

## PSEGSPeRAIPEm Resource

---

**From:** Chowdhury, Prosanta  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 21, 2013 12:06 PM  
**To:** 'PSEGRAIResponses@pseg.com'  
**Cc:** PSEGSPeRAIPEm Resource; 'James.Mallon@pseg.com'; 'David.Robillard@pseg.com'; Segala, John; Roach, Kevin; Clark, Phyllis; McLellan, Judith; Candelario, Luisette; Vega, Frankie; Erwin, Kenneth; Karas, Rebecca  
**Subject:** PSEG Site ESPA FINAL RAI 69 (eRAI 7017) SRP-02.05.04 (RGS2)  
**Attachments:** PSEG Site ESPA Final RAI 69 (eRAI 7017).pdf

Please find attached RAI 69 (eRAI 7017) for the PSEG Site ESP Application. A draft of the RAI was provided to you on February 12, 2013. At your request, a clarification discussion on this RAI was held on February 21, 2013. As a result of the discussion, we understand that you have no further questions on this specific RAI, and therefore, we are issuing this RAI as final with no changes made to it.

The schedule we have established for review of your application assumes technically correct and complete responses within 30 calendar days of receipt of RAIs; however, you informed during the clarification discussion on February 21, 2013, that you would need 45 days instead of the usual 30 days to respond to this RAI. After reviewing your request, we concluded that a 45-day response period is acceptable for this RAI. As our standard practice, we will assess any impact the additional response time may have on the review schedule. If this RAI cannot be responded to within 45 calendar days, it is expected that a date for receipt of this information will be provided to the staff within the 30-calendar day period so that the staff can assess how this information will impact the published schedule.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Prosanta Chowdhury  
Project Manager  
Licensing Branch 1 (LB1)  
Division of New Reactor Licensing  
Office of New Reactors  
301-415-1647

**Hearing Identifier:** PSEG\_Site\_EarlySitePermit\_RAI  
**Email Number:** 145

**Mail Envelope Properties** (320204600EA7B9408FE833FF15E4FF7DCE7558A387)

**Subject:** PSEG Site ESPA FINAL RAI 69 (eRAI 7017) SRP-02.05.04 (RGS2)  
**Sent Date:** 2/21/2013 12:06:12 PM  
**Received Date:** 2/21/2013 12:06:13 PM  
**From:** Chowdhury, Prosanta

**Created By:** Prosanta.Chowdhury@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**

"PSEGESPeRAIPEm Resource" <PSEGESPeRAIPEm.Resource@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"James.Mallon@pseg.com" <James.Mallon@pseg.com>

Tracking Status: None

"David.Robillard@pseg.com" <David.Robillard@pseg.com>

Tracking Status: None

"Segala, John" <John.Segala@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Roach, Kevin" <Kevin.Roach@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Clark, Phyllis" <Phyllis.Clark@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"McLellan, Judith" <Judith.McLellan@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Candelario, Luisette" <Luisette.Candelario@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Vega, Frankie" <Frankie.Vega@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Erwin, Kenneth" <Kenneth.Erwin@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Karas, Rebecca" <Rebecca.Karas@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"PSEGRAIResponses@pseg.com" <PSEGRAIResponses@pseg.com>

Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:** HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1427	2/21/2013 12:06:13 PM
PSEG Site ESPA Final RAI 69 (eRAI 7017).pdf	11685	

**Options**

**Priority:** Standard

**Return Notification:** No

**Reply Requested:** No

**Sensitivity:** Normal

**Expiration Date:**

**Recipients Received:**

Request for Additional Information 69

Application Revision 1

FINAL

2/21/2013

PSEG Site ESP

PSEG Power LLC, PSEG Nuclear LLC

Docket No. 52-043

Review Section: 02.05.04 - Stability of Subsurface Materials and Foundations

Application Section: 2.5.4

QUESTIONS

02.05.04-27

**Supplemental RAI**

In response to RAI 41, Question 02.05.04-19, you presented a table (Table RAI-41-19-1) comparing the factor of safety of liquefaction potential for stress reduction factor ( $r_d$ ) calculated at elevation -67 ft with that at elevation 12.8 ft. You stated that using the  $r_d$  at the top of the competent layer at elevation -67 ft is more conservative than using the  $r_d$  at the existing ground surface (elevation 12.8 ft). However, calculating  $r_d$  at elevation -67 ft is not consistent with the rest of the parameters used in the formula, which were determined corresponding to the existing ground surface (elevation 12.8 ft), and you did not propose any changes to the SSAR. In compliance with 10 CFR 100.23(d)(4), please justify in the SSAR the deviation from the formula and explain why the results are appropriate, or correct the liquefaction analysis and include the appropriate changes in the SSAR.