

AP1000DCDFileNPEm Resource

From: Buckberg, Perry
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2010 12:21 PM
To: Loza, Paul G.
Cc: Brehm, Jason A.; Melton, Michael A; McKenna, Eileen
Subject: RE: OI-SRP 9.1.5-SBPB-01 Response of 11/11/09

Paul,

After some additional feedback from the staff, the following concern relates to this OI:

This is an additional concern regarding the 11/11/09 OI/RAI response that described the equipment hatch hoist as 'foot mounted on a platform supported by the containment structure.' There appears to be nothing in the DCD that would explain how the structural load on containment from the hoist was evaluated - though a seismic event could result in additional loading on the containment structure, based on the load being held in place. Westinghouse should describe the design load combinations and acceptance criteria for the containment structure when the hoist is holding the critical load. If an analysis exists, a revised OI response can reference the document thereby identifying it for an audit. Bottom line, some identification is needed to show where this concern is analyzed.

Thanks,

Perry Buckberg

Senior Project Manager
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of New Reactors
phone: (301)415-1383
fax: (301)415-5397
perry.buckberg@nrc.gov

From: Loza, Paul G. [mailto:lozapg@westinghouse.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 27, 2010 4:30 PM
To: Buckberg, Perry
Cc: Brehm, Jason A.; Melton, Michael A
Subject: RE: OI-SRP 9.1.5-SBPB-01 Response of 11/11/09

Hi Perry,

I asked our engineers to respond to the two questions in the second paragraph. I'll consolidate the response here.

For the [previously non-single failure proof] hatch hoists, the (upper) equipment hatch hoist has been single failure proof for a long time. The (lower) maintenance hatch hoist was made single failure proof by an Approved Design Change Proposal (DCP 256 (APP-GW-GEE-256), 6/27/08). The DCD (Rev 17) states that the equipment hatch hoist and maintenance hatch hoist are single failure proof (DCD R17, pg. 2.3.5-1) and that the safety function is to "Avoid uncontrolled lowering of heavy load." (DCD R17, pg. 2.3.5-2).

With regards to the cask handling crane, we think you actually mean the polar crane (DCD Table 9.1-5 indicates that the cask handling crane is in the auxiliary building). The polar crane seismic evaluation and stresses associated with the containment vessel have been analyzed and are in the process of being signed off and archived in EDMS. These can be provided for audit as needed.

The seismic analyses for the equipment hatch hoist and maintenance hatch hoist will be finalized after their detailed designs are complete. These can also be provided for audit.

Thanks,

Paul Loza

From: Buckberg, Perry [mailto:Perry.Buckberg@nrc.gov]

Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2010 7:43 AM

To: Loza, Paul G.

Cc: Melton, Michael A; Sisk, Robert B.; McKenna, Eileen

Subject: OI-SRP 9.1.5-SBPB-01 Response of 11/11/09

Paul,

This is a re-send.....

The Westinghouse response to OI-SRP 9.1.5-SBPB-01 regarding the use of NOG-1 and NUREG-0554 for hatch hoists, and the additional elaboration of code applicability, seems technically acceptable.

Please reply and indicate where, or how, in the DCD the structural load on containment from the hatch hoist and from the cask handling crane was evaluated. For the previously non-single failure proof hatch hoist, for instance, there is no assurance that the evaluation considered the lifted load in conjunction with the seismic accelerations because they were not required to hold a load during and following a seismic event.

Thanks,

Perry Buckberg

Senior Project Manager

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Office of New Reactors

phone: (301)415-1383

fax: (301)415-5397

perry.buckberg@nrc.gov

Hearing Identifier: AP1000_DCD_Review
Email Number: 332

Mail Envelope Properties (Perry.Buckberg@nrc.gov20100218122100)

Subject: RE: OI-SRP 9.1.5-SBPB-01 Response of 11/11/09
Sent Date: 2/18/2010 12:21:21 PM
Received Date: 2/18/2010 12:21:00 PM
From: Buckberg, Perry

Created By: Perry.Buckberg@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"Brehm, Jason A." <brehmja@westinghouse.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Melton, Michael A" <melto1ma@westinghouse.com>
Tracking Status: None
"McKenna, Eileen" <Eileen.McKenna@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Loza, Paul G." <lozapg@westinghouse.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office:

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3737	2/18/2010 12:21:00 PM

Options

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