Greg Gibson
Vice President, Regulatory Affairs

750 East Pratt Street, Suite 1600
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

UniStar
NUCLEAR ENERGY

10 CFR 50.4
10 CFR 52.79

June 15, 2009

UN#09-284

ATTN: Document Control Desk
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Subject: UniStar Nuclear Energy, NRC Docket No. 52-016
Response to Request for Additional Information for the
Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 3,
RAI No. 117, Offsite Power System

Reference: John Rycyna (NRC) to Robert Poche (UniStar Nuclear Energy), "RAI No 117 EEB 2242.doc (PUBLIC)" email dated May 15, 2009

The purpose of this letter is to respond to the request for additional information (RAI) identified in the NRC e-mail correspondence to UniStar Nuclear Energy, dated May 15, 2009 (Reference). This RAI addresses the Offsite Power System as discussed in Section 8.2 of the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR), as submitted in Part 2 of the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant (CCNPP) Unit 3 Combined License Application (COLA), Revision 4.

The enclosure provides our response to RAI No. 117, Question 08.02-9. Our response to Question 08.02-9 does not include any new regulatory commitments and does not impact COLA content.

D096
NRO

If there are any questions regarding this transmittal, please contact me at (410) 470-4205, or Mr. Michael J. Yox at (410) 495-2436.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on June 15, 2009

Christian Clement
for Greg Gibson

Greg Gibson

Enclosure: Response to NRC Request for Additional Information RAI No. 117, Question 08.02-9, Offsite Power System, Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 3

cc: John Rycyna, NRC Project Manager, U.S. EPR COL Application
Laura Quinn, NRC Environmental Project Manager, U.S. EPR COL Application
Getachew Tesfaye, NRC Project Manager, U.S. EPR DC Application (w/o enclosure)
Loren Plisco, Deputy Regional Administrator, NRC Region II (w/o enclosure)
Silas Kennedy, U.S. NRC Resident Inspector, CCNPP, Units 1 and 2
U.S. NRC Region I Office

GTG/JMR/kat

Enclosure

Response to NRC Request for Additional Information
RAI No. 117, Question 08.02-9, Offsite Power System
Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 3

RAI No. 117

Question 08.02-9

Concerning the applicant's FSAR Section 8.2.2.4, page 8-16, Compliance with GDC 17: This section indicates that a system impact study was performed using PJM's [Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Maryland's regional transmission organization] reliability planning process against 2011 summer loading. Please explain why the base case timeframe for the system impact study is selected as year 2011, and not beyond, and also why winter loading cases are not considered in the study.

Response

The System Impact Study for Calvert Cliffs Unit 3 was performed by Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Maryland Regional Transmission Organization (PJM) as part of the PJM interconnection process. The study year in which a particular interconnection project is studied, is determined by the submission date of the interconnection request to PJM. For CCNPP Unit 3, the PJM Large Generator Interconnection Request (LGIR) was submitted in September, 2006. Interconnection requests received by PJM are placed in the interconnection queue in sequential order by date of submission, and assigned a letter designator by year. CCNPP Unit 3 was assigned queue position Q-48. The process is fully described in the PJM's Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) approved Open Access Transmission Tariff (OATT).

System Impact Studies are conducted by PJM using software modeling based on a five year planning horizon. The five year planning horizon incorporates expected load changes, generator retirements, regulated and merchant transmission expansion projects, and merchant generator interconnections. Interconnection projects submitted in 2006 were studied through the 2011 model year. Since PJM does not maintain a dynamic model of the transmission system beyond a five year planning horizon, any studies conducted beyond a five year horizon would be speculative.

Within PJM, summer load conditions represent the worst case loading and more stressed transmission system. For this reason, PJM conducts the System Impact Study stability analysis under summer load conditions. The summer load condition represents the bounding condition.

COLA Impact

COLA revision is not required as a result of this response.