

## CCNPP3COLA PEmails

---

**From:** John Rycyna  
**Sent:** Monday, August 11, 2008 8:29 AM  
**To:** Price, John (UniStar); Wrobel, George  
**Cc:** Jonathan Ortega-Luciano; Juan Peralta; Joseph Colaccino; Getachew Tesfaye; Tarun Roy; CCNPP3COL Resource  
**Subject:** RAI No 7 CQVP 769.doc  
**Attachments:** RAI No 7 CQVP 769.doc

Attached please find the subject request for additional information (RAI). A Draft of the RAI was provided to you on July 31, 2008. UniStar indicated to NRC that no discussion of this RAI was needed prior to it being sent formally. The schedule we have established for review of your application assumes technically correct and complete responses within 30 days of receipt of RAIs. For any RAIs that cannot be answered within 30 days, it is expected that a date for receipt of this information will be provided to the staff within the 30 day period so that the staff can assess how this information will impact the published schedule.

John Rycyna, PE  
Project Manager  
Division of New Reactor Licensing  
Office of New Reactors  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
301-415-4122

**Hearing Identifier:** CalvertCliffs\_Unit3Cola\_Public\_EX  
**Email Number:** 220

**Mail Envelope Properties** (499C2FC6BB962446994CA8682D8ADF330DC86527AE)

**Subject:** RAI No 7 CQVP 769.doc  
**Sent Date:** 8/11/2008 8:29:24 AM  
**Received Date:** 8/11/2008 8:29:25 AM  
**From:** John Rycyna

**Created By:** John.Rycyna@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**

"Jonathan Ortega-Luciano" <Jonathan.Ortega-Luciano@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Juan Peralta" <Juan.Peralta@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Joseph Colaccino" <Joseph.Colaccino@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Getachew Tesfaye" <Getachew.Tesfaye@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Tarun Roy" <Tarun.Roy@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"CCNPP3COL Resource" <CCNPP3COL.Resource@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Price, John (UniStar)" <John.Price2@unistarnuclear.com>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Wrobel, George" <George.Wrobel@unistarnuclear.com>  
Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:** HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	800	8/11/2008 8:29:25 AM
RAI No 7 CQVP 769.doc		25198

**Options**

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

Request for Additional Information No. 7 Revision 0  
8/11/08

Calvert Cliffs Unit 3  
UniStar  
Docket No. 52-016

SRP Section: 17.5 - Quality Assurance Program Description - Design Certification, Early Site Permit  
and New License Applicants  
Application Section: 17.5

QUESTIONS

17.5-1

Section 17.5 of the Constellation Generation Group and UniStar Nuclear Operating Services (Calvert Cliffs NPP Unit 3) FSAR references UniStar Nuclear Topical Report UN-TR-06-001-A as the quality assurance program description that will be used to satisfy Appendix B to 10 CFR Part 50 requirements. UN-TR-06-001-A was reviewed and approved by the staff on March 14, 2007. Section U of Topical Report UN-TR-06-001-A identifies the NRC Regulatory Guides and other quality assurance standards applicable to the QAPD for Calvert Cliffs NPP Unit 3. However, RG 1.37, Revision 1, is not listed in the QAPD consistent with the latest version of the Section 17.5 of the SRP. Please explain if it is the applicants' intention to revise Section U of the QAPD to include a commitment to RG 1.37, Revision 1, or explain why a revision is not necessary.

17.5-2

Section 17.5 of the Constellation Generation Group and UniStar Nuclear Operating Services (Calvert Cliffs NPP Unit 3) FSAR references UniStar Nuclear Topical Report UN-TR-06-001-A as the quality assurance program description (QAPD) that will be used to satisfy Appendix B to 10 CFR Part 50 requirements. UN-TR-06-001-A was reviewed and approved by the staff on March 14, 2007. Section U of Topical Report UN-TR-06-001-A identifies the NRC Regulatory Guides and other quality assurance standards applicable to the QAPD for Calvert Cliffs NPP Unit 3. However, the revision versions for RG 1.26 and RG 1.29 are not consistent with the latest versions of these RGs. Please explain if it is the applicants' intention to revise Section U of the QAPD to include the latest version for RG 1.26 and RG 1.29, or explain why a revision is not necessary.