

CCNPP3eRAIPEm Resource

From: Arora, Surinder
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2011 3:21 PM
To: 'Poche, Robert'; 'cc3project@constellation.com'
Cc: CCNPP3eRAIPEm Resource; Phan, Hanh; Mrowca, Lynn; Colaccino, Joseph; Carneal, Jason; Wilson, Anthony; Vrahoretis, Susan
Subject: Draft RAI 306 SPRA 5606
Attachments: Draft RAI 306 SPRA 5606.doc

Rob,

Attached is Draft RAI No. 306 (eRAI No. 5606). You have until May 10, 2011 to review it and decide whether you need a clarification phone call to discuss any questions in the RAI before the final issuance. After the phone call or on May 10, 2011, the RAI will be finalized and sent to you for response. You will then have 30 days to provide a technically complete response or an expected response date for the RAI.

Thanks.

SURINDER ARORA, PE
PROJECT MANAGER,
Office of New Reactors
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Phone: 301 415-1421
FAX: 301 415-6406
Email: Surinder.Arora@nrc.gov

Hearing Identifier: CalvertCliffs_Unit3Col_RAI
Email Number: 111

Mail Envelope Properties (B46615B367D1144982B324704E3BCEED6AD0498E52)

Subject: Draft RAI 306 SPRA 5606
Sent Date: 4/26/2011 3:21:28 PM
Received Date: 4/26/2011 3:21:39 PM
From: Arora, Surinder

Created By: Surinder.Arora@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"CCNPP3eRAIPEm Resource" <CCNPP3eRAIPEm.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Phan, Hanh" <Hanh.Phan@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Mrowca, Lynn" <Lynn.Mrowca@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Colaccino, Joseph" <Joseph.Colaccino@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Carneal, Jason" <Jason.Carneal@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Wilson, Anthony" <Anthony.Wilson@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Vrahoretis, Susan" <Susan.Vrahoretis@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Poche, Robert" <Robert.Poche@constellation.com>
Tracking Status: None
"cc3project@constellation.com" <cc3project@constellation.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	643	4/26/2011 3:21:39 PM
Draft RAI 306 SPRA 5606.doc		31738

Options

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

Request for Additional Information No. 5606 Revision 7

4/26/2011

Calvert Cliffs Unit 3
UniStar
Docket No. 52-016
SRP Section: 17.04 - Reliability Assurance Program (RAP)
Application Section: 17.4

QUESTIONS for PRA and Severe Accidents Branch (SPRA)

17.04-10

Follow-up to Question 17.04-5

Since the RAP structures, systems, and components (SSCs) are subjected to QA controls and the system boundary is one of the key sources of information for D-RAP ITAAC closure, therefore, revise the final safety analysis report (FSAR) to clearly provide a common basis for defining and understanding the system boundaries and the associated interfaces as briefly discussed in the response to Question 17.04-5.

17.04-11

Follow-up to Question 17.04-9

The deterministic categorization process presented in CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR Section 17.4.4.1.4.2 is used to determine whether a SSC that has been determined to be low risk significant by the PRA should be included in the scope of D-RAP. In the response to Question 17.04-9, the 4 systems (i.e., normal heat sink (NHS), startup and shutdown system (SSS), auxiliary cooling water system (ACWS), and raw water supply system (RWSS)) were deterministically evaluated to be not risk-significant by the design certification expert panel and excluded from the scope of D-RAP. Since, these systems are site-specific as discussed in CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR Section 19.1.4, please provide the outcome (including the answers to the five questions, the rationale to each answer, and the resulting weighted scores) from the deterministic categorization process of Section 17.4.4.1.4.2 performed by the COL applicant.

17.04-12

Follow-up to Question 17.04-6

The response to Question 17.04-6 states that, "The selection criteria used to establish an expert panel for the RAP to screen SSCs is found in ASME RA-Sb-2005, Section 6, which provides general information on the selection process and personnel qualifications ..." The staff finds that the criteria in Section 6 of ASME RA-Sb-2005 are not all suitable to make up the D-RAP expert panel since they were intentionally developed to establish a team to review a PRA, focusing on PRA models, database, assumptions, etc. In the light of industry guidelines such as NEI 00-04 on Integrated Decision-making Panel, please provide the rationale for the criteria used for selecting the D-RAP panel

and justify that a panel of 3 individual with five years experience would be sufficient to review the results of the initial risk-significance determinations and finalize the D-RAP list.