

## CCNPP3eRAIPEm Resource

---

**From:** Arora, Surinder  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 27, 2012 10:56 AM  
**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 - Draft RAI 361 CITB 6571  
**Attachments:** DRAFT RAI 361 CITB 6571.doc

Paul,

Attached is DRAFT RAI No. 361 (eRAI No. 6571) pertaining to Part 10 of the Calvert Cliffs Unit 3 Combined License Application. You have until July 12, 2012 to review it and decide whether you need a conference call to discuss the RAI questions before the final issuance. After the clarification phone call, if requested, or after July 12, 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:** 229

**Mail Envelope Properties** (B46615B367D1144982B324704E3BCEEDC49FFEBED3)

**Subject:** CCNPP3 - Draft RAI 361 CITB 6571  
**Sent Date:** 6/27/2012 10:56:01 AM  
**Received Date:** 6/27/2012 10:56:02 AM  
**From:** Arora, Surinder

**Created By:** Surinder.Arora@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**

"CCNPP3eRAIEm Resource" <CCNPP3eRAIEm.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	744	6/27/2012 10:56:02 AM
DRAFT RAI 361 CITB 6571.doc		37882

**Options**

**Priority:** Standard

**Return Notification:** No

**Reply Requested:** No

**Sensitivity:** Normal

**Expiration Date:**

**Recipients Received:**

Request for Additional Information No. 361 (eRAI 6571)  
DRAFT  
6/27/2012

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

