

## CCNPP3eRAIPEm Resource

---

**From:** Steckel, James  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 02, 2010 9:16 AM  
**To:** robert.poche@constellation.com; cc3project@constellation.com; Scott, Roger D  
**Cc:** CCNPP3eRAIPEm Resource; Hawkins, Kimberly; Jeng, David; Colaccino, Joseph; Miernicki, Michael; Vrahoretis, Susan; Kirkwood, Sara  
**Subject:** Final RAI 270 SEB2 5140.docx  
**Attachments:** Final RAI 270 SEB2 5140.docx

Rob,

Attached please find the subject request for additional information (RAI). The draft of this RAI was sent to you on October 21, 2010. In a phone call on November 1, 2010, you informed us that UniStar does not need a clarification phone call for this RAI and the RAI can be issued final.

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 schedule date for submitting your technically correct and complete response will be provided to the staff within the 30 day period so that the staff can assess how this information will impact the review schedule.

Your response letter should also include a statement confirming that the response does or does not contain any sensitive or proprietary information.

Thank you,

Jim Steckel

**Hearing Identifier:** CalvertCliffs\_Unit3Col\_RAI  
**Email Number:** 41

**Mail Envelope Properties** (AF843158D8D87443918BD3AA953ABF7819C785C0F9)

**Subject:** Final RAI 270 SEB2 5140.docx  
**Sent Date:** 11/2/2010 9:16:18 AM  
**Received Date:** 11/2/2010 9:16:20 AM  
**From:** Steckel, James

**Created By:** James.Steckel@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**

"CCNPP3eRAIPEm Resource" <CCNPP3eRAIPEm.Resource@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Hawkins, Kimberly" <Kimberly.Hawkins@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Jeng, David" <David.Jeng@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Colaccino, Joseph" <Joseph.Colaccino@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Miernicki, Michael" <Michael.Miernicki@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Vrahoretis, Susan" <Susan.Vrahoretis@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Kirkwood, Sara" <Sara.Kirkwood@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"robert.poche@constellation.com" <robert.poche@constellation.com>

Tracking Status: None

"cc3project@constellation.com" <cc3project@constellation.com>

Tracking Status: None

"Scott, Roger D" <roger.scott@unistarnuclear.com>

Tracking Status: None

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

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	947	11/2/2010 9:16:20 AM
Final RAI 270 SEB2 5140.docx		16793

**Options**

**Priority:** Standard

**Return Notification:** No

**Reply Requested:** No

**Sensitivity:** Normal

**Expiration Date:**

**Recipients Received:**

Request for Additional Information No. 270 (eRAI 5140)

11/2/2010

Calvert Cliffs Unit 3  
UniStar

Docket No. 52-016

SRP Section: 14.03.02 - Structural and Systems Engineering - Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and  
Acceptance Criteria

Application Section: FSAR Section 14.3.2

QUESTIONS for Structural Engineering Branch 2 (ESBWR/ABWR Projects) (SEB2)

14.03.02-11

The staff reviewed the response to Question 14.03.02-5 provided in UniStar Letter UN#10-169 dated June 30, 2010 (ML101880073) and found that the response to Item 2 of the RAI regarding the revision of Item 1 of ITAAC Table 2.4-8 and Item 3 of the RAI are acceptable. However, additional information noted below is needed regarding Item 1 of the RAI. In addition, regarding Item 2 of the RAI, Item 4 of the revised Table 2.4-8 needs to be revised as discussed below:

Item 1 of the RAI is related to the need for ITAAC to require an analysis for reconciling the as-built plant with all the structural design-basis loads and acceptance criteria, and a report documenting the analysis results. The response indicated that the contents of Item 1b and 7b in the second column of Table 2.4-8 had been revised to state that an inspection will be performed to verify the UHS Electrical Building is constructed and its water tight measures are installed as specified on the construction drawings and deviations will be and are reconciled, respectively. The response also explained that the reconciliation of the as-built condition is addressed in Items 1b and 7b, rather than Items 1a and 7a, because as-built conditions are addressed in inspection ITAAC rather than analysis ITAAC. The staff's review of the response and the revised table found that neither the response nor the revised table clearly indicate whether an analysis for reconciling the as-built plant with the structural design-basis loads would be performed. Therefore, the staff requests that the applicant clarify whether an analysis for reconciling the as-built plant with structural design-basis loads will be performed or not. If not, explain why not. If yes, revise the response and Table 2.4-8 to clearly state that the analysis will be performed. If the analysis is performed only under certain conditions, provide the criteria for determining when the analysis has to be performed. Such criteria should be indicated in the revised ITAAC Table. The staff needs the above noted clarification to ensure that an adequate ITAAC is proposed and there is reasonable assurance that adequate ITAAC, including reconciliation of as-built plant with the structural design-basis loads and acceptance criteria by analysis, as appropriate, will be implemented pursuant to 10 CFR 52.80(a).

Regarding Item 2 of the RAI, Items 4d and 4e of the revised Table 2.4-8 should not be included in this building structures ITAAC table, since they are fire protection system related. Revise Table 2.4-8 to exclude Items 4d and 4e and move these two items to an ITAAC table applicable to fire protection systems.