

CCNPP3COLA PEmails

From: Steckel, James
Sent: Friday, November 26, 2010 12:49 PM
To: Poche, Robert
Cc: Colaccino, Joseph; CCNPP3COL Resource
Subject: Draft RAI No. 274 SEB2 5141
Attachments: Draft RAI 274 SEB2 5141.doc

Rob,

Attached is DRAFT RAI No. 274 (eRAI No. 5141). You have until December 10, 2010, to review this RAI and decide whether you need a conference call to discuss/clarify the question(s) in this RAI before the final issuance of the RAI. After the clarification phone call or on December 10, 2010, the RAI will be finalized and sent to you for a response. You will then have 30 days to provide a technically complete response or an expected response date for the RAI.

Thank you,

Jim Steckel

James Steckel
Project Manager
NRC EPR Projects Branch
301 415-1026
james.steckel@nrc.gov

Hearing Identifier: CalvertCliffs_Unit3Cola_Public_EX
Email Number: 1780

Mail Envelope Properties (AF843158D8D87443918BD3AA953ABF781C3D4206AF)

Subject: Draft RAI No. 274 SEB2 5141
Sent Date: 11/26/2010 12:48:40 PM
Received Date: 11/26/2010 12:48:42 PM
From: Steckel, James

Created By: James.Steckel@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"Colaccino, Joseph" <Joseph.Colaccino@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"CCNPP3COL Resource" <CCNPP3COL.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Poche, Robert" <Robert.Poche@constellation.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	681	11/26/2010 12:48:42 PM
Draft RAI 274 SEB2 5141.doc	32762	

Options

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

DRAFT
Request for Additional Information No. 274 (eRAI 5141) Revision 6
11/26/2010

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 14.3.2

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

14.03.02-12

The staff reviewed the response to RAI 236 (eRAI 4435), Question 14.03.02-6, provided in UniStar Letters UN#10-169 dated June 30, 2010 (ML101880073) and UN#10-222 dated August 6, 2010 (ML101880073) and found that the responses to Items 2 through 5 of the RAI are acceptable. However, the following additional information is needed regarding Items 1 and 6 of the RAI:

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 Items 2b and 9b in the second column of Table 2.4-7 and the contents of Item 1b in the second column of Table 2.4-33 had been revised to state that an inspection will be performed to verify that the construction and installation are as specified on the construction drawings and that deviations will be or have been reconciled. The response also explained that the reconciliation of the as-built condition is addressed in Items 2b and 9b of Table 2.4-7 rather than Items 2a and 7a in Table 2.4.7, and in Item 1b of Table 2.4-33 rather than Item 1a in Table 2.4-33, because the 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. If not, explain why not. If yes, revise the response and Tables 2.4-7 and 2.4-33 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 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 6 of the RAI, in the third column of Item 2 of the table, the words "A report exists that concludes" were removed from the beginning of the first sentence. This is consistent with revised ITAAC Tables 2.4-11, 12 and 19 as presented in the response to RAI 118, Question 14.03.03-2, Item G dated August 6, 2010. However, it is inconsistent with revised ITAAC Tables 2.4-7 through 2.4-10 as presented in the response to Question 14.03.02.2, Item H dated June 18, 2010. Revise the applicable

ITAAC tables so that the format regarding concrete specific parameters is consistent. Also, explain why the Acceptance Criteria column of Item 2 of the revised Table 2.4-33 has information on supplementary cementitious material, while the columns of Commitment Wording and Inspection, Test, or Analysis do not. Otherwise, revise the table for consistency.