

ArevaEPRDCPEm Resource

From: RYAN Tom (AREVA) [Tom.Ryan@areva.com]
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2011 10:28 AM
To: Tesfaye, Getachew
Cc: BENNETT Kathy (AREVA); DELANO Karen (AREVA); ROMINE Judy (AREVA); RYAN Tom (AREVA); WILLIFORD Dennis (AREVA); GUCWA Len (EXTERNAL AREVA)
Subject: Response to U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 490 (5788), FSAR Ch. 6
Attachments: RAI 490 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 490 Response US EPR DC.pdf", provides a schedule since a technically correct and complete response to the 10 questions cannot be provided at this time.

The following table indicates the respective pages in the response document, "RAI 490 Response US EPR DC.pdf," that contain AREVA NP's response to the subject question.

Question #	Start Page	End Page
RAI 490 — 06.02.02-100	2	2
RAI 490 — 06.02.02-101	3	3
RAI 490 — 06.02.02-102	4	4
RAI 490 — 06.02.02-103	5	5
RAI 490 — 06.02.02-104	6	6
RAI 490 — 06.02.02-105	7	7
RAI 490 — 06.02.02-106	8	8
RAI 490 — 06.02.02-107	9	9
RAI 490 — 06.02.02-108	10	10
RAI 490 — 06.02.02-109	11	11

A complete answer is not provided for the 10 questions in RAI 490. The schedule for a technically correct and complete response to this question is provided below.

Question #	Response Date
RAI 490 — 06.02.02-100	August 17, 2011
RAI 490 — 06.02.02-101	August 17, 2011
RAI 490 — 06.02.02-102	August 17, 2011
RAI 490 — 06.02.02-103	August 17, 2011
RAI 490 — 06.02.02-104	August 17, 2011
RAI 490 — 06.02.02-105	August 17, 2011
RAI 490 — 06.02.02-106	August 17, 2011
RAI 490 — 06.02.02-107	August 17, 2011
RAI 490 — 06.02.02-108	August 17, 2011
RAI 490 — 06.02.02-109	August 17, 2011

Sincerely,

Tom Ryan for Dennis Williford, P.E.
U.S. EPR Design Certification Licensing Manager
AREVA NP Inc.

7207 IBM Drive, Mail Code CLT 2B
Charlotte, NC 28262
Phone: 704-805-2223
Email: Dennis.Williford@areva.com

From: Tesfaye, Getachew [<mailto:Getachew.Tesfaye@nrc.gov>]
Sent: Friday, May 20, 2011 3:00 AM
To: ZZ-DL-A-USEPR-DL
Cc: Makar, Gregory; Terao, David; Carneal, Jason; Colaccino, Joseph; ArevaEPRDCPEm Resource
Subject: U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 490 (5788), FSAR Ch. 6

Attached please find the subject requests for additional information (RAI). A draft of the RAI was provided to you on May 16, 2011, and on May 19, 2011, 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_RAIs
Email Number: 3134

Mail Envelope Properties (8D609EE2F807714CBF5297D9BA8602FB012EFD1E)

Subject: Response to U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 490 (5788),
FSAR Ch. 6
Sent Date: 6/20/2011 10:27:35 AM
Received Date: 6/20/2011 10:27:38 AM
From: RYAN Tom (AREVA)

Created By: Tom.Ryan@areva.com

Recipients:

"BENNETT Kathy (AREVA)" <Kathy.Bennett@areva.com>
Tracking Status: None
"DELANO Karen (AREVA)" <Karen.Delano@areva.com>
Tracking Status: None
"ROMINE Judy (AREVA)" <Judy.Romine@areva.com>
Tracking Status: None
"RYAN Tom (AREVA)" <Tom.Ryan@areva.com>
Tracking Status: None
"WILLIFORD Dennis (AREVA)" <Dennis.Williford@areva.com>
Tracking Status: None
"GUCWA Len (EXTERNAL AREVA)" <Len.Gucwa.ext@areva.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Tsfaye, Getachew" <Getachew.Tsfaye@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: AUSLYNCMX02.adom.ad.corp

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2946	6/20/2011 10:27:38 AM
RAI 490 Response US EPR DC.pdf		70860

Options

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

Response to
Request for Additional Information No. 490

5/20/2011

U. S. EPR Standard Design Certification
AREVA NP Inc.
Docket No. 52-020
SRP Section: 06.02.02 - Containment Heat Removal Systems
Application Section: 6.2.2

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

Question 06.02.02-100:

The staff requests that AREVA modify Appendix D of ANP-10293P to address directly and completely the change in IRWST peak temperature from 230°F to 250°F. For example, there is a statement on page D-5 that, "The temperature during the test was controlled to simulate the IRWST response to a large-break LOCA as closely as practicable." The autoclave testing was conducted at a lower temperature than the IRWST peak, and this needs to be acknowledged and justified. Another example is on page D-11, which has a statement about Nukon binder stability relative to 230°F (rather than 250°F).

Response to Question 06.02.02-100:

A response to this question will be provided by August 17, 2011.

Question 06.02.02-101:

The staff requests that AREVA either justify the linear extrapolation of the calcium release rate shown in Figure D.3-1 or propose an alternative. It does not appear to the staff that the linear extrapolation from 230°F to 250°F is justified and conservative. Rather, it appears that an exponential form would fit the data better and at 250°F would predict a significantly higher release rate than the proposed linear extrapolation.

Response to Question 06.02.02-101:

A response to this question will be provided by August 17, 2011.

Question 06.02.02-102:

The staff requests that AREVA explain why Table D.2-3 does not identify carbon as a constituent of pulverized concrete, even though the sample presumably contained carbonate. If the analysis was normalized in some way based on the measurement technique, the staff requests that this be explained in the text or the table.

Response to Question 06.02.02-102:

A response to this question will be provided by August 17, 2011.

Question 06.02.02-103:

With respect to Figure D.2-10, the staff requests that AREVA discuss, or identify on the graph, the relationship between the measured concentrations and the amount of material added to the autoclave, since a measured value less than the theoretical added suggests precipitation was occurring.

Response to Question 06.02.02-103:

A response to this question will be provided by August 17, 2011.

Question 06.02.02-104:

The staff requests that AREVA identify in Figure D.2-10 and D.2-11 whether the elemental concentrations are based on filtered or unfiltered samples, and the timing of the key steps in the analysis (e.g., filtration before or after cooling, filter pore size).

Response to Question 06.02.02-104:

A response to this question will be provided by August 17, 2011.

Question 06.02.02-105:

Page D-60 discusses the corrosion rate of the fiberglass and states that the data suggest the corrosion rate becomes negligible after about 100 hours. The staff requests that AREVA clarify that the analysis assumed there was negligible fiberglass corrosion after 80 hours and, hence, the corrosion rate was set to zero in the release calculation after 80 hours. The staff also requests that AREVA discuss the possible role of silicon precipitation after 80 hours, since precipitation would seem to result in more corrosion to maintain equilibrium.

Response to Question 06.02.02-105:

A response to this question will be provided by August 17, 2011.

Question 06.02.02-106:

Figure D.3-5 compares calculated steady-state aluminum corrosion rates to measured values from NUREG/CR-6915 and WCAP-16530-NP. Since the measured values correspond to more than one pH, the staff requests that AREVA annotate the figure accordingly. (The staff also notes that the figure appears to have a typographical error: "WCAP-16539").

Response to Question 06.02.02-106:

A response to this question will be provided by August 17, 2011.

Question 06.02.02-107:

Beginning on page D-66, there is a discussion of how, for “the U.S. EPR LOCA calculations,” the corrosion rate of aluminum was assumed to be made up of two parts (up to 20 hours and after 20 hours). It is the staff’s understanding that these two different corrosion rate relationships were used together to subsequently calculate the aluminum releases listed in Tables D.3-6, D.3-7, D.3-9, and D.3-10 (158 hours or 720 hours). The staff requests that AREVA clarify this in the discussion on page D-66 (i.e., define “the U.S. EPR LOCA calculations”). The staff also notes that the reference to Figure D.3-4 on page D-66 probably intends to reference Figure D.3-5.

Response to Question 06.02.02-107:

A response to this question will be provided by August 17, 2011.

Question 06.02.02-108:

The staff requests that AREVA confirm that the chemical effects analysis included insulation (other than RMI) or other materials that will not necessarily be destroyed (i.e., outside the zone of influence) but will be wetted and potentially add to the chemical debris and ionic content of the sump liquid. The mass of those other materials and the amount of ionic materials that may be leached should be included in the calculation.

Response to Question 06.02.02-108:

A response to this question will be provided by August 17, 2011.

Question 06.02.02-109:

The chemical precipitate quantities ("Total Solids") identified in Table D.3-10 and in the text on page D-80 are different than the chemical precipitate quantities listed in Table E.5-2 (debris head-loss tests). The staff requests that AREVA modify ANP-10293P to include an explanation of how the quantities calculated in Appendix D relate to the quantities used in head-loss testing.

Response to Question 06.02.02-109:

A response to this question will be provided by August 17, 2011.