

## ArevaEPRDCPEm Resource

---

**From:** Tesfaye, Getachew  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 06, 2009 1:54 PM  
**To:** 'usepr@areva.com'  
**Cc:** Phan, Hanh; Clark, Theresa; Fuller, Edward; Mrowca, Lynn; Chowdhury, Prosanta; Colaccino, Joseph; ArevaEPRDCPEm Resource  
**Subject:** Draft - U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 269 (3448), FSAR Ch. 19  
**Attachments:** Draft RAI\_269\_SPLA\_3448.doc

Attached please find draft RAI No. 269 regarding your application for standard design certification of the U.S. EPR. If you have any question or need clarifications regarding this RAI, please let me know as soon as possible, I will have our technical Staff available to discuss them with you.

Please also review the RAI to ensure that we have not inadvertently included proprietary information. If there are any proprietary information, please let me know within the next ten days. If I do not hear from you within the next ten days, I will assume there are none and will make the draft RAI publicly available.

Thanks,  
Getachew Tesfaye  
Sr. Project Manager  
NRO/DNRL/NARP  
(301) 415-336

**Hearing Identifier:** AREVA\_EPR\_DC\_RAIs  
**Email Number:** 719

**Mail Envelope Properties** (C56E360E9D804F4B95BC673F886381E71FBDD56770)

**Subject:** Draft - U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 269 (3448), FSAR Ch. 19  
**Sent Date:** 8/6/2009 1:53:49 PM  
**Received Date:** 8/6/2009 1:53:50 PM  
**From:** Tesfaye, Getachew

**Created By:** Getachew.Tesfaye@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**

"Phan, Hanh" <Hanh.Phan@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Clark, Theresa" <Theresa.Clark@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Fuller, Edward" <Edward.Fuller@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Mrowca, Lynn" <Lynn.Mrowca@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Chowdhury, Prosanta" <Prosanta.Chowdhury@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Colaccino, Joseph" <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

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	721	8/6/2009 1:53:50 PM
Draft RAI_269_SPLA_3448.doc		28154

**Options**

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

Draft

Request for Additional Information No. 269 (3448), Revision 0

8/6/2009

U. S. EPR Standard Design Certification

AREVA NP Inc.

Docket No. 52-020

SRP Section: 19 - Probabilistic Risk Assessment and Severe Accident Evaluation

Application Section: 19

QUESTIONS for PRA Licensing, Operations Support and Maintenance Branch 1 (AP1000/EPR Projects) (SPLA)

19-327

(Follow-up to Question 19-302) As indicated in the response to Question 19-302, the estimated CCDP for the RCP fire scenario of "Pump Oil Fire with a Catastrophic Failure of Lube Oil Collection System (major spill)" is  $1.1E-6$ . This value seems to be low compared to the calculated CCDP of  $8.7E-5$  given an electric motor fire within the containment as described in the responses to Questions 19.01-29 and 19-223. In addition, the response specifies the use of 0.1 and 0.01 for minor leak and major oil spill likelihoods, respectively. In the response to Question 19-302, these likelihoods were characterized as being conservative. However, Section E.3 of NUREG/CR-6850 assigns a severity factor of 0.02 to a scenario consisting of 98% or more of the amount of oil spilled and ignited and a severity factor of 0.98 to a scenario consisting of 10% of the amount of oil spilled and ignited.

Please further describe in detail the three RCP fire scenarios mentioned in the response to Question 19-302 and justify why an RCP fire with a major spill would have a lower CCDP compared to an electric motor fire CCDP.