

CCNPP3eRAIPEm Resource

From: Arora, Surinder
Sent: Monday, November 28, 2011 1:53 PM
To: Infanger, Paul
Cc: CCNPP3eRAIPEm Resource; Colaccino, Joseph; Segala, John; Ford, Tanya; Wilson, Anthony; Vrahoretis, Susan; See, Kenneth; Raione, Richard; Jones, Henry
Subject: Final RAI 327 RHEB 6185
Attachments: FINAL RAI 327 RHEB 6185.doc

Paul,

Attached please find the subject request for additional information (RAI). The draft of this RAI was sent to you on November 17, 2011. As stated in your email of November 23, 2011, UniStar did not require a clarification phone call to discuss the draft RAI question. The RAI is, therefore, being issued as "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 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.

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: 159

Mail Envelope Properties (B46615B367D1144982B324704E3BCEED85D675D851)

Subject: Final RAI 327 RHEB 6185
Sent Date: 11/28/2011 1:53:23 PM
Received Date: 11/28/2011 1:53:25 PM
From: Arora, Surinder

Created By: Surinder.Arora@nrc.gov

Recipients:

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

Tracking Status: None

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

Tracking Status: None

"Segala, John" <John.Segala@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Ford, Tanya" <Tanya.Ford@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Wilson, Anthony" <Anthony.Wilson@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

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

Tracking Status: None

"See, Kenneth" <Kenneth.See@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Raione, Richard" <Richard.Raione@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Jones, Henry" <Henry.Jones@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Infanger, Paul" <paul.infanger@unistarnuclear.com>

Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1170	11/28/2011 1:53:25 PM
FINAL RAI 327 RHEB 6185.doc		31226

Options

Priority: Standard

Return Notification: No

Reply Requested: No

Sensitivity: Normal

Expiration Date:

Recipients Received:

Request for Additional Information No. 327 (eRAI 6185)

11/28/2011

Calvert Cliffs Unit 3
UniStar

Docket No. 52-016

SRP Section: 02.04.05 - Probable Maximum Surge and Seiche Flooding
Application Section: FSAR Section 2.4.5

QUESTIONS for Hydrologic Engineering Branch (RHEB)

02.04.05-8

To meet the requirements of GDC 2, 10 CFR 52.17, and 10 CFR Part 100, estimates of the probable maximum hurricane (PMH) and probable maximum storm surge are needed. In response to RAI No. 289, Question 02.04.05-7, the applicant provided a table of PMH tracks and associated parameters that were used in the Sea, Lake, and Overland Surges from Hurricanes (SLOSH) model simulations. The applicant performed 59 SLOSH simulations presented in Table 12 of the RAI response (ML11111A126). The applicant stated in the RAI response that SLOSH case WTON9 was used to generate the storm track in COLA Revision 7; in Table 11 of the RAI response, the applicant stated that the maximum surge level for the WTON9 case was estimated to be 18.8 ft. The applicant stated in the RAI response that CCNPP Unit 3 COLA would not be updated as a result of the response to RAI No. 289, Question 02.04.05-7. However, in COLA Revision 7, FSAR Section 2.4.5.2.2.4 states that the final PMSS elevation in 17.6 ft NGVD29 and wave height and runup are estimated in FSAR Section 2.4.5.3.2 using the same PMSS stillwater elevation, 17.6 ft NGVD29.

The applicant is requested to explain why the higher stillwater elevation of 18.8 ft, obtained from SLOSH case WTON9, was apparently not used in COLA Revision 7, or provide updated estimates of maximum PMSS water surface elevation accounting for wind wave activity.