

CCNPP3eRAIPEm Resource

From: Steckel, James
Sent: Wednesday, June 01, 2011 3:43 PM
To: Poche, Robert
Cc: Carneal, Jason; Arora, Surinder; Colaccino, Joseph; CCNPP3eRAIPEm Resource; Wilson, Anthony; Phan, Hanh
Subject: Final RAI306 SPRA 5606
Attachments: Final RAI 306 SPRA 5606.doc

Rob,

Attached please find the subject request for additional information (RAI). The draft of this RAI was sent to you on April 26, 2011. A clarification phone call requested by UniStar to discuss the draft questions was held on May 31; 2011. The changes agreed to during this phone call have been incorporated in the final version of the RAI.

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 of the applicable FSAR Chapter.

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

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

Hearing Identifier: CalvertCliffs_Unit3Col_RAI
Email Number: 125

Mail Envelope Properties (AF843158D8D87443918BD3AA953ABF782031CBB692)

Subject: Final RAI306 SPRA 5606
Sent Date: 6/1/2011 3:43:21 PM
Received Date: 6/1/2011 3:43:22 PM
From: Steckel, James

Created By: James.Steckel@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"Carneal, Jason" <Jason.Carneal@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Arora, Surinder" <Surinder.Arora@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Colaccino, Joseph" <Joseph.Colaccino@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"CCNPP3eRAIPEm Resource" <CCNPP3eRAIPEm.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Wilson, Anthony" <Anthony.Wilson@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Phan, Hanh" <Hanh.Phan@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Poche, Robert" <robert.poche@unistarnuclear.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1169	6/1/2011 3:43:22 PM
Final 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. 306 (eRAI 5606) Revision 7

6/1/2011

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, three systems (i.e., normal heat sink (NHS), 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.