PMSummerColpEM Resource

From: Sebrosky, Joseph
Sent: Friday, September 03, 2010 8:39 AM
To: PMSummerColpEM Resource
Cc: Stirewalt, Gerry; Sheikh, Mina; Weber, Carl; Joshi, Ravindra; Spicher, Terri; Webb, Michael; Thomas, Brian; Patel, Pravin; Ayres, David; Wang, Weijun; Bagchi, Goutam; Wilson, Jerry; Cook, Christopher; Karas, Rebecca; See, Kenneth; Munson, Clifford; Vega, Frankie; Thompson, Jenise; O'Donohue, Kathleen; Jackson, Rahsean; Davis, Bradley; Abbott, Coleman; Cruz, Jeffrey; Thomas, Brian; 'amonroe@scana.com'; 'jmgiles@scana.com'
Subject: Summary of August 31, 2010 phone call with V.C. Summer to discuss preconstruction activities at Summer Units 2 and 3

MEMORANDUM TO: File (Summer Units 2 and 3)

From: Joe Sebrosky, Project Manager
AP1000Projects Branch (NWE1)
Division of New reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors

Subject: Summary of August 31, 2010 phone call with V.C. Summer to discuss preconstruction activities

The NRC headquarters attendees were: Brian Thomas, Christopher Cook, Ken See, Gerry Stirewalt, Jenise Thompson, Frankie Vega, Michael Webb, Weijun Wang, Goutam Bagchi, Pravin Patel, Jerry Wilson, Terri Spicher and Joe Sebrosky

The NRC Region II attendees were: David Ayers, Kathleen O'Donohue, Mina Sheikh, Bradley Davis, and Rahsean Jackson

The South Carolina Electric and Gas (SCE&G) participants were: Amy M. Monroe, Julie Giles, John Todd, Alan Torres, Kyle Young, April Rice, and Ev Washer (Shaw – SCE&G consultant).

The agenda for the phone call was as follows:

Purpose: Discuss the questions below that are associated with preconstruction activities at Summer Units 2 and 3. The questions were developed as a result of a recent site visit to view the Unit 2 excavation. A summary of the trip is available at ML102380454.

Outcome: Clear understanding of the issue and the response, and determination made on whether any NRC followup was needed.

Agenda: The agenda for the phone call was based on 4 questions that were provided to the SCE&G prior to the call. The questions and a summary of the discussion during the phone call are provided below.

Question 1

Could you confirm that the blasting techniques will only be used to remove the rock above foundation level, and that the applicant will ensure that the blasting will have no impact on the underlying rock?

Summary of Discussion

SCE&G indicated that the blasting will be done in layers. SCE&G will restrict the size of the charges and will require monitoring of the blasting to measure the displacement at a prescribed distance from the blast to ensure that blasting's affect on the surrounding area is within specifications. In addition, after a layer of the rock is removed geologic mapping will be performed prior to removing the next layer of the rock. This process will ensure that the foundation rock will not be fractured. As the blasting progresses from layer to layer and as

SCE&G approaches the foundation rock assessments will be made. If necessary non-explosive methods (e.g., expansive chemicals) will be used to remove the rock to prevent damage to the foundation rock.

The NRC staff indicated that it will visit the Unit 2 excavation again once the blasting is completed to view the foundation rock and to ensure that the foundation rock was not damaged by the techniques to remove the rock above it. Based on SCE&G's discussions, the staff determined that the staff's future trip to view the foundation rock after the blasting is completed was the appropriate followup for this issue.

Question 2

Has or will the large modular fabrication building be analyzed as a missile hazard for Unit 2 and 3 operations? The staff does not believe that this large building is described in the final safety analysis report (FSAR). If the fabrication building will still be in use when Unit 2 is scheduled for fuel load, it may be necessary to evaluate this building as a missile hazard. (Note: The large modular fabrication facility is a building that is 120 feet high that is designed to allow assembly of the AP1000 modules out of the weather for later placement by a large crane in Unit 2 and Unit 3. The building is nearing completion on the site)

Summary of Discussion

SCE&G confirmed that the large modular fabrication building is not described in the FSAR. It is not designed as a permanent feature of the site. If the building is still in place to support Unit 3 construction at the time of completion of construction of Unit 2 (as defined by 10 CFR 52.103) SCE&G will perform assessments in accordance with the process described in Vigil C Summer Nuclear Station (VCSNS) combined license (COL) application FSAR section 1.10, "Nuclear Power Plants to be Operated on Multi Unit Sites." This section of the FSAR describes the process to ensure that management and administrative controls are established to identify potential hazards to structures, systems, and components (SSCs) of an operating unit as a result of construction activities at a unit under construction. In addition at the time of completion of construction of Unit 2, SCE&G indicated that it would perform 10 CFR 50.59 evaluations as appropriate to document any changes needing to be made to the FSAR based on construction activities at Unit 3. Subsequent to the call SCE&G also confirmed that it would perform other evaluations (e.g., security evaluations in accordance with 10 CFR 50.54) to determine if changes needed to be made to other licensing basis documents to support Unit 2 operations while construction of Unit 3 continued.

The NRC staff determined that no immediate followup was needed on this issue. The construction inspection program will ensure that when operations begin at Unit 2 the appropriate SCE&G management and administrative controls are in place to mitigate potential hazards from Unit 3 construction activities on Unit 2.

Question 3

Has an analysis been done of the Unit 2 and 3 nuclear island basemats to support the construction sequence envisioned by SCE&G? The staff understands that large lifts (around 1500 tons) are envisioned for the construction sequence for Unit 2 and Unit 3. What analysis, if any, has been done by SCE&G to support these lifts to ensure that they do not overstress the nuclear island basemat.

Summary of Discussion

SCE&G was not able to arrange Westinghouse's participation on the call. The staff and SCE&G indicated that another call was necessary with both Westinghouse and Vogtle to discuss the issue further. The staff indicated that a new COL information item regarding the construction sequence of the shield building was developed as part of its review of the AP1000 design certification amendment (DCA). The COL information item is discussed in AP1000 DCA request for additional information (RAI) 3.8.4-SEB- 1.04. Subsequent to the call the staff informed SCE&G that it wants to discuss how the site-specific construction sequences for Summer and Vogtle are consistent with the discussion in AP1000 design control document (DCD) Tier 2 Section 3.8.5.4.2, "Analyses of Settlement During Construction."

Question 4

Has a review been done of VCSNS COL FSAR section 1.10 to determine if changes are needed to support the use of the large crane that will be used at the site? It was described to the staff that the boom of the crane will be approximately 500 feet in length. There is some discussion in FSAR section 1.10 of the distance between the centerline of the plants based on assumptions about the crane height. Is the description in the FSAR consistent with the large heavy-lift crane that is being procured for the site?

Summary of Discussion

SCE&G determined that at this point in time no changes to VCSNS COL FSAR Section 1.10 are needed. SCE&G did indicate that it is currently envisioned that both the crane and the modular fabrication facility described in question 2 will be in place to support Unit 3 construction at the time of Unit 2's operation. Although a final determination has not been made, SCE&G indicated that it will evaluate whether or not the crane will be relocated to prevent its impact on Unit 2's operation.

NRC determined that no followup at this time is needed. The construction inspection program will ensure that the appropriate assessments are made at the time of Unit 2's operations.

Hearing Identifier: VCSummer_COL_Public
Email Number: 339

Mail Envelope Properties (36CF286628C20846A68047F24632330933175FCDBA)

Subject: Summary of August 31, 2010 phone call with V.C. Summer to discuss preconstruction activities at Summer Units 2 and 3
Sent Date: 9/3/2010 8:38:32 AM
Received Date: 9/3/2010 8:38:34 AM
From: Sebrosky, Joseph

Created By: Joseph.Sebrosky@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"Stirewalt, Gerry" <Gerry.Stirewalt@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status:: Response: None : 8/30/2010 3:51:00 PM
"Sheikh, Mina" <Mina.Sheikh@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Weber, Carl" <Carl.Weber@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Joshi, Ravindra" <Ravindra.Joshi@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Spicher, Terri" <Terri.Spicher@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status:: Response: None : 8/31/2010 5:51:00 AM
"Webb, Michael" <Michael.Webb@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Thomas, Brian" <Brian.Thomas@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Patel, Pravin" <Pravin.Patel@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Ayres, David" <David.Ayres@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status:: Response: None : 8/31/2010 5:54:00 AM
"Wang, Weijun" <Weijun.Wang@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status:: Response: None : 8/30/2010 3:36:00 PM
"Bagchi, Goutam" <Goutam.Bagchi@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status:: Response: None : 8/30/2010 2:22:00 PM
"Wilson, Jerry" <Jerry.Wilson@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status:: Response: None : 8/31/2010 9:24:00 AM
"Cook, Christopher" <Christopher.Cook@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status:: Response: None : 8/30/2010 10:16:00 AM
"Karas, Rebecca" <Rebecca.Karas@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status:: Response: None : 8/30/2010 10:16:00 AM
"See, Kenneth" <Kenneth.See@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status:: Response: None : 8/30/2010 4:17:00 PM
"Munson, Clifford" <Clifford.Munson@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Vega, Frankie" <Frankie.Vega@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Thompson, Jenise" <Jenise.Thompson@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"O'Donohue, Kathleen" <Kathleen.ODonohue@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Jackson, Rahsean" <Rahsean.Jackson@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status:: Response: None : 8/30/2010 3:36:00 PM

"Davis, Bradley" <Bradley.Davis@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Abbott, Coleman" <Coleman.Abbott@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Cruz, Jeffrey" <Jeffrey.Cruz@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Thomas, Brian" <Brian.Thomas@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"'amonroe@scana.com'" <amonroe@scana.com>
Tracking Status: None
"'jmgiles@scana.com'" <jmgiles@scana.com>
Tracking Status: None
"PMSummerColpEM Resource" <PMSummerColpEM.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	7822	9/3/2010 8:38:34 AM

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