

**From:** Habib, Donald  
**Sent:** Friday, March 13, 2020 10:16 AM  
**To:** Vogtle PEmails  
**Subject:** 2020-03-11 Update to Questions on LAR 19-019 DRAFT Supplement - SNC Responses.docx  
**Attachments:** 2020-03-11 Update to Questions on LAR 19-019 DRAFT Supplement - SNC Responses.docx

**Hearing Identifier:** Vogtle\_COL\_Docs\_Public  
**Email Number:** 547

**Mail Envelope Properties** (BN8PR09MB35241706DB7DA89BE2619A2E97FA0)

**Subject:** 2020-03-11 Update to Questions on LAR 19-019 DRAFT Supplement - SNC Responses.docx  
**Sent Date:** 3/13/2020 10:15:45 AM  
**Received Date:** 3/13/2020 10:15:49 AM  
**From:** Habib, Donald

**Created By:** Donald.Habib@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**  
"Vogtle PEmails" <Vogtle.PEmails@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:** BN8PR09MB3524.namprd09.prod.outlook.com

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3	3/13/2020 10:15:49 AM
2020-03-11 Update to Questions on LAR 19-019 DRAFT Supplement - SNC Responses.docx		
39438		

**Options**  
**Priority:** Normal  
**Return Notification:** No  
**Reply Requested:** No  
**Sensitivity:** Normal  
**Expiration Date:**

**Vogtle Electric Generating Plant Units 3 and 4**  
**License Amendment Request 19-019**  
**Staff Audit Discussion Topics**  
**March 6, 2020**

1. In Draft Supplement (ERR), Enclosure 2, page 7 of 34, UFSAR Table 3H.5-3 Elevation 135'3" to 137'-0", Note 4, required area of steel listed is 3.09 in-sq./ft. However, the staff could not find in the table. Is this a typo or correction to the table value of 3.08 in-sq./ft? The value 3.09 in-sq/ft is also listed in the Enclosure 1, pages 8 and 16 of 42.

The required reinforcement of 2.81 in<sup>2</sup>/ft in Note 4 of UFSAR Table 3H.5-3 is proposed to be revised to 3.09 in<sup>2</sup>/ft to reflect combined seismic and accident thermal loads. This change does not impact the conclusion in Note 4 that the required vertical reinforcement is less than the provided vertical reinforcement in the area with reduced reinforcement between EL.135'-3" and EL.137'. This change is not a typo or correction to the table value of 3.08 in<sup>2</sup>/ft.

2. In Enclosure 2, page 4 of 34, Table 3.8.5-3, Note 5 lists Fig. 3.8.5-2, Sheets 3 to 6. The staff noted that in UFSAR Rev. 8 there is only one sheet associated to the Figure 3.8.5-2. Should the draft supplement reference Figure 3.8.5-3, Sheets 3 to 7?

Yes, reference to Figure 3.8.5-2 is a typo. Note 5 on Page 4 of 34 will be revised to reflect the current Note 5 in the most recent revision of the UFSAR, which references Figure 3.8.5-3, sheets 3 to 6. Please note that Note 5 is not being changed by LAR-19-019 and that Note 5 was added to LAR-19-019R1 to improve reader understanding of the markups.

3. On Table 3H.5-9, Sheet 1 and Sheet 2a of 3, the staff has confusion of interpretation of applied tolerance on the table's last column and Note 1. Please clarify intent of the tolerance in both places.

In response to Staff feedback to the original markups where the 2% margin would cause values in the last column to be greater than 1.0, the applicability Note 1 (the 2% margin) is removed from the columns where the values would exceed the 1.0 threshold but kept elsewhere.

**4. Informal Question to SNC:** In response to staff audit questions dated January 29, 2020 (ADAMS Accession No. ML20029F008), UFSAR Table 3H.5-9 was revised to accurately reflect values from calculation APP-1278-GEF-084, Rev. 0. In the response (RFI APP-GW-GF-938), the applicant noted that an extended review had been performed on UFSAR Tables 3H.5-9 and 3H.5-15 which led to additional changes to the tables to reflect values from the latest calculations. It is unclear to the staff if an extent of condition review was conducted on the other UFSAR tables associated with LAR 19-019 that may also need to be updated to reflect the latest calculations.

The second extent of condition review was performed on the relevant tables of structures which were discussed in the NRC meeting on 1/30/2020. We do not expect any discrepancies between other UFSAR tables in LAR-19-019 and the latest calculations.

5. The Draft Supplement states on Enclosure 1, page 11, element size. Since it is considered methodology, the UFSAR needs to be updated for Section 3H.5.5.1 (or other appropriate sections of UFSAR) for FEM element size change from 5'x5' to 1'x1".

It is unclear to SNC why UFSAR Section 3H.5.5.1 needs to be updated, since it does not currently reference element size of the finite element analysis model. The analysis assumptions in this section of the UFSAR are not impacted by LAR-19-019.