

GE Hitachi Nuclear Energy

Richard E. Kingston Vice President, ESBWR Licensing

P.O. Box 780 3901 Castle Hayne Road, M/C A-65 Wilmington, NC 28402 USA

T 910.819.6192 F 910.362.6192 rick.kingston@ge.com

MFN 10-076 Docket No. 52-010

March 10, 2010

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Document Control Desk Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

Subject: **Transmittal of ESBWR DCD Tier 2 Chapter 6 Markups Related to Engineered Safety Features**

The purpose of this letter is to submit ESBWR DCD, Tier 2 Chapter 6 markups that are being incorporated into Revision 7. The changes reflected by the markups that are boxed or within clouds are corrections identified by GEH that have not otherwise been transmitted to the NRC. Where LTR references are updated, the DCD has been reviewed against the LTR changes and no further changes to the DCD are necessary. The markup pages and a list of changes to Chapter 6 are contained in Enclosure 1. The change list identifies the letter that transmitted each identified change to the NRC.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me.

Sincerely,

myada FOR

Richard E. Kingston Vice President, ESBWR Licensing

MFN 10-076 Page 2 of 2

Enclosure:

- 1. MFN 10-076 Transmittal of ESBWR DCD Tier 2 Chapter 6 Markups Related to Engineered Safety Features – Markups and Change List
- cc: AE Cubbage USNRC (with enclosures) JG Head GEH/Wilmington (with enclosures)
DH Hinds GEH/Wilmington (with enclosures) DH Hinds GEH/Wilmington (with enclosures)
SC Moen GEH/Wilmington (with enclosures) GEH/Wilmington (with enclosures) eDRFSection 0000-0114-7299

Enclosure 1

MFN 10-076

Transmittal of ESBWR DCD Tier 2 Chapter 6 Markups

Related to Engineered Safety Features

Markups and Change List

A loss of all power generation buses is not the limiting assumption and the effects of continued feedwater injection is more limiting, as it can potentially add water to the wetwell and compress the wetwell air space. The ESBWR design incorporates features that mitigate this challenge by isolating reactor inventory sources outside of containment and provides a method of GDCS initiation based on LOCA condition detection. These features ensure that containment remains within design pressure for the entire 72-hour event duration. These features also ensure acceptable performance for the full spectrum of LOCA events within containment, with or without the assumption of loss of external injection capability. Additionally, although power generation buses are considered available to add feedwater or High Pressure Control Rod Drive (HP CRD) injection, no credit is given for heat removal systems powered by these buses. Table 6.2-7h shows the sequence of events for the Main Steam Line Break with failure of one SRV and with offsite power available. Figures 6.2-14^{j1} through 6.2-14m3 show the pressure, temperature, DW and GDCS airspace pressure responses and PCCS heat removal for this analysis. The noncondensable mass and the void fraction in the DW and GDCS are presented in Figures 6.2- 14n1 through 6.2-14o3. The detailed discussion on the chronology of progression is given in Appendix 6E.5. The cases analyzed without offsite power and water addition assume higher initial pressure, and result in higher pressure as shown in Table 6.2-5. The highest value of Maximum DW Pressure in Table 6.2-5 is the calculated peak containment internal pressure for the design basis loss of coolant accident.

6.2.1.1.3.5.1 Post-LOCA Containment Cooling and Recovery Analysis

For post-LOCA containment cooling and recovery, the Main Steam Line Break scenarios selected are one SRV failure and one DPV failurewith failure of one DPV is selected. The analysis with PARs and 4 of the 6 PCCS vent fans uses the failure with one SRV and the analysis with RWCU/SDC in suppression pool cooling mode followed by shutdown cooling mode uses the failure with one DPV. The analysis results are not sensitive to the event selection (failure of one DPV versus one SRV) due to the fact that these two cases are nearly the same in transient responses up to 72 hours and the containment pressure and temperature are rapidly reduced upon the activation of the nonsafety-related Structure, System, or Components (SSC).

After the first 72 hours of the accident, the following nonsafety-related SSCs are utilized to keep the reactor at safe stable shutdown conditions, to rapidly reduce containment pressure and temperature to a level where there is acceptable margin, and then to maintain these conditions indefinitely:

- (1) SSCs to refill the IC/PCCS pools;
- (2) PCCS Vent Fans;
- (3) Passive Autocatalytic Recombiner System (PARS); and
- (4) Power supplies to the PCCS Vent Fans and the IC/PCCS pool refill pumps.

Once a state of safe, stable reactor shutdown is reached, containment pressure and temperature are maintained with sufficient margin to containment design limits for a long period of time. Figure 6.2-14e1 through Figure 6.2-14e10a show key parameters for the long term pressure reduction and maintenance phase. PARS function at 72 hrs and 4 of 6 PCCS vent fans are credited in the calculation. A containment system performance acceptance criteria ("Analytical

6.2.6.5 (Deleted)

6.2.7 Fracture Prevention of Containment Pressure Boundary

The reactor containment system includes the functional capability of enclosing the reactor system and of providing a final barrier against the release of radioactive fission products attendant postulated accidents.

Fracture prevention of the containment pressure boundary is assured. The ESBWR meets the relevant requirements of the following regulations:

- General Design Criterion 1 (as it relates to the quality standards for design and fabrication) - See Subsection 3.1.1.1.
- General Design Criterion 16 (as it relates to the prevention of the release of radioactivity to the environment) - See Subsection 3.1.2.7.
- General Design Criterion 51 (as it relates to the reactor containment pressure boundary design) - See Subsection 3.1.5.2.

To meet the requirements of GDC 1, 16 and 51, the ferritic containment pressure boundary materials meet the fracture toughness criteria for ASME Section III Class 2 components. These criteria provide for a uniform review, consistent with the safety function of the containment pressure boundary within the context of RG 1.26, which assigns correspondence of Group B Quality Standards to ASME Code Section III Class 2.

6.2.8 COL Information

6.2-1-H (Deleted)

6.2.9 References

- 6.2-1 GE Nuclear Energy, "TRACG Application for ESBWR," NEDC-33083P-A, Class III, (Proprietary), March 2005, and NEDO-33083-A, Class I (Non-proprietary), October 2005.
- 6.2-2 Galletly, G.D., "A Simple Design Equation for Preventing Buckling in Fabricated Torispherical Shells under Internal Pressure," ASME Journal of Pressure Vessel Technology, Vol.108, November 1986.
- 6.2-3 GE letter from David H. Hinds to U.S. Regulatory Commission, TRACG LOCA SER Confirmatory Items (TAC # MC 8168), Enclosure 2, Reactor Pressure Vessel (RPV) Level Response for the Long Term PCCS Period, Phenomena Identification and Ranking Table, and Major Design Changes from Pre-Application Review Design to DCD Design, MFN 05-105, October 6, 2005.
- 6.2-4 GE letter from David H. Hinds to U.S. Regulatory Commission, Revised Response GE Response to Results of NRC Acceptance Review for ESBWR Design Certification Application – Item 2, MFN 06-094, March 28, 2006.
- 6.2-5 Moody, F.J., "Maximum Flow Rate of a Single Component, Two-Phase Mixture," Journal of Heat Transfer, Trans. ASME, Series C, Vol. 87, P 134, February 1965.
- 6.2-6 (Deleted)
- 6.2-7 GE Hitachi Nuclear Energy, "ESBWR Feedwater Temperature Operating Domain Transient and Accident Analysis," NEDO-33338, Revision 1, Class I (Non-proprietary), May 2009.
- 6.2-8 Moody, F.J. "Maximum Discharge Rate of Liquid-Vapor Mixtures from Vessels," General Electric Company, Report No. NEDO-21052-A, May 1979.
- 6.2-9 GE Hitachi Nuclear Energy, "ESBWR Scaling Report," NEDC-33082P, Revision 2, Class III (Proprietary), April 2008; NEDO-33082, Revision 2, Class I (Non-proprietary), April 2008.
- 6.2-10 TRACG Qualification for Simplified Boiling Water Reactor (SBWR), NEDC-32725P, Rev. 1, Vol. 1 and 2, August 2002.
- 6.2-11 GE Hitachi Nuclear Energy "ESBWR Safety Analysis Additional Information," NEDE-33440P, Revision 1, Class III (Proprietary), June 2009; NEDO-33440, Revision 1, Class I (Non-proprietary), June 2009.
- 6.2-12 Idel'chik, I.E., Barouch, A. "Handbook of hydraulic resistance: coefficients of local resistance and of friction," National Technical Information Service, 1960.
- 6.2-13 SMSAB-02-04, "CONTAIN Code Qualification Report/User Guide for Auditing Subcompartment Analysis Calculations," Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, September 2002 (ADAMS Accession Number ML023220288).

Table 6.2-49

1. The inlet losses for the PCCS are described in Table 6.2-8, Item 4. The outlet losses shall not exceed a k/A² value of 1500 m⁻⁴ (174,000 ft⁻⁴).

2. The range of fluid densities associated with values in the Table is 1.81 kg/m³ to 3.81 kg/m³

ESBWR Design Control Document/Tier 2

ESBWR Design Control Document/Tier 2

Figure 6.2-7. TRACG Nodalization of the ESBWR Containment

- The failure rates of the individual components in the system; and
- The schedule of periodic tests (simultaneous versus uniformly staggered versus randomly staggered).

All ECCS safety-related valves are tested during plant initial power ascension per RG 1.68, Appendix A, except that the mechanical components of the ECCS squib type valves are fully tested by the manufacturer prior to delivery to the site.

All SRVs, which include those used for ADS, and DPVs are bench tested to establish lift settings in compliance with ASME Code Section XI.

Testing of the initiating instrumentation and controls portion of the ECCS is discussed in Subsection 7.3.1. The emergency power system, which supplies electrical power to the ECCS is tested as described in Subsection 8.3.1. The frequency of testing is specified in the Technical Specifications. Components inside the DW can be visually inspected only during periods of access to the DW.

6.3.5 Instrumentation Requirements

Design details including redundancy and logic of the ECCS instrumentation are discussed in Subsection 7.3.1.

All instrumentation required for automatic and manual initiation of the GDCS and ADS is discussed in Subsection 7.3.1, and is designed to meet the requirements of IEEE- $\frac{279603}{271}$ and || other applicable regulatory requirements. The GDCS and ADS can be manually initiated from the control room.

The ECCS initiating signals are shown in Table 6.3-1.

6.3.6 COL Information

6.3-1-H ECCS Testing Requirements (Deleted)

6.3-2-H Limiting Break Results (Deleted)

6.3.7 References

- 6.3-1 (Deleted)
- 6.3-2 GE Nuclear Energy, "TRACG Application for ESBWR," NEDC-33083P-A, Class III (Proprietary), March 2005 and NEDO-33083-A, Class I (Non-proprietary), October 2005.
- 6.3-3 GE Hitachi Nuclear Energy, "ESBWR Feedwater Temperature Operating Domain Transient and Accident Analysis," NEDO-33338, Revision 1, Class I (Non-proprietayr), May 2009.
- 6.3-4 GE Hitachi Nuclear Energy, "ESBWR Scaling Report," NEDC-33082P, Revision 2, Class III (Proprietary), April 2008; NEDO-33082, Revision 2, Class I (Non-proprietary), April 2008.

DW, and eventually to the WW. The current TRACG nodalization of the ESBWR Containment includes these changes as seen in Figure 6.2-7. These changes result in a MSLB DW pressure increase of about 1% when compared to a single pipe and a pressure margin reduction from 19% to about 14% for the FWLB.

The difference in the effect on DW pressure between these two events is attributed to their corresponding scenarios. During the initial part of the FWLB, the lower DW accumulates more water, displacing the noncondensable gases and forcing them to migrate faster to the WW area than during the MSLB; as seen in Figure 6.2-13d4 and Figure 6.2-14d4. During this period some amount of noncondensable gases migrate and hide in the GDCS drained volume by a greater amount and at a faster rate than during the MSLB, due to earlier and greater inventory drainage from the GDCS pool to the RPV. At the same time this hideout is minimized by the carry over of noncondensable gases to the WW, thereby increasing the containment pressure, as seen in Figure 6.2-13d5, Figure 6.2-14d5, Table 6.2-7e and Table 6.2-7d.

These two main scenarios contribute to their different noncondensable gases migration pattern, such that the difference in noncondensable gases migration patterns is attributed mainly to different system event responses and not to nodalization changes.

Even though these two scenarios have a different noncondensable gas migration, the two-pipe nodalization stated above and the assumption that all DW noncondensable gases migrate to the WW airspace at 72 hours adds sufficient conservatism to their DW pressure. The addition of two pipes promotes migration of noncondensable gases from the DW to the WW resulting in a conservatively high DW pressure increase. Furthermore this migration enhancement is maximized when all the containment noncondensable gases, including those added to the containment from pneumatic supplies are assumed to relocate to the WW, see Appendix 6E.2.

Table 6B-2 provides a summary of differences from the ESBWR description given in Reference 6B.1-2 and the ESBWR design in the DCD.

6B.1 References

- 6B.1-1 GE Nuclear Energy, "TRACG Application for ESBWR," NEDC-33083P-A, Class III, (Proprietary), March 2005, and NEDO-33083-A, Class I (Non-proprietary), October 2005.
- 6B.1-2 GE Nuclear Energy, "TRACG Model Description," NEDE-32176P, Revision 4, Class III, (Proprietary), April 2006January 2008; NEDO-32176, Revision 4, Class (Non-proprietary), January 2008.

6G.3 References

- 6G-1 MFN 05-105, "TRACG LOCA SER confirmatory Items (TAC#MC8168)," October 6, 2005.
- 6G-2 NEDC-33079P, Rev. 1, "ESBWR Test and Analysis Program Description," March 2005; NEDO-333079, Revision 1, Class I (Non-proprietary), November 2005.

ESBWR DCD Tier 2 Chapter 6

ESBWR DCD Tier 2 Chapter 6

E8BWR DCD Tier 2 Chapter 6

ESBWR DCD Tier 2 Chapter 6

