

US-APWRRRAIsPEm Resource

From: Ciocco, Jeff
Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2013 3:09 PM
To: us-apwr-rai@mhi.co.jp; US-APWRRRAIsPEm Resource
Cc: Williams, Stephen; McCoppin, Michael; Otto, Ngola; Hamzehee, Hossein
Subject: US-APWR Design Certification Application RAI 989-6988 (11.02)
Attachments: US-APWR DC RAI 989 RPAC 6988.pdf

MHI,

The attachment contains the subject Request for Additional Information (RAI). This RAI was sent to you in draft form. Your licensing review schedule assumes technically correct and complete responses within 30 days of receipt of RAIs. However, MHI requests, and we grant, 60 days to respond to this RAI. We will the adjust the schedule accordingly.

Please submit your RAI response to the NRC Document Control Desk.

Thank you,

Jeff Ciocco
US-APWR Projects
New Nuclear Reactor Licensing
301.415.6391
jeff.ciocco@nrc.gov



Hearing Identifier: Mitsubishi_USAPWR_DCD_eRAI_Public
Email Number: 54

Mail Envelope Properties (320204600EA7B9408FE833FF15E4FF7DC2718DEACC)

Subject: US-APWR Design Certification Application RAI 989-6988 (11.02)
Sent Date: 1/30/2013 3:08:30 PM
Received Date: 1/30/2013 3:08:31 PM
From: Ciocco, Jeff

Created By: Jeff.Ciocco@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"Williams, Stephen" <Stephen.Williams@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"McCoppin, Michael" <Michael.McCoppin@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Otto, Ngola" <Ngola.Otto@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Hamzehee, Hossein" <Hossein.Hamzehee@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"us-apwr-rai@mhi.co.jp" <us-apwr-rai@mhi.co.jp>
Tracking Status: None
"US-APWRRRAIsPEm Resource" <US-APWRRRAIsPEm.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	611	1/30/2013 3:08:31 PM
US-APWR DC RAI 989 RPAC 6988.pdf		64244
image001.jpg	3989	

Options

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

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION 989-6988

Issue Date: 1/30/2013

Application Title: US-APWR Design Certification - Docket Number 52-021

Operating Company: Mitsubishi Heavy Industries

Docket No. 52-021

Review Section: 11.02 - Liquid Waste Management System

Application Section: Liquid Waste Management

QUESTIONS

11.02-36

Supplemental RAI proposed for US APWR (RAI 956-6630, Question 11.02-35)

1. The 2nd and 3rd paragraph of the applicant's response, discussing the classification of the Auxiliary Building (A/B) structure determination, does not address the RG 1.143 sections below.

Per RG 1.143, the classification of a rad waste structure is defined as:

RG 1.143 Section 5.1

For a given structure housing radwaste processing systems or components, if the total design basis unmitigated radiological release (considering the maximum inventory) at the boundary of the unprotected area is greater than 500 millirem per year or the maximum unmitigated exposure to site personnel within the protected area is greater than 5 rem per year, the external structures are classified as RW-IIa.

RG 1.143 Section 5.2

For a given structure housing radwaste processing systems or components, if the total design basis unmitigated radiological release (considering the maximum inventory) at the boundary of the unprotected area is less than 500 millirem per year and the maximum unmitigated exposure to site personnel within the protected area is less than 5 rem per year, the external structure is classified as RWE-IIb.

The RG logic is committed to by the applicant for structure classification. If the applicant determines that the rad waste source term is large enough to exceed these dose rates or performs actual unmitigated dose calculations exceeding these dose rates indicating a structure classification of RW-IIa, the FSAR needs revised to indicate the reason for the structure classification.

2. DCD revision Section 11.4.4, needs to include the reference for RG 1.143 for the Table 11.4-8 results methodology and needs to reference the RG 1.143 in this section.

3. Many inconsistencies exist in the radionuclides included in the source term tables that are utilized in deriving the A1 and A2 Ratios. Cs, Sr, Ce, Cr, Zr, etc., are missing in some tables and are included in others. The basis of these inconsistencies needs to be explained.

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION 989-6988

4. FSAR Table 3.2-2 is missing some information in the footnotes, based upon the new RG 1.143 classifications listed for RWMS SSCs. The criteria are incomplete concerning meeting RG 1.143 in footnotes 1 and 3.(6) for the listed RWMS.

5. The responses in the revisions of FSAR Sections 10.4.8, 11.2, 11.3, and 11.4 are incomplete in explaining the provisions of RG 1.143 in these sections.

