Request for Additional Information 3
Application Title: Westinghouse SMR Pre-Application Activities
Operating Company: Westinghouse Electric Company
Docket No. PROJ 0797
Review Section: W-SMR Test Plan and Scaling

QUESTIONS

W SMR Test Plan and Scaling-79

Follow-up to RAI-TR-SBLOCA-PIRT-91: The changes due to RAI-TR-SBLOCA-PIRT-91 as shown in response to RAI-TR-SBLOCA-PIRT-103 simply alter the importance ranking for [   ]^{a,c}

W SMR Test Plan and Scaling-80

Follow-up to RAI-TR SBLOCA PIRT-75: According to the response to RAI-TR-SBLOCA-PIRT-74, Westinghouse has agreed that the [   ]^{a,c}. Similarly, the response to RAI-TR-SBLOCA-PIRT-74 also states that there is [   ]^{a,c}. However, the updated version of Figure 3-2 shown in response to RAI-TR-SBLOCA-PIRT-103 does not appear to capture these changes. Figure 3-2 shown in response to RAI-TR-SBLOCA-PIRT-103 continues to states that the SDGVs [   ]^{a,c}." Please make appropriate changes to Figures 3-2 and 3-3.

W SMR Test Plan and Scaling-81

Follow-up to RAI-TR SBLOCA PIRT-78: The response cites [   ]^{a,c}

W SMR Test Plan and Scaling-82

Follow-up to RAI-TR SBLOCA PIRT-89: The response to the original RAI provided justification for the importance ranking which is acceptable. However, the rationale for the corresponding importance ranking still states that a [   ]^{a,c}." It is not clear how the [   ]^{a,c}. The rationale is expected to incorporate the justification provided in response to the RAI. Please clarify the rationale and/or make appropriate changes.

W SMR Test Plan and Scaling-83

Follow-up to RAI-TR SBLOCA PIRT-99: Even though the response to the original RAI is acceptable, the definition for the [   ]^{a,c} phenomenon (D37 in Table 3-2 of the LTR) is unclear and does not contain the clarification provided in response to part (a) of the RAI. It is recommended that the definition be updated to clarify the phenomenon T.1.e to improve the LTR and facilitate review.

W SMR Test Plan and Scaling-84

Follow-up to RAI-TR-SBLOCA-PIRT-88: The original RAI only questioned the knowledge ranking form phenomenon E.1 in Table 3-3. The response to the original RAI agreed to change the knowledge ranking to [   ]^{a,c}. However, the response to the original RAI also changed, without justification, the importance ranking for the phenomena to [   ]^{a,c} as seen in the response to RAI-TR-SBLOCA-PIRT-103. The importance ranking was never questioned in the original RAI. Furthermore, detailed justification for decreasing the importance ranking is necessary. Please explain the reason for changing the importance ranking for phenomenon E.1.

W SMR Test Plan and Scaling-85

Follow-up to RAI-TR SBLOCA PIRT-164: The response did not provide sufficient information for staff evaluation. Please supply more information on how the process is modeled in the code, not just the code name and its version.

W SMR Test Plan and Scaling-86

Follow-on to RAI-TR SBLOCA PIRT-118: Please provide the form loss coefficients in the sump injection line and sump coupling valve.

W SMR Test Plan and Scaling-87

Follow-up to RAI-TR SBLOCA PIRT-132: The information provided on structures surrounding the RPV cylindrical wall and lower head is inadequate to visualize or understand the natural circulation flow that can occur around the lower head. Please provide a schematic drawing of [   ]^{a,c}. Furthermore, please explain the role of [   ]^{a,c}.