

ArevaEPRDCPEm Resource

From: Getachew Tesfaye
Sent: Thursday, March 19, 2009 5:35 PM
To: 'usepr@areva.com'
Cc: Christopher VanWert; Shanlai Lu; Joseph Donoghue; Peter Hearn; Joseph Colaccino; ArevaEPRDCPEm Resource
Subject: U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 204 (2270), FSAR Ch. 9
Attachments: RAI_204_SRSB_2270.doc

Attached please find the subject requests for additional information (RAI). A draft of the RAI was provided to you on March 12, 2009, and on March 19, 2009, 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: 318

Mail Envelope Properties (C56E360E9D804F4B95BC673F886381E71D99A5C045)

Subject: U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 204 (2270), FSAR Ch. 9
Sent Date: 3/19/2009 5:35:22 PM
Received Date: 3/19/2009 5:35:23 PM
From: Getachew Tesfaye

Created By: Getachew.Tesfaye@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"Christopher VanWert" <Christopher.VanWert@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Shanlai Lu" <Shanlai.Lu@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Joseph Donoghue" <Joseph.Donoghue@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Peter Hearn" <Peter.Hearn@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Joseph Colaccino" <Joseph.Colaccino@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"ArevaEPRDCPEm Resource" <ArevaEPRDCPEm.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"usepr@areva.com" <usepr@areva.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	791	3/19/2009 5:35:23 PM
RAI_204_SRSB_2270.doc	29690	

Options

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

Request for Additional Information No. 204 (2270), Revision 0

3/19/2009

U. S. EPR Standard Design Certification

AREVA NP Inc.

Docket No. 52-020

SRP Section: 09.01.01 - Criticality Safety of Fresh and Spent Fuel Storage and Handling
Application Section: 9.1.1

QUESTIONS for Reactor System, Nuclear Performance and Code Review (SRSB)

09.01.01-19

In an email communication from Sandra Sloan (AREVA) to Joseph Colaccino (NRC), dated June 6, 2008, AREVA requested NRC to review HOLTEC topical report UN-TR-08-001(P), "Spent and New Fuel Storage Analysis for U.S.EPR", dated March 2008 under the U.S.EPR Design Certification review (Docket 52-020) in support of FSAR Section 9.1.1. This report had been initially submitted as a part of the Calvert Cliffs Unit 3 COL application (Docket 52-016) on March 14, 2008 by UniStar letter UN#08-005. As such, it is presented as a site-specific preliminary topical report and not as a generic design applicable to all US EPR sites. It was understood that AREVA's intention is to convert the topical report to a generic technical report in support of its EPR FSAR review. Accordingly, the NRC requests AREVA to submit the technical report that captures the following items:

- (a) The technical report should be generic to the EPR design and not site-specific
- (b) All analyses presented in the report must be final and reviewed by AREVA following appropriate QA procedures instead of preliminary as currently stated
- (c) Responses to RAIs previously submitted should be incorporated as necessary

In addition to revising the technical report, AREVA should similarly revise Section 9.1.1 of the EPR FSAR. In particular, this section should present high level discussion addressing how the AREVA spent fuel pool design satisfies each of the areas of review listed in SRP Section 9.1.1. The UN-TR-08-001 technical report should be referenced as the technical basis for the high level conclusions presented in the FSAR.

09.01.01-20

Provide a more detailed description of the validation of the codes used in this analysis (i.e. MCNP and CASMO). For example, Section 4.2 states that benchmark calculations were used to determine the bias and uncertainty for MCNP4a. As a minimum, a description of the benchmark cases and their relation to the EPR spent fuel pool analysis is necessary to ensure applicability.