

## CCNPP3eRAIPEm Resource

---

**From:** Arora, Surinder  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 04, 2012 8:31 AM  
**To:** Infanger, Paul; UNECC3Project@unistarnuclear.com  
**Cc:** CCNPP3eRAIPEm Resource; Segala, John; Jeng, David; Wilson, Anthony; Vrahoretis, Susan; Thomas, Brian; Jaffe, David  
**Subject:** Draft RAI 334 SEB2 6215  
**Attachments:** DRAFT RAI 334 SEB2 6215.doc

Paul,

Attached is DRAFT RAI No. 334 (eRAI No. 6215). You have until January 19, 2012 to review it and decide whether you need a conference call to discuss the RAI before the final issuance. After the phone call or after January 19, 2012, the RAI will be finalized and sent to you for your response. You will then have 30 days to provide a technically complete response or an expected response date for the RAI.

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](mailto:Surinder.Arora@nrc.gov)

**Hearing Identifier:** CalvertCliffs\_Unit3Col\_RAI  
**Email Number:** 168

**Mail Envelope Properties** (B46615B367D1144982B324704E3BCEED8B961E07A3)

**Subject:** Draft RAI 334 SEB2 6215  
**Sent Date:** 1/4/2012 8:30:49 AM  
**Received Date:** 1/4/2012 8:31:11 AM  
**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  
"Jeng, David" <David.Jeng@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Wilson, Anthony" <Anthony.Wilson@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Vrahoretis, Susan" <Susan.Vrahoretis@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Thomas, Brian" <Brian.Thomas@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Jaffe, David" <David.Jaffe@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

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	631	1/4/2012 8:31:11 AM
DRAFT RAI 334 SEB2 6215.doc		31738

**Options**

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

Request for Additional Information No. 334 eRAI 6215)  
DRAFT  
1/4/2012

Calvert Cliffs Unit 3  
UniStar  
Docket No. 52-016  
SRP Section: 14.03.02 - Structural and Systems Engineering - Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and  
Acceptance Criteria  
Application Section: FSAR 14.3.2

QUESTIONS for Structural Engineering Branch 2 (ESBWR/ABWR Projects) (SEB2)

14.03.02-19

**Supplemental RAI for RAI 275 Question 14.03.02-13 (eRAI 5205)**

In RAI 275, Question 14.03.02-13, the staff requested that the applicant, for Seismic Category II and II-SSE structures, provide a summary of the analysis and design approach and design results for some representative structural members, and include the information in the FSAR.

The staff reviewed the RAI response provided in UniStar Letter UN#11-246, dated September 1, 2011. The staff determined that the RAI response addresses most of the staff's concerns. However, as requested in the original RAI, the staff requests again that the applicant, for all Seismic Category II structures, include in appropriate section(s) of the FSAR all of the summary of design information provided in the response to RAI 275, Question 14.03.02-13 (which include building layout/details, acceptable codes and standards, loads and load combinations, analysis procedures, materials and acceptance criteria), and that provided in the response to RAI 315, Question 03.07.02-63.

In addition, the first sentence of the proposed markup for FSAR Section 3.7.2.8 states "The analysis and design of the Seismic Category II Turbine Building, Switchgear Building and Access Building for loads and load combinations not involving seismic loads, are performed to the same requirements as Seismic Category I structures." The phrase "not involving seismic loads" in the sentence is inconsistent with the ITAACs related to CCNPP Unit 3 Seismic Category II structures. The ITAACs state that the design of CCNPP Unit 3 Seismic Category II structures is to the same requirements as a Seismic Category I structure.

Therefore, the staff requests that the applicant explain the inconsistency and revise the FSAR accordingly.

The staff needs the above information to be able to conclude that there is reasonable assurance that the specific COL interface requirements for the CCNPP Unit 3 Seismic Category II structures have been adequately implemented and addressed in the CCNPP Unit 3 COLA.