

ITAAC CLOSURE VERIFICATION EVALUATION FORM (VEF)

An ITAAC engineer from the Office of New Reactors, Division of Construction Inspection, and Operational Programs (DCIP) in concert with other reviewer(s) assigned to an ITAAC closure review will complete this form for the ITAAC under review.

Docket No:	5200025	Plant Name:	Vogtle Unit 3 Combined License
Licensee Name:	Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc.	Combined License No:	NPF-91
ITAAC ID No:	2.1.03.08	ITAAC Type:	Non-Targeted
ITAAC Family Designation or enter N/A:	05A		
ITAAC Closure Notification (ICN) or ITAAC Post-Closure Notification (IPCN) ADAMS ML Number:			ML13213A154
Name of ITAAC Engineer:			Gaslevic, James

Enter “Yes” in the blank at the beginning of a statement below if the whole statement is true, “No” if the whole or part of the statement is not true, and “N/A if the statement is not applicable.

- a. **Yes** The ICN or IPCN identifies all of the following: (1) licensee, (2) plant site name, (3) unit number, and (4) plant docket number.
- b. **Yes** The ITAAC in the ICN or IPCN agrees with the version of the ITAAC in the combined license.
- c. **N/A** If ITAAC is a “reference ITAAC”, all the ITAAC it references have been verified as successfully completed. (Enter “N/A” if ITAAC is not a reference ITAAC.)
- d. **N/A** All ITAAC findings relevant to the ITAAC are listed in the ICN or IPCN as closed, and any required Region II inspections have been completed for the ITAAC. (Enter “N/A” if Construction Inspection Program Management System (CIPIMS) has no inspection findings and/or no required inspections for the ITAAC.)
- e. **N/A** If the licensee performed the inspections, tests, and/or analyses of the ITA at locations other than the final installed location for ITAAC where the ITA is specified as being performed on “as-built” structures, systems, or components, then the licensee has based on the guidance in NEI 08-01, either summarized a technical justification or provided a reference to a generic technical justification in the ITAAC determination basis (IDB) of the ICN or IPCN that establishes why it was acceptable to perform the ITA at a location other than its final installed location. (Enter N/A if ITA

ITAAC CLOSURE VERIFICATION EVALUATION FORM (VEF)

was not performed at a remote location or if the ITA is not specified as “as-built”)

- f. **Yes** The ICN or IPCN indicates that the licensee completed the ITAAC as affirmed by the signature of a licensee representative.
- g. **Yes** Person(s) with the requisite technical and engineering knowledge has/have determined that the IDB contains sufficient information, including summarizing the methodology for performing the ITAAC, to conclude that the licensee has successfully performed the inspection, test, and/or analysis stated in the ITAAC.
- h. **Yes** Person(s) with the requisite technical and engineering knowledge has/have determined that the IDB contains sufficient information to conclude that the licensee has fully met the entire acceptance criterion stated in the ITAAC.
- i. **No** During concurrence review, a potential problem was identified which prevents verifying the completion of the ITAAC
- j. **No** An additional NRO or NSIR Reviewer was assigned to the ITAAC closure review with his or her name entered into the blank at the top of previous page based on his or her expertise being required.

If statements “a” through “h” are all “Yes” or all are “Yes” except step(s) “c”, “d”, and/or “e” being “N/A”, the ICN or IPCN has sufficient information; otherwise, the ICN or IPCN is rejected, and the NRC must communicate with the licensee regarding the need for a new ICN of record or new IPCN. For reviews of IPCNs, the reviewer must consider the IPCN in conjunction with the earlier ICN to determine whether statements “g” and “h” are “Yes”. If a potential problem is identified which prevents verifying the ITAAC as completed”, an evaluation will be performed which may or may not result in Region II inspections. If an ITAAC finding is confirmed by Region II as a result of the potential problem identified in step “i”, (1) a new ICN will be submitted by the licensee, (2) the ITAAC will be categorized as not completed, and (3) other ITAAC in the same family will be assessed with appropriate actions taken. If there is a material concern, for which Region II did not identify an ITAAC finding, the licensee must submit a new ICN to address the concern. For exceedance of a maintenance threshold, the licensee will submit an IPCN to be reviewed by the ITAAC closure verification process (ICVP). For steps “g” and “h,” the person(s) making those determinations should refer to Section 3.2 in the office instruction (OI) for the ICVP for additional information to assist them. If the ITAAC completion package at the plant site was used in the evaluation of the ITAAC, in accordance with this form, indicate in the “Review Documents List” field below what documents were reviewed.

The reviewers may provide integrated comments in the “Closure Support Notes” field below that support the bases for verifying that the licensee successfully completed the ITAAC including, but not limited to, identifying pertinent ICN or IPCN statements, comments on performance of ITAAC at other than final installed location, listing documents reviewed from the licensee’s ITAAC completion package, conditional status of ITAAC, etc. Comments are mandatory in the field “Insufficient ICN/Deficiency Notes” below if the ITAAC was not verified as successfully completed explaining the basis for this determination.

ITAAC CLOSURE VERIFICATION EVALUATION FORM (VEF)

The reviewers have verified that the licensee successfully completed the inspections, tests, and analyses prescribed for this ITAAC, and that the acceptance criteria have been met. This determination of the successful completion of this ITAAC is subject to the licensee's ability to maintain the condition that the acceptance criteria are met, and is based on information available at this time. Subsequently, if new information disputes this determination, this ITAAC will be reopened as necessary. This determination will be used to support a recommendation to the Commission that it can find, pursuant to 10 CFR 52.103(g), that all acceptance criteria in the combined license are met. The ITAAC closure verification process is not finalized for this ITAAC until the Commission makes an affirmative finding under 10 CFR 52.103(g).

ITAAC Engineer: Gaslevic, James

Date: 8/20/2013

DCIP Branch Chief or Designee: Anderson, Brian

Date: 8/20/2013

DNRL PM: Joshi, Ravindra