ArevaEPRDCPEm Resource

From: DUNCAN Leslie E (AREVA NP INC) [Leslie.Duncan@areva.com]
Sent: Monday, January 18, 2010 4:21 PM
To: Tesfaye, Getachew
Cc: BENNETT Kathy A (OFR) (AREVA NP INC); DELANO Karen V (AREVA NP INC)
Subject: Response to U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 338, FSARCh. 3
Attachments: RAI 338 Response US EPR DC.pdf

Getachew,

Attached please find AREVA NP Inc.'s response to the subject request for additional information (RAI). The attached file, "RAI 338 Response US EPR DC.pdf," provides a schedule since a technically correct and complete response to the 1 question is not provided.

The following table indicates the respective pages in the response document, "RAI 338 Response US EPR DC.pdf," that contain AREVA NP's responses to the subject question.

Question #	Start Page	End Page
RAI 338 — 03.06.03-27	2	2

A complete answer is not provided for the 1 question. The schedule for a technically correct and complete response to this question is provided below.

Question #	Response Date
RAI 338 — 03.06.03-27	March 5, 2010

Sincerely,

Les Duncan
Licensing Engineer
AREVA NP Inc.
An AREVA and Siemens Company
Tel: (434) 832-2849
Leslie.Duncan@areva.com

From: Tesfaye, Getachew [mailto:Getachew.Tesfaye@nrc.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, December 15, 2009 1:46 PM
To: ZZ-DL-A-USEPR-DL
Cc: Reichelt, Eric; Terao, David; Patel, Jay; Miernicki, Michael; Colaccino, Joseph; ArevaEPRDCPEm Resource
Subject: U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 338 (4077), FSARCh. 3

Attached please find the subject requests for additional information (RAI). A draft of the RAI was provided to you on December 6, 2009, and on December 15, 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 with the exception of typographical error correction in Draft RAI Question 03.08.04-8 identified by AREVA. The schedule we have established for review of your application assumes technically correct and complete responses within 30 days of receipt of RAIs, excluding the time period of **December 25, 2009 thru January 3, 2010, to account for the holiday season** as discussed with AREVA NP. For any RAIs that cannot be answered **within 40 days**, it is expected that a date for receipt of this information will be provided to the staff within the 40-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: 1093

Mail Envelope Properties (F322AA625A7A7443A9C390B0567503A1017FA5BE)

Subject: Response to U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 338, FSARCh. 3
Sent Date: 1/18/2010 4:21:07 PM
Received Date: 1/18/2010 4:21:10 PM
From: DUNCAN Leslie E (AREVA NP INC)

Created By: Leslie.Duncan@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
"Tesfaye, Getachew" <Getachew.Tesfaye@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: AUSLYNCMX01.adom.ad.corp

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	2342	1/18/2010 4:21:10 PM
RAI 338 Response US EPR DC.pdf	58400	

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

Response to

Request for Additional Information No. 338 (4077), Revision 1

12/15/2009

U. S. EPR Standard Design Certification
AREVA NP Inc.
Docket No. 52-020
SRP Section: 03.06.03 - Leak-Before-Break Evaluation Procedures
Application Section: 03.06.03

QUESTIONS for Component Integrity, Performance, and Testing Branch 1
(AP1000/EPR Projects) (CIB1)

Question 03.06.03-27:

Follow-up Question to RAI No. 265, Question 03-06-03-24

In response to RAI question 03.06.03-24, AREVA stated that the safety factor of 1.7 for dynamic loads to be applied for leak-before-break (LBB) of the main steam line will be revised to 2.0 due to a decrease in seismic loads based on the application of more accurate, but still conservative, methods of modal combinations as described in RG 1.92 Revision 2. Please provide an explanation as to how using RG 1.92 Revision 2, it was able to achieve the LBB dynamic safety factor of 2.0 for its main steam piping. Specifically, discuss which modal combination method was used previously and which modal combination was used that resulted in lower seismic loads. Also, provide a comparison of the seismic loads for both of these methods.

Response to Question 03.06.03-27:

A response to this question will be provided by March 5, 2010.