ENCLOSURE 2

APP-GW-GLN-014-NS, Revision 0

"AP1000 Integrated Head Package"

Technical Report 61

Redacted version of Enclosure 1 with sensitive material relative to the physical protection of an AP1000 Nuclear Plant withheld from public disclosure pursuant to 10 CFR 2.390(d)

AP1000 DOCUMENT COVER SHEET

		TDC:	Perm	TDC: Permanent File:		
			RFS#:	RFS IT	EM #:	
AP1000 DOCUMENT NO.	REVISION NO.		ASSIGNED T	0		
APP-GW-GLN-014-NS	0	Page 1 of 1	W-A. Sterd	is		
ALTERNATE DOCUMENT N	UMBER:		WORK BREA	KDOWN #:		
ORIGINATING ORGANIZAT	ION: Westinghouse E	Electric Company	,			
TITLE: AP1000 Integrated	Head Package					
ATTACHMENTS: None			DCP #/RI DOCUME	EV. INCORPOR	ATED IN THIS	
CALCULATION/ANALYSIS I N/A	REFERENCE:		APP-GW GEE-130	/-GEE-069 Rev. Rev. 1	1 and APP-GW-	
ELECTRONIC FILENAME APP-GW-GLN-014.doc	ELECTRONIC FILE Microsoft Word		ELECTRONIC FILE Text	DESCRIPTION		
(C) WESTINGHOUSE EL	ECTRIC COMPAN	Y LLC – <u>2006</u>				
Class 3 Documents bein	CLASS 3 (NON PR)	OPRIETARY)	ng two review signatu	ires in lieu of a For	m 36.	
LEGAL REVIEW	SIGNATU	JRE/DATE				
PATENT REVIEW	SIGNATU	JRE/DATE				

WESTINGHOUSE PROPRIETARY CLASS 2

This document is the property of and contains Proprietary Information owned by Westinghouse Electric Company LLC and/or its subcontractors and suppliers. It is transmitted to you in confidence and trust, and you agree to treat this document in strict accordance with the terms and conditions of the agreement under which it was provided to you.

.

ORIGINATOR	SIGNATURE/DATE	
J. M. Iacovino Jr		
REVIEWERS	SIGNATURE/DATE	
M. McCullough		
VERIFIER	SIGNATURE/DATE	VERIFICATION METHOD
D. Lindgren		
AP1000 RESPONSIBLE MANAGER	SIGNATURE*	APPROVAL DATE
K. Quinn		

* Approval of the responsible manager signifies that document is complete, all required reviews are complete, electronic file is attached and document is released for use.

APP-GW-GLN-014-NS Revision 0 November 2006

AP1000 Standard Combined License Technical Report

AP1000 Integrated Head Package

Public (redacted) Version with sensitive unclassified nonsafeguards information relative to the physical protection of an AP1000 nuclear plant withheld under 10 CFR 2.390(d)

Westinghouse Electric Company LLC P.O. Box 355 Pittsburgh, PA 15230-0355

© 2006 Westinghouse Electric Company LLC All Rights Reserved

APP-GW-GLN-014-NS

AP1000 Licensing Design Change Document

Page 1 of

17

Document Num	ber:	APP-GW-GLN-014-NS	Revision Number:	0
Title:	AP100	0 Integrated Head Package		

Brief Description of the change (what is being changed and why):

The control rod drive mechanism (CRDM) cooling fans are no longer supported on the Integrated Head Package, but on an adjacent structure. This reduces the size and load to be picked up by the polar crane. A cable bridge is no longer used for instrumentation and power cable management. A stud hoist rail system is used to support individual stud hoist tensioners. Shielded covers are provided for the in-core instrument guide tubes to enhance radiation protection during refueling operations.

I. APPLICABILITY DETERMINATION

This evaluation is prepared to document that the change described above is a departure from Tier 2 information of the AP1000 Design Control Document (DCD) that may be included in plant specific FSARs without prior NRC approval.

Α.	Does the proposed change include a change to:		
	1. Tier 1 of the AP1000 Design Control	\square NO \square YES	(If YES, prepare a report for NRC
	Document APP-GW-GL-700		review of the changes.)
	2. Tier 2* of the AP1000 Design Control	\square NO \square YES	(If YES, prepare a report for NRC
	Document, APP-GW-GL-700		review of the changes.)
	3. Technical Specification in Chapter 16 of the	🛛 NO 🗌 YES	(If YES, prepare a report for NRC
	AP1000 Design Control Document,		review of the changes.)
	APP-GW-GL-700		
В.	Does the proposed change involve:		
	1. Closure of a Combined License Information	\square NO \square YES	(If YES, prepare a COL item
	Item identified in the AP1000 Design Control		closure report for NRC review.)
	Document, APP-GW-GL-700		_
	2. Completion of an ITAAC item identified in	NO YES	(If YES, prepare an ITAAC
	Tier 1 of the AP1000 Design Control		completion report for NRC
	Document, APP-GW-GL-700		review.)

The questions above are answered no, therefore the departure from the DCD in a COL application does not require prior NRC review unless review is required by the criteria of 10 CFR Part 52 Appendix D Section VIII B.5.b. or B.5c

II. TECHNICAL DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION

Removal of CRDM Cooling Fans from Integrated Head Package – The purpose of the Integrated Head Package is to facilitate the rapid removal of the reactor vessel head during a refueling outage. With the CRDM cooling fans on the Integrated Head Package, this became a difficult task. The size and weight of the Integrated Head Package was large. It required disconnection of the CRDM cooling fan power cables. Heavy shield doors would have to be placed where the fans are disconnected from the ductwork. Because the CRDM fans were not uniformly distributed on the Integrated Head Package, it would be difficult to meet the levelness criteria while lifting it. The CRDM cooling fans and their supporting

AP1000 Licensing Design Change Document

Page	2 of	· 17	,
------	------	------	---

Document Num	nber: <u>/</u>	APP-GW-GLN-014-NS	Revision Number:	0
Title:	<u>AP1000</u>	Integrated Head Package		

structure interfered with the removal and insertion process of the in-core instrumentation cable assemblies. For all of these reasons, the CRDM cooling fans were removed from the Integrated Head Package and placed on a support structure adjacent to the Integrated Head Package.

Cable Bridge – The cable/support/management function was not correctly described in the DCD. There is no cable bridge for the Integrated Head Package. In its place is a cable support structure with removable cable guides. The CRDM power and digital rod position indication cables are disconnected from the connector plates, retracted, and temporarily stored below the operating deck so they do not interfere with refueling operations.

Lifting of the Integrated Head Package – The Integrated Head Package is not lifted with the reactor vessel stud tensioners, studs, nuts, and washers. These items are removed from the reactor vessel head before the Integrated Head Package is lifted by the polar crane to the in-containment storage stand during refueling.

There is a clarification of the lifting system (tripod) for the Integrated Head Package. This apparatus lifts the reactor vessel head and Integrated Head Package as a unit. The lifting system attaches to the control rod drive mechanism seismic support structure. The lift legs transfer the head load during a head lift from the head attachment lugs through the control rod drive mechanism seismic support structure to the lift rig. The lifting system consists of lift legs, sling block, clevises, and sling rods, required interfacing with the polar crane hook.

Stud Hoist Rail – A stud hoist rail has been added to Figure 3.9-7. The stud hoist rail is used to support individual stud hoist tensioners used during refueling operations.

In-core Instrumentation Guide Tube Covers – Shielded covers are provided for the 42 in-core instrument guide tubes to enhance radiation protection during refueling operations.

III. REFERENCES

- 1. APP-GW-GL-700, AP1000 Design Control Document, Revision 15.
- 2. NUREG 1793, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission "Final Safety Evaluation Report for AP1000 Design," September 2004.

IV. DCD MARK-UP

The following mark-ups of AP1000 DCD Revision 15 Tier 2 (Reference 1) identify how COL application FSARs should be prepared to incorporate the subject change.

AP1000 Licensing Design Change Document

Page 3 of

17

Document Num	ber:	APP-GW-GLN-014-NS	Revision Number:	0
Title:	AP100	0 Integrated Head Package		

Revise subsection 3.9.7 as follows:

3.9.7 Integrated Head Package

The integrated head package (IHP) combines several components in one assembly to simplify refueling the reactor. Figure 3.9-7 illustrates the integrated head package. The integrated head package includes a lifting rig, seismic restraints for control rod drive mechanisms, support for reactor head vent piping, power cables, cables and conduit for in-core instrumentation, cable supports (including messenger tray and cable bridge), and cooling shroud assembly; and cooling system.

The integrated head package provides the ability to rapidly disconnect <u>cables</u>, <u>including</u> the <u>CRDM</u> power <u>cables</u>, <u>digital rod position indication cables</u>, and <u>in-core</u> instrumentation cables from the components.⁵ including the control rod drive mechanism and The integrated head package also provides the ability to rapidly <u>disconnect</u> the reactor head vent system.

<u>The integrated head package It also</u>provides the ability to move these components as an assembly to permit the<u>ir</u> lifting and removal <u>of with</u> the reactor vessel head. In addition, the integrated head package provides support for the vessel head multi-stud tensioner/detensioner during refueling.

The lifting rig function is discussed in subsection 9.1.5. The control rod drive mechanisms are discussed in subsection 3.9.4. The control rod drive mechanism support and cooling function is discussed in Section 4.6. The reactor vessel head vent function is discussed in subsection 5.4.12. The function and requirements of the in-core instrumentation are discussed in Chapter 7.

Revise the fifth and tenth paragraphs of subsection 3.9.7.1 as follows:

3.9.7.1 Design Bases

Those components that function as part of the lifting rig are required to be capable of lifting and carrying the total assembled load of the package. This includes the vessel head, control rod drive mechanisms, control rod drive mechanism seismic supports, cooling shroud, instrumentation support, cooling ducts and fans, stud tensioners, vessel studs, nuts, washers, instrumentation support structure, and insulation. The lifting rig components are required to meet the guidance for special lifting rigs, in NUREG-0612, (Reference 10). The lifting rig components are nonsafety-related, AP1000 equipment Class E.

The messenger tray <u>cable support</u> provides seismic support and maintains separation for instrumentation and power cables when it is in the normal position spanning the space over the cavity from operating deck to the integrated head package.

AP1000 Licensing Design Change Document

Page 4 of	17
-----------	----

Document Num	nber:	APP-GW-GLN-014-NS	Revision Number:	0
Title:	AP100	0 Integrated Head Package		

Revise subsection 3.9.7.2 as follows:

3.9.7.2 Design Description

The integrated head package combines several separate components in one assembly to simplify refueling of the reactor. The purpose of the integrated head package is to reduce the outage time and personnel radiation exposure by combining operations associated with movement of the reactor vessel head during the refueling outage. In addition, the integrated head concept reduces the laydown space required in the containment. With the integrated head package, disconnections from and connections to the control rod drive mechanisms and rod position indicators (RPI) and other components within the cooling shroud assembly are not made at the individual component.

The integrated head package consists of the following main elements:

- <u>Cooling Sshroud assembly and cooling system</u>
- Lifting system
- Mechanism seismic support structure
- Messenger tray and cCable support structure
- Cables
- In-core instrumentation support structure

Brief descriptions of the principal elements of the integrated head package are provided in the following paragraphs.

<u>Cooling Sshroud assembly and cooling system</u> - The cooling shroud <u>assembly</u> is a carbon steel structure that <u>includes an outer shroud and an inner air baffle and</u> encloses the control rod drive mechanisms above the reactor vessel head. During normal operation, it provides for the flow of cooling air to the control rod drive mechanism coil stacks. The rod position indicators are also cooled by this air flow. The <u>air cooling fans and</u> the duct work <u>and air baffle</u> are integral with, and supported by, the shroud assembly. <u>The air cooling fans are</u> supported on a separate platform. Structurally, the shroud is integrated with the head lifting system and the mechanism seismic support structure. The shroud also provides shielding at the vessel flange region.

The shroud structure is bolted to attachment lugs on the reactor vessel head, which also serve as the lifting attachment to the reactor vessel head. The shroud transfers the head load during a head lift to the control rod drive mechanism seismic support and into the lift rig.

Cabling, conduit and their supports and attachment hardware for the control rod drive mechanisms, control rod drive mechanism coil, cooling fans, and in-core instrumentation is are routed around the messenger traycable support attached to the shroud.

Lifting system - This apparatus lifts the reactor vessel head and integrated head package as a unit. The lifting system attaches to the <u>control rod drive</u> mechanism seismic support structure. <u>The lift legs transfer the head</u>

Page 5 of 17

Document Num	ber:	APP-GW-GLN-014-NS	R	evision Number:	0
Title:	AP100) Integrated Head Package			

load during a head lift from the head attachment lugs through the control rod drive mechanism seismic support structure to the lift rig. The lifting system It consists of lift legs, sling block, clevises, and sling rods required to interface with the polar crane hook.

Mechanism seismic support structure - This structure provides seismic restraint for the mechanisms. It is located near the top of the control rod drive mechanism rod travel housings. The spike on the top of the control rod drive mechanism rod travel housing interfaces with this support. This support interfaces with the cooling shroud assembly to transfer seismic loads from the mechanisms to the reactor vessel head. In addition to this function, the mechanism seismic support structure acts as a spreader for the lift system and transfers the reactor vessel head loads to the lift system. The in-core instrument support structure is also supported from the mechanism seismic support structure.

Messenger tray and c<u>C</u>able support structure - The messenger tray cable support is located at an elevation above the top of the rod travel housings. It provides permanent support and routing for the control rod drive mechanism power cables, and rod position indication cables, and in core instrumentation cables which remain with the integrated head package and are normally not disturbed. These cables terminate at the connector plates, which constitutes the interface with the mating cables. Cable disconnects are made at the connector plates.

Cables - The integrated head package cables include those portions of the control rod drive mechanism power cables, in-core instrumentation, and rod position indication instrumentation cables extending from the connector plates, through the messenger tray and cooling shroud assembly to the user devices. These cables remain with the integrated head package and are normally not disturbed. The individual cables length are sized to provide an orderly arrangement in the messenger tray and inside the cooling shroud. For a refueling or other operation requiring movement of the integrated head package, the cables that span the space over the cavity from the operating deck to the integrated head package connected to the cables on the messenger tray are disconnected at a-the connector plates. The cables are then moved away from the integrated head package.

Revise Table 8.3.1-1 (Sheet 4 of 5), "Onsite Standby Diesel Generator ZOS MG 02A Nominal Loads," and Table 8.3.1-2 (Sheet 4 of 4), "Onsite Standby Diesel Generator ZOS MG 02B Nominal Loads," as shown on the following pages.

AP1000 Licensing Design Change Document Page 6 of <u>17</u>

APP-GW-GLN-014 Ite: AP1000 Integrated Head F		APP-GW-GLN-014-NS		Revision Number: 0	
		00 Integrated Head Package			
		Table 8.3.1-1 (Shee	tt 4 of 5)		
ONSITE STANDBY DIESEL GENERATOR ZOS MG 02A NOMINAL LOADS					
	r	Manual Loads (Note 2)		
Item No.	Time Seq. (sec)	Event or Load Description	Rating (hp/kW)	Operating Load (kW)	
47.		Class 1E Div. A Battery Charger 1 (Note 13)	78 kVA	26	
48.		Class 1E Div. C Battery Charger 1 (Note 13)	78 kVA	26	
49.		Class 1E Div. C Battery Charger 2	78 kVA	15	
50.		Supplemental Air Filtration System Fan A	15 hp	15	
51.		Supplemental Air Filtration System Electric Heater A	20 kW	20	
52.		Backup Group 4A Pressurizer Heaters	246 kW	246	
53.		CRDM Fan 01A	40 hp	33	
54.		CRDM Fan 01 <u>C</u> B	40 hp	33	
55.		Spent Fuel Cooling Pump A	250 hp	200	
56.		Make-Up Pump A	600 hp	498	
57.		Non-1E Regulating XFMR EDS1-DT-1	75 kVA	25	
58.		Non-1E Regulating XFMR EDS3-DT-1	75 kVA	25	
59.		Instrument Air Compressor A (Note 14)	200 hp	166	
60.		Main Control Room AHU Supply Fan A (Note 11)	40 hp	34	
61.		Main Control Room AHU Return Fan A (Note 11)	25 hp	21	
62.		Div A/C Class 1E Electrical Room AHU Supply Fan A (Note 11)	40 hp	34	
63.		Div A/C Class 1E Electrical Room Return Fan A (Note 11)	25 hp	21	

AP1000 Licensing Design Change Document

Page 7 of 17

ument Number:		APP-GW-GLN-014-NS	Re	evision Number: 0
e: <u>AP1</u>		00 Integrated Head Package		
		. Table 8.3.1-2 (Sheet	4 of 4)	
	ONSITE	STANDBY DIESEL GENERATOR	ZOS MG 02B NC	MINAL LOADS
Manual Loads (Note 2)				
Item No.	Time Seq. (sec)	Event or Load Description	Rating (hp/kW)	Operating Load (kW)
53.		Class 1E Div. B Battery Charger 1	78 kVA	26
54.		Class 1E Div. B Battery Charger 2	78 kVA	15
55.		Class 1E Div. D Battery Charger 1	78 kVA	26
56.		Supplemental Air Filtration System Fan B	15 hp	15
57.		Supplemental Air Filtration System Electric Heater B	20 kW	20
58.		Backup Group 4B Pressurizer Heaters	246 kW	246
59.		CRDM Fan 01 <u>B</u> C	40 hp	33
<u>60.</u>		CRDM Fan 01D	<u>40 hp</u>	<u>33</u>
6 <u>01</u> .		Spent Fuel Cooling Pump B	250 hp	200
64 <u>2</u> .		Make-Up Pump B	600 hp	498
6 <u>23</u> .		Non-1E Regulating XFMR EDS2-DT-1	75 kVA	25
6 <u>34</u> .		Annex Bldg Equipment Room Return/Exhaust Fan B	20 hp	17
64 <u>5</u> .		Annex Bldg Equipment Room AHU MS02B Fan	50 hp	42
6 <u>56</u> .		Annex Bldg Swgr Rm AHU MS 05B Fan	50 hp	42
6 <u>67</u> .		Annex Bldg Swgr Rm Ret/Exhaust Fan 06B	25 hp	21
		Total Manually Sequenced Loads (kW)		12 26<u>59</u>

AP1000 Licensing Design Change Document

Page 8 of 17

Document Num	ber: APP-GW-GLN-014-NS	Revision Number: 0
Title:	AP1000 Integrated Head Package	

Revise Figure 3.9-7, "Integrated Head Package," as shown on the following page, to reflect its current configuration with CRDM cooling fans on an adjacent structure.

Revise Figure 1.2-9, "Nuclear Island General Arrangement Plan at Elevation 117'6" with Equipment," to eliminate CRDM cooling fans on the Integrated Head Package. This figure is at the end of this document.

Revise Figure 12.3-1, "Radiation Zones, Normal Operations/Shutdown Nuclear Island, Elevation 135'-3" (Sheet 8 of 16)," as shown at the end of this document.

AP1000 Licensing Design Change Document



Integrated Head Package

CURRENT FIGURE

17

Page 9 of

AP1000 Licensing Design Change Document Page 10 of 17





Integrated Head Package

REVISED FIGURE

1

AP1000 Licensing Design Change Document

Page	11	of	17
------	----	----	----

Title: AP1000 Integrated Head Package V. REGULATORY IMPACT A. FSER IMPACT The Integrated Head Package is described in subsection 3.9.4 of the NRC Final Safety Evaluation Report (FSER) (Reference 2). The changes detailed in this document do not impact the FSER. B. SCREENING QUESTIONS (Check correct response and provide justification for that determination under each response) 1. Does the proposed change involve a change to an SSC that adversely affects a DCD described design function? The proposed IHP change does not involve a change to an SSC that adversely affects a DCD described design function. YES 2. Does the proposed change involve a change to a procedure that adversely affects a DCD described SSC design functions are performed or controlled? YES The proposed IHP change does not involve a change to a procedure that adversely affects how DCD described SSC design functions are performed or controlled. YES 3. Does the proposed activity involve revising or replacing a DCD described evaluation methodology that is used in establishing the design bases or used in the safety analyses. YES 4. Does the proposed activity involve a test or experiment not described in the DCD, where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or descriptions in the DCD? The proposed IHP activity does not involve a test or experiment not described in the DCD?	Docu	ment Number:	APP-GW-GLN-014-NS	Revision Number: 0
 V. REGULATORY IMPACT A. FSER IMPACT The Integrated Head Package is described in subsection 3.9.4 of the NRC Final Safety Evaluation Report (FSER) (Reference 2). The changes detailed in this document do not impact the FSER. B. SCREENING QUESTIONS (Check correct response and provide justification for that determination under each response) 1. Does the proposed change involve a change to an SSC that adversely affects a □ YES ⊠ DCD described design function? The proposed IHP change does not involve a change to an SSC that adversely affects a DCD described design function. 2. Does the proposed change involve a change to a procedure that adversely affects how DCD described SSC design functions are performed or controlled? The proposed IHP change does not involve a change to a procedure that adversely affects how DCD described SSC design functions are performed or controlled? The proposed IHP change does not involve a change to a procedure that adversely affects how DCD described SSC design functions are performed or controlled. 3. Does the proposed activity involve revising or replacing a DCD described evaluation methodology that is used in establishing the design bases or used in the safety analyses? The proposed IHP activity does not involve revising or replacing a DCD described evaluation methodology that is used in establishing the design bases or used in the safety analyses. 4. Does the proposed activity involve a test or experiment not described in the DCD, □ YES ⊠ where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or descriptions in the DCD.	Title:	<u>AP100</u>	00 Integrated Head Package	
 A. FSER IMPACT The Integrated Head Package is described in subsection 3.9.4 of the NRC Final Safety Evaluation Report (FSER) (Reference 2). The changes detailed in this document do not impact the FSER. B. SCREENING QUESTIONS (Check correct response and provide justification for that determination under each response) Does the proposed change involve a change to an SSC that adversely affects a □ YES □ DCD described design function? The proposed IHP change does not involve a change to an SSC that adversely affects a DCD described design function. Does the proposed change involve a change to a procedure that adversely affects a DCD described design function. Does the proposed change involve a change to a procedure that adversely affects a DCD described SSC design functions are performed or controlled. Does the proposed activity involve revising or replacing a DCD described evaluation methodology that is used in establishing the design bases or used in the safety analyses. Does the proposed activity involve a test or experiment not described in the DCD, where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or descriptions in the DCD. 	v.	REGULATORY	ИМРАСТ	
 The Integrated Head Package is described in subsection 3.9.4 of the NRC Final Safety Evaluation Report (FSER) (Reference 2). The changes detailed in this document do not impact the FSER. B. SCREENING QUESTIONS (Check correct response and provide justification for that determination under each response) 1. Does the proposed change involve a change to an SSC that adversely affects a □ YES ≥ DCD described design function? The proposed IHP change does not involve a change to an SSC that adversely affects a DCD described design function. 2. Does the proposed change involve a change to a procedure that adversely affects a DCD described SSC design functions are performed or controlled? The proposed IHP change does not involve a change to a procedure that adversely affects how DCD described SSC design functions are performed or controlled. 3. Does the proposed activity involve revising or replacing a DCD described evaluation methodology that is used in establishing the design bases or used in the safety analyses? 4. Does the proposed activity involve a test or experiment not described in the DCD, where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or descriptions in the DCD. 	A.	FSER IMPACT		
 B. SCREENING QUESTIONS (Check correct response and provide justification for that determination under each response) 1. Does the proposed change involve a change to an SSC that adversely affects a DCD described design function? The proposed IHP change does not involve a change to an SSC that adversely affects a DCD described design function. 2. Does the proposed change involve a change to a procedure that adversely affects how DCD described SSC design functions are performed or controlled? The proposed IHP change does not involve a change to a procedure that adversely affects how DCD described SSC design functions are performed or controlled. 3. Does the proposed activity involve revising or replacing a DCD described evaluation methodology that is used in establishing the design bases or used in the safety analyses? The proposed IHP activity does not involve revising or replacing a DCD described evaluation methodology that is used in establishing the design bases or used in the safety analyses. 4. Does the proposed activity involve a test or experiment not described in the DCD, where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or descriptions in the DCD, where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or descriptions in the DCD. 		The Integrated He Report (FSER) (F	ead Package is described in subsection 3.9.4 of the N Reference 2). The changes detailed in this document	NRC Final Safety Evaluation to not impact the FSER.
 Does the proposed change involve a change to an SSC that adversely affects a DCD described design function? The proposed IHP change does not involve a change to an SSC that adversely affects a DCD described design function. Does the proposed change involve a change to a procedure that adversely affects bw DCD described SSC design functions are performed or controlled? The proposed IHP change does not involve a change to a procedure that adversely affects how DCD described SSC design functions are performed or controlled? Does the proposed activity involve revising or replacing a DCD described evaluation methodology that is used in establishing the design bases or used in the safety analyses? The proposed activity involve a test or experiment not described in the DCD, where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or descriptions in the DCD, where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or descriptions in the DCD. 	B.	SCREENING QU determination uno	JESTIONS (Check correct response and provide jus der each response)	tification for that
 The proposed IHP change does not involve a change to an SSC that adversely affects a DCD described design function. Does the proposed change involve a change to a procedure that adversely affects how DCD described SSC design functions are performed or controlled? The proposed IHP change does not involve a change to a procedure that adversely affects how DCD described SSC design functions are performed or controlled. Does the proposed activity involve revising or replacing a DCD described evaluation methodology that is used in establishing the design bases or used in the safety analyses? The proposed IHP activity does not involve revising or replacing a DCD described evaluation methodology that is used in establishing the design bases or used in the safety analyses. Does the proposed activity involve a test or experiment not described in the DCD, where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or described in the DCD, where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or described in the DCD. 	1.	Does the propose DCD described d	d change involve a change to an SSC that adversely lesign function?	affects a 🗌 YES 🖾 NO
 Does the proposed change involve a change to a procedure that adversely affects how DCD described SSC design functions are performed or controlled? The proposed IHP change does not involve a change to a procedure that adversely affects how DCD described SSC design functions are performed or controlled. Does the proposed activity involve revising or replacing a DCD described evaluation methodology that is used in establishing the design bases or used in the safety analyses? The proposed IHP activity does not involve revising or replacing a DCD described evaluation methodology that is used in establishing the design bases or used in the safety analyses. Does the proposed activity involve a test or experiment not described in the DCD, where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or described in the DCD? The proposed IHP activity does not involve a test or experiment not described in the DCD, where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or described in the DCD, where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or described in the DCD. 		The proposed IHI affects a DCD dea	P change does not involve a change to an SSC that a scribed design function.	dversely
 The proposed IHP change does not involve a change to a procedure that adversely affects how DCD described SSC design functions are performed or controlled. Does the proposed activity involve revising or replacing a DCD described evaluation methodology that is used in establishing the design bases or used in the safety analyses? The proposed IHP activity does not involve revising or replacing a DCD described evaluation methodology that is used in establishing the design bases or used in the safety analyses. Does the proposed activity involve a test or experiment not described in the DCD, where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or descriptions in the DCD, where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or descriptions in the DCD, where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or descriptions in the DCD, where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or descriptions in the DCD. 	2.	Does the propose how DCD describ	ed change involve a change to a procedure that adverted bed SSC design functions are performed or controlle	rsely affects 🗌 YES 🖾 NO ed?
 3. Does the proposed activity involve revising or replacing a DCD described evaluation methodology that is used in establishing the design bases or used in the safety analyses? The proposed IHP activity does not involve revising or replacing a DCD described evaluation methodology that is used in establishing the design bases or used in the safety analyses. 4. Does the proposed activity involve a test or experiment not described in the DCD, where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or descriptions in the DCD, where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or descriptions in the DCD, where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or descriptions in the DCD. 		The proposed IHI affects how DCD	P change does not involve a change to a procedure the described SSC design functions are performed or c	hat adversely ontrolled.
 The proposed IHP activity does not involve revising or replacing a DCD described evaluation methodology that is used in establishing the design bases or used in the safety analyses. 4. Does the proposed activity involve a test or experiment not described in the DCD, YES where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or descriptions in the DCD? The proposed IHP activity does not involve a test or experiment not described in the DCD? The proposed IHP activity does not involve a test or experiment not described in the DCD, where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or descriptions in the DCD, where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or described in the DCD, where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or descriptions in the DCD. 	3.	Does the propose evaluation method safety analyses?	ed activity involve revising or replacing a DCD descended descended of the design bases of the design base	ribed \Box YES \boxtimes NO or used in the
 4. Does the proposed activity involve a test or experiment not described in the DCD, ☐ YES ⋈ where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or descriptions in the DCD? The proposed IHP activity does not involve a test or experiment not described in the DCD, where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or descriptions in the DCD, where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or descriptions in the DCD. 		The proposed IHI evaluation methor safety analyses.	P activity does not involve revising or replacing a D dology that is used in establishing the design bases of	CD described or used in the
The proposed IHP activity does not involve a test or experiment not described in the DCD, where an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the reference bounds of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or descriptions in the DCD.	4.	Does the propose where an SSC is a bounds of the des the DCD?	ed activity involve a test or experiment not described utilized or controlled in a manner that is outside the sign for that SSC or is inconsistent with analyses or	in the DCD, I YES NO reference descriptions in
		The proposed IHI the DCD, where a reference bounds descriptions in th	P activity does not involve a test or experiment not of an SSC is utilized or controlled in a manner that is of of the design for that SSC or is inconsistent with an a DCD.	described in outside the alyses or

AP1000 Licensing Design Change Document

Page 12 of 17

Docu	ment Number: APP-GW-GLN-014-NS	Revision Number: 0
Title:	AP1000 Integrated Head Package	1.00 - 00 - 1.00
C.	EVALUATION OF DEPARTURE FROM TIER 2 INFORMATION provide justification for that determination under each response)	(Check correct response and
	10 CFR Part 52, Appendix D, Section VIII. B.5.a. provides that an applicensee who references the AP1000 design certification may depart fr without prior NRC approval, if it does not require a license amendment questions below address the criteria of B.5.b.	plicant for a combined rom Tier 2 information, nt under paragraph B.5.b. The
1.	Does the proposed departure result in more than a minimal increase in occurrence of an accident previously evaluated in the plant-specific D Since there is no change to the design function or operation of the Inte	the frequency of YES X NO CD? grated Head Package there are no new
2.	accident initiators and no effect on the frequency of evaluated acciden Does the proposed departure result in more than a minimal increase in occurrence of a malfunction of a structure, system, or component (SSG safety and previously evaluated in the plant-specific DCD?	ts. the likelihood of YES X NO C) important to
	Since there is no change to the design function or operation of the Inte	grated Head Package there is no new
3.	Does the proposed departure Result in more than a minimal increase in of an accident previously evaluated in the plant-specific DCD?	n the consequences \Box YES \boxtimes NO
	The changes have no effect on the operation, performance, and pressu containment vessel. Therefore, there is no increase in the calculated re- postulated accident conditions	re boundary integrity of the elease of radioactive material during
4.	Does the proposed departure result in more than a minimal increase in of a malfunction of an SSC important to safety previously evaluated in DCD2	the consequences \Box YES \boxtimes NO n the plant-specific
	The changes have no effect on the design functions or reliability of the	e Integrated Head Package. Therefore
5.	Does the proposed departure create a possibility for an accident of a d any evaluated previously in the plant-specific DCD?	ifferent type than \Box YES \boxtimes NO
	The changes have no effect on the operation, performance and pressu Head Package or containment vessel. The changes do not introduc Integrated Head Package. Therefore, there is no possibility of an	the boundary integrity of the Integrated any additional failure modes to the accident of a different type than any
6.	Does the proposed departure create a possibility for a malfunction of a safety with a different result then any evoluted previously in the plan	In SSC important to \Box YES \boxtimes NO
	The changes have no effect on the design functions of the Integrated additional failure modes or the possibility for a malfunction of an SS result than evaluated previously	Head Package. Therefore, there are no SC important to safety with a differen
7.	Does the proposed departure result in a design basis limit for a fission described in the plant-specific DCD being exceeded or altered?	product barrier as YES XNO
	There is no change to the design function of the Integrated Head Pack result does not result in a design basis limit for a fission product ba DCD being exceeded or altered	age. Therefore, the proposed departure arrier as described in the plant-specifie

t

AP1000 Licensing Design Change Document

Page 13 of _____

Doc	ument Number:	APP-GW-GLN-014-NS	Revision Number:	0
Title	: <u>AP10</u>	00 Integrated Head Package		
8.	Does the propose in the plant-speci The methods of altered by the pro	ed departure result in a departure from a method of eva fic DCD used in establishing the design bases or in the evaluation for the Integrated Head Package describe oposed departure.	luation described e safety analyses? ed in the plant-speci	☐ YES ⊠ NO fic DCD are not
	The answers to the require prior NRC Section VIII. B.5.	e evaluation questions above are "NO" and the propos review to be included in plant specific FSARs as pro- b	ed departure from Ti /ided in 10 CFR Part	er 2 does not 52, Appendix D,
	One or more of the NRC review.	e answers to the evaluation questions above are "YES"	' and the proposed cl	nange requires
D.	IMPACT ON RE	ESOLUTION OF A SEVERE ACCIDENT ISSUE		
	10 CFR Part 52, licensee who refe without prior NR questions below	Appendix D, Section VIII. B.5.a. provides that an apperences the AP1000 design certification may depart from C approval, if it does not require a license amendment address the criteria of B.5.c.	licant for a combined om Tier 2 information ounder paragraph B.3	l n, 5.c. The
1.	Does the propose If the answer is Y	ed activity result in an impact to features that mitigate (es answer Questions 2 and 3 below.	severe accidents.	🗌 YES 🖾 NO
2.	Is there is a subst particular severe become credible?	tantial increase in the probability of a severe accident s accident previously reviewed and determined to be no ?	such that a t credible could	□ YES □ NO
	The changes hav change in the pro	e no effect on the operation and performance of the l bability of a severe accident.	ntegrated Head Pack	age. There is no
3.	Is there is a subst accident previous	tantial increase in the consequences to the public of a p sly reviewed?	particular severe	□ YES □ NO ⊠ N/A
	The changes hav effect on the calc	e no effect on the operation and performance of the l culation of the release of radioactive material during a	ntegrated Head Pack severe accident.	age. There is no
	The answers to the from Tier 2 does 10 CFR Part 52,	he evaluation questions above are "NO" or are not app not require prior NRC review to be included in plant s Appendix D, Section VIII. B.5.c	licable and the prope specific FSARs as pr	osed departure ovided in
	One or more of the NRC review.	he answers to the evaluation questions above are "YES	3" and the proposed of	change requires
E.	SECURITY ASS	SESSMENT		
1.	Does the propose AP1000.	ed change have an adverse impact on the security asses	sment of the	🗌 YES 🖾 NO
The changes to the Integrated Head Package will not alter barriers or alarms that control access to protected areas of the plant. The changes to the Integrated Head Package will not alter requirements for security personnel.				

•

Document Number: APP-GW-GLN-014-NS

c,

•

.

-

Title: AP1000 Integrated Head Package

CURRENT FIGURE

Page 14 of	17

Revision Number: 0

Withhold from public disclosure under 10 CFR 2.390 (d)

Figure 1.2-9

Nuclear Island General Arrangement Plan at Elevation 117'-6" with Equipment

Document Number: APP-GW-GLN-014-NS

Title: AP1000 Integrated Head Package

REVISED FIGURE

. .

Page 15 of	17	
Revision Nu	mber:	0

Withhold from public disclosure under 10 CFR 2.390 (d)

Figure 1.2-9

Nuclear Island General Arrangement Plan at Elevation 117'-6" with Equipment

Document Number: APP-GW-GLN-014-NS

Title: AP1000 Integrated Head Package

÷

CURRENT FIGURE

.

•----

Page 16 of	17			
			-	
Revision Nu	mber:	0		

Withhold from public disclosure under 10 CFR 2.390 (d)

Figure 12.3-1 (Sheet 8 of 16)

Radiation Zones, Normal Operations/Shutdown Nuclear Island, Elevation 135'-3"

.

Document Number: APP-GW-GLN-014-NS

Title: AP1000 Integrated Head Package

REVISED FIGURE

Page 17 of	17	

Revision Number: 0

Withhold from public disclosure under 10 CFR 2.390 (d)

Figure 12.3-1 (Sheet 8 of 16)

Radiation Zones, Normal Operations/Shutdown Nuclear Island, Elevation 135'-3"