

ArevaEPRDCPEm Resource

From: WILLIFORD Dennis (AREVA) [Dennis.Williford@areva.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2011 2:23 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. 514 (5998), FSAR Ch. 15
Attachments: RAI 514 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 514 Response US EPR DC.pdf," provides a schedule since a technically correct and complete response to the one question cannot be provided at this time.

The following table indicates the respective pages in the response document, "RAI 514 Response US EPR DC.pdf," that contain AREVA NP's response to the subject question.

Question #	Start Page	End Page
RAI 514 — 15.06.05-114	2	2

A complete answer is not provided for the one question in RAI 514. The schedule for a technically correct and complete final response to this question is provided below.

Question #	Response Date
RAI 514 — 15.06.05-114	November 18, 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: Friday, September 23, 2011 7:59 AM
To: ZZ-DL-A-USEPR-DL
Cc: Lu, Shanlai; Donoghue, Joseph; Colaccino, Joseph; ArevaEPRDCPEm Resource
Subject: U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 514 (5998), FSAR Ch. 15

Attached please find the subject requests for additional information (RAI). A draft of the RAI was provided to you on September 14, 2011, and discussed with your staff on September 22, 2011. No change is made to the draft RAI as a result of that discussion. 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: 3493

Mail Envelope Properties (2FBE1051AEB2E748A0F98DF9EEE5A5D4937E69)

Subject: Response to U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 514 (5998),
FSAR Ch. 15
Sent Date: 10/20/2011 2:23:06 PM
Received Date: 10/20/2011 2:23:32 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	2233	10/20/2011 2:23:32 PM
RAI 514 Response US EPR DC.pdf		54802

Options

Priority: Standard

Return Notification: No

Reply Requested: No

Sensitivity: Normal

Expiration Date:

Recipients Received:

Response to

Request for Additional Information No. 514 (5998), Revision 0

9/23/2011

U. S. EPR Standard Design Certification

AREVA NP Inc.

Docket No. 52-020

**SRP Section: 15.06.05 - Loss of Coolant Accidents Resulting From Spectrum of
Postulated Piping Breaks Within the Reactor Coolant Pressure Boundary**

Application Section: 15.06.05.04

QUESTIONS for Reactor System, Nuclear Performance and Code Review (SRSB)

Question 15.06.05-114:

The latest in-vessel downstream effect fuel assembly head loss tests indicate that the measured head loss variation can be small with only fiber and particulate introduced into the test loop. Once the chemical precipitant was added into the test loop, the stabilized head loss and flow rate varied significantly. Considering the large differences among test results observed so far, evaluate the large variation and the repeatability of test results with regard to initial flow rate, debris loading, testing procedures and other contributing factors. Demonstrate that the measured head loss and flow rate are limiting with respect to design basis flow conditions corresponding to two-train, three-train and four-train ECCS operation.

Response to Question 15.06.05-114:

A response to this question will be provided by November 18, 2011.