

NRR-PMDAPEm Resource

From: Lingam, Siva
Sent: Thursday, November 01, 2012 2:57 PM
To: Westcott, Daniel
Cc: Andruszkiewicz, Edward; Sheng, Simon; Poehler, Jeffrey
Subject: RE: EIVB RAI follow-up questions
Attachments: EVIB RAI Follow-up Questions - Final.docx.docx

Attached please find our version of the RAIs. Though your answers to RAIs 4 and 5 are satisfactory, we like to see them on the docket. In your response to these RAIs, please repeat the attached RAIs exactly. Thank you.

From: Westcott, Daniel [<mailto:Daniel.Westcott@pgnmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2012 4:11 PM
To: Lingam, Siva
Subject: EIVB RAI follow-up questions

Siva,

A call was conducted on October 10th to discuss clarifications regarding EVIB RAI responses. These clarifying questions were emailed on October 2nd and October 9th. After the call, additional clarifications were emailed on October 11th. The purpose of the email is to propose a consolidated set of RAIs based on the aforementioned emails and the October 10th call. Attached for your consideration and use is a consolidated list of RAIs. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you wish to discuss this further.

Sincerely,

Dan

From: Wilson, Kenneth R
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2012 11:51 AM
To: Westcott, Daniel
Cc: NANA Ashok (AREVA); Ellis, Gregg; HOSLER Ryan (AREVA); SCOTT Dallas (AREVA)
Subject: EIVB RAI Follow-up Questions - KRW-ge-adn.docx

I think the attached integration of the NRC draft RAIs and some of our discussions well-reflect the NRC's areas of inquiry. AREVA and we are essentially prepared to promptly answer all of these questions as we did during previous telecons and otherwise. AREVA will need to edit their 103 to reflect the way I restructured the questions but the technical work is done.

I do suggest that the last two are not really necessary but if they need it on the docket the answers are rather simple.

Please supply these to Siva so he can discuss them with the Branch prior to sending formal RAIs. We certainly recognize we may have not quite captured all of their areas of interest but if we did so it was an oversight on my part.

One point we will want to make formally and perhaps as part of the eMail to Siva is that we are trying to segregate but not ignore the ongoing generic activities from the EPU. We really to think that is consistent with NRC policy and guidance.

Ken

Hearing Identifier: NRR_PMDA
Email Number: 525

Mail Envelope Properties (Siva.Lingam@nrc.gov20121101145600)

Subject: RE: EIVB RAI follow-up questions
Sent Date: 11/1/2012 2:56:35 PM
Received Date: 11/1/2012 2:56:00 PM
From: Lingam, Siva

Created By: Siva.Lingam@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"Andruszkiewicz, Edward" <Edward.Andruszkiewicz@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Sheng, Simon" <Simon.Sheng@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Poehler, Jeffrey" <Jeffrey.Poehler@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Westcott, Daniel" <Daniel.Westcott@pgnmail.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office:

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2211	11/1/2012 2:56:00 PM
EIVB RAI Follow-up Questions - Final.docx.docx		20547

Options

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

Follow-Up RAIs Related to the September 27, 2012 Response from FPC

1. Regarding the last paragraph of FPC's response to RAI EVIB-1 (EVIB 2-1), please provide clarification relative to areas of geometric discontinuities in the RPV considering irradiation embrittlement under EPU. Specifically,
 - (a) Provide the initial RT_{NDT} , the copper (Cu) and nickel (Ni) content values, and estimated fluence for the outlet nozzle. If these values are not available, please provide the generic values that were used in generating the current P-T limits. For estimated fluence, interpolation is permissible.
 - (b) Estimate the 1/4T ART value of the outlet nozzle forging corner region using the values identified in (a).
 - (c) Generate P-T limits (heatup, cooldown, and hydrostatic/leak test) for the outlet nozzle using information in (b) and demonstrate that the current P-T limits remain bounding for EPU conditions. Adjust the EPFY value for the current P-T limits if necessary.
 - (d) Demonstrate that closure head is not the limiting material in any portion of the composite P-T limits.
2. With regard to ferritic RCPB materials other than those in the RPV, the licensee's current 32 EPFY P-T limits allow the RCS temperature as low as 60 °F, but the licensee indicates in their response to EVIB-1 (EVIB 2-1) that the lowest service temperature cannot be lower than 150 °F for the piping. ASME Code, Section III, NB-2332 (b) states, "The lowest service temperature shall not be lower than $RT_{NDT} + 100$ °F unless a lower temperature is justified by following methods similar to those contained in Appendix G." Please clarify how you meet this requirement.
3. Please provide the edition (year) of the ASME Code, Section III (Construction Code) based on which that the RCPB (e.g., piping, pumps, and valves) was constructed and identify whether the NB-2332 (b) cited above was already in that edition of the Construction Code.
4. Regarding the first paragraph of FPC's response to EVIB-2 (EVIB 2-2), please clarify whether the program was developed and implemented.
5. Regarding the last paragraph of FPC's response to EVIB-2 (EVIB 2-2), please clarify your response to Item (2) of the RAI in relation to the deferred ultrasonic testing of the accessible RPV core barrel bolts. Would such deferral require relief from the ASME Code?