

CCNPP3eRAIPEm Resource

From: Arora, Surinder
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2012 4:38 PM
To: 'Infanger, Paul'; 'UNECC3Project@unistarnuclear.com'
Cc: CCNPP3eRAIPEm Resource; Segala, John; Kleeh, Edmund; Kowal, Mark; Wilson, Anthony; Vrahoretis, Susan; Jaffe, David; McLellan, Judith
Subject: CCNPP3 - Final RAI 361 CITB 6571
Attachments: FINAL RAI 361 CITB 6571.doc

Paul,

Attached is the "Final" version of RAI No. 361 (eRAI No. 6571) pertaining to Part 10 of the Calvert Cliffs Unit 3 Combined License Application. The draft version of this RAI was issued to you on June 27, 2012. A clarification phone call, requested by UniStar to discuss the draft RAI questions, was held on July 12, 2012; however, based on this call, no changes were made to the draft questions in this RAI. This email forwards the subject RAI as "final" for your response.

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.

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: 236

Mail Envelope Properties (B46615B367D1144982B324704E3BCEEDC6EDEE8ABA)

Subject: CCNPP3 - Final RAI 361 CITB 6571
Sent Date: 7/16/2012 4:37:52 PM
Received Date: 7/16/2012 4:37:53 PM
From: Arora, Surinder

Created By: Surinder.Arora@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"CCNPP3eRAIPEm Resource" <CCNPP3eRAIPEm.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Segala, John" <John.Segala@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Kleeh, Edmund" <Edmund.Kleeh@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Kowal, Mark" <Mark.Kowal@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Wilson, Anthony" <Anthony.Wilson@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Vrahoretis, Susan" <Susan.Vrahoretis@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Jaffe, David" <David.Jaffe@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"McLellan, Judith" <Judith.McLellan@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Infanger, Paul" <paul.infanger@unistarnuclear.com>
Tracking Status: None
"UNECC3Project@unistarnuclear.com" <UNECC3Project@unistarnuclear.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1288	7/16/2012 4:37:53 PM
FINAL RAI 361 CITB 6571.doc		38394

Options

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

Request for Additional Information No. 361 (eRAI 6571)

7/16/2012

Calvert Cliffs Unit 3

UniStar

Docket No. 52-016

SRP Section: 14.03 - Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria

Application Section: Part 10-ITAAC and ITAAC Closure

QUESTIONS for ITAAC Branch (CITB)

14.03-28

ITAAC 2.4.00.08 in Table 2.4-20

Why does the AC not indicate what threshold triggers the simulated signal?

Applicable also to ITAAC 2.4.00.03 in Table 2.4-21 and ITAAC 2.4.00.09c in Table 2.4-26

14.03-29

ITAAC 2.4.00.02 in Table 2.4-21

Why does the ITAAC not indicate the temperature that Fire Protection Building is maintained to support operation of the diesel driven fire pumps?

14.03-30

ITAAC 2.4.00.02 in Table 2.4-22

Why do the three parts of ITAAC not state that each division is independently powered by its respective Class 1E division and that testing will be done on each division one at a time?

14.03-31

ITAAC 2.4.00.08b in Table 2.4-22

Why does the AC not state that the components listed in Table 2.4-29 are fabricated in accordance with requirements of ASME Code Section II and that design reconciliation per NCA-3554 has taken place?

14.03-32

ITAAC 2.4.00.08 in Table 2.4-22

Where is the ITAAC that verifies the as-built installations of the components in Table 2.4-29 were installed and inspected in accordance with ASME Code Section III?

14.03-33

ITAAC 2.4.00.08d in Table 2.4-22

Why does the AC not agree with the Commitment Wording in regard to stating that "based on hydrostatic tests that the components in question retain their pressure boundary integrity at their design pressure?"

Applicable also to ITAAC:
2.4.00.11 in Table 2.4-22
2.4.00.12 in Table 2.4-22

14.03-34

ITAAC 2.4.00.17 in Table 2.4-22

Why are the words "greater than" used in the AC given that the flowrate can be equal to 300 gpm?

14.03-35

ITAAC 2.4.00.19 in Table 2.4-22

Why does the ITA and AC not use the term MOVs instead of valves similarly to the Commitment Wording, and why does the AC not duplicate the words of the Commitment Wording?

14.03-36

ITAAC 2.4.00.21 in Table 2.4-22

Why is the surveillance test bypass line for each division not identified on Figure 2.4-1?

14.03-37

ITAAC 2.4.00.01 in Table 2.4-23

Why does the AC not indicate that the Raw Water Supply System provides water to fire water storage tanks at a rate of greater than or equal to 625 GPM for a period of 8 hours?

14.03-38

ITAAC 2.4.00.01c in Table 2.4-26

Why does the AC not refer to the offsite transmission power, instrumentation, and control circuits under test? Can a power, instrumentation, and control circuit all be energized at same time because that would not seem to violate independence rules?

14.03-39

ITAAC 2.4.00.02 in Table 2.4-26

Why do the Commitment Wording and AC not agree on the wording regarding reference to main step-up transformer?

14.03-40

ITAAC 2.4.00.03 in Table 2.4-26

Why is the ITAAC not clear on what is being sized here each Emergency Auxiliary Transformer or the independent circuit connecting it to switchyard or both?

14.03-41

ITAAC 2.4.00.03b in Table 2.4-26

Why does this ITAAC not verify that the transformer analyzed in Part a is the one installed in the field?

14.03-42

ITAAC 2.4.00.07 in Table 2.4-26

Why are the words after the term "switchyard" in ITA not included in the AC?

Applicable also to ITAAC:

ITAAC 2.4.00.08 in Table 2.4-26

ITAAC 2.4.00.09b in Table 2.4-26 regarding reconciliation of deviations.

14.03-43

ITAAC 2.4.00.01 in Table 2.4-27

Why is this ITAAC not two ITAACs - one for analysis to size the breakers and the other for inspection to verify that correct breakers are installed in field? Also why does the ITAAC not indicate for what percentage of load that breakers are sized?

Applicable also to ITAAC 2.4.00.04a in Table 2.4-28 for sizing of MCCs, breakers, and transformers as a percentage of load

14.03-44

ITAAC 2.4.00.02a in Table 2.4-28

Why is the ITA of this ITAAC not written for just MCR similar to AC instead of for both MCR and RSS?

Applicable also to ITAAC 2.4.00.03a in Table 2.4-28 and

ITAAC 2.4.00.09a in Table 2.4-28

14.03-45

ITAAC 2.4.00.02b in Table 2.4-28

Why is the ITA of this ITAAC not written for just RSS similar to AC instead of for both MCR and RSS?

Applicable also to ITAAC 2.4.00.03b in Table 2.4-28 and

ITAAC 2.4.00.09b in Table 2.4-28

