### ArevaEPRDCPEm Resource

From:	BRYAN Martin (EXTERNAL AREVA) [Martin.Bryan.ext@areva.com]
Sent:	Monday, August 23, 2010 4:56 PM
То:	Tesfaye, Getachew
Cc:	DELANO Karen (AREVA); ROMINE Judy (AREVA); BENNETT Kathy (AREVA); CORNELL
	Veronica (EXTERNAL AREVA)
Subject:	Response to U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 320, FSAR Ch 3,
	Supplement 2, Part 2 of 2
Attachments:	RAI 320 Supplement 2 Response US EPR DC (Part 2 of 2) - INTERIM.pdf

### Getachew,

Attached is part 2 of 2 for RAI 320 Supplement 2, which contains the remainder of the FSAR markups for responses to questions 3.7.2-63 and 3.7.3-37.

### Sincerely,

Martin (Marty) C. Bryan U.S. EPR Design Certification Licensing Manager AREVA NP Inc. Tel: (434) 832-3016 702 561-3528 cell Martin.Bryan.ext@areva.com

From: BRYAN Martin (External RS/NB)
Sent: Monday, August 23, 2010 4:36 PM
To: 'Tesfaye, Getachew'
Cc: DELANO Karen (RS/NB); ROMINE Judy (RS/NB); BENNETT Kathy (RS/NB); CORNELL Veronica (External RS/NB)
Subject: Response to U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 320, FSAR Ch 3, Supplement 2, Part 1 of 2

Getachew,

AREVA NP Inc. (AREVA NP) provided a schedule for a technically correct and complete response to RAI 320 on November 24, 2009. AREVA NP submitted Supplement 1 on June 21, 2010, to provide a revised schedule for responding to RAI 320.

The attached file, "RAI 320 Supplement 2 US EPR DC (Part 1 of 2) – INTERIM.pdf" and the file "RAI 320 Supplement 2 US EPR DC (Part 2 of 2) – INTERIM.pdf" in subsequent email, provide technically correct and complete INTERIM responses to Question 03.07.02-63 and Question 03.07.03-37, as committed.

The following table indicates the respective pages in the response document, "RAI 320 Supplement 2 US EPR DC (Part 1 of 2) – INTERIM.pdf," that contains AREVA NP's INTERIM response to Question 03.07.02-63 and Question 03.07.03-37.

Question #	Start Page	End Page
RAI 320 — 03.07.02-63	2	3
RAI 320 — 03.07.03-37	4	4

The schedule for technically correct and complete FINAL responses is unchanged and provided below:

Question #	Interim Response Date	Final Response Date
RAI 320 — 03.07.02-63	August 23, 2010 (Actual)	January 13, 2011
RAI 320 — 03.07.03-37	August 23, 2010 (Actual)	January 13, 2011

Sincerely,

Martin (Marty) C. Bryan U.S. EPR Design Certification Licensing Manager AREVA NP Inc. Tel: (434) 832-3016 702 561-3528 cell Martin.Bryan.ext@areva.com

From: BRYAN Martin (EXT)
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2010 7:09 PM
To: 'Tesfaye, Getachew'
Cc: DELANO Karen V (AREVA NP INC); ROMINE Judy (AREVA NP INC); BENNETT Kathy A (OFR) (AREVA NP INC); VAN NOY Mark (EXT); CORNELL Veronica (EXT)
Subject: Response to U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 320, FSAR Ch 3, Supplement 1

Getachew,

AREVA NP Inc. (AREVA NP) provided a schedule for a technically correct and complete response to RAI No. 320 on November 24, 2009.

Based upon the civil/structural re-planning activities and revised RAI response schedule presented to the NRC during the June 9, 2010, Public Meeting, the schedule for Questions 03.07.02-63 and 03.07.03-37 has been changed.

Prior to submittal of the final RAI response, AREVA NP will provide an interim RAI response that includes:

- (1) a description of the technical work (e.g., methodology)
- (2) U.S. EPR FSAR revised pages, as applicable

The revised schedule for an interim response and the technically correct and complete response to these questions is provided below.

Question #	Interim Response Date	Final Response Date
RAI 320 — 03.07.02-63	August 23, 2010	January 13, 2011
RAI 320 — 03.07.03-37	August 23, 2010	January 13, 2011

Sincerely,

Martin (Marty) C. Bryan U.S. EPR Design Certification Licensing Manager AREVA NP Inc. Tel: (434) 832-3016 702 561-3528 cell Martin.Bryan.ext@areva.com From: WELLS Russell D (AREVA NP INC)
Sent: Monday, November 30, 2009 10:15 AM
To: 'Getachew Tesfaye'; 'Michael Miernicki'
Cc: Pederson Ronda M (AREVA NP INC); BENNETT Kathy A (OFR) (AREVA NP INC); DELANO Karen V (AREVA NP INC)
Subject: Response to U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 320, FSAR Ch 3

### Getachew,

Attached please find AREVA NP Inc.'s response to the subject request for additional information (RAI). The attached file, "RAI 320 Response US EPR DC.PDF" provides a schedule for a technically correct and complete response to the 2 questions.

The following table indicates the respective pages in the response document, "RAI 320 Response US EPR DC.PDF," that contain AREVA NP's response to the subject questions.

Question #	Start Page	End Page
RAI 320 — 03.07.02-63	2	2
RAI 320 — 03.07.03-37	3	3

A complete answer is not provided for 2 of the 2 questions. The schedule for a technically correct and complete response to these questions is provided below.

Question #	Response Date
RAI 320 — 03.07.02-63	June 21, 2010
RAI 320 — 03.07.03-37	June 21, 2010

Sincerely,

## (Russ Wells on behalf of) *Ronda Pederson*

ronda.pederson@areva.com

Licensing Manager, U.S. EPR Design Certification New Plants Deployment **AREVA NP, Inc.** An AREVA and Siemens company 3315 Old Forest Road Lynchburg, VA 24506-0935 Phone: 434-832-3694 Cell: 434-841-8788

From: Tesfaye, Getachew [mailto:Getachew.Tesfaye@nrc.gov]
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2009 2:10 PM
To: ZZ-DL-A-USEPR-DL
Cc: Chakravorty, Manas; Hawkins, Kimberly; Miernicki, Michael; Patel, Jay; Colaccino, Joseph; ArevaEPRDCPEm Resource
Subject: U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 320 (3881, 3880),FSAR Ch. 3

Attached please find the subject requests for additional information (RAI). A draft of the RAI was provided to you on October 22, 2009, and on October 30, 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\_RAIsEmail Number:1880

Mail Envelope Properties (BC417D9255991046A37DD56CF597DB71074C901D)

Subject:Response toU.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 320, FSAR Ch3, Supplement 2, Part 2 of 2Sent Date:8/23/2010 4:56:00 PMReceived Date:8/23/2010 4:58:02 PMFrom:BRYAN Martin (EXTERNAL AREVA)

Created By: Martin.Bryan.ext@areva.com

**Recipients:** 

"DELANO Karen (AREVA)" <Karen.Delano@areva.com> Tracking Status: None "ROMINE Judy (AREVA)" <Judy.Romine@areva.com> Tracking Status: None "BENNETT Kathy (AREVA)" <Kathy.Bennett@areva.com> Tracking Status: None "CORNELL Veronica (EXTERNAL AREVA)" <Veronica.Cornell.ext@areva.com> Tracking Status: None "Tesfaye, Getachew" <Getachew.Tesfaye@nrc.gov> Tracking Status: None

Post Office:

AUSLYNCMX02.adom.ad.corp

 Files
 Size
 Date & Time

 MESSAGE
 6460
 8/23/2010 4:58:02 PM

 RAI 320 Supplement 2 Response US EPR DC (Part 2 of 2) - INTERIM.pdf
 5863552

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

RAI 320, Question 03.07.02-63

# EPR

### **U.S. EPR FINAL SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT**





RAI 320, Question 03.07.02-63

### **U.S. EPR FINAL SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT**





# RAI 320, Question 03.07.02-63

### **U.S. EPR FINAL SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT**
































































































































































# **EPR**











RAI 320, Question 03.07.02-63



EPR






































































































































































































































Tier 2












Figure 3.7.2-113 Dynamic 3D Finite Element Model of Nuclear Island, Isometric View

Figure 3.7.2-114 Dynamic 3D Finite Element Model of Nuclear Island, Elevation View

Figure 3.7.2-115 Dynamic 3D Finite Element Model of Fuel Building (FB) TO BE PROVIDED

### Figure 3.7.2-116 Dynamic 3D Finite Element Model of Safeguard Building 1 (SB1)

Figure 3.7.2-117 Dynamic 3D Finite Element Model of Safeguard Building 2/3 (SB2/3)

Figure 3.7.2-118 Dynamic 3D Finite Element Model of Safeguard Building 4 (SB4)

Figure 3.7.2-119 Dynamic 3D Finite Element Model of Reactor Containment Building (RCB)

Figure 3.7.2-120 Dynamic 3D Finite Element Model of Reactor Building Internal Structures (RBIS)

Figure 3.7.2-121 SSI Analysis Model - Excavated Soil Solid Elements, Nuclear Island Foundation

Figure 3.7.2-122 SSI Analysis Model – Nuclear Island Beam Elements TO BE PROVIDED Figure 3.7.2-123 SSI Analysis Model – Nuclear Island Shell Elements TO BE PROVIDED

#### Figure 3.7.2-124 SSI Analysis Model - Adjacent Structures Foundation Rigid Beam Elements

Figure 3.7.2-125 SSI Analysis Model – Near-Field Springs for Displacement Tracking

Figure 3.7.2-126 SSI Analysis Model – Nuclear Auxiliary Building Foundation Rigid Beams

#### Figure 3.7.2-127 SSI Analysis Model – Nuclear Auxiliary Building Side Wall Rigid Beams

Figure 3.7.2-128 SSI Analysis Model – Nuclear Auxiliary Building Stick Model

Figure 3.7.2-129 SSI Analysis Model – Nuclear Auxiliary Building Foundation Excavated Soil

Figure 3.7.2-130 Nuclear Island and Nuclear Auxiliary Building Interface Nodes

Figure 3.7.2-131 Foundation and Embedment Layout of Adjacent Structures Relative to Nuclear Island

Figure 3.7.2-132 Nuclear Island Foundation Layout showing Basemat, Sidewalls and Shear Key

Figure 3.7.2-133 Near Field Soil Nodes

Figure 3.7.2-134 Fire Protection Building Foundation and Surface Nodes for Tracking Response Attenuations

Figure 3.7.2-135 Isometric View of GTSTRUDL FEM for Emergency Power Generating Building (HF Motion)

Figure 3.7.2-136 Isometric View of GTSTRUDL FEM for Essential Service Water Building (HF Motion)

Figure 3.7.2-137 Location of Response Output Nodes - Location of Response Output Nodes, NI Common Basemat

Figure 3.7.2-138 Location of Response Output Nodes - Location of Response Output Nodes, Reactor Building Internal Structure -Elev. +16 ft, 10-3/4 in (+5.15m)

Figure 3.7.2-139 Location of Response Output Nodes - Location of Response Output Nodes, Reactor Building Internal Structure -Elev. +63 ft, 11-3/4 in (+19.50m)

Figure 3.7.2-140 Location of Response Output Nodes, Safeguard Building 1 - Elev. +26 ft, 3 in (+8.10m)

Figure 3.7.2-141 Location of Response Output Nodes, Safeguard Building 1 - Elev. +68 ft, 10-3/4 in (+21.00m)

Figure 3.7.2-142 Location of Response Output Nodes, Safeguard Building 2&3 - Elev. +26 ft, 7 in (+8.10m)

Figure 3.7.2-143 Location of Response Output Nodes, Safeguard Building 2&3 - Elev. +50 ft, 6-1/4 in (+15.40m)

Figure 3.7.2-144 Location of Response Output Nodes, Safeguard Building 4 - Elev. +68 ft, 10-3/4 in (+21.00m)

Figure 3.7.2-145 Location of Response Output Nodes, Containment Building - Elev. +123 ft, 4-1/4 in (+37.60m)

Figure 3.7.2-146 Location of Response Output Nodes, Containment Building - Elev. +190 ft, 3-1/2 in (+58.00m)

Figure 3.7.2-147 Location of Response Output Nodes, Fuel Building at Elev. +12 ft, 1-2/3 in (3.7 m)



Where:

 $S_d$  = maximum displacement at each support.

RAI 320, Question 03.07.03-37

 $S_a$  = spectral acceleration in "g's" at the ZPA cutoff frequency.

in Sections 3.2.2, 3.2.3, and 3.2.4.

 $\omega$  = fundamental frequency of the building (rad/sec).

The support displacements are imposed on the subsystems in the most unfavorable combination. The responses due to support displacements are combined with inertial responses as described in Sections 3.7.3.9.1 or 3.7.3.9.2.

met as described in Topical Report ANP-10264

#### 3.7.3.9.1 Uniform Support Motion Method

Distribution subsystems supported at multiple elevations within one or more buildings may be analyzed using the USM method. This analysis method applies a single spectrum, called a uniform response spectrum, at each support location. This spectrum envelops the individual response spectra for other locations. The enveloping response spectrum is developed and applied for each of the three orthogonal directions of input motion. The modal and directional responses are then combined as described in Sections 3.7.3.7 and 3.7.3.6, respectively. The responses due to relative displacements at the support points are combined with the inertial responses by the absolute sum method.

#### 3.7.3.9.2 Independent Support Motion Method

Distribution subsystems supported at multiple locations within one or more buildings with different seismic input response maybe analyzed using the ISM method. In this method of analysis, supports may be divided into support groups. A single ISRS is applied to all supports of each group, but different ISRS are applied to different groups. Typically, a support group is made up of supports attached to the same structure, floor, or portion of a floor. For distribution subsystems analyzed using the ISM method, criteria presented in NUREG-1061 (Reference 8) are followed.

In lieu of performing a response spectrum analysis with USM or ISM inputs, time histories of support motions may be utilized as input excitations. The responses due to relative displacements at the support points are combined with the inertial responses by the SRSS method.

#### 3.7.3.10 Use of Equivalent Vertical Static Factors

Equivalent vertical static factors are not used in the design of subsystems for the U.S. EPR design. Seismic loads are calculated assuming that the vertical seismic motion occurs simultaneously with the two horizontal motions.


Tri linear springs development uses the linear development as the starting point. The subsurface soil is assumed to be relatively high plasticity clay. Based on the modulus degradation for clays with plasticity index in the range 50 to 70, a relationship is developed between displacement of the foundation basemat and the corresponding average reaction imposed by the underlying soil medium on the foundation basemat. Using an incremental approach, the methodology calculates the reaction at the base of the foundation basemat for a small increment of basemat displacement, using the appropriate soil spring associated with the shear modulus at this step. In the next incremental step, the solution is advanced using a reduced shear modulus consistent with the shear strain at a representative depth associated with the soil reaction from the previous step. For the two aforementioned soil cases (4u and 2sn4u) the resultant bearing pressure versus subgrade modulus values are provided in Table 3.8-14 Tri-Linear Subgrade Modulus vs. Bearing PressuresTable Deleted.

The results of the soil spring analyses are used in determining forces and moments in the basemat for concrete design and for determining the acceptability of the supporting soil media under static loading conditions.

## RAI 320, Question 03.07.02-63

ln |

A FEM model for SSI analysis of the embedded portions of the NI common basemat was used to evaluate the soil bearing pressures, sliding and overturning due to seismic events. This model explicitly represents the transient nature of the seismic loadings, the properties of the soils, and the dynamic characteristics of the structure. This approach produces a more realistic picture of the NI Common Basemat Structure response to seismic loadings than is possible using the static model alone.

## RAI 320, Question 03.07.02-63

The NI Common Basemat Structure superstructure is modeled using lumped parameter systems identical to those used for the soil structure interaction analysis. The masses, stiffnesses, and eccentricities of the buildings are mathematically computed, and spatially arranged to represent the dynamic characteristics of the NI Common Basemat structures.



The model is excited by simultaneous application of three EUR seismic transients (CSDRS) to the base of the foundation basemat for soil cases 2sn4u, 4u, and 5a representing soft, medium and hard soils. Transients are applied, one each, in the three principal building directions. The weight of the building, including the water in the in-containment refueling water storage tank (IRWST), fuel pool, and the four emergency feedwater storage tanks (because this water is always present within the NI Common Basemat Structure), and full buoyancy are the other loadings included in this analysis.

Section 3.8.1, Section 3.8.3, and Section 3.8.4 provide descriptions of interfacing structures that induce loads on the NI Common Basemat Structure foundation basemat. The figures in those sections illustrate the concrete shear walls and columns that transfer loads to the NI Common Basemat Structure foundation basemat. The