
RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

03/22/2013

**US-APWR Design Certification
Mitsubishi Heavy Industries
Docket No. 52-021**

RAI NO.: NO. 766-5819 REVISION 3
SRP SECTION: 03.07.02 – Seismic System Analysis
APPLICATION SECTION: 3.7.2
DATE OF RAI ISSUE: 06/09/2011

QUESTION NO. RAI 03.07.02-57:

In MUAP-11002 (R0) Subsection 5.2.1, "Subsurface Profiles/Properties," (page 15), the applicant presents Equation 5-1 for the maximum recommended thickness of a subsurface profile layer. However, a similar equation should also be imposed on the finite element mesh size so that the finite element model is able to transmit the same cut-off frequency of the wave motion represented by Equation 5-1.

The staff noted in Section 5.4 of the report that the mesh size of 13 feet was used. If the cut-off frequency is chosen to be that of ZPA (50 Hz), the element size of 13 feet cannot transmit this wave component. The applicant is requested to provide a rationale for choosing the element size used in the SSI analyses.

ANSWER:

This answer revises and replaces the previous MHI answer that was transmitted by letter UAP-HF-11393, dated November 16, 2011 (ML11326A130).

Per Equation 4.2-2 of Technical Report MUAP-11002 Rev. 2, the maximum passing frequency was evaluated in terms of the shear wave velocities, which have been updated in Technical Report MUAP-10006 Rev. 3, and the coarse mesh model element size of approximately 12 feet. As discussed in Subsection 4.2.1 of Technical Report MUAP-11002 Rev. 2, the mesh size and passing frequencies are justified based on the frequency content of the input motion.

Impact on DCD

There is no impact on the DCD.

Impact on R-COLA

There is no impact on the R-COLA.

Impact on S-COLA

There is no impact on the S-COLA.

Impact on PRA

There is no impact on the PRA.

Impact on Technical/Topical Report

There is no impact on a Technical/Topical Report.

This completes MHI's response to the NRC's question.