

ArevaEPRDCPEm Resource

From: WILLIFORD Dennis (AREVA) [Dennis.Williford@areva.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 28, 2011 5:05 PM
To: Tesfaye, Getachew
Cc: BENNETT Kathy (AREVA); DELANO Karen (AREVA); ROMINE Judy (AREVA); RYAN Tom (AREVA); GUCWA Len (EXTERNAL AREVA)
Subject: Response to U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 500 (5944), FSAR Ch. 6
Attachments: RAI 500 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 500 Response US EPR DC.pdf" provides a schedule since technically correct and complete responses to the 7 questions cannot be provided at this time.

The following table indicates the respective pages in the response document, "RAI 500 Response US EPR DC.pdf," that contain AREVA NP's response to the subject questions.

| Question # | Start Page | End Page |
|--------------------------|------------|----------|
| RAI 500 — 06.02.01.02-11 | 2 | 2 |
| RAI 500 — 06.02.01.02-12 | 3 | 3 |
| RAI 500 — 06.02.01.02-13 | 4 | 4 |
| RAI 500 — 06.02.01.02-14 | 5 | 5 |
| RAI 500 — 06.02.01.02-15 | 6 | 6 |
| RAI 500 — 06.02.01.02-16 | 7 | 7 |
| RAI 500 — 06.02.01.02-17 | 8 | 8 |

A complete answer is not provided for the 7 questions. The schedule for technically correct and complete responses to these questions is provided below.

| Question # | Response Date |
|--------------------------|-------------------|
| RAI 500 — 06.02.01.02-11 | February 29, 2012 |
| RAI 500 — 06.02.01.02-12 | February 29, 2012 |
| RAI 500 — 06.02.01.02-13 | February 29, 2012 |
| RAI 500 — 06.02.01.02-14 | February 29, 2012 |
| RAI 500 — 06.02.01.02-15 | February 29, 2012 |
| RAI 500 — 06.02.01.02-16 | February 29, 2012 |
| RAI 500 — 06.02.01.02-17 | February 29, 2012 |

Sincerely,

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: Wednesday, August 31, 2011 11:42 AM
To: ZZ-DL-A-USEPR-DL
Cc: Peng, Shie-Jeng; McKirgan, John; Carneal, Jason; Colaccino, Joseph; ArevaEPRDCPEm Resource
Subject: U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 500 (5944), FSAR Ch. 6

Attached please find the subject requests for additional information (RAI). A draft of the RAI was provided to you on July 21, 2011, and discussed with your staff on July 27 and August 31, 2011. Draft RAI Questions 06.02.01.02-11, 06.02.01.02-12, 06.02.01.02-13, 06.02.01.02-14, and 6.02.01.02-15 have been modified as a result of those discussions. 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: 3436

Mail Envelope Properties (2FBE1051AEB2E748A0F98DF9EEE5A5D48E86F8)

Subject: Response to U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 500 (5944),
FSAR Ch. 6
Sent Date: 9/28/2011 5:04:43 PM
Received Date: 9/28/2011 5:05:45 PM
From: WILLIFORD Dennis (AREVA)

Created By: Dennis.Williford@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
"GUCWA Len (EXTERNAL AREVA)" <Len.Gucwa.ext@areva.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Tsfaye, Getachew" <Getachew.Tsfaye@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: auscharm02.adom.ad.corp

| Files | Size | Date & Time |
|--------------------------------|-------------|------------------------|
| MESSAGE | 2837 | 9/28/2011 5:05:45 PM |
| RAI 500 Response US EPR DC.pdf | | 70525 |

Options

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

Response to

Request for Additional Information No. 500(5944), Revision 0

8/31/2011

U. S. EPR Standard Design Certification

AREVA NP Inc.

Docket No. 52-020

SRP Section: 06.02.01.02 - Subcompartment Analysis

Application Section: 6.2.1.2

**QUESTIONS for Containment and Ventilation Branch 1 (AP1000/EPR Projects)
(SPCV)**

Question 06.02.01.02-11:

The following question is a follow-up to the subcompartment analysis calculation audit held in Twinbrook, MD between May 25 and July 7, 2011 regarding Calculation 32-9067227-003, "Bounding High Energy Lines in Reactor Building." In Sec. 2.2.5, it describes that the operating pressure and temperature used for the calculation of mass and energy release from Main Steam and emergency feedwater are based on hot zero power condition. Justify this hot zero power condition to be used to calculate the mass and energy release.

Response to Question 06.02.01.02-11:

A response to this question will be provided by February 29, 2012.

Question 06.02.01.02-12:

The following question is a follow-up to the subcompartment analysis calculation audit held in Twinbrook, MD between May 25 and July 7, 2011 regarding Calculation 32-9067227-003, "Bounding High Energy Lines in Reactor Building." In Sec. 2.3.1, it states that the critical flow is calculated based on the GOTHIC technical manual Appendix A. The pressure considered in Appendix A is in the range of 1 and 3000 psia. However, the stagnation pressure listed in the high energy lines can be higher than 3000 psia. Explain how the critical flow is calculated for the case with pressure higher than 3000 psia. Justify the calculation method applied for the case being beyond range to be conservative.

Response to Question 06.02.01.02-12:

A response to this question will be provided by February 29, 2012.

Question 06.02.01.02-13:

The following question is a follow-up to the subcompartment analysis calculation audit held in Twinbrook, MD between May 25 and July 7, 2011. As described in Calc 32-7004322-000, "Subcompartment Pressurization of Steam Generator Rooms," the mass and energy release from line LAB90BR005 break in room UJA23008 termed as Modified Feedwater Line Break Mass and Energy, is based on the CRAFT2 computer model calculation. In that calculation, it models the pressure loss in pump and long pipe on the steam generator side of the break realistically since the frictional effects imposed by this section of pipe play important roles on the mass and energy release (see Calc 32-7004322-000). In the Area of Review subsection of SRP Section 6.2.1.2, it also specifies (3rd bullet) that the analytical procedure used to determine the loss coefficients should be reviewed. Provide the total loss coefficient from steam generator through pump and long pipe to the break. Since the total loss will affect the critical flow significantly, it should be determined and provided as a basis for the demonstration of any further application (see below) of the calculated mass release to be conservative.

The same Modified Feedwater Line Break Mass and Energy has been applied to a few pressurization calculations for compartments, e.g. UJA23013, UJA23014, UJA23015 and UJA23016 (Calc 32-7003808-002) as based on the consideration of boundedness of the operating condition. However, it is not clear if the total loss coefficient used in the CRAFT2 calculation as provided in the above question will bound the total loss coefficient for each compartment case as identified. Provide the total loss coefficient for each above mentioned compartment's pressurization and demonstrate the appropriateness for the application of Modified Feedwater Line Break Mass and Energy to these compartments in terms of the total loss coefficient.

Response to Question 06.02.01.02-13:

A response to this question will be provided by February 29, 2012.

Question 06.02.01.02-14:

The following question is a follow-up to the subcompartment analysis calculation audit held in Twinbrook, MD between May 25 and July 7, 2011. In Appendix G of Calc 32-7003667-002, "Subcompartment Analysis at +5 ft Elevation for CVCS and FPPS Rooms," the mass and energy release from lines KBA10BR002, KBA10BR004, and KBA34BR012, are calculated by a detailed modeling of CVCS piping and heat exchanger with RELAP. In the Area of Review subsection of SRP Section 6.2.1.2, it specifies (3rd bullet) that the analytical procedure used to determine the loss coefficients should be reviewed. Provide the total loss coefficient from water source through elbows and pipe or heat exchanger to the break. Since the total loss will affect the critical flow significantly, it should be determined and provided as a basis for the demonstration of any further application (see below) of the calculated mass release to be conservative.

The calculated line break mass and energy for these lines have been applied to a few pressurization calculations for compartments, e.g. UJA11002, UJA11022, UJA11023, UJA11024 and UJA07029 (Calc 32-7003200-002 and 32-7003667-002). However, it is not clear if the total loss coefficients used in these RELAP calculations have bounded the total loss coefficient for each compartment case as identified. Specifically, the compartment UJA11022 does not actually contain the line KBA34BR012 but the RELAP-calculated line break mass and energy for KBA34BR012 is applied to the pressurization calculation of compartment UJA11022. Similarly, the compartment UJA11024 does not actually contain the line KBA10BR002 but the RELAP-calculated line break mass and energy for KBA10BR002 is applied to the pressurization calculation of compartment UJA11024. The pressurization calculation of compartment UJA11023 applies the RELAP-calculated line break mass and energy for KBA10BR002 and KBA10BR004 without knowing if the total loss coefficient to the UJA11023's break is bounded by those of KBA10BR002 and KBA10BR004 as modeled with RELAP. Provide the total loss coefficient for each above mentioned compartment's pressurization and demonstrate the appropriateness for the application of RELAP-calculated line break mass and energy in terms of the total loss coefficient.

Response to Question 06.02.01.02-14:

A response to this question will be provided by February 29, 2012.

Question 06.02.01.02-15:

The following question is a follow-up to the subcompartment analysis calculation audit held in Twinbrook, MD between May 25 and July 7, 2011. Provide the information for choked flow model including discharge coefficient that is used in CRAFT2 and RELAP for the break mass release rate calculations.

Response to Question 06.02.01.02-15:

A response to this question will be provided by February 29, 2012.

Question 06.02.01.02-16:

The following question is a follow-up to the subcompartment analysis calculation audit held in Twinbrook, MD between May 25 and July 7, 2011. The portion of "Valve Data" in GOTHIC run output shows that all valves (or doors) are valve type 4 while the input data file shows that it should have 17 valve types. There exists inconsistency. In addition, the "Valve Performance Curve" portion seems having the data under wrong titles of "Travel" and "Loss Coefficient". These two titles should be switched. Evaluate if the required or intended input data were used correctively and ensure the calculated results still comply with the NRC regulations.

Response to Question 06.02.01.02-16:

A response to this question will be provided by February 29, 2012.

Question 06.02.01.02-17:

The following question is a follow-up to the subcompartment analysis calculation audit held in Twinbrook, MD between May 25 and July 7, 2011. The opening time for the following doors as shown in Table 6.2.1-13 of Rev. 3-Interim FSAR markup (See Response to RAI No. 457 Supplement 4 on 12/21/2010) is not the same as the data specified in GOTHIC input, "Summary of Subcompartment Analysis in the Reactor Building":

FSAR Markup GOTHIC Input

Opening Time (sec) Opening Time (sec)

+5 ft Door 4 0.75 0.50

+5 ft Door 14 0.75 0.50

+45 ft Door 2 0.75 0.50

Since the opening times as described in FSAR are not conservative as compared with those applied in the GOTHIC calculation, justify these differences to assure that the NRC regulations are complied.

In addition, the door full opening area should also be provided in the same FSAR table to reflect a complete set of door characteristics data. Otherwise, an annotation should be provided in this table to link the availability of full opening area with some other FSAR sections. A complete and consistent set of data should be maintained to assure the integrity of safety grade doors and to further assure the compliance of NRC regulations.

Response to Question 06.02.01.02-17:

A response to this question will be provided by February 29, 2012.