From: Getachew Tesfaye
Sent: Thursday, May 29, 2008 11:20 AM
To: 'usepr@areva.com'
Cc: John Rycyna; Kenneth See; Mark Thaggard; Joseph Colaccino; Judith McLellan
Subject: U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 13
Attachments: RAI 13 RHEB 260261262263264.doc

Attached please find the subject requests for additional information (RAI). A draft of the RAI was provided to you on May 18, 2008, and discussed with your staff on May 29, 2008. No change was made to the draft RAI as a result of that discussion. 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.

Getachew Tesfaye
Office of New Reactors
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
(301) 415-3361

E-mail Properties

Mail Envelope Properties (C56E360E9D804F4B95BC673F886381E71441ADD374)

Subject: U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 13
Sent Date: 5/29/2008 11:20:24 AM
Received Date: 5/29/2008 11:19:00 AM
From: Getachew Tesfaye

Created By: Getachew.Tesfaye@nrc.gov

Recipients:
usepr@areva.com ('usepr@areva.com')
Tracking Status: None
John.Rycyna@nrc.gov (John Rycyna)
Tracking Status: None
Kenneth.See@nrc.gov (Kenneth See)
Tracking Status: None
Mark.Thaggard@nrc.gov (Mark Thaggard)
Tracking Status: None
Joseph.Colaccino@nrc.gov (Joseph Colaccino)
Tracking Status: None
Judith.McLellan@nrc.gov (Judith McLellan)
Tracking Status: None

Post Office:
HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	41245	5/29/2008
RAI 13 RHEB 260261262263264.doc	30498	

Options
Expiration Date:
Priority: olImportanceNormal
ReplyRequested: False
Return Notification: False

Sensitivity: olNormal
Recipients received:

Request for Additional Information No. 13, Revision 0

5/29/2008

U. S. EPR Standard Design Certification
Alternate Energy Holdings
Docket No. 52-020
SRP Section: 02.04 - Hydrology
SRP Section: 02.04.04 - Potential Dam Failures
SRP Section: 02.04.06 - Probable Maximum Tsunami Flooding
SRP Section: 02.04.09 - Channel Diversions
SRP Section: 09.02.05 - Ultimate Heat Sink
Application Section: 2.4
RHEB Branch

QUESTIONS

02.04-1

Table 5.0-1 (Tier 1) states the maximum rainfall rate parameters as being for roof design while Table 2.1-1 (Tier 2) does not mention roof design. Is the rainfall rate of 19.4 in/hr to be used only for roof design?

02.04.04-1

Section 2.4.4 of the EPR DCD appears to only address seismically induced dam failures. SRP 2.4.4 addresses both seismic and non-seismic causes of dam failure. Please provide a basis for excluding non-seismic causes?

02.04.06-1

Section 2.4.6.2 states that the COL applicant will "…determine the extent to which safety-related facilities require protection from tsunami effects ". Clarify that "tsunami effects" includes the Probable Maximum Tsunami? If not, please provide a basis for excluding the Probable Maximum Tsunami.

02.04.09-1

Section 2.4.9.2 states that the COL applicant will "demonstrate in the event of upstream diversion or rerouting of the source of cooling water, alternate water supplies will be available to safety-related equipment." Explain why nearby down-stream diversions, which could lead to a backwater effect and therefore alter the water surface elevation at the site, not considered.

09.02.05-1

Section 9.2.5 UHS, Table 9.2.5 Ultimate Heat Sink Design Parameters. Were the values given based on the most severe meteorological conditions expected at a site? If so, what assures that they are representative of a reasonable number of sites?