

ArevaEPRDCPEm Resource

From: WILLIFORD Dennis (AREVA) [Dennis.Williford@areva.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 06, 2011 2:36 PM
To: Tesfaye, Getachew
Cc: BENNETT Kathy (AREVA); DELANO Karen (AREVA); ROMINE Judy (AREVA); RYAN Tom (AREVA); KOWALSKI David (AREVA)
Subject: Response to U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 509 (6011), FSAR Ch. 9
Attachments: RAI 509 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 509 Response US EPR DC.pdf," provides a schedule since a technically correct and complete response to the two questions cannot be provided at this time.

The following table indicates the respective pages in the response document, "RAI 509 Response US EPR DC.pdf," that contain AREVA NP's response to the subject questions.

Question #	Start Page	End Page
RAI 509 — 09.04.01-6	2	2
RAI 509 — 09.04.01-7	3	3

The schedule for technically correct and complete responses to these questions is provided below.

Question #	Response Date
RAI 509 — 09.04.01-6	November 9, 2011
RAI 509 — 09.04.01-7	November 9, 2011

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: Tuesday, September 06, 2011 7:06 PM
To: ZZ-DL-A-USEPR-DL
Cc: ODriscoll, James; Jackson, Christopher; McKirgan, John; Clark, Phyllis; Colaccino, Joseph
Subject: U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 509 (6011), FSAR Ch. 9

Attached please find the subject request for additional information (RAI). A draft of the RAI was provided to you on August 31, 2011, and on September 6, 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: 3455

Mail Envelope Properties (2FBE1051AEB2E748A0F98DF9EEE5A5D48E8E36)

Subject: Response to U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 509 (6011),
FSAR Ch. 9
Sent Date: 10/6/2011 2:35:48 PM
Received Date: 10/6/2011 2:36:09 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
"KOWALSKI David (AREVA)" <David.Kowalski@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	2211	10/6/2011 2:36:09 PM
RAI 509 Response US EPR DC.pdf		61070

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

Response to

Request for Additional Information No. 509 (6011), Revision 0

9/06/2011

U.S. EPR Standard Design Certification

AREVA NP Inc.

Docket No. 52-020

SRP Section: 09.04.01 - Control Room Area Ventilation System

Application Section: 9.4.1

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

Question 09.04.01-6:

Clarify the FSAR Tier 1 markup provided in response to RAI 277, Question 09.04.01-1:

With regard to the response of the CRACS to a high radiation condition, the FSAR Tier 1 markup provided in response to RAI 277 Question 09.04.01-1, page 2.6-2, show a deletion of the words “or high radiation alarm signal in the intake duct.” This markup conflicts with the discussion on page 2.6-1 of the same markup which does not delete these words. FSAR Revision 2 Tier 2 page 6.5-5 also discusses isolation on high radiation alarm signal. Please clarify Tier 1. The staff understands that the CRACS will automatically align to maintain a positive pressure in the CRE relative to adjacent areas upon receipt of either a containment isolation signal or a high radiation alarm signal sensed from the intake ducts.

Response to Question 09.04.01-6:

A response to this question will be provided by November 9, 2011.

Question 09.04.01-7:**Confirm the accident response and function of the low volume purge system for the rod ejection accident:**

In your response to RAI 277, Question 09.04.03-3, you provided markups of FSAR Tier 1 and 2 to claim a safety-related function of the CBVS. In the Tier 1 markup on page 2.6-104 you state the CBVS filters exhaust from the containment atmosphere upon receipt of the containment isolation signal until the containment isolation valves close. The staff understands that these CIVs should close automatically within 5 seconds (FSAR Tier 2 paragraph 9.4.7.3). Therefore the staff is unclear if the CBVS tier 1 filtering safety function, as described, is able to reduce off site dosage. In the tier 2 markup on page 9.4-92, you state the safety-related function of the CBVS as, "provides containment isolation and low-flow purge exhaust from the containment isolation valves during a postulated rod ejection accident." Is there a requirement for a containment purge operation using these valves in this particular accident? If so the staff is concerned that the configuration of the low volume purge penetrations do not support operation with a single active failure, since only one containment penetration with two valves in series are supplied. A configuration which is not susceptible to single failure (failure to isolate containment on demand or failure open to purge containment on demand) would necessitate two containment penetrations, with two valves in series.

The staff believes that there is no credited role for containment filtration via the CBVS low volume purge trains in the accident analyses, and that the intent of the design is for the CBVS low accident exhaust filter trains to be optionally aligned and utilized as a back-up to the SBVS safety-related functions. The staff notes that one SBVS safety related function is the establishment of a negative pressure in the Fuel Building and the radiological controlled areas of the Safeguard Building in order to ensure that potentially contaminated air does not escape to the environment (Reference Tier 2 FSAR table 14.3-2). If the CBVS is to act as a backup system for this function, please clarify the safety-related function of the CBVS trains, and propose Technical Specification operability and surveillance requirements to verify operability of the CBVS accident exhaust trains (i.e. provide surveillance requirements to operate the train, do the filter testing, verify system actuation, verify system alignment in accident mode). Propose additional ITACC for the CBVS accident exhaust filter trains in order to test the drawdown time and the negative pressure of the Fuel Building and the Safeguard Building. Alternatively, if filtration via the CBVS filter trains is required to function in a specific DBA, please clarify this function and the accident scenario, and propose technical specification requirements for the CBVS accident exhaust trains. If filtration of containment is required for a specific DBA, include a discussion on how the system meets single failure criteria for this DBA function.

Response to Question 09.04.01-7:

A response to this question will be provided by November 9, 2011.