

## Vogle PEmails

---

**From:** Patel, Chandu  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 23, 2016 3:07 PM  
**To:** 'Sparkman, Wesley A.' (WASPARKM@southernco.com); Chamberlain, Amy Christine  
**Cc:** Vogle PEmails  
**Subject:** Draft RAI for Interim Amendment Request LAR 16-015 for Vogle 3 and 4  
**Attachments:** Draft IAR RAIs RP9532.docx

Hi Wes,

Please see attached draft RAI for Interim Amendment Request LAR 16-015 for Vogle 3 and 4. Please let me know if you need any clarifications.

Sincerely,  
Chandu Patel

**Hearing Identifier:** Vogtle\_COL\_Docs\_Public  
**Email Number:** 63

**Mail Envelope Properties** (e41f36af81fe431ba6b84f3d7046898c)

**Subject:** Draft RAI for Interim Amendment Request LAR 16-015 for Vogtle 3 and 4  
**Sent Date:** 11/23/2016 3:06:47 PM  
**Received Date:** 11/23/2016 3:06:48 PM  
**From:** Patel, Chandu

**Created By:** Chandu.Patel@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**

"Vogtle PEmails" <Vogtle.PEmails@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"'Sparkman, Wesley A.'" (WASPARKM@southernco.com)" <WASPARKM@southernco.com>

Tracking Status: None

"Chamberlain, Amy Christine" <ACCHAMBE@southernco.com>

Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:** HQPWMSMRS04.nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	195	11/23/2016 3:06:48 PM
Draft IAR RAIs RP9532.docx		22720

**Options**

**Priority:** Standard

**Return Notification:** No

**Reply Requested:** No

**Sensitivity:** Normal

**Expiration Date:**

**Recipients Received:**

## Draft RAI for Interim Amendment Request for Vogtle Units 3 and 4

Regarding your license amendment request (LAR 15-016) dated July 29, 2016, the NRC requests that Southern Nuclear Corporation (SNC) provide responses to the following questions. Please use as much detail and real examples as possible.

### 1. Construction Experience

(a) Provide examples of specific instances during the current construction activities for the Vogtle units when the proposed interim amendment request (IAR) process could have been utilized as contrasted to the use of the Preliminary Amendment Request (PAR) process.

(b) Describe from a safety perspective why it would have been advantageous to utilize the IAR process instead of the PAR process.

(c) Provide details about what unnecessary regulatory burdens may have been present under the PAR process versus the proposed IAR process.

(d) Explain how the proposed IAR process would impact recordkeeping, quality assurance and inspections/inspectability.

### 2. Emergent Conditions

(a) Define “emergent conditions” under the IAR process and explain how SNC would assess that emergent conditions exist.

(b) Explain the safety advantages of recognizing these emergent conditions as part of the staff’s assessment of Nuclear Construction Safety Assessment (NCSA).

3. What do you mean when you say on page 3 of 11 that there are emergent conditions and that the work activity cannot be adjusted? What are the standards by which the licensee will judge that the work activity cannot be adjusted? In addition, please explain why the exigent circumstances detailed in 50.91 would not be appropriate to deal with such a situation (the staff notes that it approved an LAR under exigent circumstances early in the construction of Vogtle Units 3 and 4).

4. In proposed license condition 2.D(1)(e) regarding the content of the NCSA, the licensee is to evaluate whether the continued construction would make the nonconforming condition irreversible. What are the standards by which the licensee would assess irreversibility? What if the work would be deemed irreversible? How would the licensee disposition such a situation when the work would be irreversible and the NRC did not approve the LAR?

5. SNC has stated that an IAR would include all of the items listed in proposed license condition 2.D(1)(d) and (e). Please explain the difference in scope and depth of the content of the NCSA and the eventual LAR. What information would not be available to the licensee, the public, and NRC staff at the time an IAR is commenced and before the LAR is submitted? With that difference in information in mind, how can the licensee or the NRC staff come to a conclusion that there would be no objection to proceeding with the work that was not done in accordance with the licensing basis?
6. What is the typical time it takes from identification of a nonconformance to submission of an LAR? Good examples to highlight this issue may be the mechanical coupler weld issue/LARs and the embed plate issue which were identified as nonconformances and that took many months to resolve and to submit the LARs to the NRC staff.
7. Please explain what is meant on page 5 of 11 as “prompt notification” to the NRC of use of the IAR process. What form would this notification take?
8. Please provide additional details on proposals for the expiration date of a no objection response to an IAR. What would the licensee do if a no objection date is passed and the requirements for submitting a LAR/PAR are not met?
9. What are the proposed requirements for the tie to the associated LAR/PAR? Would the LAR have to be accepted in order to move from the IAR process to the LAR/PAR process? Would the no objection letter for the PAR have to be issued to satisfy that requirement or would mere submission of the LAR/PAR be enough?
10. Please explain how the public will be informed of and could participate in the IAR process to the same extent that it can now participate in the LAR/PAR process. It appears that the public will not have the opportunity to provide comments and petitions to intervene on the IAR and not until after the changes are already implemented. Does this proposal decrease the ability of the public to participate as compared to the current process?
11. In proposed license condition 2.D.(1)(f) the first sentence states that the “...NRC will issue an IAR notification...” It is inappropriate to use this particular language in a license condition for licensee. Please remove this language from the license condition.