

## Vogle PEmails

---

**From:** Gleaves, Bill  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 01, 2018 2:06 PM  
**To:** Chamberlain, Amy Christine; Vogle PEmails  
**Cc:** Adam Quarles (AGQUARLE@southernco.com); Mitchell, Matthew; Terry, Leslie; Makar, Gregory; Patel, Chandu; Dixon-Herrity, Jennifer; Ashley, Clinton; Wes Sparkman (WASPARKM@southernco.com)  
**Subject:** Final RAI #1 for LAR-17-039, "Unqualified Service Level 1 Coatings Program"  
**Attachments:** Vogle LAR-17-039 Unqualified Service Level 1 Coatings Program Final RAI No1 1Question.pdf

Ms. Chamberlain,

On 3.1.18 the NRC staff and SNC staff and contractors discussed the draft RAI from 2.23.18 (ML18054A023). As a result of the discussion on the 3.1.18 clarification call, the staff withdrew the draft RAI Question No. 2. SNC accepted the draft RAI with the draft Question 2 withdrawn, as final.

The staff is issuing the RAI as "final" and is attached. The final RAI is related to your LAR-17-039, "Unqualified Service Level 1 Coatings Program."

We typically expect that the RAI response will be 1 month after the draft RAI is accepted by SNC as "final." In addition, the staff will not be able to complete the review approximately 1 month after receipt of an acceptable response or supplement. If the change is needed sooner than that date to support construction, please consider submitting a request for a PAR.

We do not believe that there is SUNSI information in this RAI, however, if we are incorrect please let me know immediately. If there is SUNSI information in the RAI response, please so state in the response letter and mark appropriately.

We will be available to support a meeting or conference call on this topic if desired.

Respectfully,

Billy

William (Billy) Gleaves  
Senior Project Manager  
Licensing Branch 4  
Office OWFN 8H17  
US NRC, Office of New Reactors

The contents of this message may be sensitive. If this message has been received in error, please delete it without reading it. Your receipt of this message is not intended to waive any applicable privilege. Do not disseminate this message without the permission of the author. Communications by this author are not binding on The Commission.

**Hearing Identifier:** Vogtle\_COL\_Docs\_Public  
**Email Number:** 231

**Mail Envelope Properties** (BY2PR09MB1032B9BBCAC0BF0BC76364809FC60)

**Subject:** Final RAI #1 for LAR-17-039, "Unqualified Service Level 1 Coatings Program"  
**Sent Date:** 3/1/2018 2:05:48 PM  
**Received Date:** 3/1/2018 2:05:55 PM  
**From:** Gleaves, Bill

**Created By:** Bill.Gleaves@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**

"Adam Quarles (AGQUARLE@southernco.com)" <AGQUARLE@southernco.com>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Mitchell, Matthew" <Matthew.Mitchell@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Terry, Leslie" <Leslie.Terry@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Makar, Gregory" <Gregory.Makar@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Patel, Chandu" <Chandu.Patel@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Dixon-Herrity, Jennifer" <Jennifer.Dixon-Herrity@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Ashley, Clinton" <Clinton.Ashley@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Wes Sparkman (WASPARKM@southernco.com)" <WASPARKM@southernco.com>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Chamberlain, Amy Christine" <ACCHAMBE@southernco.com>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Vogtle PEmails" <Vogtle.PEmails@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:** BY2PR09MB1032.namprd09.prod.outlook.com

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1747	3/1/2018 2:05:55 PM
Vogtle LAR-17-039 Unqualified Service Level 1 Coatings Program Final RAI No1 1Question.pdf		
107459		

**Options**

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

Vogtle Units 3 & 4  
LAR-17-039, "Unqualified Service Level 1 Coatings Program"  
FINAL Request for Additional Information  
March 1, 2018

Regulatory Bases for Request for Additional Information

The NRC staff have reviewed and evaluated the information provided by SNC for this LAR, and has determined that the following information is needed in order to complete its review of the request. The information is needed to determine if the proposed allowance of unqualified IOZ inside containment will meet Part 50 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), Appendix A, General Design Criteria 1, 4, 35, and 38, and 10 CFR 50.46, as they relate to the effects of debris on the operation of the emergency core cooling system and long-term core cooling.

**RAI 1, Question 1**

The NRC staff is unclear on the scope of the request, therefore, please address the following regarding nonconforming coatings and Service Level I epoxy coatings:

- a. The request proposes to add the following paragraph to the end of Subsection 6.1.2.1.5 in Tier 2 of the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR): "Nonconforming coatings that cannot be qualified as Service Level I are evaluated on a case basis relative to impact on plant safety. The total inventory of unqualified coatings (coatings which cannot be qualified as Safety-Service Level I) within Service Level I areas combined with the total amount of coating debris fines that can be generated by a LOCA [loss of coolant accident] jet is restricted to the limits established in Subsection 6.3.2.2.7.1." It is the NRC staff's understanding that the proposed amendment is for coatings that could have been qualified as Service Level I but qualification cannot be verified. If the request is for more than coatings that could have been qualified as Service Level I but whose qualification could not be verified, please provide examples so that the NRC staff can fully understand the scope of this request.
- b. Please explain the applicability of this request to any epoxy coatings designated as Service Level I. The request appears to consider only IOZ, but the proposed changes to Tier 2 of the UFSAR are not limited to IOZ. For example, the proposed text for Subsection 6.1.2.1.5 in Tier 2 of the UFSAR seems to apply to all Service Level I coatings and does not suggest that it applies only to IOZ coatings that are not qualified as Service Level I. If the absence of Service Level I epoxy is a result of differences between VEGP, Units 3 and 4, and the AP1000 certified design, please identify and explain those differences.

<END>