ArevaEPRDCPEm Resource

From: Pederson Ronda M (AREVA NP INC) [Ronda.Pederson@areva.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 08, 2009 6:04 PM
To: Getachew Tesfaye
Cc: BENNETT Kathy A (OFR) (AREVA NP INC); DELANO Karen V (AREVA NP INC); VAN NOY Mark (EXT); KOWALSKI David J (AREVA NP INC)
Subject: Response to U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 83, FSAR Ch 10, Supplement 2
Attachments: RAI 83 Supplement 2 Response US EPR DC.pdf

Getachew,

AREVA NP Inc. provided responses to 12 of the 17 questions of RAI No. 83 on November 10, 2008. Supplement 1 response to RAI No. 83 was sent on December 29, 2008 to address 2 of the remaining 5 questions. The attached file, "RAI 83 Supplement 2 Response US EPR DC.pdf" provides technically correct and complete responses to 1 of the remaining 3 questions, as committed.

The following table indicates the respective pages in the response document, "RAI 83 Supplement 2 Response US EPR DC.pdf," that contain AREVA NP's response to the subject questions.

Question #	Start Page	End Page
RAI 83 — 10.04.07-2	2	2

The schedule for technically correct and complete responses to the remaining 2 questions is unchanged and provided below:

Question #	Response Date
RAI 83 — 10.04.09-5	February 20, 2009
RAI 83 — 10.04.09-9	February 20, 2009

Sincerely,

Ronda Pederson
ronda.pederson@areva.com
Licensing Manager, U.S. EPR Design Certification
AREVA NP Inc.
An AREVA and Siemens company
3315 Old Forest Road
Lynchburg, VA 24506-0935
Phone: 434-832-3694
Cell: 434-841-8788

From: WELLS Russell D (AREVA NP INC)
Sent: Monday, December 29, 2008 1:53 PM
To: 'Getachew Tesfaye'
Cc: 'John Rycyna'; Pederson Ronda M (AREVA NP INC); BENNETT Kathy A (OFR) (AREVA NP INC); DELANO Karen V (AREVA NP INC)
Subject: Response to U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 83, FSAR Ch 10, Supplement 1

Getachew,

AREVA NP Inc. (AREVA NP) provided responses to 12 of the 17 questions of RAI No. 83 on November 10, 2008. The attached file, "RAI 83 Supplement 1 Response US EPR DC.pdf" provides technically correct and complete responses to 2 of the remaining 5 questions, as committed.

Appended to this file are affected pages of the U.S. EPR Final Safety Analysis Report in redline-strikeout format which support the response to RAI 83 Supplement 1 Questions 10.04.09-1 and 10.04.09-10.

The following table indicates the respective pages in the response document, "RAI 83 Supplement 1 Response US EPR DC.pdf" that contain AREVA NP's response to the subject questions.

Question #	Start Page	End Page
RAI 83 — 10.04.09-1	2	3
RAI 83 — 10.04.09-10	4	4

The schedule for technically correct and complete responses to the remaining 3 questions is unchanged and is provided below:

Question #	Response Date
RAI 83 — 10.04.09-5	February 20, 2009
RAI 83 — 10.04.09-9	February 20, 2009
RAI 83 — 10.04.07-2	January 9, 2009

Sincerely,

(Russ Wells on behalf of)
Ronda Pederson
ronda.pederson@areva.com
Licensing Manager, U.S. EPR Design Certification
New Plants Deployment
AREVA NP, Inc.
An AREVA and Siemens company
3315 Old Forest Road
Lynchburg, VA 24506-0935
Phone: 434-832-3694
Cell: 434-841-8788

From: WELLS Russell D (AREVA NP INC)
Sent: Monday, November 10, 2008 5:03 PM
To: 'Getachew Tesfaye'
Cc: 'John Rycyna'; Pederson Ronda M (AREVA NP INC); BENNETT Kathy A (OFR) (AREVA NP INC); DELANO Karen V (AREVA NP INC)
Subject: Response to U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 83, FSAR Ch 10

Getachew,

Attached please find AREVA NP Inc.'s response to the subject request for additional information (RAI). The attached file, "RAI 83 Response US EPR DC.pdf" provides technically correct and complete responses to 12 of the 17 questions.

Appended to this file are affected pages of the U.S. EPR Final Safety Analysis Report in redline-strikeout format which support the response to RAI 83 Questions 10.04.09-2, 10.04.09-3, 10.04.09-6, 10.04.09-7, 10.04.09-8, 10.04.09-11, 10.04.07-1, 10.04.07-3, 10.04.05-1, 10.04.02-1 and 10.04.01-1.

The following table indicates the respective pages in the response document, "RAI 83 Response US EPR DC.pdf," that contain AREVA NP's response to the subject questions.

Question #	Start Page	End Page
RAI 83 — 10.04.09-1	2	2
RAI 83 — 10.04.09-2	3	3
RAI 83 — 10.04.09-3	4	5
RAI 83 — 10.04.09-4	6	8
RAI 83 — 10.04.09-5	9	9
RAI 83 — 10.04.09-6	10	10
RAI 83 — 10.04.09-7	11	11
RAI 83 — 10.04.09-8	12	12
RAI 83 — 10.04.09-9	13	13
RAI 83 — 10.04.09-10	14	14
RAI 83 — 10.04.09-11	15	15
RAI 83 — 10.04.07-1	16	16
RAI 83 — 10.04.07-2	17	17
RAI 83 — 10.04.07-3	18	19
RAI 83 — 10.04.05-1	20	21
RAI 83 — 10.04.02-1	22	23
RAI 83 — 10.04.01-1	24	24

A complete answer is not provided for 5 of the 17 questions. The schedule for a technically correct and complete response to these questions is provided below.

Question #	Response Date
RAI 83 — 10.04.09-1	December 31, 2008
RAI 83 — 10.04.09-5	February 20, 2009
RAI 83 — 10.04.09-9	February 20, 2009
RAI 83 — 10.04.09-10	December 31, 2008
RAI 83 — 10.04.07-2	January 9, 2009

Sincerely,

(Russ Wells on behalf of)
Ronda Pederson
ronda.pederson@areva.com
Licensing Manager, U.S. EPR Design Certification
New Plants Deployment
AREVA NP, Inc.
An AREVA and Siemens company
3315 Old Forest Road
Lynchburg, VA 24506-0935
Phone: 434-832-3694
Cell: 434-841-8788

From: Getachew Tesfaye [mailto:Getachew.Tesfaye@nrc.gov]
Sent: Thursday, October 09, 2008 3:36 PM
To: ZZ-DL-A-USEPR-DL

Cc: Angelo Stubbs; Devender Reddy; John Segala; Peter Hearn; Joseph Colaccino; John Rycyna
Subject: U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 83(1230,1132,1233,1234,976), FSAR Ch 10

Attached please find the subject requests for additional information (RAI). A draft of the RAI was provided to you on September 16, 2008, and on October 7, 2008, 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: 96

Mail Envelope Properties (5CEC4184E98FFE49A383961FAD402D3193F7F2)

Subject: Response to U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 83, FSAR Ch 10, Supplement 2
Sent Date: 1/8/2009 6:04:28 PM
Received Date: 1/8/2009 6:04:32 PM
From: Pederson Ronda M (AREVA NP INC)

Created By: Ronda.Pederson@areva.com

Recipients:
"BENNETT Kathy A (OFR) (AREVA NP INC)" <Kathy.Bennett@areva.com>
Tracking Status: None
"DELANO Karen V (AREVA NP INC)" <Karen.Delano@areva.com>
Tracking Status: None
"VAN NOY Mark (EXT)" <Mark.Vannoy.ext@areva.com>
Tracking Status: None
"KOWALSKI David J (AREVA NP INC)" <David.Kowalski@areva.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Getachew Tesfaye" <Getachew.Tesfaye@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: AUSLYNCMX02.adom.ad.corp

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	6705	1/8/2009 6:04:32 PM
RAI 83 Supplement 2 Response US EPR DC.pdf	60695	

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

Response to

Request for Additional Information No. 83 Supplement 2, (1230,1132,1233,1234,976), Revision 0

10/9/2008

U. S. EPR Standard Design Certification
AREVA NP Inc.
Docket No. 52-020
SRP Section: 10.04.09 - Auxiliary Feedwater System (PWR)
SRP Section: 10.04.07 - Condensate and Feedwater System
SRP Section: 10.04.05 - Circulating Water System
SRP Section: 10.04.02 - Main Condenser Evacuation System
SRP Section: 10.04.01 - Main Condensers
Application Section: FSAR Ch. 10
SBPA Branch

Question 10.04.07-2:

SRP Section 14.3.2 Acceptance Criteria Number 6, for Seismic II/I specifies: For non-seismic Category I Structures, Systems, and Components (SSCs), the need for ITAAC to verify that their failure will not impair the ability of near-by safety-related SSCs to perform their safety-related functions should be assessed based on the specific design. If the design detail and as-built and as-procured information for many non-safety-related systems (e.g., field-run piping and balance-of-plant systems) is not provided by the applicant for design certification and the spatial relationship between such systems and seismic Category I SSCs cannot be established until after the as-built design information is available, the non-seismic to seismic (II/I) interaction cannot be evaluated until the plant has been constructed. Therefore, the staff requested that the applicant describe the process for completion of the design of the CFS to minimize II/I interactions, and to specify how they would provide a COL information item or an ITAAC to ensure that the CFS as built design satisfies SRP Section 14.3.2 acceptance criteria for Seismic II/I Interactions.

Response to Question 10.04.07-2:

The seismic design classification of the condensate and feedwater system (CFS) components is provided in U.S. EPR FSAR Tier 2, Table 3.2.2-1 and is consistent with the guidance provided in SRP 3.2.1 (see the response to RAI Batch 71, Question 03.02.01-5, for further details of the methodology for classifying SSCs). Designation of a particular non-safety-related component as Seismic Category II (as stated in RG 1.29, Regulatory Position C.2) is dependent on the potential failure modes and consequences of that component, the proximity of Seismic Category I/safety-related components, and the vulnerability of those components to the consequences of the failure mode of the particular non-safety-related component in question. Failure of the non-safety-related non-seismic portions of the CFS does not prevent or degrade the safety function of any safety-related Seismic Category I component of the CFS.

Non-seismic lines and associated equipment are routed, to the extent possible, outside of safety-related structures and areas to avoid potentially adverse interactions. In the event that this routing is not possible and non-seismic lines must be routed in safety-related areas, the non-seismic items are evaluated for seismic interactions (refer to U.S. EPR Tier 2, Section 3.7.3.8).

Since the seismic (II/I) interaction evaluation process is described in U.S. EPR FSAR Tier 2, Section 3.7.3.8, no COL information item or ITAAC is required.

FSAR Impact:

The U.S. EPR FSAR will not be changed as a result of this question.