

July 29, 2013

Mr. Pedro Salas, Manager
U.S. EPR New Plants Regulatory Affairs
AREVA NP, Inc.
3315 Old Forest Road
P.O. Box 10935
Lynchburg, VA 24506-0935

SUBJECT: EIGHTH REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING
ANP-10285P, "U.S. EPR FUEL ASSEMBLY MECHANICAL DESIGN TOPICAL
REPORT" (TAC NO. RN1224)

Dear Mr. Salas:

By letter dated October 2, 2007, which can be accessed through NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML072840180, AREVA NP (AREVA) submitted for U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff review Topical Report (TR) ANP-10285P, "Fuel Assembly Mechanical Design." The first set of requests for additional information (RAIs) was issued by the NRC on April 29, 2008 (ML081080360), and the AREVA responses were received on May 29, 2008 (ML081560318) and June 13, 2008 (ML081690559). Subsequent sets of RAIs were issued by the NRC staff on June 24, 2008 (ML081640135), January 15, 2009 (ML083330034), June 23, 2009 (ML091380286), August 3, 2009 (ML092080469), and May 17, 2011 (ML111230049). The AREVA responses were received on July 24, 2008 (ML082100438), April 2, 2009 (ML090960483), August 14, 2009 (ML092310532), December 16, 2009 (ML093520662) and May 23, 2013 (ML13150A004). The NRC staff determined that some areas of this report require additional information in order for the staff to complete its safety review. The specific information requested was sent to AREVA as draft RAI 72 on May 23, 2013.

On June 19, 2013, AREVA informed the staff that no AREVA proprietary information is contained in the draft RAI. On July 17, 2013, AREVA agreed to provide an advanced response

P. Salas

- 2 -

to the RAI by August 9, 2013, and a final response to the RAIs by September 20, 2013. The final RAIs can be found in the enclosure.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, I may be reached at 301-415-6822.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Amy M. Snyder, Senior Project Manager
Licensing Branch 1 (LB1)
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors

Docket No. 52-020

Enclosure:
Request for Additional Information

cc: See next page

P. Salas

- 2 -

to the RAI by August 9, 2013, and a final response to the RAIs by September 20, 2013. The final RAIs can be found in the enclosure.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, I may be reached at 301-415-6822.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Amy M. Snyder, Senior Project Manager
Licensing Branch 1 (LB1)
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors

Docket No. 52-020

Enclosure:
Request for Additional Information

cc: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC
NARP R/F
ASnyder, NRO
BGleaves, NRO
JSegala, NRO
JMcLellan, NRO
JDonoghue, NRO

RidsRgn2MailCenterResource
RidsAcrsAcnwMailCenterResource
RidsNroDnrlResource
RidsOgcMailCenterResource
RidsNroDnrlLb1

ADAMS Accession Number: ML13205A301 *via e-mail NRO-002

OFFICE	DNRL/LB1:PM	DNRL/LB1:LA *	DSRA/SRSB	DNRL/LB1:PM
NAME	BGleaves	JMcLellan	JDonoghue	ASnyder
DATE	07/29/2013	07/25/2013	07/29/2013	07/29/2013

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

RAI 72: Addressing Damping Assumptions for U.S. EPR Fuel Seismic Response Analysis with Detailed Regulatory Basis

Background

Recent operating experience at nuclear power plants has shown that full reactor coolant system (RCS) flow is not likely to be maintained following a seismic event due to a loss of offsite power (LOOP). Maintaining full RCS flow requires several reactor coolant pumps (RCPs) to be operating at full speed, and these RCPs are not connected to safety-related, seismically qualified, electrical buses. During a LOOP, all RCPs would coast down in a relatively short period of time. Loss of other non-seismically qualified equipment during a seismic event, such as the turbine, could also cause RCPs to coast down, resulting in decreased core flow. The staff's concern is that before the reactor is shutdown (i.e. operating at greater than hot zero power), maximum ground acceleration could occur in conjunction with decreased core flow, reducing the flow rate dependent critical damping ratio, which could cause larger spacer grid impact loads than assumed in the existing analysis.

The guidance used to evaluate external forces on fuel assemblies is NUREG-0800, "Standard Review Plan for the Review of Safety Analysis Reports for Nuclear Power Plants: LWR Edition," (SRP) Section 4.2, "Fuel System Design," Revision 3, March 2007, Appendix A, "Evaluation Of Fuel Assembly Structural Response To Externally Applied Forces." SRP Section 4.2, Appendix A, Section II.2, states, "analytical methods used in performing structural response analyses should be reviewed." This includes the bases for the various input assumptions, such as the critical damping ratio, that have a direct impact on the spacer grid impact loads. SRP Section 4.2, Appendix A, Section IV.2, which gives the safe-shutdown earthquake (SSE) acceptance criteria, further states, "control rod insertability must be assured," and it must be assured for "SSE loads alone if [SRP 4.2, Appendix A] Subsection IV.1 does not require an analysis for combined loads." This means that control rod insertability still needs to be demonstrated for SSE-only loads even if the combined loads analysis does not exceed $P(\text{crit})$ – the spacer grid crushing load.

Analyses typically compare maximum spacer grid loads to $P(\text{crit})$ to show that control rod insertability will be maintained since there is a presumption that significant permanent grid deformation does not occur for loads less than $P(\text{crit})$, and that only buckling could prevent control rod insertion. However, for the U.S. EPR design, significant permanent grid deformation is predicted under maximum spacer grid loads without spacer grid buckling, which could challenge control rod insertability. Therefore, if the maximum spacer grid impact loads are being under-predicted due to the use of a non-conservative critical damping ratio, then spacer grid impact loads would need to be updated accordingly, and control rod insertability may need to be re-evaluated.

Regulatory Basis and Acceptance Criteria

General Design Criterion (GDC) 2 states:

Structures, systems, and components important to safety shall be designed to withstand the effects of natural phenomena such as earthquakes, tornadoes, hurricanes, floods, tsunamis, and seiches without loss of capability to perform their safety functions.

The applicable component is the fuel, with the safety functions being maintenance of fuel integrity and control rod insertability. The applicable natural phenomenon for the fuel seismic response analysis is the most severe earthquake, which is the SSE. Fuel integrity is typically demonstrated by showing that coolability is always maintained – specifically by demonstrating that the departure from nucleate boiling ratio (DNBR) is always maintained above an appropriate lower limit under all normal conditions of operation in accordance with SRP Section 4.4, and for all anticipated operational occurrences in accordance with SRP Chapter 15.

The current AREVA fuel seismic response analysis does not justify the appropriateness of the assumed critical damping ratio corresponding to full reactor coolant system flow based on the above considerations in Topical Report ANP-10285P, “U.S. EPR Fuel Assembly Mechanical Design Topical Report.” Therefore, the staff cannot conclude that the U.S. EPR design meets the requirements of GDC 2.

Request for Additional Information

SRP Section 4.2, Appendix A discusses fuel coolability criteria related to a loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA), which is based on the assumption of combined loads, and addresses the impact on the ECCS analysis. The U.S. EPR design has shown that it may be necessary to perform additional coolability and control rod insertability evaluations above decay heat power levels, including full power operation, in order to address permanent spacer grid deformation caused by spacer grid impact forces that do not exceed $P(\text{crit})$ under SSE-only loads.

Since the assumed critical damping ratio has a direct impact on the predicted spacer grid impact loads, it will also have a direct impact on the amount of permanent grid deformation that is predicted. Therefore, the predicted permanent grid deformation resulting from a reduced critical damping ratio during a LOOP following a seismic event should be evaluated for the U.S. EPR design with respect to control rod insertability and fuel rod coolability.

Justify the critical damping ratio used in the fuel assembly structural response analysis for the U.S. EPR. Address the following points in your response:

- a. Quantify any change to the critical damping ratio assumed in the analysis based on RCP coastdown considerations.
- b. Include considerations for both the unirradiated and irradiated cases. Additionally, provide the Rayleigh damping coefficients being used for the irradiated fuel assembly cases in the fuel assembly structural response analysis for the U.S. EPR.
- c. Quantify the damping ratio margin (i.e., the difference between the critical damping ratio derived from test data and that credited in the analysis) change for both the unirradiated and irradiated fuel assembly cases.
- d. Address both SSE-only and combined SSE and LOCA loads analyses.

DC AREVA - EPR Mailing List
cc:

(Revised 04/15/2013)

Dr. Charles L. King
Licensing Manager, IRIS Project
Westinghouse Electric Company
Science and Technology Department
20 International Drive
Windsor, CT 06095

Mr. Robert E. Sweeney
IBEX ESI
4641 Montgomery Avenue
Suite 350
Bethesda, MD 20814

Mr. Gary Wright, Director
Division of Nuclear Facility Safety
Illinois Emergency Management Agency
1035 Outer Park Drive
Springfield, IL 62704

DC AREVA - EPR Mailing List

Email

alau@washdc.whitecase.com (Albie Lau)
APH@NEI.org (Adrian Heymer)
awc@nei.org (Anne W. Cottingham)
bgattoni@roe.com (William (Bill) Gattoni))
Brian.Vance@areva.com (Brian Vance)
cwaltman@roe.com (C. Waltman)
david.hinds@ge.com (David Hinds)
david.lewis@pillsburylaw.com (David Lewis)
dennis.williford@areva.com (Dennis Williford)
erg-xl@cox.net (Eddie R. Grant)
Gayle.Elliott@areva.com (Gayle Elliott)
gcesare@enercon.com (Guy Cesare)
george.honma.ext@areva.com (George Honma)
greg.gibson@unistarnuclear.com (Greg Gibson)
james.p.mcquighan@constellation.com (Jim McQuighan)
james1.beard@ge.com (James Beard)
jerald.head@ge.com (Jerald G. Head)
Joseph_Hegner@dom.com (Joseph Hegner)
judy.romine@areva.com (Judy Romine)
KSutton@morganlewis.com (Kathryn M. Sutton)
kwaugh@impact-net.org (Kenneth O. Waugh)
lchandler@morganlewis.com (Lawrence J. Chandler)
Len.Gucwa.ext@areva.com (Len Gucwa)
maria.webb@pillsburylaw.com (Maria Webb)
mark.beaumont@wsms.com (Mark Beaumont)
mark.t.hunter@unistarnuclear.com (Mark Hunter)
matias.travieso-diaz@pillsburylaw.com (Matias Travieso-Diaz)
mcintyba@westinghouse.com (Brian McIntyre)
media@nei.org (Scott Peterson)
mjcaverly@ppl.web.com (Michael Caverly)
MSF@nei.org (Marvin Fertel)
nirsnet@nirs.org (Michael Mariotte)
Nuclaw@mindspring.com (Robert Temple)
patriciaL.campbell@ge.com (Patricia L. Campbell)
paul.gaukler@pillsburylaw.com (Paul Gaukler)
Paul@beyondnuclear.org (Paul Gunter)
pbessette@morganlewis.com (Paul Bessette)
pedro.salas@areva.com (Pedro Salas)
RJB@NEI.org (Russell Bell)
rrsgarro@pplweb.com (Rocco Sgarro)
ryan_sprengel@mnes-us.com (Ryan Sprengel)
sabinski@suddenlink.net (Steve A. Bennett)
sfrantz@morganlewis.com (Stephen P. Frantz)
Sherry.Mcfaden@areva.com (Sherry McFaden)

DC AREVA - EPR Mailing List

SRubin@numarkassoc.com (Stuart Rubin)
stephan.moen@ge.com (Stephan Moen)
strambgb@westinghouse.com (George Stramback)
Tiffany.Wills@areva.com (Tiffany Wills)
tkkibler@scana.com (Tria Kibler)
Tony.McNulty@hse.gsi.gov.uk (Tony McNulty)
Tony.Robinson@areva.com (Tony Robinson)
trsmith@winston.com (Tyson Smith)
Vanessa.quinn@dhs.gov (Vanessa Quinn)
vijukrp@westinghouse.com (Ronald P. Vijuk)
Wanda.K.Marshall@dom.com (Wanda K. Marshall)
wayne.marquino@ge.com (Wayne Marquino)
whorin@winston.com (W. Horin)

NRO COVER PAGE

DUE DATE:

FROM (Originator-Div/Branch – Phone): Amy Snyder, DNRL/LB4, 301-6822

SUBJECT: EIGHTH REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING ANP-10285P, “U.S. EPR FUEL ASSEMBLY MECHANICAL DESIGN TOPICAL REPORT” (TAC NO. RN1224)

SECRETARY (Div/Branch – Phone): C. Nagel, DNRL/LB4, 301-415-1126

DATE: July 29, 2013

●●● ROUTING LIST ●●●

	NAME	DATE
1.	B. Gleaves	/ /13
2.	J. McLellan	07/25/13
3.	J. Donoghue	/ /13
4.	A. Snyder	/ /13
5.	Secretary	/ /13

ADAMS ACCESSION #ML13205A301

TEMPLATE #: NRO-002

Profiled in ADAMS - / /13	Put in DPC Folder on - / /13
(DPC) Official Agency Record / /13	Internal Distribution Dispatched On - / / 13 External Distribution Dispatched On - / / 13

Mailed original on - / /13

Mailed cc: mailing list on - / /13
(if applicable)

Quality Control Check by:	NOTES: _____
Initials / Date	_____
_____	_____

(For use by NRO Correspondence Ctr ONLY) _____

Front Office Initials _____

Date In: / / Date Out: / /