, and May 3, 2007. On August 15, 2007, SNC submitted to the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) a supplement to the ESP application expanding the scope of the application to include a request for approval to perform selected construction activities, generally labeled limited work authorization-2 (LWA-2) activities, as described in Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* Section 50.10(e)(3).

The NRC staff is performing a detailed review of your ESP application and LWA-2 request, and has determined that it needs additional information to continue portions of the safety review. The topics covered in the enclosed RAIs are related to Chapter 2 and Chapter 13 in the LWA-2 supplement (ML072330242).

The NRC staff transmitted these RAIs to SNC in draft form via electronic mail on January 4, 2008, and provided the option for a phone call to discuss the Requests for Additional Information (RAIs). On January 11, 2008 the NRC conducted a phone call with your staff and provided clarification on the RAIs.

Receipt of the requested information within 30 days of the date of this letter will support the NRC's efficient and timely review of the SNC ESP application. Please note that failure to respond in a timely fashion may delay the completion of the staff's safety evaluation report.

J. Miller

-2-

If you have any questions or comments concerning this matter, you may contact me at (301) 415-3637 or cja2@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Christian Araguas, Project Manager
AP1000 Projects Branch 1
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors

Docket No. 52-011

Enclosure: As stated

cc: See next page

J. Miller

-2-

If you have any questions or comments concerning this matter, you may contact me at (301) 415-3637 or cja2@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Christian Araguas, Project Manager
AP1000 Projects Branch 1
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors

Docket No. 52-011

Enclosure: As stated

cc: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

Public
CAraguas
RidsNroLAKGoldstein
RidsNroDnrlNwe1
RidsNroDnrl
MNotich
RidsAcrsAcnwMailCenter
RidsOgcMailCenter (JRund)
RidsRgn2MailCenter
RKaras
CMunson
YLi
TCheng
JGeorge

ADAMS Accession No.: ML080040228

NRR-088

OFFICE	DNRL/NWE1:LA	DNRL/NWE1:PM	OGC:NLO	DNRL/NWE1:BC
NAME	KGoldstein	CAraguas	JRund	SCoffin
DATE	1/7/08	1/7/08	1/10/08	1/11/08

**Second Round Requests for Additional Information Regarding the
Southern Nuclear Operating Company Supplement to the Vogtle ESP Application**

RAI 2.5.4-19

The staff's review of Southern Nuclear Operating Company's (SNC) response to Request for Additional Information (RAI) 1.1-1 identified the following four issues:

- (1) An issue discussed at the meeting during the limited work authorization-2 (LWA-2) site visit conducted on September 5 and 6, 2007, is how the impact of: compaction equipment size, number of passes, lift thickness, etc. on the uniformity of compaction and soil wave velocity achieved are to be determined. During the second LWA-2 site visit (December 10 and 11, 2007), the staff found that SNC is currently conducting a test bed program that considers several factors (number of passes, lift thickness, use of a single compactor, etc.) to determine the state of compaction of the production fill. Through the discussion during the second LWA-2 site visit, the staff found that SNC may adopt a Phase II compaction program, modified from Phase I of the test bed program, and revise the compaction procedures determined from Phase II of the test compaction program. SNC should provide information on how these modified procedures are to be developed and also indicate if a section of the mechanically-stabilized earth (MSE) wall is to be included in the Phase II program. If so, SNC should provide information on how the planned compaction is to be accomplished in and around the test wall section. SNC should confirm that the compaction procedures developed at the end of the Phase II program will be used during the placement of the production fill. In addition, SNC should provide information on how soil wave velocity testing is to be accomplished during the placement of the production fill in and around the final nuclear island configuration.
- (2) The second paragraph of the response states that "the construction of the MSE wall begins with installation of a concrete footer, and ... the size and reinforcement of the concrete footer will be as required by the designer of the MSE wall." A description of the design details of the concrete footer (e.g., concrete mix design, reinforcing steel sizes) should be provided in the response for staff review of its design adequacy.
- (3) In its response, SNC stated that when the lower mud mat slab has reached the specified strength, a layer of waterproof membrane will be applied to the entire top of the slab, and extended vertically up the face of the MSE wall surface. During a conference call on November 14, 2007, Westinghouse stated that in order to develop a friction coefficient of 0.7 between the mudmat and the waterproofing membrane, spikes are to be provided on both sides of the waterproofing membrane by the manufacturer. SNC should explain how the spikes can be anchored into the lower mudmat after the mudmat concrete is hardened and reaches its specified strength. SNC should provide details to explain how the waterproofing material is to be connected to both the top and bottom mudmats.
- (4) SNC should provide details to explain how the waterproofing membrane (with spikes on both sides) is to be placed against the vertical MSE wall, and how the connection is to be made between the vertical and horizontal sections.

SNC is requested to provide additional information to address these four issues.

RAI 2.5.4-20

The response to RAI 2.5.4-1 indicates that only 42 borings have penetrated the Blue Bluff Marl (BBM) extending into the Lower Sands and therefore these are the only borings that satisfy the site foundation criteria provided in Regulatory Guides (RG) 1.132 and 1.138, including the boring depth acceptance criteria. SNC is requested to provide additional information to demonstrate how these RG criteria are satisfied. In addition, the statement, "six of the 70 borings penetrated into the underlying Lower Sands (LS) accounting for 611 linear feet of drilling in this stratum," in Page 6 of 32 of the response indicates that only 6 of the borings penetrated the LS. SNC should clarify this inconsistency.

RAI 2.5.4-21

From its review of the response to RAI 2.5.4-2, the staff requests SNC to provide a clarification of how the formulae provided in the response were used to obtain corrected standard penetration test (SPT) blow counts.

RAI 2.5.4-22

The last sentence of the third paragraph of the response to RAI 2.5.4-3 states that resonance-column torsional-shear (RCTS) test samples were transported to Fugro's Houston laboratory by automobile using approved transportation procedures. SNC is requested to provide a description of the approved transportation procedures and also describe which sources the procedures are derived from.

RAI 2.5.4-23

The staff found that the response to RAI 2.5.4-4 did not address the concern regarding "the effect of the two-dimensional wave velocity configuration of the excavated zone on site response and soil-structure interaction (SSI) effects." Additional information should be provided to justify why the effect of the two-dimensional wave velocity consideration was not considered in the SSI analysis.

RAI 2.5.4-24

The staff's review of the response to RAI 2.5.4-6 identified the following concerns:

- (1) SNC's response addressed only static bearing capacity evaluations for failure conditions and did **NOT** consider settlement considerations, which normally control the allowable pressures under large rigid basemats. In addition, the response did not address dynamic effects, which are the overwhelming effects on the computed toe pressures. Additional information is needed.
- (2) SNC should justify how the compacted fill (about 50' of which is below the basemat and above the BBM) can be considered the "**strong**" layer (as compared to the "**weak**" BBM), since the calculation provided did not show that the shear wave velocity of the backfill soil is higher than that of the BBM which is above 2,000 fps.

- (3) The calculations provided in the response do not indicate that the design value for cohesion of 10,000 psf was used. SNC is requested to further justify why this value was not used. Also the adequacy of the assumption for slope of the influence zone (1v:2h) = 0.5 was not explained. SNC should justify the adequacy of this assumption.

RAI 2.5.4-25 (from the review of the response to RAIs 2.5.4-7 and 3.8.5-1)

During the second site visit (December 10-11, 2007), the staff observed the Phase I Test Fill program and conducted a discussion with SNC staff regarding the application of this program to the production backfill. According to the SNC staff, the controlling values of the program (compaction equipment, number of passes, lift thicknesses, soil water content) were preliminarily selected and these values will be finalized during the Phase II program. One of these values that the staff is concerned with is the acceptable range of sizes of the backfill material, because the grain size of the backfill material may have a significant impact on the shear wave velocity, soil nonlinear degradation properties and the results of the SSI response calculation. For both the test program and production backfill, SNC is requested to explain how the limitation of 25% fines was selected, how different the fines content can be and still be acceptable for the production backfill, and how an acceptable range of sizes will be defined.

RAI 2.5.4-26

In the response to the RAI 2.5.4-9, SNC stated in part that "SNC will revise [early site permit] ESP application Section 2.5.4.3 in revision 3 to conform to the testing frequency recommended by NQA-1-2004, Section 506, In-Process Tests on Compacted fill." Table 506 of this standard recommends a frequency for performing field density tests for mass earthwork as one test for every 2,000 cubic yards of compacted material placed. The response further states in part that "...adopting the ASME ... standard will provide an accepted consistent industry testing frequency not tied to lift thickness..." This does not appear to be completely correct, since the standard still requires one test per lift as part of the criteria, in addition to the criteria of one test for every 2,000 cubic yards of compacted material placed. SNC is requested to provide further clarification on how this standard would be implemented, since two criteria would need to be tracked under the standard. SNC also should provide justification for using this testing density and how this number will provide assurance of adequate uniformity of shear wave velocity.

RAI 2.5.4-27

In the response to RAI 2.5.4-10, SNC states in part that "Sufficient borrow material ... has been identified and no additional investigations and testing is necessary." The response further states that "These materials (identified) were classified ... as silty sands (SM), poorly graded sands (SP), and lesser amounts of clayey sands (SC)." The response further describes testing of various material properties and borrow sources, but does not include figures or survey results to justify that sufficient material exists. It is also unclear in the response whether all or just part of the stockpiled material is suitable material. SNC is requested to provide further clarification and justification of the quantity of suitable material in the switchyard area stockpiles. Further, SNC states that approximately 30% of the excavated material from the power block will be salvageable for reuse as structural backfill. However, SNC should provide a description of how the 30% value was determined so the staff can evaluate whether sufficient borrow material exists.

RAI 2.5.4-28

From the review of the response to RAIs 2.5.4-14 and 2.5.4-15, it is not clear that the normal variability inherent in the compaction test program (variability of fill grain size distribution, uniformity of water content of compacted soil, etc) will be evaluated sufficiently to capture the variability expected during the production fill program without shear wave velocity testing. In SNC's proposed approach, the wave velocity in its final configuration under the facility and 40 feet of fill to the side will be generated using both analytic approximations for the effects of confinement on in-situ velocity as well as the results from a few RCTS samples of the fill. In-situ wave velocity measurements during production backfill placement are needed for confirmatory purposes to be able to estimate the average velocities of placed soil as well as variability in these velocities under the completed facility. The objective of this confirmatory program is to ensure that in-situ wave velocities in the completed backfill will be equal to or greater than 1,000 fps. SNC is requested to provide additional information and justification of the adequacy of its testing program or a revised testing program.

RAI 13.7-2

In an October 26, 2007, letter from Christian Araguas, NRC, to J.A. "Buzz" Miller, Southern Nuclear Operating Company (SNC), the NRC requested that the applicant provide a description of the Fitness for Duty (FFD) program and its implementation consistent with the guidance in the August 16, 2007, letter from NRC to Nuclear Energy Institute and the NRC's regulations. The application's description of the FFD program and its implementation in SNC's November 28, 2007, response is not consistent with the NRC's regulations. 10 CFR 26.2(c) describes the required elements of an FFD program for applicants seeking NRC authority to perform certain construction activities, including the activities proposed by SNC. SNC's FFD program plan contains the following deficiencies:

- (a) 10 CFR 26.2(c)(1) requires compliance with 10 CFR 26.20. 10 CFR 26.20(b), (e), and (f) state that the written policies and procedures must: (1) contain a description of programs which are available to personnel desiring assistance in dealing with drug, alcohol, or other problems that could adversely affect the performance of activities within the scope of this part; (2) ensure that persons called in to perform an unscheduled working tour are fit to perform the task assigned; and (3) allow for the Commission at any time to review the licensee's written policy and procedures to assure that they meet the performance objectives of Part 26. Please revise the FFD program plan to comply with 10 CFR 26.20(b), (e), and (f).
- (b) 10 CFR 26.2(c)(1) requires compliance with 10 CFR 26.23. 10 CFR 26.23(a)(2) states that personnel that violate a fitness for duty policy will not be assigned to work within the scope of the rule without the knowledge and consent of the licensee. The submitted FFD program plan, however, states that: "A construction site entity can maintain an [individual's access to the construction facility] as long as the person remains in the construction site entity random fitness for duty testing program for new plant construction." Please revise the FFD program plan to comply with 10 CFR 26.23(a)(2).
- (c) 10 CFR 26.2(c)(1) requires compliance with 10 CFR 26.70. 10 CFR 26.70 contains provisions for NRC inspections. The FFD program plan does not address NRC inspections. Please revise the FFD program plan to comply with 10 CFR 26.70.

(d) 10 CFR 26.2(c)(1) requires compliance with 10 CFR 26.73. 10 CFR 26.73(a) specifies the FFD events that must be reported to NRC. The FFD program plan does not specify these events. Please revise the FFD program plan to comply with 10 CFR 26.73(a).

ESP Southern Nuclear - Vogtle Mailing List

(Revised 1/3/08)

cc:

Lucious Abram
Commissioner - Burke's County Commissioner
P. O. Box 1626
Waynesboro, GA 30830

Christey Alexander
P. O. Box 276
Waynesboro, GA 30830

S. Clay Alexander
P. O. Box 1177
Waynesboro, GA 30830

Anne F. Appleby
Oglethorpe Power Corporation
2100 East Exchange Place
Tucker, GA 30084

Attorney General
Law Department
132 Judicial Building
Atlanta, GA 30334

Donald Baynet
622 Hill Street
Atlanta, GA 30312

Mr. Laurence Bergen
Oglethorpe Power Corporation
2100 East Exchange Place
P.O. Box 1349
Tucker, GA 30085-1349

Rodney Bigswell
402 Pine Street
Waynesboro, GA 30830

Mr. M. Stanford Blanton
Esquire
Balch and Bingham, LLP
P.O. Box 306
Birmingham, AL 35201

Ms. Michele Boyd
Legislative Director
Energy Program
Public Citizens Critical Mass Energy
and Environmental Program
215 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20003

Ed Burke
828 N. Liberty Street
Waynesboro, GA 30830

Geri Burke
828 N. Liberty Street
Waynesboro, GA 30830

Mathew Cardinale
Inter-Press Service
Atlanta Progressive News
P. O. Box 56154
Atlanta, GA 30343

Ruby Carter
Volunteer ACS
187 Penn Lane
Girard, GA 30426

Michael E. Chance
902 Highway 80 East
Waynesboro, GA 30830

W. Craig Conklin, Director
Chemical and Nuclear Preparedness &
Protection Division (CNPPD)
Office of Infrastructure Protection
Department of Homeland Security
Washington, DC 20528

County Commissioner
Office of the County Commissioner
Burke County Commission
Waynesboro, GA 30830

Gregory T. Coursey, Sr.
P. O. Box 702
Waynesboro, GA 30830

Carter Crawford
City of Sylvania
P. O. Box 555
Sylvania, GA 30467

Mr. James Davis
ESP Project Engineer
Southern Nuclear Company
PO Box 1295, BIN B056
Birmingham, AL 35201

Director
Consumer's Utility
Counsel Division
Governor's Office of Consumer Affairs
2 Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive
Plaza Level East, Suite 356
Atlanta, GA 30334-4600

Mr. Arthur H. Domby, Esquire
Troutman Sanders
Nations Bank Plaza
600 Peachtree Street, NE
Suite 200
Atlanta, GA 30308-2216

Mr. Marvin Fertel
Senior Vice President
and Chief Nuclear Officer
Nuclear Energy Institute
1776 I Street, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20006-3708

Mr. Jeffrey T. Gasser
Executive Vice President
Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc.
P.O. Box 1295
Birmingham, AL 35201-1295

Edwin D. Groover
1306 Bimini Place
Augusta, GA 30909-2610

Mr. Dave Hanley
327 Barlow Drive
Waynesboro, GA 30830

Jim Hardeman
GA DNR / EPD
4220 International Pkwy
Suite 100
Atlanta, GA 30354

O. C. Harper, IV
Vice President - Resources Planning and
Nuclear Development
Georgia Power Company
241 Ralph McGill Boulevard
Atlanta, GA 30308

Mr. Steven M. Jackson
Senior Engineer - Power Supply
Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia
1470 Riveredge Parkway, NW
Atlanta, GA 30328-4684

Harry Judd
GPSC
244 N Main Street
Concord, NH 03304

Patricia Keefer
The Borough
466 Highway 56 N
Waynesboro, GA 30830

Robert W. Lee
GCC
1035 Postell Drive
Hephzibah, GA 30815

Mr. Dale M. Lloyd
Vogtle Deployment Director
Southern Nuclear Operating Co., Inc.
P. O. Box 1295
Birmingham, AL 35201-1295

Kathi May
394A Knight Road
Waynesboro, GA 30830

Tyler May
394 A Knight Road
Waynesboro, GA 30830

Mr. Reece McAlister
Executive Secretary
Georgia Public Service Commission
Atlanta, GA 30334

Mr. Thomas O. McCallum
Site Development Project Engineer
Southern Nuclear Operating Co., Inc.
PO Box 1295
Birmingham, AL 35201-1295

Marshall A. Miller, IV
634 Miller's Pond Road
Waynesboro, GA 30830

Mr. Thomas Moorer
Environmental Project Manager
Southern Nuclear Operating Co., Inc.
PO Box 1295
Birmingham, AL 35201-1295

Ms. Karen Patterson
Tetra Tech NUS
900 Trail Ridge Road
Aiken, SC 29803

Mr. Charles R. Pierce
Vogtle Deployment Licensing Manager
Southern Nuclear Operating Co., Inc.
PO Box 1295
Birmingham, AL 35201-1295

Vanessa E. Quinn, Acting Director
Technological Hazards Division
National Preparedness Directorate
Federal Emergency Management Agency
500 C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20472

Resident Inspector
Vogtle Plant
8805 River Road
Waynesboro, GA 30830

Resident Manager
Oglethorpe Power Corporation
Alvin W. Vogtle Nuclear Plant
7821 River Road
Waynesboro, GA 30830

Elaine Sikes
Burke County Library
130 Highway 24 South
Waynesboro, GA 30830

Mr. Jerry Smith
Commissioner
District 8
Augusta-Richmond County Commission
1332 Brown Road
Hephzibah, GA 30815

Mr. Robert E. Sweeney
IBEX ESI
4641 Montgomery Avenue
Suite 350
Bethesda, MD 20814

George B. Taylor, Jr.
Oglethrope Power Corporation
2100 East Exchange Place
Tucker, GA 30084

Michael Vandembulalu
P. O. Box 587
Waynesboro, GA 30830

Email

agaughtm@southernco.com (Amy Aughtman)
APH@NEI.org (Adrian Heymer)
arspears@southernco.com (Annie Spears)
awc@nei.org (Anne W. Cottingham)
bennettS2@bv.com (Steve A. Bennett)
BrinkmCB@westinghouse.com (Charles Brinkman)
chris.maslak@ge.com (Chris Maslak)
cwaltman@roe.com (C. Waltman)
david.lewis@pillsburylaw.com (David Lewis)
dlochbaum@UCSUSA.org (David Lochbaum)
frankq@hursttech.com (Frank Quinn)
greshaja@westinghouse.com (James Gresham)
jgutierrez@morganlewis.com (Jay M. Gutierrez)
jim.riccio@wdc.greenpeace.org (James Riccio)
JJNesrsta@cpsenergy.com (James J. Nesrsta)
John.o'Neill@pillsburylaw.com (John O'Neil)
Joseph.savage@ge.com (Joseph Savage)
Joseph_Hegner@dom.com (Joseph Hegner)
jtdavis@southernco.com (Jim Davis)
KSutton@morganlewis.com (Kathryn M. Sutton)
kwaugh@impact-net.org (Kenneth O. Waugh)
MaddenG@BV.com (George Madden)
Margaret.Bennet@dom.com (Margaret Bennet)
maria.webb@pillsburylaw.com (Maria Webb)
mark.beaumont@wsms.com (Mark Beaumont)
matias.travieso-diaz@pillsburylaw.com (Matias Travieso-Diaz)
mcaston@southernco.com (Moanica Caston)
media@nei.org (Scott Peterson)
mike_moran@fpl.com (Mike Moran)
nirsnet@nirs.org (Michael Mariotte)
patriciaL.campbell@ge.com (Patricia L. Campbell)
Paul@beyondnuclear.org (Paul Gunter)
phinnen@entergy.com (Paul Hinnenkamp)
pshastings@duke-energy.com (Peter Hastings)
RJB@NEI.org (Russell Bell)
RKTemple@cpsenergy.com (R.K. Temple)
roberta.swain@ge.com (Roberta Swain)
ronald.hagen@eia.doe.gov (Ronald Hagen)
sandra.sloan@areva.com (Sandra Sloan)
sfrantz@morganlewis.com (Stephen P. Frantz)
tom.miller@hq.doe.gov (Tom Miller)
tomccall@southernco.com (Tom McCallum)
Vicki_Hull@dom.com (Vicki Hull)
VictorB@bv.com (Bill Victor)
waraksre@westinghouse.com (Rosemarie E. Waraks)