

## CCNPP3COLA PEmails

---

**From:** John Rycyna  
**Sent:** Monday, March 23, 2009 4:49 PM  
**To:** Poche, Robert; McQueeney, Jennifer; katie.thurstin@unistarnuclear.com  
**Cc:** CCNPP3COL Resource; Nan Chien; Christopher Jackson; Michael Miernicki; Joseph Colaccino; James Biggins; Adam Gendelman  
**Subject:** RAI No 83 SPCV 1701.doc (PUBLIC)  
**Attachments:** RAI No 83 SPCV 1701.doc

Rob,

Attached please find the subject request for additional information (RAI). A draft of the RAI was provided to you on March 9, 2009. A conference call was held on March 23, 2009 to discuss this RAI. The RAI was not changed as a result of that call. 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:** 597

**Mail Envelope Properties** (499C2FC6BB962446994CA8682D8ADF331740668A83)

**Subject:** RAI No 83 SPCV 1701.doc (PUBLIC)  
**Sent Date:** 3/23/2009 4:49:00 PM  
**Received Date:** 3/23/2009 4:49:02 PM  
**From:** John Rycyna

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

**Recipients:**

"CCNPP3COL Resource" <CCNPP3COL.Resource@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Nan Chien" <Nan.Chien@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Christopher Jackson" <Christopher.Jackson@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Michael Miernicki" <Michael.Miernicki@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Joseph Colaccino" <Joseph.Colaccino@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  
"McQueeney, Jennifer" <Jennifer.McQueeney@unistarnuclear.com>  
Tracking Status: None  
"katie.thurstin@unistarnuclear.com" <katie.thurstin@unistarnuclear.com>  
Tracking Status: None

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

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	827	3/23/2009 4:49:02 PM
RAI No 83 SPCV 1701.doc		26734

**Options**

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

Request for Additional Information No. 83  
3/23/2009

Calvert Cliffs Unit 3  
UniStar  
Docket No. 52-016  
SRP Section: 06.04 - Control Room Habitability System  
Application Section: SRP 6.4

QUESTIONS for Containment and Ventilation Branch 1 (AP1000/EPR Projects) (SPCV)

06.04-4

Exposure to Control Room Occupants

10 CFR Part 50 App. A, General Design Criteria (GDC)19 requires that control rooms be maintained in safe condition under accident conditions, including loss of coolant accidents (LOCAs). This requirement applies to the control room of a nearby unit at a multi-unit site as well as the control room of the affected plant. In the case of the CCNPP, it needs to be established that a LOCA at Unit 3 will not result in unacceptable radiation exposures in the Unit 1 and Unit 2 control rooms, and it needs to be established that a LOCA either at Unit 1 or Unit 2 will not violate safe conditions in the Unit 3 control room.

In Section 6.4.4 of the CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR, the applicant stated that:

- The main control room dose to Units 1 and 2 from a LOCA in Unit 3 is less than 2.0 rem total effective dose equivalent (TEDE), and
- The main control room dose to Unit 3 from a LOCA in either Unit 1 or Unit 2 is acceptable because the Unit 3 control room is better designed and equipped for radiological exposure control. It is equipped with safety-related radiation monitors in the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) intake ducts and would isolate in a timely manner.

What are the differences between the Unit 3 and the Units 1 and 2 control room designs with respect to protection against radiation exposure? Are there safety-related monitors in the Units 1 and 2 HVAC intakes? What makes the Unit 3 control room better designed and equipped for radiological exposure control?