

ArevaEPRDCPEm Resource

From: WILLIFORD Dennis (AREVA) [Dennis.Williford@areva.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2012 4:17 PM
To: Tesfaye, Getachew
Cc: BENNETT Kathy (AREVA); DELANO Karen (AREVA); ROMINE Judy (AREVA); RYAN Tom (AREVA); KOWALSKI David (AREVA)
Subject: Response to U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 526 (6190, 6191), FSAR Ch. 9
Attachments: RAI 526 Response US EPR DC.pdf

Getachew,

Attached please find AREVA NP Inc.'s response to the subject request for additional information (RAI). The attached file, "RAI 526 Response US EPR DC.pdf," provides a schedule since technically correct and complete responses to the four questions cannot be provided at this time.

The following table indicates the respective pages in the response document, "RAI 526 Response US EPR DC.pdf," that contain AREVA NP's response to the subject questions.

Question #	Start Page	End Page
RAI 526 — 09.01.02-40	2	2
RAI 526 — 09.01.02-41	3	3
RAI 526 — 09.01.03-14	4	4
RAI 526 — 09.01.03-15	5	5

A preliminary schedule for technically correct and complete responses to these questions is provided below. This schedule is being reevaluated and a new supplement with a revised schedule will be transmitted by January 25, 2012.

Question #	Response Date
RAI 526 — 09.01.02-40	January 25, 2012
RAI 526 — 09.01.02-41	January 25, 2012
RAI 526 — 09.01.03-14	January 25, 2012
RAI 526 — 09.01.03-15	January 25, 2012

Sincerely,

Dennis Williford, P.E.
U.S. EPR Design Certification Licensing Manager

AREVA NP Inc.

7207 IBM Drive, Mail Code CLT 2B

Charlotte, NC 28262

Phone: 704-805-2223

Email: Dennis.Williford@areva.com

From: Tesfaye, Getachew [<mailto:Getachew.Tesfaye@nrc.gov>]
Sent: Friday, November 25, 2011 10:43 AM
To: ZZ-DL-A-USEPR-DL
Cc: Hernandez, Raul; Dreisbach, Jason; Segala, John; Hearn, Peter; Colaccino, Joseph
Subject: U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 526 (6190, 6191), FSAR Ch. 9

Attached please find the subject request for additional information (RAI). A draft of the RAI was provided to you on November 11, 2011, and on November 21, 2011, you informed us that the RAI is clear and no further clarification is needed. As a result, no change is made to the draft RAI. The schedule we have established for review of your application assumes technically correct and complete responses within 30 days of receipt of RAIs. For any RAIs that cannot be answered within 30 days, it is expected that a date for receipt of this information will be provided to the staff within the 30 day period so that the staff can assess how this information will impact the published schedule.

Thanks,
Getachew Tesfaye
Sr. Project Manager
NRO/DNRL/NARP
(301) 415-3361

Hearing Identifier: AREVA_EPR_DC_RAIs
Email Number: 3669

Mail Envelope Properties (2FBE1051AEB2E748A0F98DF9EEE5A5D4A53509)

Subject: Response to U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 526 (6190, 6191), FSAR Ch. 9
Sent Date: 1/4/2012 4:17:12 PM
Received Date: 1/4/2012 4:17:40 PM
From: WILLIFORD Dennis (AREVA)

Created By: Dennis.Williford@areva.com

Recipients:

"BENNETT Kathy (AREVA)" <Kathy.Bennett@areva.com>

Tracking Status: None

"DELANO Karen (AREVA)" <Karen.Delano@areva.com>

Tracking Status: None

"ROMINE Judy (AREVA)" <Judy.Romine@areva.com>

Tracking Status: None

"RYAN Tom (AREVA)" <Tom.Ryan@areva.com>

Tracking Status: None

"KOWALSKI David (AREVA)" <David.Kowalski@areva.com>

Tracking Status: None

"Tesfaye, Getachew" <Getachew.Tesfaye@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

Post Office: auscharm02.adom.ad.corp

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2520	1/4/2012 4:17:40 PM
RAI 526 Response US EPR DC.pdf		63913

Options

Priority: Standard

Return Notification: No

Reply Requested: No

Sensitivity: Normal

Expiration Date:

Recipients Received:

Response to

Request for Additional Information No. 526 (6190, 6191), Revision 0

11/25/2011

U.S. EPR Standard Design Certification

AREVA NP Inc.

Docket No. 52-020

SRP Section: 09.01.02 - New and Spent Fuel Storage

SRP Section: 09.01.03 - Spent Fuel Pool Cooling and Cleanup System

Application Section: 09.01

QUESTIONS for Balance of Plant Branch 1 (SBPA)

Question 09.01.02-40:

OPEN ITEM

In response to RAI 385, Question 9.1.4-17 the applicant provided a description of the design features relied upon to ensure that the SFCTF will remain leak-tight following an SSE. The staff reviewed FSAR Tier 2 Sections 9.1.2.2.2, "Spent Fuel Storage," and 9.1.2.3, "Safety Evaluation," and identified that the system description in the FSAR does not address the impact of seismic event while the SFCTF is in operation (all the gates open).

The staff requests the applicant to update FSAR Tier 2 Section 9.1.2 to include the description and justification by which the design of the SFCTF and all the pressure retaining components prevent a SFP drain-down (seismic classification).

Response to Question 09.01.02-40:

A response to this question will be provided by January 25, 2012.

Question 09.01.02-41:**OPEN ITEM**

In its response to RAI 385, Question 9.1.4-17, the applicant stated that the swivel gate between the CLP and the SFP, and the SFCTF upper cover are prevented from opening simultaneously, without having a cask connected to the SFCTF by an interlock. The staff evaluated the applicant's design for the SFCTF and determined that the applicant has not proposed any regulatory control over the gates SFP gates or the SFCTF cover to prevent inadvertent opening of these gates while the SFCTF is not in operation, which would result in draining of the SFP below the minimum water level. The staff also identified that the applicant design relies on interlock to prevent the inadvertent opening of gates before the cask is secured and docked in the SFCTF, but the applicant has not specify which of the interlocks are safety related, which are procedural controlled or which are controlled by electronic switches.

The staff requests the applicant to

- a. justify not having a Technical Specification or a license condition that would require at least two of the seismic barriers to be in place while there is no cask attached to the SFCTF;
- b. describe in the FSAR the prevention of the inadvertent draining of the SFP by the interlocks (safety related and non-safety related), by providing which alarms are associated with the interlocks, which interlocks are automatically cleared once the conditions are met, and which interlock are manually cleared by operator actions.

Response to Question 09.01.02-41:

A response to this question will be provided by January 25, 2012.

Question 09.01.03-14:

OPEN ITEM

The staff also identified that the applicant's response to RAI 9.1.4-17 proposes to update FSAR Tier 2 Section 9.1.4 to address the design and safety evaluation of the SFCTF. The SFCTF relies on the FPCS for makeup water in order to prevent a SFP drain-down.

The staff requests the applicant to update FSAR Section 9.1.3 to reflect the new safety function of the FPCS (make up to the CLP if the SFCTF leaks). Furthermore, include the safety analysis discussion that addresses the impact of a seismic event while the SFCTF is in operation and the design features relied upon to minimize potential leakage and handle the event.

Response to Question 09.01.03-14:

A response to this question will be provided by January 25, 2012.

Question 09.01.03-15:

OPEN ITEM

In FSAR Tier 2 Section 9.1.3.4 "Safety Evaluation," Item 7, the applicant states that the safety-related FPCS pumps will automatically trip on a low SFP level of 16.9 m (55 ft 6 in). The FSAR further states that the SFP is provided with a low level and a low-low level alarms at elevations of 18.7 m (61 ft 6 in) and 17.8 m (58 ft 6 in) respectively. In Item 10, the application states that Seismic Category I piping and valves are provided to allow isolation of purification piping exiting the bottom of the FB pools. It is not clear to the staff that all the piping that exits and connects to the SFP at or below the elevation of 16.9 m (55 ft 6 in) is design to Seismic Category I criteria.

The staff requests the applicant to clarify in FSAR Tier 2 Section 9.1.3 that all the piping and valves that connects with the SFP at or below the elevation of 16.9 m (55 ft 6 in) are design to seismic criteria I, and to that any non-seismic pipe that extends below the elevation of 16.9 m (55 ft 6 in) are provided of an anti-siphon device.

Response to Question 09.01.03-15:

A response to this question will be provided by January 25, 2012.