CCNPP3COLA PEmails

From: John Rycyna
Sent: Tuesday, January 06, 2009 9:07 AM
To: Poche, Robert
Cc: CCNPP3COL Resource; Sara Bernal; Timothy Frye; Joseph Colaccino; Surinder Arora; James Biggins; Adam Gendelman
Subject: RAI No 44 CHPB 1567.doc (P)
Attachments: RAI No 44 CHPB 1567.doc

Rob,

Attached please find the subject request for additional information (RAI). A draft of the RAI was provided to you on December 10, 2008. No conference call was requested to discuss this RAI. 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
Sr. 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: 524

Mail Envelope Properties (John.Rycyna@nrc.gov20090106090600)

Subject: RAI No 44 CHPB 1567.doc (P)
Sent Date: 1/6/2009 9:06:31 AM
Received Date: 1/6/2009 9:06:00 AM
From: John Rycyna

Created By: John.Rycyna@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"CCNPP3COL Resource" <CCNPP3COL.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Sara Bernal" <Sara.Bernal@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Timothy Frye" <Timothy.Frye@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Joseph Colaccino" <Joseph.Colaccino@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Surinder Arora" <Surinder.Arora@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"James Biggins" <James.Biggins@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Adam Gendelman" <Adam.Gendelman@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Poche, Robert" <robert.poche@unistarnuclear.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office:

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	770	1/6/2009 9:06:00 AM
RAI No 44 CHPB 1567.doc	25198	

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

Request for Additional Information No. 44 Revision 3
1/6/09

Calvert Cliffs Unit 3
UniStar
Docket No. 52-016
SRP Section: 12.03-12.04 - Radiation Protection Design Features
Application Section: Section 12.3

QUESTIONS for Health Physics Branch (CHPB)

12.03-12.04-1

The NRC has sent RAIs requesting the US EPR design certification applicant to provide a general description of how each of the main design objectives contained in Regulatory Guide 4.21 will be met in the generic design. The US EPR design certification applicant was also requested to address the objectives that are more operational or procedural in nature by providing COL information items in the appropriate sections of the US EPR design control document (DCD) for COLAs referencing the US EPR design.

A detailed description of how the COL information items contained in the US EPR DCD will be resolved should be included in the appropriate sections of the Calvert Cliffs COLA FSAR where applicable, with a listing addressing each of these COL information items in Section 12.3 of the Calvert Cliffs COLA FSAR. For example, an acceptable description of a groundwater monitoring program should include implementation considerations and a description of the key components of the program, such as types and periodicity of routine samples to be taken, threshold activities to be detected, actions to be taken upon detection of leakage into the groundwater, and a description of quality assurance practices to be used to ensure reasonable assurance of prompt identification of leakage into the groundwater.

Using the guidance provided in Regulatory Guide 4.21, “Minimization of Contamination and Radioactive Waste Generation: Life Cycle Planning” (June 2008), provide a description of all of the operational programs and how the facility's procedures for operations will meet the requirements of 10 CFR 20.1406 (a)-minimize to the extent practicable, contamination of the facility and the environment, facilitate eventual decommissioning, and minimize, to the extent practicable, the generation of radioactive waste. Alternatively, justify another approach.