



U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
**STANDARD REVIEW PLAN**

**3.8.5 FOUNDATIONS****REVIEW RESPONSIBILITIES**

**Primary** -- Organization responsible for structural analysis reviews

**Secondary** -- None

**I. AREAS OF REVIEW**

The review covers areas relating to the foundations of all Seismic Category I structures.

The specific areas of review are as follows:

4. Description of the Foundations. The review covers descriptive information, including plans and sections of each foundation, to establish that sufficient information is provided to define the primary structural aspects and elements relied on to perform the foundation function. The review also addresses the relationship between adjacent foundations, including the methods of separation provided if such separation is used to minimize seismic interaction between the buildings. In particular, the review identifies the type of foundation and examines its structural characteristics. Among the various types of foundations reviewed are mat foundations and footings, including individual column footings, combined footings supporting more than one column, and wall footings ~~supporting bearing walls. Some recent applications submitted for design certification (DC) use a single foundation mat for the nuclear island structures.~~

Draft Revision 4 ~~December 2012~~ – September 2013

---

**USNRC STANDARD REVIEW PLAN**

This Standard Review Plan (SRP), NUREG-0800, has been prepared to establish criteria that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff responsible for the review of applications to construct and operate nuclear power plants intends to use in evaluating whether an applicant/licensee meets the NRC regulations. The SRP is not a substitute for the NRC regulations, and compliance with it is not required. However, an applicant is required to identify differences between the design features, analytical techniques, and procedural measures proposed for its facility and the SRP acceptance criteria and evaluate how the proposed alternatives to the SRP acceptance criteria provide an acceptable method of complying with the NRC regulations.

The standard review plan sections are numbered in accordance with corresponding sections in Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.70, "Standard Format and Content of Safety Analysis Reports for Nuclear Power Plants (LWR Edition)." Not all sections of RG 1.70 have a corresponding review plan section. The SRP sections applicable to a combined license application for a new light-water reactor (LWR) are based on RG 1.206, "Combined License Applications for Nuclear Power Plants (LWR Edition)."

These documents are made available to the public as part of the NRC policy to inform the nuclear industry and the general public of regulatory procedures and policies. Individual sections of NUREG-0800 will be revised periodically, as appropriate, to accommodate comments and to reflect new information and experience. Comments may be submitted electronically by email to [NRR\\_SRP@nrc.gov](mailto:NRR_SRP@nrc.gov).

Requests for single copies of SRP sections (which may be reproduced) should be made to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Reproduction and Distribution Services Section, or by fax to (301) 415-2289; or by email to [DISTRIBUTION@nrc.gov](mailto:DISTRIBUTION@nrc.gov). Electronic copies of this section are available through the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/nuregs/staff/sr0800/>, or in the NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS), at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>, under Accession # ~~ML12353A388~~ ML13198A267.

---

supporting bearing walls. Some applications submitted for design certification (DC) use a single mat foundation for the nuclear island structures.

Other types of foundations that may be used include pile foundations, drilled caissons, caissons for waterfront structures, such as a pumphouse, and rock anchor systems. The review addresses these types of foundations on a case-by-case basis.

The paragraphs below list major plant seismic Category I foundations that are reviewed, together with associated descriptive information:

A. Containment Structure Foundation

The most commonly used type of foundation for both concrete and steel containments is a mat foundation, which is a flat thick slab supporting the containment, its interior structures, and any shield building surrounding the containment. For some pressurized-water reactor containments, the base-mat has a central depression that forms the reactor cavity. The review addresses the general arrangement of the containment base slab, as described in Subsection I.1 of NUREG-0800, Standard Review Plan (SRP) Section 3.8.1, with particular emphasis on methods of transferring horizontal shears, such as those caused by earthquakes, to the foundation media. If shear keys are used for such purposes, the review covers the general arrangement of the keys. If waterproofing membranes are used, the review addresses their effect on the shear resistance of the foundation. In prestressed concrete containments with a tendon inspection gallery, the review includes the arrangement of the gallery and means of either isolating it from the remainder of the base slab or relying on it for some function, such as resisting shears.

B. Containment Enclosure Building Foundation

If the containment enclosure building is constructed of reinforced concrete, it is usually supported on the same mat foundation that supports the containment.

If the containment enclosure building is constructed of structural steel and metal siding, it may surround only the exposed portion of the containment. In such a situation, the enclosure building columns are founded on individual or combined footings at grade level, on the roof of the buildings adjacent to or surrounding the containment, on the dome of the containment, or possibly on brackets anchored to the exterior face of the cylindrical wall of the containment. The review includes the general arrangement of such foundations, with particular emphasis on methods of isolating the enclosure building from other buildings in a lateral direction when this is preferable to minimize seismic interaction.

C. Auxiliary Building Foundation

The auxiliary building foundation is typically of a mat type, particularly if the supporting medium is soil.

The review addresses the general arrangement of the foundation, with particular emphasis on methods of transferring loads from the structure to the foundation media.

D. Other Seismic Category I Foundations

The foundations for other Seismic Category I structures, which may be one or a combination of several foundation types, are reviewed to an extent similar to that of the containment foundation. Among Seismic Category I structures with foundations subject to such a review are fuel storage buildings, control buildings, diesel generator buildings, intake structures, and cooling towers. The review also includes the foundations of ~~safety-related~~ structures that may be important to safety, which because of other design provisions, are not classified as Seismic Category I- (e.g., radwaste building).

2. Applicable Codes, Standards, and Specifications. The review addresses information pertaining to design codes, standards, specifications, Regulatory Guides regulatory guides (RGs), and other industry standards that are applied in the design, fabrication, construction, testing, and surveillance of Seismic Category I foundations.
3. Loads and Load Combinations. The review includes information pertaining to the applicable design loads and their various combinations. The loads normally applicable to Seismic Category I foundations are the same as those applicable to the structures that the foundations support. SRP Section 3.8.1, Subsection I.3 describes these loads for the containment foundation, and SRP Section 3.8.4, Subsection I.3 details such loads for all other Seismic Category I foundations. These should also include the loads that are induced by the proposed construction sequence and by the differential settlements of the soil under and to the sides of the structures.
4. Design and Analysis Procedures. The review assesses design procedures used for Seismic Category I foundations other than containment, emphasizing the extent of compliance with American Concrete Institute (ACI) 349, with additional guidance provided by RG 1.142, for concrete structures and the American National Standards Institute/American Institute of Steel Construction (ANSI/AISC N690-1994) including Supplement 2 (2004) specifications for steel structures. For containment foundations, the emphasis is on the extent of compliance with the procedures discussed in Subsection I.4 of SRP Section 3.8.1 are met. The review includes analysis procedures used for Seismic Category I foundations with respect to the applicability of the theories on which these procedures are based.

Among the areas reviewed are the following:

- A. Assumptions about boundary conditions and the expected behavior of each foundation when subjected to the various design loads.
- B. Methods that transmit lateral loads and forces and overturning moments thereof from the structure to the foundation media. Such forces are mainly generated by environmental and abnormal plant conditions, such as wind, tornadoes, hurricanes, earthquakes, and pipe ruptures. The review includes methods of

determining overturning moments attributable to earthquakes, as described in SRP Section 3.7.2.

C. ~~E.~~ Treatment of transient and localized loads.

D. Treatment of the effects of shrinkage and cracking of the concrete.

E. Computer programs that are used in the design and analysis of seismic Category I foundations.

Seismic Category I ~~foundations.~~

F. ~~D.~~ Category I structures design report (see Appendix C to SRP Section 3.8.4).

G. ~~E.~~ A structural audit (see Appendix B to SRP Section 3.8.4). ~~Some recent applications submitted for DC use~~

Where a single mat foundation is used for ~~the nuclear island~~multiple plant structures. ~~For such designs~~, attention is given to bending, shear, and similar factors in the ~~base-mat~~basemat that are attributable to uneven settlement, construction sequence, and mat flexibility. The review also considers the design of the junction of the sidewall and ~~base-mat~~basemat, as well as stiff or soft spots in the underlying soil and soil on the side of the foundation walls. Site-specific soil-bearing capacities are reviewed as part of SRP Section 2.5.4.

5. Structural Acceptance Criteria. The review assesses the foundation for its capability to receive loads from the structure and to transmit loads to the soil media, with appropriate safety margins.

The review addresses the design limits imposed on the various parameters that serve to quantify the structural behavior of each foundation, emphasizing the extent ~~of compliance with~~ the allowable limits delineated in Subsection II.5 of this SRP section are met. The review includes factors of safety against overturning and sliding to ensure adequate safety margins.

6. Materials, Quality Control, and Special Construction Techniques. The review assesses information on the materials used in the construction of ~~Seismic~~seismic Category I foundations. Among the major materials of construction reviewed are the following:

- A. Concrete ingredients
- B. Reinforcing bars and mechanical splices
- C. Structural steel (including steel embedments)
- D. Rock anchors, including any prestressing system, if applicable

The review includes the quality control program proposed for the fabrication and construction of ~~Seismic~~seismic Category I foundations, including nondestructive examination of the materials to determine physical properties, placement of concrete, and erection tolerances.

The review addresses any ~~proposed~~ special construction techniques on a case-by-case basis.

In addition, for ~~Seismic~~ seismic Category I foundations other than containment, the following information should be provided:

- A. The extent to which the materials and quality control programs comply with ACI 349, with additional guidance provided by RG 1.142, for concrete, and with ANSI/AISC N690-1994 including Supplement 2 (2004) for steel, as applicable.
- B. If welding of reinforcing bars is ~~proposed~~ used, the design should comply with the applicable sections of American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (hereafter referred as Code), Section III, Division 2. Any exceptions taken ~~to compliance~~ should be justified.

The review of geological and seismological information to establish the free-field ground motion is performed as described in SRP Sections 2.5.1 and 2.5.2.

The review of the geotechnical parameters and methods employed in the analysis of free-field soil media and soil properties is conducted as described in SRP Sections 2.5.4 and 2.5.5.

- 7. Testing and Inservice Surveillance Programs. For ~~seismic~~ seismic Category I foundations, the review addresses information on structure monitoring and maintenance requirements.

It is important for ~~seismic~~ seismic Category I foundations to accommodate inservice inspection of critical areas. The review therefore assesses any special design provisions (e.g., providing sufficient physical access, furnishing alternative means for identification of conditions in inaccessible areas that can lead to degradation, conducting remote visual monitoring of high-radiation areas) to accommodate inservice inspection of ~~seismic~~ seismic Category I foundations.

The review of postconstruction testing and inservice surveillance programs for foundations, such as periodic examination of inaccessible areas, monitoring of ground-water chemistry, and monitoring of settlements and differential displacements, is on a case-by-case basis.

- 8. Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria (ITAAC). For DC and combined license (COL) reviews, the staff reviews the applicant's proposed ITAAC associated with the structures, systems, and components (SSCs) related to this SRP section in accordance with SRP Section 14.3, "Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria." The staff recognizes that the review of ITAAC cannot be completed until after the rest of this portion of the application has been reviewed against acceptance criteria contained in this SRP section. Furthermore, the staff reviews the ITAAC to ensure that all SSCs in this area of review are identified and addressed as appropriate in accordance with SRP Section 14.3.
- 9. COL Action Items and Certification Requirements and Restrictions. For a DC application, the review ~~will~~ also ~~address~~ addresses COL action items and requirements and restrictions (e.g., interface requirements and site parameters).

For a COL application referencing a DC, a COL applicant must address COL action items (referred to as COL license information in certain DCs) included in the referenced DC. Additionally, a COL applicant must address requirements and restrictions (e.g., interface requirements and site parameters) included in the referenced DC.

## Review Interfaces

Other SRP sections interface with this section as follows:

1. The determination of structures that are subject to a quality assurance program in accordance with the requirements of Appendix B to Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, (10 CFR) Part 50 is performed under SRP Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2. The review of safety-related structures is performed on that basis.
2. The determination of pressure loads from high-energy lines located in safety-related structures other than containment is performed in accordance with SRP Section 3.6.1. The loads thus generated are included in the load combination equations of this SRP section.
3. The determination of loads generated by pressure under accident conditions is performed in accordance with SRP Section 6.2.1. The loads thus generated are included in the load combinations in this SRP section.
4. The organization responsible for quality assurance performs the reviews of design, construction, and operation phase quality assurance programs under SRP Chapter 17. In addition, while conducting regulatory audits in accordance with Office Instruction NRR-LIC-111 or NRO-REG-108, "Regulatory Audits," the technical staff may identify quality-related issues. If this occurs, then the technical staff should contact the organization responsible for quality assurance to determine if an inspection should be conducted.
5. The review for foundation settlement, effects of settlement on construction procedures, and modeling of soil stiffness for various loading conditions, as described in SRP Sections 3.8.5 II.4 E, J, and K, is coordinated with the review under SRP Section 2.5.4. The modeling of soil stiffness for seismic loading is coordinated with the review under SRP Section 3.7.2.

~~The specific acceptance criteria and review procedures are contained in the referenced SRP sections 6. Review of the Probabilistic Risk Assessment is performed under SRP Section 19.~~

## II. ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA

### Requirements

Acceptance criteria are based on meeting the relevant requirements of the following Commission regulations:



1. 10 CFR 50.55a and 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix A, General Design Criterion (GDC) 1, as they relate to safety-related structures being designed, fabricated, erected, and tested to quality standards commensurate with the importance of the safety functions to be performed.
2. GDC 2, as it relates to the design of the safety-related structures that are capable of withstanding the most severe natural phenomena, such as wind, tornadoes, [hurricanes](#), floods, and earthquakes and the appropriate combination of all loads.
3. GDC 4, as it relates to appropriately protecting safety-related structures against dynamic effects, including the effects of missiles, pipe whipping, and discharging fluids, that may result from equipment failures and from events and conditions outside the nuclear power unit.
4. GDC 5, as it relates to not sharing safety-related structures among nuclear power units unless it can be shown that such sharing will not significantly impair their ability to perform their safety functions.
5. Appendix B to 10 CFR Part 50, as it relates to the quality assurance criteria for nuclear power plants.
6. 10 CFR 52.47(b)(1), which requires that a DC application contain the proposed ITAACs that are necessary and sufficient to provide reasonable assurance that, if the inspections, tests, and analyses are performed and the acceptance criteria met, a [plant facility](#) that incorporates the DC ~~is built~~[has been constructed](#) and will ~~operate~~[be operated](#) in ~~accordance~~[conformity](#) with the DC, the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act (AEA), and the ~~U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's~~ [\(NRC\) rules and regulations](#);
7. 10 CFR 52.80(a), which requires that a COL application contain the proposed inspections, tests, and analyses, including those applicable to emergency planning, that the licensee shall perform, and the acceptance criteria that are necessary and sufficient to provide reasonable assurance that, if the inspections, tests, and analyses are performed and the acceptance criteria met, the facility has been constructed and will operate in conformity with the ~~combined license~~[COL](#), the provisions of the ~~AEA~~[Atomic Energy Act](#), and the ~~NRG~~[Commission's rules and](#) regulations.

### SRP Acceptance Criteria

Specific SRP acceptance criteria acceptable to meet the relevant requirements of the ~~NRG's~~[Commission's](#) regulations identified above are as follows for the review described in this SRP section. The SRP is not a substitute for the ~~NRG's~~[Commission's](#) regulations, and compliance with it is not required. However, an applicant is required to identify differences between [this SRP section and](#) the design features, analytical techniques, and procedural measures proposed for ~~its~~[the](#) facility ~~and the SRP acceptance criteria~~, and ~~evaluated~~[discussing](#) how the proposed alternatives ~~to the SRP acceptance criteria~~ provide acceptable methods of ~~compliance~~[complying](#) with the ~~NRG~~ regulations [that underlie the SRP acceptance criteria](#).

1. Description of the Foundation. The descriptive information in the Safety Analysis Report (SAR) is acceptable if it meets the criteria in Section 3.8.5.1 of RG 1.206.

New or unique design features that are not specifically covered in RG 1.206 or RG 1.70 may require a more detailed review. The reviewer determines the additional information that may be needed to accomplish a meaningful review of the structural aspects of such new or unique features.

RG 1.206 provides the basis for evaluating the description of structures to be included in a DC or a COL application.

RG 1.70 provides guidance for information to be submitted with an application for construction permit (CP) or operating license (OL).

2. Applicable Codes, Standards, and Specifications. The design, materials, fabrication, erection, inspection, testing, and surveillance, if any, of Seismic Category I foundations are covered by codes, standards, and guides that apply either in their entirety or in part. Subsection II.2 of SRP Section 3.8.4 includes a list of such documents. In addition, the documents listed in Subsection II.2 of SRP Section 3.8.1 are acceptable for the containment foundation.
3. Loads and Load Combinations. The specified loads and load combinations used in the design of Seismic Category I foundations are acceptable if found to be in accordance with those combinations referenced in Subsection II.3 of SRP Section 3.8.1 for the containment foundation and with those combinations listed in Subsection II.3 of SRP Section 3.8.4 for all other Seismic Category I foundations. Also to be included are loads that are induced by the construction sequence and by the differential settlements of the soil under and to the sides of the structures.

In addition to the load combinations referenced above, the combinations used to check against sliding and overturning attributable to earthquakes, winds, tornadoes, hurricanes, and against flotation because of floods are acceptable if found to be in accordance with the following:

- A.  $D + H + E$
- B.  $D + H + W$
- C.  $D + H + E'$
- D.  $D + H + W_t$
- E.  $D + F'$

Where D, E, W, E', and  $W_t$  are as referenced in Subsection II.3 of SRP Section 3.8.4, where H is the lateral earth pressure, and F' is the buoyant force of the design-basis flood. In load combination D, the higher of  $W_t$  or hurricane should be used. Justification should be provided for including live loads or portions thereof in these combinations.

As noted in Appendix S to 10 CFR Part 50, the operating-basis earthquake (OBE), designated as E above, is only associated with plant shutdown and inspection unless the applicant specifically selects it as a design input. If the OBE is set at one-third or less of the safe-shutdown earthquake (SSE) ground motion, an explicit response analysis or design analysis is not required. If the OBE is set at a value greater than one-third of the SSE, an analysis and design must be performed to demonstrate that the Seismic



Category I foundations remain functional and fall within applicable stress, strain, and deformation limits. SRP Section 3.7 provides additional guidance on OBE use.

4. Design and Analysis Procedures. The design and analysis procedures used for Seismic Category I foundations are acceptable if found to be in accordance with the following:
  - A. The design should consider the soil-structure interaction, (SSI), hydrodynamic effect, and dynamic soil pressure.
  - B. For Seismic Category I concrete foundations other than the containment foundations, the procedures are in accordance with the ACI 349, with additional guidance provided by RG 1.142.
  - C. For seismic Category I steel foundations, the procedures are in accordance with ANSI/AISC N690-1994 including Supplement 2 (2004).
  - D. For the containment foundation, if in accordance with the design and analysis procedures referenced in SRP Section 3.8.1, Subsection II.4.
  - E. The design report is acceptable if it satisfies the guidelines provided in SRP Section 3.8.4, Appendix C.
  - F. The structural audit is conducted in accordance with SRP Section 3.8.4, Appendix B.
  - G. Methods for determining the sliding forces and overturning moment attributable to an earthquake should be in accordance with the methods described in SRP Section 3.7.2.
  - H. Computer programs are acceptable if the validation provided is found to be in accordance with the procedures delineated in Subsection II.4.E of SRP Section 3.8.1.

In addition to the above, the design and analysis procedures for the following details are reviewed on a case-by-case basis:

- A. Appropriateness of the method for determination of the bending moments and shear forces in the mat foundation ~~mat~~ for seismic loads.
- B. Adequacy of the sliding analysis method and ~~of~~ the analysis results to account for potential mat foundation ~~mat~~-liftoff effects. The staff should also review the calculation of the factor of safety against sliding. If sliding resistance is the sum of shear friction along the ~~base-mat~~basemat and contribution of soil lateral pressure up to the full passive pressure capacity induced by embedment effects, the adequacy of the analysis to consider these effects is addressed using a consistent lateral displacement criterion. This involves the use of static versus dynamic coefficient of friction consistent with the use of partial versus full passive pressure. ~~Whether~~The reviewer should also consider whether the selection of the coefficient of friction used in the sliding stability analysis considers the various

sliding interfaces (e.g., soil shear failure, concrete to soil, waterproofing to soil, concrete basemat to concrete mudmat).

If the stability evaluation is performed based on a pseudo-static approach, using the maximum seismic demand loads (e.g., maximum forces in the two horizontal directions and one vertical direction), then the factors of safety for sliding and overturning can be determined by the ratio of capacity to demand loads.

However, if a linear time history analysis approach is utilized, then the factor of safety can be calculated at each time step throughout the time history. The minimum value of the factors of safety calculated in this manner should be compared against the acceptance criteria for that load combination. For the pseudo-static and time history analysis methods, all three directional demand forces should be considered to act simultaneously. Therefore, the resultant seismic forces (horizontal resultant force for sliding from the two horizontal forces and similarly the resultant overturning moment for overturning stability) should be considered. In the case of the sliding evaluation, if instead of using the resultant horizontal force with the vertical force, ~~the pair~~each pair of ~~each~~ horizontal force ~~with the~~and vertical force ~~are~~is evaluated separately, then the frictional resistance in the horizontal directions should be apportioned considering the existence of the two horizontal forces.

If the stability evaluation is performed using a nonlinear time history analysis that includes foundation sliding and uplift, the analysis should consider the following criteria:

- ~~1.~~1.~~i.~~ The development of the set of time histories should follow the guidance described in SRP Section 3.7.1. This includes identification of the number of ~~input~~ time histories needed to perform the nonlinear time history analyses and the development of each of the individual time histories. In this case, the guidance in SRP 3.7.1 II.B, Option 2, for multiple sets of time histories is applicable.
- ~~2.~~2.~~ii.~~ To demonstrate an adequate factor of safety, the seismic input time histories should be increased by a factor equal to the factor of safety for the applicable load combination (e.g., increase the seismic input time history amplitudes by a factor of 1.1 for load combination C). ~~No~~, or minimal sliding, and no overturning should be demonstrated for each of the time history analyses.
- ~~3.~~3.~~iii.~~ The mathematical model should include the effects of sliding and uplift between the foundation and the soil media using appropriate finite elements that can simulate sliding once the frictional limit is reached and can simulate contact surfaces that can transmit compression but not tension.
- ~~4.~~4.~~iv.~~ The sliding and overturning stability evaluation should consider the various significant parameters that were evaluated in the design basis seismic ~~soil structure interaction~~SSI analysis (e.g., range of soil profiles, concrete stiffness variation).

5-v. If the input motion applied at the foundation of ~~the mathematical~~ structural model without the soil is developed from the response of the linear ~~soil structure interaction (SSI)~~ analysis, justification is needed to demonstrate that any minimal sliding or uplift ~~that might occur~~ would not affect the assumed seismic input motion ~~which was~~ taken from the SSI analysis that does not consider any sliding and uplift. Alternatively, the structural model could be coupled with the soil model and a nonlinear SSI analysis performed.

6-vi. The mathematical model should adequately represent the dynamic characteristics of the structure and capture the vibration modes important for the sliding and overturning stability analysis.

7-vii. If some minimal sliding does occur, the justification for incurring a small magnitude of sliding needs to be provided. In this case, the magnitude of sliding should be based on the envelope of the values obtained from the individual time history analyses. In addition, the magnitude of sliding/overturning plus the SSI building displacements need to be evaluated for adequate seismic gaps between structures, and the design adequacy of commodities attached to the structures (e.g., piping and conduit between adjacent structures above grade; buried piping, conduit, and tunnels) need to be evaluated.

- C. Adequacy of the evaluation of the capability of a foundation to transfer shear when waterproofing is used for a range of site conditions (soil sites with shear wave velocity of 1000 feet per second to hard rock).
- D. Adequacy of the definition of dead load for uplift evaluations (floatation and seismic overturning), including the treatment of the stored volume of water in any pools.
- E. Detailed explanation of how settlement is evaluated, (including potential effects of static or dynamic differential settlement, dependence on time (i.e., short term vs. long term), effect of the soil type (i.e., granular vs. cohesive), and effect of the foundation type and size (e.g., basemats, spread footings)). Evaluation of the effects of settlement on construction procedures. Evaluation of the allowable settlement (total and differential) that can be accommodated in the foundation/structures.
- F. The maximum toe pressure for ~~base mat~~basemat design under worst-case static and dynamic loads and its justification.
- G. The evaluation of stiff and soft spots in the foundation soil to maximize the bending moments used in the design of the mat foundation-~~mat~~.
- H. Description of the design details of critical locations, such as the junction of sidewall and ~~base mat~~basemat and the junctions of ~~base mat~~basemat to sumps.

- I. Detail explanation of the load path from all superstructures to the [mat](#) foundation ~~mat~~ to the subgrade. Discussion of any unique design features that occur in the load path (e.g., any safety-related function that the tendon gallery may have as part of the foundation in a prestressed containment or the connection of any internal structures to a steel containment and its supporting foundation).
- J. Explanation of how loads attributable to construction are evaluated in the design. Some examples of items to be discussed include the excavation sequence and loads from the construction sequence of the [mat](#) foundation ~~mat~~ and walls, as well as the potential for loss of subgrade contact (e.g., because of loss of cement from a mud mat) that may lead to a differential pressure distribution on the mat.
- K. An essential aspect of the design and analysis procedures for [Seismieseismic](#) Category I foundations is the stiffness modeling of the soil material under and to the sides of the structures. Soil stiffness can be represented by means of analytical or numerical (e.g., solid finite elements, distributed springs) formulations that are appropriate for the loading conditions as well as for the soil type, foundation type and size, and time scale being considered.

In the case of seismic dynamic loads, the soil stiffness parameters should be consistent with the magnitude of soil strains assumed in the SSI analysis described in SRP Section 3.7.2, which are associated with the relatively short time scale of the seismic input. The distribution of toe bearing pressures used in foundation design should be consistent with the distribution of toe bearing pressures obtained from the SSI analysis.

In the case of gravity loads and basemat foundations, the soil stiffness parameters should be consistent with: (a) dishing or Boussinesq effects (if uncoupled distributed springs are used then it may be necessary for the stiffness to be increased at the edges and reduced at the center of the basemat footprint); (b) basemat size (subgrade modulus could be highly dependent on basemat dimensions); (c) time scale of the loads (i.e., short term construction loads vs. long term loads present throughout the life of the structure); and (d) soil type (i.e., granular vs. cohesive soils).

Appropriate stiffness parameters are particularly important when evaluating loads induced by the construction process and by differential settlements, as described in items E and J above. Additional guidance to consider in the review of DC and COL applications is given below.

i. In the case of a DC application, the staff reviews the following information:

- Postulated set of soil stiffness parameters for the construction phase and the technical bases for its selection, for all soils within the zone of influence surrounding the structures. The zone of influence is defined as that region to the side and below the structure that may induce loads on the structure if induced settlements occur and/or loads are applied within the zone.

- Postulated set of soil stiffness parameters for the post-construction phase and the technical basis for its selection.
- Postulated construction sequence and corresponding set of construction loads and the technical basis for its selection.
- Analysis methodology for computing soil settlements (total and differential, short term and long term), which should incorporate the postulated soil stiffness and construction sequence, and include potential long term settlement effects through the life of the structure.
- Analysis methodology for computing member forces and moments induced by the settlements and construction sequence, which should then be taken as a separate construction sequence/soil settlement load case, to be included in the structural design of the foundation and superstructure in addition to all other load cases.
- Interface considerations between DC and COL applications (e.g., COL action items and appropriate acceptance criteria) that permit verification of the foundation design by a COL applicant. An acceptable interface consideration is to incorporate the settlement profiles computed for a postulated construction sequence (the various stages of construction and post construction), which a COL applicant can then use for verification purposes in conjunction with predictive calculations (associated with the actual construction sequence) and a settlement monitoring program. The acceptance criteria for these verifications need to be clearly identified.
- Development of a short term and long-term settlement monitoring program that can detect both vertical and horizontal movements in and around the structures, as well as differential distortion across the foundation footprint, from the beginning of construction at the site. The movements induced by site excavation, backfill, and re-compaction should be included in the monitoring program. Consideration should be given to maintaining all or pieces of the monitoring program over the life of the structure.

ii. In the case of a COL application that incorporates a DC application by reference, the staff reviews the following information:

- [Site](#)[In addition to the geotechnical investigation performed in SRP Section 2.5.4, the staff reviewer for this section should review, the site-specific geotechnical investigation program to determine predicted settlements during construction and post construction, based on the construction sequence to be used. The investigation program should be carried to sufficient depths to be able to ascertain these properties over the depth considered important to](#)

the settlement analyses. The methodology for site-specific settlement analyses should be consistent with the corresponding methodology in the DC application.

- Settlement monitoring program to verify whether measured settlements and distortions are consistent with predicted site-specific settlements during construction and post-construction phases, through the life of the structure.
- Verification of the interface considerations between DC and COL applications, which should be based on the information described in the above two bullets.

The above considerations are appropriate for major ~~Seismic~~ Seismic Category I foundations ~~such as a Nuclear Island basemat~~. Alternative, more simplified, approaches are acceptable for the case of smaller structures if adequate justifications are provided.

In the case of adjacent structures connected by appurtenances (non-flexible commodities, such as piping and conduit), the staff reviews the design criteria for total settlement and for relative settlement between adjacent structures to ensure consistency with the criteria used in the design of the appurtenances.

5. Structural Acceptance Criteria. For the loading combinations referenced in the first paragraph of Subsection II.3 of this SRP section, the allowable limits that constitute the acceptance criteria are referenced in Subsection II.5 of SRP Section 3.8.1 for the containment foundation and in Subsection II.5 of SRP Section 3.8.4 for all other foundations. In addition, for the five other load combinations in Subsection II.3 of this SRP section, the factors of safety against overturning, sliding, and flotation are acceptable if found to be in accordance with the following:

Minimum Factors of Safety

<u>For Combination</u>	<u>Overturning</u>	<u>Sliding</u>	
<u>Flotation</u>			
A. -----	1.5	1.5	---
B. -----	1.5	1.5	---
C. -----	1.1	1.1	---
D. -----	1.1	1.1	---
E. -----		---	1.1

6. Materials, Quality Control, and Special Construction Techniques.



For the containment foundation, Subsection II.6 of SRP Section 3.8.1 references the acceptance criteria for materials, quality control, and any special construction techniques.

For all other ~~Seismic~~seismic Category I foundations, the materials and quality control programs are acceptable if found to be in accordance with the codes and standards indicated in Subsection I.6 of this SRP section. Special construction techniques, if any, are treated on a case-by-case basis.

7. Testing and Inservice Surveillance Requirements. For seismic Category I foundations, structure monitoring and maintenance requirements are acceptable if found to be in accordance with 10 CFR 50.65 and RG 1.160.

For water control structures, inservice inspection programs are acceptable if found to be in accordance with RG 1.127. Water control structures covered by this program include concrete structures, embankment structures, spillway structures and outlet works, reservoirs, cooling water channels and canals, as well as intake and discharge structures, and safety and performance instrumentation.

For seismic Category I foundations, it is important to accommodate inservice inspection of critical areas. The staff considers monitoring and maintaining the condition of seismic Category I foundations as essential for plant safety. It is also important that a foundation monitoring program include monitoring of settlements (both differential and total) during construction and post construction to ensure that the foundation continues to perform as designed.

Any special design provisions (e.g., providing sufficient physical access, supplying a means for identification of conditions in inaccessible areas that can lead to degradation, performing remote visual monitoring of high-radiation areas) to accommodate inservice inspection of seismic Category I foundations are reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

For plants with nonaggressive ground water/soil (i.e., pH > 5.5, chlorides < 500 parts per million (ppm), sulfates < 1500 ppm), an acceptable program for normally inaccessible below-grade concrete walls and foundations is to (1) examine the exposed portions of below-grade concrete for signs of degradation, when excavated for any reason, and (2) conduct periodic site monitoring of ground-water chemistry to confirm that the ground water remains nonaggressive.

For plants with aggressive ground water/soil (i.e., exceeding any of the limits noted above), an acceptable approach is to implement a periodic surveillance program to monitor the condition of normally inaccessible below-grade concrete for signs of degradation.

Subsection II.7 of SRP Section 3.8.1 covers additional testing and surveillance requirements for the containment foundation. Design of any special foundations ~~will be~~is reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

#### Technical Rationale

The technical rationale for application of these acceptance criteria to the areas of review addressed by this SRP section is discussed in the following paragraphs:

This rationale addresses [seismic](#) Category I foundations other than containment. The technical rationale for containment foundations is the same as that for concrete containment, as discussed in Subsection II of SRP Section 3.8.1.

1. Compliance with 10 CFR 50.55a requires that SSCs be designed, fabricated, erected, constructed, tested, and inspected to quality standards commensurate with the importance of the safety functions to be performed.

[This](#) SRP Section ~~3.8.5~~ refers to a list of acceptable documents in SRP Section 3.8.4 that provide guidance regarding construction, quality control, tests, and inspections. ACI 349, with additional guidance provided by RG 1.142 and ANSI/AISC N690-1994 including Supplement 2 (2004) contains basic specifications for concrete and steel structures, respectively. These guides and specifications impose specific restrictions to ensure that the foundations of structures other than containment will perform their intended safety function.

Meeting these requirements [and criteria](#) provides additional assurance that the foundations of structures other than containment described in this section will perform their intended safety function and limit the release of radioactive materials.

2. Compliance with GDC 1 requires that (1) SSCs important to safety be designed, fabricated, erected, and tested to quality standards commensurate with the importance of their safety function, (2) a quality assurance program be established and implemented, and (3) sufficient and appropriate records be maintained. If generally recognized codes and standards are used, they should be identified and evaluated to determine their applicability, adequacy, and sufficiency and supplemented or modified as necessary to assure a quality product in keeping with the required safety function.

[This](#) SRP ~~Section 3.8.5~~section, which also refers to SRP Section 3.8.4, describes acceptable criteria related to static and dynamic loadings and evaluation programs for structures other than containment. It also describes acceptable materials, design methodology, quality control procedures, construction methods, and inservice inspections, as well as documentation criteria for design and construction controls.

[This](#) SRP ~~Section 3.8.5~~section, which also refers to SRP Section 3.8.4, cites ACI 349, ANSI/AISC\_N690-1994 including Supplement 2 (2004), and RGs to provide guidance describing design methodology, materials testing, and construction techniques that are commensurate with the importance of the safety function to be performed. Conformance with these requirements imposes specific restrictions to ensure that structures other than the containment will perform acceptably, commensurate with their intended safety function, when designed in accordance with the above standards.

Meeting these requirements [and criteria](#) provides assurance that the foundations of structures other than containment described in this section will perform their intended safety function.

3. Compliance with GDC 2 requires that the design of SSCs important to safety withstand the effects of expected natural phenomena, such as earthquakes, tornadoes, hurricanes, floods, tsunami, and seiches, without losing the capability to perform their safety functions. The design bases for these SSCs shall reflect appropriate combinations of the effects of normal and accident conditions with the effects of the natural phenomena.

To ensure that the design of structures other than containment of a nuclear power plant will withstand natural phenomena, it is necessary to consider the most severe natural phenomena that have been historically reported, allowing sufficient margin for the limited accuracy, quantity, and period of time in which the historical data have been accumulated. These data should be used to specify the design requirements of nuclear power plant components to be evaluated as part of CP, OL, COL, and early site permit (ESP) reviews, or for site parameter envelopes in the case of DCs, thereby ensuring that components important to safety will function in a manner that will maintain the plant in a safe condition.

[This SRP Section 3.8.5 section](#), which also refers to SRP Section 3.8.4, provides detailed acceptance criteria and cites appropriate regulatory guidance for design methodology, materials testing, and construction techniques that are acceptable to the staff. GDC 2 requires that the design of structures other than containment be able to withstand the effects of natural phenomena combined with the effects of normal and accident conditions without losing the capability to perform their safety functions. The primary function of a foundation is to transmit the loads imposed by the superstructure to the foundation material, bedrock, and/or soil supporting the structure. Foundations must be designed to interact with the structures they support. Consequently, it is necessary to specify the most severe natural phenomena (e.g., earthquakes) likely to occur as a function of their frequency of occurrence. The load combinations and specifications cited in these SRP sections provide acceptable engineering criteria to accomplish that function.

Meeting these requirements [and criteria](#) provides added assurance that the design of foundations of structures other than containment will withstand the effects of natural phenomena and will perform their intended safety functions.

4. Compliance with GDC 4 requires that the design of nuclear power plant SSCs important to safety (1) accommodate the effects of, and be compatible with, environmental conditions associated with normal operation, maintenance, testing, and postulated accidents, including loss-of-coolant accidents and (2) appropriately protect against dynamic effects, including the effects of missiles, pipe whipping, and discharging fluids, that may result from equipment failures and from events and conditions outside the nuclear power unit.

[This SRP Section 3.8.5 section](#), which also refers to SRP Section 3.8.4, provides acceptable methods including load combinations, acceptance criteria, standards, and codes to ensure compliance with GDC 4. Meeting this [requirement/criterion](#) provides assurance that the foundations of structures other than containment will withstand loads from internal events, such as those described above, and from external sources, such as explosive hazards in proximity to the site, potential aircraft crashes (non-terrorist-related incidents), and missiles generated from activities of nearby military installations or

turbine failures, thus decreasing the probability that these events would damage structures other than containment and cause release of radioactive material.

Meeting these requirements [and criteria](#) provides assurance that the foundations of structures other than containment will not fail to function as designed, thus protecting against loss of their structural integrity.

5. Compliance with GDC 5 prohibits the sharing of structures important to safety among nuclear power units unless it can be shown that such sharing will not significantly impair the ability to perform their safety functions, including, in the event of an accident in one unit, an orderly shutdown and cooldown of the remaining units.

The requirements of GDC 5 ensure that the use of common structures in multiunit plants will not significantly affect orderly and safe shutdown and cooldown in one plant in the event of an accident in another. The load-combination equations combine loads from normal operation and from design-basis accidents so that the resulting structural designs provide for mutual independence of shared structures.

Meeting this requirement provides additional assurance that structures other than the containment and its associated components are capable of performing their required safety functions even if they are shared by multiple nuclear power units.

6. Compliance with 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix B requires that applicants establish and maintain a quality assurance program for the design, construction, and operation of SSCs.

[This SRP Section 3.8.5 section](#), which also refers to SRP Section 3.8.4, provides guidance specifically related to the design, construction, testing, and inservice surveillance of structural concrete and steel used in nuclear power plants. Subsection II.2 of SRP Section 3.8.4 cites ACI 349, with additional guidance provided by RG 1.142, ANSI/AISC N690-1994 including Supplement 2 (2004), and RGs 1.127 and 1.160, to satisfy the requirements of Appendix B to 10 CFR Part 50.

Meeting these requirements [and criteria](#) provides additional assurance that the foundations of structures other than containment covered in this SRP section will meet the requirements of Appendix B to 10 CFR Part 50 and thus perform their intended safety functions.

### III. REVIEW PROCEDURES

~~The reviewer will select material from the procedures described below, as may be appropriate for a particular case.~~

These review procedures are based on the identified SRP acceptance criteria. For deviations from these acceptance criteria, the staff should review the applicant's evaluation of how the proposed alternatives provide an acceptable method of complying with the relevant NRC requirements identified in Subsection II.

[In accordance with 10 CFR 52.47\(a\)\(8\), \(21\) and \(22\), and 10 CFR 52.79\(a\)\(17\) and \(20\), for new reactor license applications submitted under 10 CFR Part 52, the applicant is required to](#)

(1) address the proposed technical resolution of unresolved safety issues and medium- and high-priority generic safety issues which are identified in the version of NUREG-0933 current on the date up to 6 months before the docket date of the application and which are technically relevant to the design; (2) demonstrate how the operating experience insights have been incorporated into the plant design; and, (3) provide information necessary to demonstrate compliance with any technically relevant portions of the Three Mile Island requirements set forth in 10 CFR 50.34(f), except paragraphs (f)(1)(xii), (f)(2)(ix), and (f)(3)(v). These cross-cutting review areas should be addressed by the reviewer for each technical subsection and relevant conclusions documented in the corresponding Safety Evaluation Report (SER) section.

1. Description of the Foundations. After the type of foundation and its structural characteristics are identified, information on similar and previously licensed plants is obtained for reference. Such information, which is available in SARs and amendments to previous license applications, enables the identification of differences for the case under review. These differences require additional scrutiny and evaluation. New and unique features that have not been used in the past are examined in greater detail.

The reviewer evaluates the information furnished in the SAR for completeness in accordance with RG 1.70 for a CP or an OL (for applications submitted in accordance with 10 CFR Part 50) or RG 1.206 for a DC or a COL (for application submitted in accordance with 10 CFR Part 52).

2. Applicable Codes, Standards, and Specifications. The list of codes, standards, guides, and specifications is compared with the list referenced in Subsection II.2 of this SRP section. The reviewer verifies that the appropriate code or guide is used and that the applicable edition and stated effective addenda are acceptable.
3. Loads and Load Combinations. The reviewer verifies that the loads and load combinations are as conservative as those referenced and specified in Subsection II.3 of this SRP section. Any deviations from the acceptance criteria for loads and load combinations that have not been adequately justified are identified as unacceptable and transmitted to the applicant.
4. Design and Analysis Procedures. The reviewer verifies that, for the design and analysis procedures, the applicant has used the procedures in the applicable code as delineated in Subsection II.4 of this SRP section.

Any computer programs that are used in the design and analysis of the foundation are reviewed to verify their validity in accordance with the acceptance criteria delineated in Subsection II.4.E of SRP Section 3.8.1.

The reviewer verifies that the provisions of Subsection II.4 of this SRP section are met.

5. Structural Acceptance Criteria. The limits on allowable stresses and strains in the concrete, reinforcement, and structural steel and on factors of safety for overturning, sliding, and flotation are compared with the corresponding allowable values specified in Subsection II.5 of this SRP section. If the applicant proposes to deviate from these limits, it should be supported with adequate justification and evaluation.

6. Materials, Quality Control, and Special Construction Techniques. The materials, quality control procedures, and any special construction techniques are compared with those referenced in Subsection II.6 of this SRP section. If a new material not used in previously licensed cases is employed, the applicant is requested to provide sufficient test and user data to establish the acceptability of such a material. Similarly, any new quality control procedures or construction techniques are evaluated in detail to ensure that there will be no degradation of quality that might affect the structural integrity of the foundation.

7. Testing and Inservice Surveillance Programs. For [seismic](#) Category I foundations, the reviewer verifies that structure monitoring and maintenance requirements are in accordance with 10 CFR 50.65, and RGs 1.127 and 1.160.

Any special design provisions (e.g., providing sufficient physical access, supplying alternative means for identification of conditions in inaccessible areas that can lead to degradation, performing remote visual monitoring of high-radiation areas) to accommodate inservice inspection of [seismic](#) Category I foundations are reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

For the containment foundation, testing and inservice surveillance programs are also reviewed in accordance with Subsection II.7 of SRP Section 3.8.1 for concrete containments. Any other testing and inservice surveillance programs for other ~~Seismic~~[seismic](#) Category I foundations are reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

8. Design Certification/Combined License Application Reviews. For review of a DC application, the reviewer should follow the above procedures to verify that the design, including requirements and restrictions (e.g., interface requirements and site parameters), set forth in the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) meets the acceptance criteria. DCs have referred to the FSAR as the design control document. The reviewer should also consider the appropriateness of identified COL action items. The reviewer may identify additional COL action items; however, to ensure these COL action items are addressed during a COL application, they should be added to the DC FSAR.

For review of a COL application, the scope of the review is dependent on whether the COL applicant references a DC, an ESP or other NRC approvals (e.g., manufacturing license, site suitability report or topical report).

For review of both DC and COL applications, SRP Section 14.3 should be followed for the review of ITAAC. The review of ITAAC cannot be completed until after the completion of this section.

#### IV. EVALUATION FINDINGS

The reviewer verifies that the applicant has provided sufficient information and that the review and calculations (if applicable) support conclusions of the following type to be included in the staff's safety evaluation report. The reviewer also states the bases for those conclusions.

The staff concludes that the design of the ~~Seismic~~[seismic](#) Category I foundations is acceptable and meets the relevant requirements of 10 CFR 50.55a, 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix B, and GDCs 1, 2, 4, and 5. This conclusion is based on the following:



1. The applicant has met the requirements of 10 CFR 50.55a and GDC 1 with respect to ensuring that the [Seismieseismic](#) Category I foundations are designed, fabricated, erected, constructed, tested, and inspected to quality standards commensurate with the safety functions to be performed by meeting the guidelines of RGs and industry standards indicated below.
2. The applicant has met the requirements of GDC 2 by designing the [Seismieseismic](#) Category I foundation described in this section to withstand not only the most severe earthquake that has been established for the site with sufficient margin, but also the combinations of the effects of normal and accident conditions with the effects of environmental loadings, such as earthquakes and other natural phenomena.
3. The applicant has met the requirements of GDC 4 by ensuring that the designs of [Seismieseismic](#) Category I foundations are capable of withstanding the dynamic effects associated with missiles, pipe whipping, and discharging fluids.
4. The applicant has met the requirements of GDC 5 by demonstrating that SSCs are not shared between units or that, if shared, they have demonstrated that sharing will not impair their ability to perform their intended safety functions.
5. The applicant has met the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix B because the quality assurance program provides adequate measures for implementing guidelines relating to structural design.
6. The criteria used in the analysis, design, and construction of all plant [Seismicseismic](#) Category I foundations to account for anticipated loadings and postulated conditions that may be imposed upon each foundation during its service lifetime are in conformance with established criteria, codes, standards, and specifications acceptable to the NRC staff. These include meeting the positions of RG and industry standards listed in Subsection II.2 of SRP Section 3.8.1 for containment foundations and Subsection II.2 of SRP Section 3.8.4 for other [Seismieseismic](#) Category I foundations.
7. ~~7.~~ The use of these criteria as defined by applicable codes, standards, and specifications; the loads and loading combinations; the design and analysis procedures; the structural acceptance criteria; the materials, ~~the~~ quality control, and special construction techniques; and the testing and inservice surveillance requirements provide reasonable assurance that, in the event of winds, tornadoes, [hurricanes](#), earthquakes, and various postulated events, [Seismieseismic](#) Category I foundations will withstand the specified design conditions without impairment of structural integrity and stability or the performance of required safety functions.

In addition to the above, the staff also concludes that the design of the [Seismieseismic](#) Category I containment foundation is acceptable and meets the relevant requirements for containments as discussed in Subsection IV of SRP Section 3.8.1.

For DC and COL reviews, the findings will also summarize the staff's evaluation of requirements and restrictions (e.g., interface requirements and site parameters) and COL action items relevant to this SRP section.

In addition, to the extent that the review is not discussed in other SER sections, the findings will summarize the staff's evaluation of the ITAAC, including design acceptance criteria, as applicable.

## V. IMPLEMENTATION

The staff will use this SRP section in performing safety evaluations of DC applications and license applications submitted by applicants pursuant to 10 CFR Part 50 or 10 CFR Part 52. Except when the applicant proposes an acceptable alternative method for complying with specified portions of the Commission's regulations, the staff will use the method described herein to evaluate conformance with Commission regulations.

~~The provisions of this SRP section apply to reviews of applications submitted 6 months or more after the date of issuance of this SRP section, unless superseded by a later revision. The referenced RGs include the implementation schedules for conformance to parts of the method discussed herein.~~

The application must contain an evaluation of the standard plant design against the SRP revision in effect 6 months before the docket date of the application. The application must identify and describe all differences between the standard plant design and this SRP section, and discuss how the proposed alternative provides an acceptable method of complying with the regulations that underlie the SRP acceptance criteria.

## VI. REFERENCES

1. ~~1.~~ 10 CFR 50.55(a), "Codes and Standards."
2. ~~2.~~ 10 CFR 50.65, "Monitoring the Effectiveness of Maintenance at Nuclear Power Plants."
3. ~~3.~~ 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix A, General Design Criterion 1, "Quality Standards and Records."
4. ~~4.~~ 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix A, General Design Criterion 2, "Design Bases for Protection Against Natural Phenomena."
5. ~~5.~~ 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix A, General Design Criterion 4, "Environmental and Dynamic Effects Design Bases."
6. ~~6.~~ 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix A, General Design Criterion 5, "Sharing of Structures, Systems and Components."
7. ~~7.~~ 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix B, "Quality Assurance Criteria for Nuclear Power Plants and Fuel Reprocessing Plants."
8. ~~8.~~ 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix S, "Earthquake Engineering Criteria for Nuclear Power Plants."
9. ~~9.~~ 10 CFR Part 52, "Early Site Permits; Standard Design Certifications; and Combined Licenses for Nuclear Power Plants."
10. ~~10.~~ [American Concrete Institute](#), ACI 349, "Code Requirements for Nuclear Safety-Related Concrete Structures."

Draft Revision 4 ~~December 2012~~ – September 2013

---

### USNRC STANDARD REVIEW PLAN

This Standard Review Plan (SRP), NUREG-0800, has been prepared to establish criteria that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff responsible for the review of applications to construct and operate nuclear power plants intends to use in evaluating whether an applicant/licensee meets the NRC regulations. The SRP is not a substitute for the NRC regulations, and compliance with it is not required. However, an applicant is required to identify differences between the design features, analytical techniques, and procedural measures proposed for its facility and the SRP acceptance criteria and evaluate how the proposed alternatives to the SRP acceptance criteria provide an acceptable method of complying with the NRC regulations.

The standard review plan sections are numbered in accordance with corresponding sections in Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.70, "Standard Format and Content of Safety Analysis Reports for Nuclear Power Plants (LWR Edition)." Not all sections of RG 1.70 have a corresponding review plan section. The SRP sections applicable to a combined license application for a new light-water reactor (LWR) are based on RG 1.206, "Combined License Applications for Nuclear Power Plants (LWR Edition)."

These documents are made available to the public as part of the NRC policy to inform the nuclear industry and the general public of regulatory procedures and policies. Individual sections of NUREG-0800 will be revised periodically, as appropriate, to accommodate comments and to reflect new information and experience. Comments may be submitted electronically by email to [NRR\\_SRP@nrc.gov](mailto:NRR_SRP@nrc.gov).

Requests for single copies of SRP sections (which may be reproduced) should be made to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Reproduction and Distribution Services Section, or by fax to (301) 415-2289; or by email to [DISTRIBUTION@nrc.gov](mailto:DISTRIBUTION@nrc.gov). Electronic copies of this section are available through the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/nuregs/staff/sr0800/>, or in the NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS), at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>, under Accession # ~~ML12353A388~~ ML13198A267.

---

- ~~11.~~ 11.—ANSI/AISC N690—1994 including Supplement 2 (2004), “Specification for the Design, Fabrication and Erection of Steel Safety-Related Structures for Nuclear Facilities.”
- ~~12.~~ 12.—~~American Society of Mechanical Engineers,~~ ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, Section III, Division 2, “Code for Concrete Reactor Vessels and Containments.”
- ~~13.~~ 13.—RG 1.70, “Standard Format and Content of Safety Analysis Reports for Nuclear Power Plants; LWR Edition.”
- ~~14.~~ 14.—RG 1.127, “Inspection of Water-Control Structures Associated with Nuclear Power Plants.”
- ~~15.~~ 15.—RG 1.142, “Safety-Related Concrete Structures for Nuclear Power Plants.”
- ~~16.~~ 16.—RG 1.160, “Monitoring the Effectiveness of Maintenance at Nuclear Power Plants.”
- ~~17.~~ 17.—RG 1.206, “Combined License Applications for Nuclear Power Plants (LWR Edition).”

---

**PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT STATEMENT**

The information collections contained in the Standard Review Plan are covered by the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50 and 10 CFR Part 52, and were approved by the Office of Management and Budget, approval number 3150-0011 and 3150-0151.

**PUBLIC PROTECTION NOTIFICATION**

The NRC may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a request for information or an information collection requirement unless the requesting document displays a currently valid OMB control number.

---

**SRP Section 3.8.5**  
**~~"Foundations"~~**

**Description of Changes**

~~Revision 3 to SRP Section 3.8.5 updates Revision 2 of this section, dated March 2007, to reflect the following changes:~~

- ~~1. This SRP section is administratively updated by the Office of New Reactors, per request from Juan D. Peralta, Branch Chief, Quality and Vendor Branch 1, Division of Construction, Inspection, and Operational Programs, memorandum dated February 17, 2010 (ADAMS Accession No. ML10090148).~~



~~SRP Section 3.8.5~~  
~~“Foundations”~~

~~Description of Changes~~

Section 3.8.5 “FOUNDATIONS”

This SRP section affirms the technical accuracy and adequacy of the guidance previously provided in Revision 3, dated May 2010 of this SRP. See ADAMS Accession No. ML100621093.

I. AREAS OF REVIEW

1. Enhanced SRP Section 3.8.5 I.3 “Loads and Load Combinations” to include loads induced by the construction sequence and differential settlements. See item 2 below (under “Acceptance Criteria”) for the technical rationale for this change.
2. Added an additional “Review Interface” Item 5 to indicate that the review of the foundation design for differential settlement and construction sequence aspects is performed in coordination with SRP ~~Section~~Sections 2.5.4 and SRP 3.7.2. See item 2 below (under “Acceptance Criteria”) for the technical rationale for this change.

II. ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA

1. Revised SRP Section 3.8.5 II.4 “Design and Analysis Procedures” item B, to include enhanced guidance to evaluate sliding and overturning stability. The technical rationale for this change is as follows.

The conservatism in the SRP pseudo-static approach for demonstrating the factors of safety for sliding and overturning stability has led to difficulties when performing such analyses for generic plant designs where higher seismic loads are defined and a range of soil profiles are typically considered. Therefore, it is reasonable to utilize more realistic analytical methods which reduce some of the conservatisms inherent in the static type stability evaluation methods.

Several ~~recent~~ DC applicants have resorted to more complex analytical methods to reduce the conservatisms inherent in the static approach. These methods rely on time history analyses using three directions of statistically-independent seismic loadings that are applied simultaneously. This approach eliminates the static analysis assumption that the maximum vertical and maximum horizontal demand forces occur at the same time. The oscillatory nature of the response in a seismic time history analysis may demonstrate that the specified factors of safety are maintained at each instant in time. If the linear time history analysis indicates that some sliding and uplift may occur, then a nonlinear time history analysis can be performed to include these effects.

To provide guidance about the staff’s expectations when performing the time history evaluations discussed above, the guidance in SRP Section 3.8.5 was enhanced to address several issues: (1) since there is no single value to be used for the seismic

demand, how the [FOS financial operations section \(FOS\)](#) should be calculated in the evaluation, (2) for nonlinear analysis, how many time histories should be considered and how should the results from each\_of\_the time histories be evaluated, (3) the adequacy of the mathematical model, (4)\_enhancement of the criteria for selection of the appropriate friction values, and (5) acceptance criteria if minimal sliding displacements do occur.

2. Revised SRP Section 3.8.5 II.4 “Design and Analysis Procedures” items E, J, and K, to include enhanced guidance to incorporate differential settlement and construction sequence aspects in the foundation design. The technical rationale for this change is as follows.

Seismic Category I structures (foundations and superstructures) should be designed to take into account the additional member forces and moments that are induced by the combined effects of the construction sequence and the short term differential settlement of the soil under the foundation, as well as the long-term settlement expected to occur during the life of the structure. Past experience and current industry codes and standards indicate that these are important design considerations.

SRP Sections 3.8.1, 3.8.3, 3.8.4, and 3.8.5 were enhanced to provide additional guidance regarding: (1) how to consider the effects of the construction sequence and the differential settlements (including the long-term settlements expected to occur during the life of the structure) in the standard design process which postulates the geotechnical parameters that are generic (i.e., not the result of a site-specific geotechnical investigation), and does not fully specify the construction sequence; (2) the need to establish a clear interface between DC and COL applications that permits verification of the foundation design by the COL applicant, including implementation of a settlement monitoring program; and (3) specific identification of the loads due to differential settlements and construction sequence as an area of staff review under the “loads and load combinations” section.

3. Enhanced SRP Section 3.8.5 II.7 “Testing and Inservice Surveillance Requirements” to include a settlement monitoring program. The technical rationale for this change is as follows.

SRP Section 3.8.5 II.7 was enhanced to specifically describe the implementation of a settlement monitoring program as part of the testing and in-service surveillance provisions for [Seismieseismic](#) Category I foundations.