

## NorthAnnaRAIsPEm Resource

---

**From:** Patel, Chandu  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 05, 2011 3:41 PM  
**To:** 'na3raidommailbox@dom.com'  
**Cc:** Weisman, Robert; NorthAnnaRAIsPEm Resource; Musico, Bruce; Galvin, Dennis  
**Subject:** RAI Letter 69 RAI 5648, Section 14.3.10, North Anna 3 COLA  
**Attachments:** RAI Letter 69 RAI 5648.doc

By letter dated November 26, 2007, Dominion Virginia Power (Dominion) submitted a Combined License Application for North Anna, Unit 3, pursuant to Title 10 of the *Code of Regulations*, Part 52. The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff is performing a detailed review of this COLA.

The NRC staff has identified that additional information is needed to continue portions of the review and a Request for Additional Information (RAI), is enclosed. To support the review schedule, Dominion is requested to respond within 30 days of the date of this request. If the RAI response involves changes to the application documentation, Dominion is requested to include the associated revised documentation with the response.

Sincerely,  
Chandu Patel  
Lead Project Manager for NA3 COLA

**Hearing Identifier:** NorthAnna3\_eRAI  
**Email Number:** 16

**Mail Envelope Properties** (8C658E9029C91D4D90C6960EF59FC0D61CB0A202E1)

**Subject:** RAI Letter 69 RAI 5648, Section 14.3.10, North Anna 3 COLA  
**Sent Date:** 5/5/2011 3:40:56 PM  
**Received Date:** 5/5/2011 3:40:57 PM  
**From:** Patel, Chandu

**Created By:** Chandu.Patel@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**

"Weisman, Robert" <Robert.Weisman@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"NorthAnnaRAIsPEm Resource" <NorthAnnaRAIsPEm.Resource@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Musico, Bruce" <Bruce.Musico@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Galvin, Dennis" <Dennis.Galvin@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"na3raidommailbox@dom.com" <na3raidommailbox@dom.com>  
Tracking Status: None

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

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	818	5/5/2011 3:40:57 PM
RAI Letter 69 RAI 5648.doc		32978

**Options**

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

RAI Letter No. 69

5/5/2011

North Anna, Unit 3

Dominion

Docket No. 52-017

SRP Section: 14.03.10 - Emergency Planning - Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria  
Application Section: Part 10

QUESTIONS for Licensing and Inspection Branch (NSIR/DPR/LIB) (EP)

Request for Additional Information No. 5648 Revision 3

14.03.10-3

Part 10, Tier 1/ITAAC – COL application Part 10, “Tier 1/ITAAC” (Revision 3, June 2010) includes emergency planning (EP) ITAAC in Table B-1, “ITAAC for Emergency Planning.” Please address the following related questions:

- a. In ITAAC 6.2 of Table B-1, a part of the EP Program Element statement is missing from the corresponding Acceptance Criterion. Specifically, Acceptance Criterion 6.2.1 does not include or reflect the words: “and the magnitude of the release of radioactive materials based on plant system parameters and effluent monitors.” In addition, Acceptance Criterion 6.2.1 should be changed to 6.2, since it is the only acceptance criterion associated with ITAAC 6.2. Revise ITAAC 6.2, or explain why a revision is not appropriate.
- b. In ITAAC 6.3 of Table B-1, a part of the EP Program Element statement is missing from the corresponding Acceptance Criterion. Specifically, Acceptance Criterion 6.3 does not include or reflect the words: “[t]he means exist is continuously assess the impact of the release of radioactive materials to the environment.” Revise ITAAC 6.3, or explain why a revision is not appropriate.
- c. In ITAAC 6.4 of Table B-1, the bullet listing of wind speed, wind direction, and ambient air temperature in the Inspections, Tests, Analyses (ITA) column should be in the Acceptance Criteria column, because it reflects specific, objective acceptance criteria that must be met. Revise ITAAC 6.4, or explain why a revision is not appropriate.
- d. In ITAAC 6.7 of Table B-1, a part of the EP Program Element statement is missing from the corresponding Acceptance Criterion. Specifically, Acceptance Criterion 6.7 does not include or reflect the words: “and for comparing these estimates with the EPA protective action guides (PAGs).” In addition, the listing of isotopes in the Inspections, Tests, Analyses (ITA) column should be in the Acceptance Criteria column, because it reflects specific, objective criteria that must be met. Revise ITAAC 6.7, or explain why a revision is not appropriate.