

Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards
 APR1400 Subcommittee: Open Session

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Rockville, Maryland

Date: Wednesday, April 20, 2016

Work Order No.: NRC-2327

Pages 1-235

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.
Court Reporters and Transcribers
1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 234-4433

DISCLAIMER

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION'S
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON REACTOR SAFEGUARDS

The contents of this transcript of the proceeding of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, as reported herein, is a record of the discussions recorded at the meeting.

This transcript has not been reviewed, corrected, and edited, and it may contain inaccuracies.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON REACTOR SAFEGUARDS

(ACRS)

+ + + + +

APR1400 SUBCOMMITTEE

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

APRIL 20, 2016

+ + + + +

ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

+ + + + +

The Subcommittee met at the Nuclear
Regulatory Commission, Two White Flint North, Room
T2B1, 11545 Rockville Pike, at 8:30 a.m., Ronald G.
Ballinger, Chairman, presiding.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

RONALD G. BALLINGER, Chairman

DENNIS C. BLEY, Member

CHARLES H. BROWN, JR. Member

MICHAEL L. CORRADINI, Member

DANA A. POWERS, Member

HAROLD B. RAY, Member

JOY REMPE, Member

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

PETER RICCARDELLA, Member

GORDON R. SKILLMAN, Member

JOHN W. STETKAR, Member

DESIGNATED FEDERAL OFFICIAL:

CHRISTOPHER BROWN

ALSO PRESENT:

JEFF CIOCCO, NRO

SANGYOUN JEON, KNF

WONSANG JEONG

YONGGUN KIM, KEPSCO-AE

JAERYONG LEE, KHNP

MARVIN LEWIS*

JIYONG (ANDY) OH, KHNP

TAESUN RO, KHNP

ROB SISK, Westinghouse

DONNA WILLIAMS, NRO

*participating via telephone

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Opening Remarks

Ron Ballinger.....4

Introductory Remarks

Donna Williams.....5

Jaeyong Lee.....6

Overview of APR1400 Design Certification (DC)

Jeff Ciocco.....7

Overview of the APR1400 DC Project

Jaeyong Lee.....42

APR1400 System Design

Nuclear Steam Supply System

Taesun Ro.....60

Fuel Design

Sangyoun Jeon.....86

Containment System

Yonggun Kim.....97

Opportunity for Public Comment

Marvin Lewis.....121

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

8:31 a.m.

CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: The meeting will please come to order.

This is a meeting of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards Subcommittee on the Advanced Power Reactor APR1400 Application.

I'm Ron Ballinger, Chairman of the Subcommittee. Subcommittee members in attendance are -- everybody. Dennis Bley, Pete Riccardella, Harold Ray, Gordon Skillman, Dana Powers, Mike Corradini, John Stetkar, Charles Brown, Joy Rempe. That's it.

The purpose of this meeting is to receive a briefing and an overview on the APR1400 design.

The Subcommittee will hear presentations, the first of many, many, many in the future, by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff and Korea, or KHNP, the applicant regarding these matters.

The Subcommittee will gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts and formulate proposed positions and actions as appropriate for deliberation by the Full Committee.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 Christopher Brown is the Designated
2 Federal Official for this meeting.

3 The rules for participation in today's
4 meeting have been announced as part of the notice
5 of this meeting previously published in the *Federal*
6 *Register* on 1 April, 2016. Portions of this
7 meeting may be closed to protect information that
8 is proprietary to KHNP; that will be this afternoon
9 and tomorrow's meeting, pursuant to 5 USC
10 552(b)(c)(4).

11 A transcript of the meeting is being
12 kept and will be made available as stated in the
13 *Federal Register* notice.

14 It is requested that speakers first
15 identify themselves -- actually first press the
16 little green button, identify themselves and speak
17 with sufficient clarity and volume so they can be
18 readily heard. Also, silence please all cell
19 phones and other things that might beep.

20 We have not received any requests from
21 members of the public to make oral statements or
22 written comments.

23 I will now proceed with the meeting,
24 and I'll call on Donna Williams, Branch Chief at
25 NRO, to begin.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WILLIAMS: Good morning. I'm Donna
2 Williams, the Acting Chief of Licensing Branch II
3 in the Office of New Reactors. I would just like
4 to thank KHNP for coming out today to present this
5 to us. I know you're a lot of folks and we
6 appreciate the effort you made and we're looking
7 forward to hearing all the presentations that you
8 have today. I think it will be very informative
9 for all of us. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: So who's the lead?
11 Mr. Lee?

12 DR. LEE: Yes, good morning ladies and
13 gentlemen. My name is Jaeyong Lee. I am the
14 project manager of this APR1400 design
15 certification project of Korea Hydro and Nuclear
16 Power Company.

17 I'd like to take this opportunity to
18 thank NRC staff and the ACRS members for the time
19 today. It's also my honor to have the opportunity
20 to present the overview of this APR1400 design
21 certification to the ACRS Subcommittee members. As
22 you may know KHNP has been eagerly pursuing to
23 obtain the design certification from the U.S. NRC
24 since 2009. It's not only for the design purpose,
25 but also for enhancing the nuclear standard in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Korea. Therefore, KHNP will support fully these
2 resources to reserve all the big issues raised by
3 ACRS and the NRC staff as well. Once again, thank
4 you for joining this scheduled meeting.

5 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Thank you. Next?
6 Oh, Jeff? Okay.

7 MR. CIOCCO: Muscle my way in here
8 amongst KHNP. Excuse me.

9 (Laughter.)

10 MR. CIOCCO: Looks like we're already
11 ahead of schedule.

12 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: That will change.

13 MEMBER STETKAR: Jeff, make sure you
14 turn your mic on. It's behind the laptop there.
15 I've been the -- no, it's right down toward the
16 base. There you go. I'm the designated microphone
17 reminder.

18 MEMBER CORRADINI: And he enjoys that.

19 MEMBER REMPE: Just because it will
20 help later on, why don't you put it over to the
21 side so it's very close to where you're speaking
22 and others might be speaking --

23 MR. CIOCCO: All right.

24 MEMBER REMPE: -- so we don't have to
25 worry about -- we can't hear you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CIOCCO: Okay. Good morning,
2 everybody. My name is Jeff Ciocco. I'm the lead
3 project manager for the NRC and the title of my
4 presentation this morning is the APR1400 Standard
5 Design Certification Review. I have copies of the
6 handouts in the back as well.

7 The agenda, I'm going to talk today,
8 I'm going to talk about the reactor review and the
9 contents of the application. I'm not going to talk
10 about the reactor. It's a big light water reactor,
11 big 1400-megawatt electric PWR. KHNP is going to
12 present that today. I'm not going to present any
13 safety findings. We are doing our safety
14 evaluations right now. I'm going to tell you about
15 the review that's underway, a little bit about the
16 review that happened as the predecessor to this.
17 I'm going to tell you about the application that
18 came in, the contents of it and what the staff is
19 doing now.

20 So the agenda is I'll talk about the
21 APR1400 application. This is Docket 52-046, the
22 46th of the Part 52s. I'm going to talk about the
23 topical reports that we have under review; there's
24 five of them, and I'm going to talk about the
25 actual Design Certification Safety and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Environmental Review which is currently underway.

2 So before I start with the first
3 bullet, which is the current review that's
4 underway, if you'd just give me a minute I'm going
5 to backtrack a little bit and just give you a
6 little bit of the background here.

7 As I think most of you know, the
8 APR1400 is based on the System 80+ design. That
9 was an early Part 2, or an early Part 52
10 certification which is currently -- it's Appendix B
11 to Part 52. It's called the design certification
12 rule for the System 80+ design. The Final Safety
13 Evaluation Report, the FSER, can be found in NUREG-
14 1462, and it was published in August of 1994. It
15 was our second docket in Part 52. It was Docket
16 52-002. So this design is an evolution of that
17 System 80+.

18 And that's some important background
19 because whenever staff comes back later and we
20 present the safety evaluations, you'll see some
21 tracing back to the Final Safety Evaluation Report
22 of the System 80+ where we had to look at deltas
23 where they used codes that were used back on System
24 80+ and how they're applied to the current APR1400.
25 And like I said, this is not the System 80+. This

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 is the APR1400 Docket 52-046, its own stand-alone
2 application. But it's an important reference point
3 and I think KHNP is going to talk about it as well.

4 That System 80+ was initially submitted
5 by Combustion Engineering, which is now ABB-CE.
6 And under the Part 50 regulations it was later
7 requested to be certified under Part 52, which it
8 was years ago. And like I said, that's Appendix B
9 to Part 52.

10 So now getting you up a little more
11 current where we are with the APR1400, the first
12 pre-application began with NRC staff in April of
13 2010, which led up to KHNP and KEPCO jointly
14 submitting its first application for standard
15 design certification on September 30th of 2013.

16 So staff did its acceptance review. We
17 reviewed the application to see if it was
18 sufficiently complete and technically adequate.
19 Well, staff determined and we issued a letter on
20 December 19th of 2013 notifying KHNP and KEPCO that
21 we were not accepting the application for
22 docketing. We issued a non-acceptance letter and
23 in that letter; and it's publically available, we
24 stated that the majority of the application was
25 very good. A lot of the critical design areas were

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 there, but we found several holes in the
2 application that we did not feel were sufficiently
3 completed, technically adequate for us to do a
4 design certification review, particularly in the
5 42-month time frame that NRC had set as a standard
6 for doing this design certification.

7 So we issued that non-acceptance in
8 December of 2013. So between December 2013 and
9 December 2014, my first bullet there, we entered
10 into a second preapplication period with KHNP. So
11 from their letter they had from us, the areas that
12 we felt were insufficient in the first application
13 for them, we called them the non-acceptance issues.
14 And for instance, the digital I&C platform wasn't
15 satisfactory.

16 And there was kind of a laundry list of
17 maybe 9 or 10 things. The PRA wasn't adequate, the
18 environmental report, the severe accident design
19 mitigation alternatives and a few others. Stress
20 corrosion cracking, the reactor core supports.
21 There were a few things that we said they were
22 inadequate in the first application. So KHNP
23 engaged us in a very active second preapplication
24 period to address these non-acceptance areas.

25 We had several public meetings with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 KHNP. They put the pen to paper, they did a lot of
2 reanalysis, a lot of redesign. And at the end we
3 had a public meeting where they kind of presented
4 their stance on the non-acceptance issues, which
5 led them to where we are now, to my first bullet
6 here.

7 So this is the current application. So
8 once again, KHNP and KEPCO jointly submitted a
9 design certification, the Part 52 application, on
10 December 23rd of 2014, which contains; and this is
11 all publically available information, the design
12 control document, the DCD. There's a Tier 1 and
13 Tier 2. And there's a public and non-public
14 version. I'm going to explain that in a minute.

15 They were required to submit an
16 environmental report required under Part 52.47.
17 There's also technical reports that were submitted
18 that kind of sit behind the DCD, about 60. And
19 you'll see they're either -- and this is where the
20 proprietary information is contained or not
21 contained in the application. It sits in the
22 technical reports. And the majority of them are
23 incorporated by reference into the design control
24 document. And you'll see them referenced in the
25 chapters. Some are just provided as technical

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 information to the staff and made publically
2 available, but aren't necessarily referenced in the
3 design control document.

4 And I know I provided Chris and
5 everybody that, because under the requirements of -
6 - I think it's Part 52.53 where we have to refer
7 the application to the ACRS, so I've notified ACRS
8 staff and provided the application, the non-public
9 version, as well as all the underlying topical and
10 technical reports to ACRS. So you have that right
11 now available to you.

12 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Can I ask just one
13 --

14 MR. CIOCCO: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: -- since you're
16 getting into process? When were these design
17 certification documents accepted by staff?

18 MR. CIOCCO: March 4th. That's my next
19 slide. But it's going to be March 4th of 2015,
20 just about a year ago.

21 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Okay.

22 MR. CIOCCO: A year and a month ago.

23 So we have the technical reports. And
24 they also included the design inspection, tests,
25 analysis, and acceptance criteria, ITAAC. That's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in Tier 1. It's in the Tier 1 document. It's also
2 in Section 14.3, which contains the ITAAC. And we
3 also have a public web site which contains the
4 application and the entire review schedule.

5 Next slide.

6 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Jeff, let me ask this
7 question, please.

8 MR. CIOCCO: Yes, please.

9 MEMBER SKILLMAN: For this construct of
10 the technical reports being IBR'd or non-IBR'd in
11 fact up into the DCD what controls are in place to
12 ensure that changes to the technical reports are
13 under some form of configuration control so that
14 our deliberations on the design control document,
15 particularly Tier 1, are not diluted by changes in
16 those technical reports that may be subsequent to
17 our activities?

18 MR. CIOCCO: There's a document flow
19 whenever there's a change to -- for instance, if a
20 request for additional information is written on
21 any particular topic -- and in the response to the
22 RAI we have them answer several questions. First,
23 they answer the question if there's technical
24 analysis, whatever, we ask them is there any
25 change? Based on this RAI response is there any

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 change to the design control document? Any change
2 to the DCD that would be Tier 1 or Tier 2? Is
3 there any change to a technical report? Is there
4 any change to a topical report? Is there any
5 change to the environmental report? Is there any
6 change to the PRA, because that has a lot of
7 tentacles.

8 So we look at changes as kind of a flow
9 up whenever there's a change to a technical report,
10 which could be revised, could be a revision to a
11 technical report. And then it would be reflected,
12 if it's incorporated by reference, in an update to
13 the DCD. We're currently in Rev 0 of the DCD.
14 There could be a Revision 1 later this summer
15 incorporating all of these changes.

16 And ultimately for you whenever you see
17 the staff's Safety Evaluation Report, which is what
18 you're going to review in addition to the DCD, we
19 have to be clear in there what rev of the DCD that
20 we are writing the safety evaluation against -- and
21 for us that's a flow down.

22 We have to be clear on which revision
23 of the technical report, which revision of the
24 topical report and which RAIs. So I think there's
25 pretty good document control starting at the lower

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 levels. The kind of information that sits behind
2 the DCD and how it flows into the DCD.

3 MEMBER STETKAR: Jeff, in simple terms
4 though if they make a change to a technical report,
5 that requires a new revision of the DCD, doesn't
6 it?

7 MR. CIOCCO: Not necessarily. It
8 depends --

9 MEMBER STETKAR: Not necessarily?

10 MR. CIOCCO: No. No, if you look at
11 the references; and not every reference --

12 MEMBER STETKAR: Wait a minute.

13 (Simultaneous speaking.)

14 MR. CIOCCO: -- a Revision 0.

15 MEMBER STETKAR: Aren't --

16 MR. CIOCCO: Because a technical report
17 will be referenced in a chapter by its title and
18 document number, prop and non-prop, but not
19 necessarily Rev 0, Rev 1, Rev 2.

20 MEMBER STETKAR: Okay.

21 MR. CIOCCO: Okay?

22 MEMBER STETKAR: Okay.

23 MEMBER BLEY: The DCD and your SER
24 isn't directly tied to a particular version of the
25 topicals and technical reports.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CIOCCO: They're tied to very
2 specific versions.

3 MEMBER STETKAR: But the topical
4 reports have separate SERs.

5 MR. CIOCCO: Yes, I'll get to that in a
6 minute.

7 MEMBER STETKAR: Technical reports --
8 I've always viewed technical reports as just an
9 adjunct to the text of the DCD.

10 MR. CIOCCO: Correct. They sit behind
11 the DCD and some are -- yes. Yes, but we have to
12 be clear whenever we come in and present this.
13 Whenever we present the safety evaluation we'll let
14 you know. It'll be in the text as well, but there
15 will be a summary from us which DCD chapter we
16 reviewed, what technical report and what versions.
17 So you have all of that information. We don't want
18 any doubt in your minds of which -- if a technical
19 report was updated -- and they do get revved --
20 that you have the most current revision of that
21 technical report.

22 MEMBER BLEY: It's been a couple years
23 since I sat through a design cert, but a couple of
24 them I have these awful memories of --

25 MR. CIOCCO: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER BLEY: -- you guys all -- both
2 the applicant and you guys coming in and giving us
3 all this stuff. And when we start asking
4 questions, the response is, oh, well, that's all
5 changed in the new version, which makes the review
6 really difficult.

7 MR. CIOCCO: Well, I have a big
8 aversion to that happening as well, and certainly
9 don't want it to happen. And we'll take the steps.
10 I mean, there were a lot of lessons learned I think
11 from the prior design certification, because there
12 are tens of thousands of pages of information that
13 have to be reviewed on these big, big PWRs, no
14 doubt about it. So we try to painstakingly work
15 with your staff so you know what revision of the
16 DCD, technical reports, topical reports, as well as
17 the thousands of RAI questions and responses that
18 are answered. So we'll make sure. I mean --

19 MEMBER BLEY: But let me follow up with
20 one --

21 MR. CIOCCO: Yes.

22 MEMBER BLEY: -- because one thing we
23 began to see was in between actual submitted
24 revisions of the DCD as the RAIs went on there's --
25 at least in one case I remember, the seemed to be a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 continuing update, not published, of the DCD. And
2 finally we started getting to see that just before
3 the meetings when everybody came in. Because
4 otherwise, it's not worth our time reviewing.

5 MR. CIOCCO: I understand.

6 MEMBER REMPE: So you mentioned the
7 connection between this plant and the System 80+,
8 but if this -- as you said, this application will
9 be a new application.

10 MR. CIOCCO: That is correct.

11 MEMBER REMPE: And so, if there's any
12 history with containment atmospheric pressure, CAP
13 --

14 MR. CIOCCO: Yes. Right. Right.
15 Right.

16 MEMBER REMPE: -- credit, that's
17 irrelevant. This is a new plant, right?

18 MR. CIOCCO: Anything is irrelevant
19 unless it's referenced in this application --

20 (Laughter.)

21 MR. CIOCCO: -- if they reference back
22 specifically.

23 MEMBER REMPE: But what the staff --

24 MR. CIOCCO: And I'm not going to --

25 MEMBER REMPE: -- did in the past is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 irrelevant with respect to CAP credit, right?

2 MEMBER CORRADINI: I think what --

3 MR. CIOCCO: Oh, yes.

4 MEMBER CORRADINI: -- Dr. Rempe is
5 asking if there's something that happens to be
6 historically similar, we're not going to be
7 referred back to the System 80+. We're going to
8 see an analysis that's specific for this design.
9 That's my interpretation of the question.

10 MEMBER REMPE: Right. And it's a new
11 design and decisions about CAP should be new.

12 MEMBER CORRADINI: Well, for example.

13 MEMBER REMPE: For example.

14 MR. CIOCCO: Right. Right. Yes, true.

15 MEMBER REMPE: Okay.

16 MR. CIOCCO: And there are certainly --
17 we as staff review the application and we see where
18 they reference back to a System 80+, a code, an
19 analysis, whatever, and whether we have to go back
20 and look at the deltas between that and this
21 application. Correct.

22 MEMBER BROWN: Jeff, I have --

23 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Jeff, I --

24 MR. CIOCCO: Yes?

25 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Excuse me. Charlie,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 go ahead.

2 MEMBER BROWN: In my particular area,
3 back to the technical reports again, the first
4 question is is the DCD as what have been presently
5 given --

6 MR. CIOCCO: Yes, sir.

7 MEMBER BROWN: -- complete at this
8 point?

9 MR. CIOCCO: Yes, sir. It's Rev 0.
10 Yes.

11 MEMBER BROWN: Do the technical reports
12 at the -- the technical reports are not works in
13 progress? They are complete at this point?

14 MR. CIOCCO: They are --

15 MEMBER BROWN: They are something
16 that's being revised or the design is being
17 changed? I'm particularly interested in one of the
18 past projects, maybe two of them, the resolutions
19 of some of the comments or the concerns we had in
20 my area. They were incorporated into the technical
21 report based on the letters and reports we wrote,
22 which really did necessitate an update to the DCD
23 and show the explicit revision of the technical
24 report in the DCD so that you had that resolution
25 documented --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CIOCCO: Yes.

2 MEMBER BROWN: -- as part of the
3 design. So I'm sitting here munching away on,
4 well, you may not have revisions listed in the DCD.
5 And that's fine, but somewhere -- well, it's not
6 fine, maybe.

7 (Laughter.)

8 MR. CIOCCO: Well, let me say that the
9 application was docketed in March of last year, so
10 we're 13 months into the review. Everything is
11 fluid at this point. Staff is in -- and I'm going
12 to get to a slide about where we are in the review.
13 Nothing is completed yet. Our safety evaluations
14 in Phase 2, the ones that we're taking to the ACRS,
15 are not completed. They are in review. So
16 everything is fluid. RAIs are being written. RAIs
17 are being responded to. Changes are being made by
18 change pages in the RAI responses. Some to
19 technical reports. Some to DCD information being
20 added. So, yes, things are fluid right now.

21 MEMBER BROWN: So I guess my --

22 MR. CIOCCO: Yes. I mean, they have to
23 be because we are in the review.

24 MEMBER BROWN: I understand that point.

25 MR. CIOCCO: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER BROWN: Yes, I don't quibble
2 with that. I'm just trying to get a grip on when
3 we review certain specific areas --

4 MR. CIOCCO: Yes.

5 MEMBER BROWN: -- when we write a
6 report and have concerns or have recommendations --

7 MR. CIOCCO: Right.

8 MEMBER BROWN: -- if they are agreed
9 to, we may have to insist that they be incorporated
10 in the DCD as opposed to a technical report.

11 MR. CIOCCO: Sure.

12 MEMBER BROWN: In other words, you IBR
13 the technical report with these exceptions or these
14 changes made and the DCD.

15 (Simultaneous speaking.)

16 MEMBER BROWN: I'm just trying to
17 figure out how we do that when --

18 MR. CIOCCO: Yes.

19 MEMBER BROWN: -- and the letter
20 writing.

21 MR. CIOCCO: If it comes out in your
22 letter writing out of your Phase 3 completion --
23 and we'll look at your recommendations. You
24 obviously look at our safety evaluation and --

25 MEMBER BROWN: I'm not looking for ones

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you reject. I'm looking --

2 MR. CIOCCO: Yes.

3 MEMBER BROWN: -- at the ones you agree
4 with --

5 MR. CIOCCO: Right.

6 MEMBER BROWN: -- and pass through and
7 the licensee or the applicant agrees with also. So
8 --

9 MR. CIOCCO: Yes. Yes.

10 MEMBER BROWN: All right. I was just
11 trying to get a calibration.

12 MR. CIOCCO: Yes. Yes, we understand.
13 We are writing the review. This review was front-
14 end loaded. We're in the middle of a six -- it's a
15 six-phase review, so -- and we're only 13 months
16 into a large, large review.

17 MEMBER BROWN: Understood. Thank you.

18 MEMBER STETKAR: Jeff, something you
19 said -- kind of a follow-up of what Dennis asked.
20 He said, well, in the RAIs there are commitments to
21 change pages for the DCD. That's the type of
22 process that really frustrated us in our Phase 2
23 reviews, because everything was in a state of flux
24 and it's all documented in the RAIs.

25 I will tell you that none of us have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the time to go read RAIs. None of us have the time
2 to do that. So if it's not --

3 PARTICIPANT: Not even you?

4 MEMBER STETKAR: Not even me.

5 (Laughter.)

6 MEMBER STETKAR: And if it's not
7 documented in the SER that's delivered to the
8 Subcommittee --

9 MR. CIOCCO: Right. Right.

10 MEMBER STETKAR: -- and the Full
11 Committee for the Phase 2 review, that's -- and
12 that's when stuff is in --

13 (Simultaneous speaking.)

14 MR. CIOCCO: Yes, correct. I
15 understand what you're saying, yes.

16 MEMBER STETKAR: That's --

17 MR. CIOCCO: Yes. I understand, yes.

18 MEMBER STETKAR: -- where it leads to
19 frustration --

20 MR. CIOCCO: Right. Right.

21 MEMBER STETKAR: -- because we have had
22 that experience where there's this undercurrent of
23 stuff that's all buried in the RAIs, and we don't
24 have the time to review that.

25 MR. CIOCCO: Right. Right. It's --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER STETKAR: It's bad enough that
2 we have to read a couple thousand pages of stuff a
3 week.

4 MR. CIOCCO: I understand, and I know
5 what your requirements are in the 52.53 for the
6 review and -- but, I mean, out of necessity when
7 they do an RAI
8 -- and I'm not talking about commitments. I'm
9 talking about actual changes --

10 MEMBER STETKAR: Yes.

11 MR. CIOCCO: -- in the RAI response.
12 Out of necessity in responding to an RAI they may
13 have to make a change to the DCD and to a technical
14 report, and maybe a topical report.

15 MEMBER STETKAR: And that's exactly
16 what I'm talking about.

17 MR. CIOCCO: And I understand what
18 you're saying. You want to see it reflected when
19 you review, right, so you're on the same page as we
20 are whenever we write the Safety Evaluation Report.
21 Yes. Yes, I understand.

22 MEMBER SKILLMAN: I wanted to pull on
23 an answer that you gave to John regarding changes
24 and whether those changes actually are a change to
25 the design cert.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CIOCCO: Yes.

2 MEMBER SKILLMAN: John kind of raised
3 that question if there are changes. You said no,
4 that's not a change in the cert. It strikes me
5 that the way 52 is written, if there is a change to
6 Tier 1, if the design cert had already been
7 approved, that requires a license amendment.

8 MR. CIOCCO: Oh, right.

9 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Hold that thought.

10 MR. CIOCCO: Okay.

11 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Now we're talking
12 about underlying information that affects Tier 1
13 presentation in the DCD. And I would assert if the
14 technical reports and topical reports amend Tier 1
15 information, we're heading for a rev on the DCD.

16 MR. CIOCCO: Correct. Sure. And the
17 same with Tier 2.

18 MEMBER SKILLMAN: So the answer to John
19 would have been --

20 MR. CIOCCO: And the same --

21 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Okay.

22 MR. CIOCCO: -- with Tier 2. Sure.
23 Any response from KHNP to a question that we ask,
24 or on their own necessity, a change to Tier 1 or
25 Tier 2 will be captured in the next revision of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DCD. It has to be.

2 MEMBER SKILLMAN: I think that that's
3 what John asked. So the answer is really yes, not
4 no?

5 MEMBER BLEY: Well, there's two pieces.

6 MR. CIOCCO: The answer is --

7 MEMBER BLEY: The technical information
8 will get rolled into the DCD, but the actual rev
9 number of the document will not of the technical
10 report.

11 MR. CIOCCO: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: I think what
13 you're hearing loud and clear is that the staff
14 should have T-shirts that say "42 months" on the
15 front of them. And we have a lot of work to do in
16 42 months and we need to be sure that we don't
17 complicate things by having confusion.

18 MR. CIOCCO: I understand. I
19 understand they are --

20 MEMBER SKILLMAN: What I'm talking
21 about is crisp control of configuration management
22 on the documentation so we know what you reviewed,
23 you know what we're looking at, and we are on the
24 same page.

25 MR. CIOCCO: I Understand.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER SKILLMAN: That's the only --

2 MR. CIOCCO: That's our responsibility.

3 MEMBER SKILLMAN: That's my only point.

4 MR. CIOCCO: Correct. Yes. These are
5 complex reviews.

6 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Thank you.

7 MR. CIOCCO: We understand, yes.

8 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Okay. Thank you,
9 Jeff.

10 MR. CIOCCO: Okay. You're welcome.

11 Okay. All right. So the next page,
12 the regulations require us to make certain
13 notifications upon receipt of the application, to
14 conduct an acceptance review and to docket the
15 application. So what I start with -- let's see if
16 my pointer works here -- maybe not. Is that
17 working?

18 Anyway, the first bullet tells you when
19 this application came in, December 23rd of 2014.
20 Then we wrote the letter of receipt on February
21 2nd, to KHNP, to the co-applicants. We also had a
22 -- we were required to publish in the *Federal*
23 *Register* a notice of receipt of the application.
24 So between December 23rd and March 4th of 2015 we
25 conducted our acceptance review of the application.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 This was a -- we evaluate the application for the
2 sufficiency of completeness as well as the
3 technical adequacy for staff to be able to conduct
4 a technical review of the application.

5 So as you can see, we determined once
6 the application was resubmitted that we did docket
7 the application on March 4th. That was also
8 published in the *Federal Register* notice, a
9 docketing on March 12th. And then we issued our
10 schedule letter a few months after which laid out
11 our six-phase review schedule I'm going to show you
12 in a second.

13 And I also included a kind of
14 significant date here. This is kind of jumping
15 ahead a little bit, but we issued a letter last
16 month on March 3rd kind of updating the status of
17 the review in this publically available schedule
18 letter to KHNP and KEPCO. And what we said, we
19 pretty much said three things: We said the good
20 news is that Phase 1 of the review is complete.
21 We've issued internally our preliminary Safety
22 Evaluation Report and we've issued RAIs. Phase 1
23 is completed on schedule.

24 We also said Phase 2 is currently
25 underway. Phase 2 is on schedule, however, there's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a lot of technical challenges that are being worked
2 on and in order for us to meet our aggressive
3 schedule here we need to resolve these technical
4 issues.

5 And we also said in -- the third kind
6 of message of this was by the summer of this year
7 we want to meet with you and kind of do an
8 assessment of the progress of this review and make
9 sure that we're still on schedule to meet the 42-
10 month schedule and our Phase 2 milestones. So that
11 was a pretty significant letter that was issued on
12 March 3rd.

13 Now I'm going to just jump ahead. Just
14 so you can see, this is the -- here's the standard
15 contents of the design certification application.
16 It includes the application submittal letter. And
17 so everything here is publically available. I know
18 it's small print, but you've got handouts. It's
19 got the application letter itself. It's got the
20 environmental report, Tier 1.

21 And the next you'll see is the 19
22 chapters of the design control document. And what
23 it doesn't show is under Chapter 19 there's --
24 Chapter 19.1 is the PRA; 19.2 is severe accidents.
25 Standard Chapter 19. It also includes in Chapter

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 19, not shown here, is -- 19.3 is the beyond-
2 design-basis external events, the Fukushima
3 evaluation, 19.4 is the loss of large area fires,
4 and 19.5 is the aircraft impact assessment. And
5 KHNP is going to get into some of the technical
6 details of that, but those are subsections under
7 Chapter 19. So the importance of this page is it
8 shows you this is all of the publically available
9 information of the DCD, and it's on our public web
10 site.

11 If you go to page 6, what's -- and this
12 is important for your review to know is that these
13 are the chapters which also contain non-public
14 information. This has the security-related
15 information. And I didn't put the accession
16 numbers here, but as you're doing your review
17 you're going to notice that these chapters have a
18 public and non-public version. And you have the
19 non-public version. So these contain security-
20 related information. That was the only purpose of
21 this slide was just to show you of that big subset
22 this is a small subset of those on the first slide.
23 So that's the application.

24 Next I'm going to talk just briefly
25 about the topical reports that we have in house.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 There are five topical reports that are
2 incorporated by reference into the APR1400 DCD.
3 You can find them referenced in Chapter 1 as well
4 as the specific chapters. These were submitted
5 back in 2012. These were submitted in advance of
6 the application.

7 One of the topical reports is the QAPD,
8 the Quality Assurance Program description. And
9 staff has issued its safety evaluation on this.
10 And I think they're on Rev 4 of the QAPD. They
11 have to update it regularly mainly as they change
12 organization because it contains a lot of the KHNP
13 and KEPCO organizations charts in there. And
14 that's really the only changes. This is the Part
15 50 Appendix B QAPD. It's approved. Staff has
16 issued and published its Safety Evaluation Report.

17 We're currently conducting the detailed
18 licensing reviews of the four remaining topical
19 reports. As Mr. Stetkar said, a Safety Evaluation
20 Report, a stand-alone Safety Evaluation Report will
21 be prepared for each of the topical reports. The
22 SERs will be reviewed by KHNP and then presented
23 for approval to the ACRS. Typically we present
24 these, as we have in the past, with its related
25 chapter of the DCD. And I'll explain that in a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 second.

2 Next is just a table showing you what
3 the five topical reports are and its related DCD
4 Tier 2 section. So the first one is the large
5 break LOCA methodology. And that's 6.2, mostly in
6 Section 15.60, Accident Analysis. That's under
7 review. Next is the critical heat flux
8 correlation. It's the DNBR evaluation. Thermal
9 design, that's Section 44 as well as some in
10 Chapter 15. Then we have the PLUS7 fuel design
11 topical report. And you can see these are all in
12 Rev -- these except for the QAPD are all in Rev 0.

13 The Quality Assurance Program
14 description document, which is tied to Chapter 17,
15 that's already been completed. And the fluidic
16 device, which is that -- it's a flow damper which
17 sits in the bottom of the advanced accumulator, the
18 fluidic device design for the APR1400. And we have
19 completed the review of the fluidic device topical
20 report. We've just issued the safety evaluation to
21 KHNP. They're doing a prop review as well as a
22 factual accuracy check.

23 Once that's completed we get their
24 comments, we make the revisions. We'll be sending
25 that down to the ACRS. That will be the first

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 safety evaluation that you have. We've pretty much
2 completed our review and we're going through
3 issuing right now the critical heat flux
4 correlation, the DNBR analysis, topical report. So
5 we made really good progress on these topical
6 reports and the reviews are underway.

7 Okay. Now where we are currently with
8 the APR1400 DCD review. As I mentioned awhile ago,
9 this is the 42-month schedule that the NRC has
10 issued. And prior to the application coming in and
11 prior to being documented, the Agency recognized
12 the need to do things differently and try to
13 deliver our products on a faster schedule while
14 still meeting all of our safety review
15 responsibilities before we came up with this 42-
16 month schedule. So a lot of preparation was
17 underway and the preapplication is to help us meet
18 and produce a 42-month schedule on this project.

19 A couple things we knew coming into
20 this. This is pretty much a known design.

21 Yes?

22 MEMBER STETKAR: Before you launch into
23 this slide --

24 MR. CIOCCO: Okay.

25 MEMBER STETKAR: -- my neurons are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 firing really slow this morning. They've submitted
2 five topical reports. Is that the full set of
3 topicals that they plan, or are there plans for
4 topicals in other areas? Do you know?

5 MR. CIOCCO: I don't know of any
6 additional interest in submitting any other topical
7 reports.

8 KHNP, do you?

9 PARTICIPANT: No, no.

10 MEMBER STETKAR: Okay.

11 MEMBER CORRADINI: So everything else -
12 -

13 MEMBER STETKAR: I was just trying to
14 get a handle on topicals because that's --

15 MEMBER CORRADINI: Others -- okay.

16 MEMBER STETKAR: Thank you.

17 MR. CIOCCO: Yes. So, right. So
18 that's the scope. The DCD, the technical reports
19 and topical reports.

20 So as I was saying, as far as us
21 building just a little bit of the background and
22 building the 42-month schedule, this is a known
23 design. We've been through two preapplication
24 periods with them. We have the topical reports.
25 The applicant made good progress on many of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 complex issues prior to submitting the application
2 like on their GSI-191, some performance design
3 testing that they did prior to submitting the
4 application. We did some things internally as far
5 as prioritizing the project, made sure that we had
6 the staffing before we built.

7 And this kind of gets to where I'm at
8 now. This is our six-phase review schedule
9 completion dates. And these are the end dates.
10 And if you look at the first -- the 42-month
11 schedule is encompassed from when the application
12 was tendered in March of 2015 through the end of
13 Phase 6 here, which is September 2018. That's the
14 42-month schedule. And then on top of that we have
15 the rulemaking which goes out beyond that because
16 we have to issue the final Safety Evaluation
17 Report.

18 So Phase 1, as I said, is completed.
19 It was completed on schedule. That went from March
20 of 2015 through February 2016. Phase 2, writing a
21 Safety Evaluation Report with open items, is
22 underway. And staff has -- and if you listen
23 carefully, you can probably hear people putting
24 pencil to paper upstairs right now as they're
25 writing the safety evaluation, kind of music to my

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 ears. But they've actually delivered to me --

2 MEMBER CORRADINI: People actually
3 pencil and paper?

4 (Laughter.)

5 MR. CIOCCO: Yes, we do. Yes.

6 MEMBER CORRADINI: Just checking.

7 MR. CIOCCO: As well as computers. But
8 we have several sections already completed in Phase
9 2 and there are no open items. And that's really
10 our goal was to do a really complete Phase 1
11 review, review the DCD in detail, review the
12 technical reports and topical reports, identify any
13 holes that you find there, put the pen to paper,
14 write the preliminary safety evaluation and then
15 write RAIs against that document. So we're really
16 trying to front-end load the review to have as few
17 open items as we can in Phase 2 of the review.

18 And then you can see the other Phase 3
19 -- and these will go along in parallel. These
20 aren't in series. So --

21 MEMBER CORRADINI: Since you're into
22 process --

23 MR. CIOCCO: Yes.

24 MEMBER CORRADINI: So to -- I won't use
25 the words "speed things up." To be more

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 expeditious in your -- do you meet more with the
2 KHNP folks face-to-face to essentially clarify
3 issues and then document the clarifications
4 appropriately, or is it more back and forth? I'm
5 trying to understand --

6 MR. CIOCCO: It's both actually. I'll
7 get to that. But it's really both. We try to use
8 all of the best tools we have at our disposal in
9 addition to obviously reading the documents. We
10 write RAIs. We have public meetings. We average
11 three to four public meetings per week. We do a
12 lot of audits to look at the calculations behind
13 the DCD. We have face-to-face public meetings. We
14 have public teleconferences with KHNP.

15 So we try to implement all of the tools
16 that the agency has to conduct a good licensing
17 review. Because everything really needs to be at
18 our disposal for us to meet a 42-month schedule.
19 So we're really trying to implement all of the best
20 practices that we have over all these years of
21 doing these big design certification reviews.

22 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: So I look at this
23 and I see ACRS in two places. And I did the math.

24 MR. CIOCCO: Yes.

25 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Seven months to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 review the SER with open items and six months to
2 review the FSER with no open items based on that
3 time schedule.

4 MR. CIOCCO: Yes. Yes, so we've been
5 working with your staff as far as when we can start
6 coming down with -- since these phases run in
7 parallel, Phase 2 is a completion date of November
8 16th, however, we're going to start producing
9 chapters of the safety evaluation in advance of
10 that date so we can start meeting with the
11 subcommittees and the full committees prior to the
12 completion date of the overall Phase 3 of June 20
13 next year.

14 So our goal is to present to the
15 subcommittees and the full committees all of our 19
16 chapters plus the three additional in 19.3, 4 and
17 5 to the ACRS subcommittees and the full committees
18 before that June 20th date. Phases 3 and 5 aren't
19 necessarily critical path. Finishing Phase 6
20 ultimately is the goal, writing the Final Safety
21 Evaluation Report.

22 And I mean, you have your job to do
23 under 52.53. We understand that. But we had to
24 look at the -- we had to build a schedule based on
25 42-month, and it's a non-trivial exercise looking

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 at the resources of the staff, looking at prior
2 reviews and how much time it takes to do a six-
3 phase review, how much time to put in Phase 1,
4 Phase 2, Phase 3, Phase 4, 5 and 6, and several
5 iterations with our staff and management to kind of
6 come up with what we thought was the best fit at
7 the time to do 42 months from March of 2015 through
8 September of 2018.

9 But you're right, Dr. Ballinger, there
10 is -- we do have the time allotted for Phase 3 and
11 Phase 5, and we want to work closely with Chris and
12 staff to get those chapters scheduled.

13 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Jeff, let me ask
14 this: What discipline is provided to make sure
15 that when the staff is requesting additional
16 information that that need really exists and that
17 the staff is just not exercising KHNP?

18 MR. CIOCCO: Right. Well, we follow --
19 I mean, the office -- the Agency has guidance as
20 far as writing RAIs. Our Office of New Reactors
21 has guidance to the staff. I mentioned awhile ago
22 that we took a lot of steps before the application
23 was submitted and doing a lot of reviews with the
24 technical staff as to how to write a safety
25 evaluation, you know, some of the best practices.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 What are the best practices for writing an RAI?

2 And we made the guidance available. We
3 had training for the staff. And a good RAI
4 contains, first off, the regulatory basis. What's
5 the reason that you need to ask the RAI? So
6 whenever -- and we have generally four staff,
7 including management, two management and two staff,
8 reviewing each RAI before it gets issued.

9 Number one, is there a good regulatory
10 basis for asking the question? What is the
11 acceptance criteria that the staff needs to make a
12 finding on that is the basis for asking the
13 question? And then what is the question that's
14 being asked? So we have the guidance. We have
15 training for the staff, we exercise due diligence
16 and we have the checks as the approvals before it
17 goes out to the applicant.

18 And, I mean, we've got a lot of
19 positive feedback from the applicant that the value
20 of the RAIs -- they go out draft to the applicant
21 before they become final and the feedback is that
22 they're very good questions. And some they can
23 answer in 30 days that we ask and some take a
24 little bit longer because of technical analysis.
25 But we make sure that we have the checks and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 balances in place to make sure that we're not
2 asking trivial RAIs.

3 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Okay. Thank you,
4 Jeff.

5 MR. CIOCCO: Yes, you're welcome.

6 And then, so those are six phases in
7 the rulemaking including the environmental
8 assessment.

9 So this is kind of where we're at. My
10 next slide. I just have two more slides. One is
11 the -- Phase 1 is completed. Phase 2 review is in
12 its 10th month, because right out of Phase 1 we had
13 some sections that were done within three or four
14 months. They wrote a preliminary Safety Evaluation
15 Report. Some had an RAI; some didn't. As soon as
16 they were done, we jumped right in and we started a
17 Phase 2 review right away. So that's why it's in
18 its 10th month. These reviews are going along in
19 parallel.

20 The environmental review is underway.
21 We have to write an environmental assessment. The
22 majority of this is the SAMDA, the Severe Accident
23 Mitigation Design Alternatives. That's included in
24 the NEPA documentation. RAIs are being issued,
25 responded to, evaluated and dispositioned as we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 speak. This has been going on since we started the
2 review.

3 As I mentioned earlier to a question,
4 we are utilizing public meetings, audits,
5 inspections in the review process as a means to
6 review as much information behind the DCD and stuff
7 that staff needs to make its findings. All these
8 tools are being implemented as part of our review.

9 And then finally just in summary, the
10 Phase 2 safety evaluations with open items and
11 associated topical report. Safety evaluations will
12 be -- they're currently underway. They're being
13 written and they will be presented to the ACRS in
14 Phase 3 of the review process, the Subcommittee and
15 Full Committee.

16 So that's the conclusion of my just
17 kind of contents. What are we doing? This is what
18 we're doing. Thank you very much.

19 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Questions?

20 (No audible response.)

21 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Thank you.

22 MR. CIOCCO: Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: We're now back on
24 schedule.

25 DR. LEE: Good morning. My name is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Jaeyong Lee, the project manager. I am very
2 pleased to share the work with you. I present a
3 brief overview of the APR1400 design certification
4 project. More details will be present by our
5 experts after my presentation.

6 After general introduction to the
7 status of nuclear power generation in Korea I
8 briefly go over the history. Then I present the
9 design features and the general arrangement of the
10 APR1400. After that I'll talk briefly about the
11 design review status. Finally, I conclude my
12 presentation.

13 First, brief, currently there are 24
14 nuclear power plants operating nationwide in Korea.
15 There are four major sites. One on the west coast
16 and three on the east coast. On the west coast
17 it's a Hanbit power station, which six plants are
18 in operation. Hanul and Wolsong and Kori sites are
19 on the east coast. There are 18 plants in
20 operation. Typically APR1400, four units are under
21 construction and four units are in the planning at
22 Kori and Hanul sites.

23 By the way, I am from this city,
24 Daejeon.

25 (Laughter.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER CORRADINI: All are PWRs, or
2 which are can dos?

3 DR. LEE: The Wolsong site we have four
4 units of can dos.

5 MEMBER CORRADINI: Oh, I see. I'm
6 sorry. I missed that. Excuse me.

7 MEMBER RICCARDELLA: What percentage of
8 the generation in Korea is from these nuclear
9 plants?

10 DR. LEE: There are around 40 percent
11 of electricity came from the nuclear.

12 MEMBER RICCARDELLA: Thank you.

13 DR. LEE: This figure shows the project
14 organization structure of our project. KEPCO.
15 KEPCO is the mother company of all participating
16 companies except Doosan and overseas consult
17 companies. KEPCO and KHNP are co-applicant for
18 this design certification, but all the work related
19 to this practice managed by KHNP. KEPCO Nuclear
20 Fuel is the fuel vendor and KEPCO Engineering and
21 Construction Company, they are the design company
22 for this NSSS design and BOP design. And Doosan
23 Heavy Industries, they are the major equipment
24 vendor. And many foreign engineering companies,
25 including Westinghouse Electric Company and AECOM,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 participating in this project as consultant to
2 KHNP.

3 Korea --

4 MEMBER CORRADINI: Consultants?
5 General consultants or for fuels?

6 DR. LEE: Both way, the general and the
7 specific area. And Korea Atomic Energy Research
8 Institute, KAERI, they perform the thermal
9 hydraulic test for our project.

10 This project was initiated early in
11 2009 through the submission of a letter of intent
12 to the U.S. NRC. From 2010 to 2014 KHNP performed
13 total 18 preapplication meetings with the NRC staff
14 to discuss details and this just -- in late
15 December KHNP submitted design certification
16 application to the NRC. Two months later, as Jeff
17 said, we received a letter from the NRC notifying
18 us of successful docketing. Since then KHNP has
19 successfully responded to RAIs, and Phase 1 review
20 was completed in January this year. This figure
21 shows the docketing.

22 Next I share some of the design
23 features and general arrangements of APR1400.

24 Originally the development of the
25 APR1400 began in 1992. We reached licensing

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 agreement between KHNP and ABB-CE, which is now
2 merged into Westinghouse. KHNP, the
3 Korean design company, has been developing the
4 OPR1000 based on the Palo Verde Unit 2 NSSS design
5 and ANO 2 core design. KHNP incorporated the
6 advanced safety features into improve the OPR1000.
7 Finally APR1400 was born by incorporating more
8 advanced design features and several design
9 features and applying for the latest code and
10 standard to meet these EPRI URD.

11 MEMBER REMPE: Excuse me.

12 DR. LEE: Yes?

13 MEMBER REMPE: As part of the transfer
14 from -- through this licensing agreement with ABB-
15 CE, could you talk a little bit about how much was
16 transferred? For example, the severe accident
17 management guidelines and the emergency operating
18 procedures, was that part of the transfer?

19 DR. LEE: Yes, I think so. The -- most
20 of NSSS design technology was transferred to KHNP,
21 including the design company in Korea.

22 MEMBER REMPE: Okay. Thank you.

23 DR. LEE: The reference plant of
24 APR1400 are Shin Kori Units 3 and 4. The Shin Kori
25 Unit 3 is scheduled to go into commercial operation

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 around the middle of this year. And the same type
2 of reactors are being built in Barakah, UAE. And
3 as I mentioned earlier, six more plants, six more
4 units of the APR1400 are under construction or
5 planning in Korea.

6 MEMBER CORRADINI: So I have a
7 question. What's the black symbol on top of the
8 containment? The black thing. Looks like a bird.

9 (Laughter.)

10 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: It's not a shadow,
11 that's for sure.

12 MEMBER CORRADINI: Since I was on the
13 site I never asked that question, so since I'm
14 curious --

15 DR. LEE: I don't know.

16 (Laughter.)

17 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: It's a really big
18 bird casting his shadow, if it's anything else.

19 DR. OH: You know, for Kori site I
20 think it's a --

21 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: A sea gull.

22 DR. OH: The Kori site is including
23 Doosan, so the one represented the bird that they
24 are -- or that sea gull. So it's represented a sea
25 gull, a big sea gull.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER CORRADINI: Curious.

2 MEMBER REMPE: After that important
3 question, I have another question.

4 (Laughter.)

5 MEMBER REMPE: Some of the documents
6 that we've reviewed or we're reviewing now for the
7 DCD will talk about the APR1400 being essentially
8 in the design stage, yet this view graph says it's
9 an essentially complete design. It's under
10 construction.

11 DR. LEE: Right.

12 MEMBER REMPE: How should we interpret
13 those type of comments? Was it because of the --
14 when the documents were issued -- it's a complete
15 design, so when I read that, I'm wondering what I'm
16 reading.

17 MR. SISK: This is Rob Sisk from
18 Westinghouse. Maybe I can help through. It really
19 is a complete design in that they have built --
20 Shin Kori 3 is getting ready to --

21 MEMBER REMPE: Right.

22 MR. SISK: -- line in. But recognize
23 that in the U.S. there are differences that have to
24 be addressed, both in terms of the regulations and
25 in terms of the timing. So it is -- there are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 things in the APR1400 that is being addressed
2 specifically to meet U.S. requirements, NRC
3 requirements. So from that aspect there are design
4 features that have to be addressed to support --

5 (Simultaneous speaking.)

6 MEMBER REMPE: So this is a certified
7 design for the U.S. plant -- to meet U.S.
8 requirements when we finally -- when the NRC gives
9 it a design certification?

10 MR. SISK: That is correct.

11 MEMBER REMPE: Okay.

12 MR. SISK: This will be -- this is
13 being presented as a Part 52 certification for --

14 MEMBER REMPE: Well, I understand that,
15 but I just was curious because I thought --

16 MR. SISK: -- for application.

17 MEMBER REMPE: Okay.

18 MEMBER CORRADINI: So not that we need
19 to care, but I'm still curious. So is Shin Kori 3
20 and 4 identical. Is Barakah identical to Shin Kori
21 3 and 4 or is Barakah closer to what's being
22 presented here?

23 DR. LEE: Yes. It's almost identical,
24 yes.

25 MEMBER CORRADINI: To which?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DR. LEE: Shin Kori 3 and 4 and the
2 Barakah 1 and 2 is -- so almost I think represented
3 as the Shin Kori 3 and --

4 MEMBER CORRADINI: Okay.

5 DR. LEE: -- 4. And basically the --
6 this design, the Shin Kori 3 and 4 design was
7 finalized in the time frame of 2002.

8 MEMBER REMPE: Right.

9 DR. LEE: And now we have more than 10
10 years to get -- between that and now and we need to
11 apply those new code and standard for this --

12 MEMBER REMPE: We see that with other
13 plants in the U.S. and I just -- because this whole
14 design certification process is a little difficult
15 at times because things change.

16 It would be good as we go through this
17 design certification to point out some of the
18 differences between the Barakah and the Shin Kori 3
19 and 4 and then what's occurring here, if we could
20 have that perspective.

21 MR. SISK: Yes, again Rob Sisk,
22 Westinghouse, the consultant to KHNP. Dr. Lee
23 brings a very good point. Recognizing that the
24 design has gone on, one of the things I know the
25 staff and the ACRS is very familiar with is things

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 like AIA.

2 MEMBER REMPE: Yes.

3 MR. SISK: That became very important
4 here. At Fukushima this comes --

5 (Simultaneous speaking.)

6 MEMBER REMPE: Absolutely.

7 MR. SISK: Those have to be
8 incorporated into the design. A lot of effort is
9 going into not just being a stagnant design in
10 Korea or in Barakah, but to incorporate the
11 operating experience and lessons learned to the
12 design.

13 I think where there are some unique
14 differences and changes you'll hear some of that
15 through the discussions.

16 MEMBER REMPE: Yes.

17 MR. SISK: So --

18 MEMBER REMPE: It's a problem with the
19 design certification process when you -- it changes
20 --

21 (Laughter.)

22 MEMBER REMPE: I'll leave at that.

23 MR. SISK: It typically is. I've been
24 involved in the earlier ones.

25 MEMBER REMPE: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. SISK: And one of the nice things
2 about this we hear a little bit in the --

3 (Simultaneous speaking.)

4 MEMBER CORRADINI: So I guess the only
5 thing is to me this is a natural evolution. So
6 you're going to have the Chevrolet appearing in
7 various countries. You'd expect the -- sometimes
8 it's right-hand drive; sometimes it's left-hand
9 drive. It's interesting, but --

10 MR. SISK: Well, the reality is
11 internationally; and I think we could say
12 generally, all the regulators have unique
13 regulatory requirements and needs. APR1400 DCA is
14 designed to meet the U.S. requirements. But
15 recognize we have -- I say "we" on behalf of KHNP
16 and KEPCO -- have the benefit of a constructed
17 plant. And that really I think is something that
18 might be a little bit unique from what we've seen
19 in the past --

20 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: But there's really
21 no point in getting us confused --

22 MEMBER STETKAR: Right. That's right.

23 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: -- between the
24 two.

25 MEMBER STETKAR: When we review the --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Because we confuse
2 ourselves all by ourselves enough.

3 MEMBER STETKAR: When we review the
4 EPR, there are differences between what was
5 submitted for the U.S. EPR compared to what
6 somebody may eventually build somewhere in Europe.
7 But those are irrelevant. And asking questions
8 about why the differences is also irrelevant
9 because what we're reviewing is what is presented
10 to us, stand-alone on its own merits. So that's --
11 if it's insufficiently documented then we ask
12 questions. But differences --

13 MEMBER BLEY: Why don't we all agree to
14 that and move on? I want to advise you of
15 something that will be of interest later, probably
16 not in this week's presentations.

17 You started with a U.S. design and you
18 moved it over there. You probably made changes
19 especially with regard to the control room and
20 procedures. Now you've brought that together for
21 operators in Korea and now we're bringing the
22 design back to the U.S. And I'll be real
23 interested in things you're doing with regard to
24 the control room and with regard to emergency
25 procedures for operators to account for differences

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in practice and even culture between the countries.
2 Westinghouse has some experience in this area in a
3 different design. And when we get to those areas,
4 be real interested in hearing how that translation
5 went from the U.S. to Korea, and especially how
6 it's going from Korea to the U.S. and what things
7 you have to do to adapt this to our practices in
8 operations.

9 DR. LEE: Okay. Thank you.

10 Okay. So design life time of major
11 equipment of the APR1400 on this 60 years. And the
12 power is 4,000 megawatt. And electric power is
13 1,400 megawatt. And primary and secondary
14 operating conditions are the same as those of
15 System 80+, but the primary temperature of the
16 plant is equal to 615 Fahrenheit in the steam
17 generator tubes.

18 The APR1400 for DC deviates from its
19 reference plant in several points such as the
20 ultimate heat sink, single unit area and so on.
21 But in the design change KHNP changed the design of
22 the different plants to take advantage of proven
23 operating plants and their performance.

24 One thing I want to highlight is the
25 effective date of applied code and standard. The

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 code docketing date of APR1400 is August 2014,
2 which is six months before the target docketing
3 date.

4 One of the strongest point of the
5 APR1400 is the coping capability of the station
6 blackout by applying the longer battery time and
7 FLEX implementation. Furthermore, the tolerance to
8 external damages has been improved. It was proved
9 that the APR1400 having improved tolerance for the
10 AIA, loss of large area and physical security
11 analysis.

12 I'm happy to tell you that the APR1400
13 is very sturdy for the safety issues such as GSI-
14 191, experimental studies of LOCA generated debris
15 accumulation and head loss with emphasis on the
16 health effect. It has diverse reactor protection
17 systems for common cause failures.

18 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: When you say
19 "FLEX," do you mean the on-site FLEX equipment that
20 they have in the U.S., or do you mean the complete
21 FLEX process where you have off-site equipment
22 that's available for transport to on-site? So when
23 you say "FLEX," what do you mean when you say "FLEX
24 implementation?"

25 (Simultaneous speaking.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DR. OH: In terms of FLEX
2 implementation for -- we just develop some strategy
3 for the beyond--the-design-basis external event.
4 And some of -- as you know, there's on-site
5 resources and off-site resources. Off-site
6 resources and a DC application don't consider that
7 extant. But the only on-site equipment --

8 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Okay.

9 DR. OH: -- we considered that. In
10 order to accommodate some of on-site equipment, we
11 have some design for connections for our design.
12 That means in a FLEX implementation.

13 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Okay. So it's
14 sort of --

15 DR. OH: The design --

16 (Simultaneous speaking.)

17 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: -- FLEX-like?

18 DR. OH: Right.

19 MEMBER STETKAR: No, it's -- they have
20 an 8-hour Phase 1 FLEX coping strategy and 8 to 72
21 hours using on-site equipment. I don't want to
22 call them portable, but it's very similar to stuff.
23 And after 72 hours you fly stuff in.

24 DR. LEE: Okay. Even though the
25 APR1400 design is based on System 80+ design, there

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 are several differences. Firstly, the containment
2 shape is different. System 80+ has a spherical
3 steel containment, but APR1400 has a cylindrical
4 shape, the pre-stressed concrete containment. And
5 the summary parts are a bit different.

6 And regarding safety injection systems,
7 APR1400 has three DVIs in the safety injection
8 tank, which is one of the passive device to control
9 the SI flow. And as I mention before, the hot leg
10 temperature is down to 621 to 615. And RCS
11 overpressure protection system of the APR1400
12 consists of four POSRV, but the System 80+ has four
13 PSVs and two SDS. The APR1400 adapt integrated
14 head assemblies for the reactor vessel head and
15 this upper structure comparing to conventional head
16 of System 80+. And to minimize the -- and mitigate
17 the severe accidents. We adapt the in-vessel
18 retention and the special cooling systems in the
19 APR1400 in addition to the cavity flooding systems.

20 MEMBER CORRADINI: Can you repeat that
21 again, please, for the severe accident?

22 DR. LEE: Yes. For the severe accident
23 in order to mitigate those severe accident, we
24 adapt this IVR, in-vessel retention, and install
25 core cooling systems into this CFS and PAR.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER CORRADINI: Okay. Thank you.

2 MEMBER REMPE: Actually in the
3 documentation for Section 19 it mentions that it's
4 not taken -- this cavity flooding system is not
5 taking credit for in the PRA, but I was curious,
6 does that mean that you don't include that in your
7 PRA, like inadvertent -- I mean, is the whole
8 system missing from the PRA?

9 DR. OH: I think the cavity flooding
10 system is we take into account for the PRA, but
11 IVR/ERVC we don't give it -- give some credit for
12 the -- in a PRA.

13 MEMBER REMPE: So the system is
14 included in the plant PRA --

15 DR. OH: Right.

16 MEMBER REMPE: -- but it's just you
17 don't take credit for the --

18 (Simultaneous speaking.)

19 DR. OH: Yes.

20 MEMBER REMPE: That's good. Okay.
21 Thank you.

22 DR. LEE: And this picture shows the
23 bird's eye view of APR1400. The containment
24 building is the in front of auxiliary building and
25 divide in four quadrants. And there is a compound

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 building, but it's to the other building.

2 And this drawing shows the main reactor
3 cooling group. And the schematics are the same as
4 those of System 80+ except for the -- this
5 overpressure protection system on top of the
6 pressurizer.

7 This drawing shows the quadrant array
8 of the auxiliary buildings which house the
9 containment building.

10 Now I'm going to show you the review
11 status of the APR1400 design certification so far.

12 This table shows the review schedule
13 for the APR1400 design certification. As you saw
14 already, the Phase 1 review was complete in January
15 this year. Now we are in Phase 2 -- which was
16 stated -- which we hope to complete by November
17 this year. And Phase 3, ACRS review is scheduled
18 for June 2017. If we keep up with all the review
19 phase well, then the final SER will be issued in
20 September of 2018. As the PM of this project I do
21 my best to keep this project on track.

22 KHNP has a lot of interactions with the
23 NRC staff to effectively respond to RAIs. We have
24 five biweekly conference calls. The topics are
25 project managing, PRA, Chapter 3, Chapter 15,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 recently Chapter 9. Those kind of conference
2 calls, as foreign engineers we feel a big burden.
3 And that verifies and confirms our extended design
4 certification either by face-to-face or electric
5 reading room audits. And also we have had QA
6 inspections twice for GSI-191 issue and computer
7 codes.

8 From the GSI-191 inspections in 2014
9 there are four findings for closing. KHNP collect
10 and responded to the findings and all findings were
11 closing of 2015. And just four observations were
12 raised from the computer code inspection held in
13 early March this year. We are correcting those
14 observations using the correctable action plant
15 process.

16 Finally, I summarize and conclude my
17 presentation. The APR1400 adopted proven
18 technologies from the operating experience of the
19 OPR1000 and construction experience with the
20 reference plants. The APR1400 used most of safety
21 analysis code and methodologies of the certified
22 System 80+. The APR1400 standard design approval
23 was issued by Korean regulatory body in 2002. And
24 my last comment is that the APR1400 is an
25 essentially complete design.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Thank you very much for your attention.
2 And any comment or questions would be appreciated.

3 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Okay. We're
4 actually half an hour ahead of schedule by my
5 thing, so we should probably just move on and --

6 MR. SISK: If we can just get a few
7 minutes to change out the presentation and --

8 (Simultaneous speaking.)

9 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Sure.

10 (Pause.)

11 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Okay. We're ready
12 to go?

13 MR. RO: Okay.

14 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Proceed. Thank
15 you.

16 MR. RO: Okay. Good morning. My name
17 is Taesun Ro working for KSNP. It's my great honor
18 to present my topic on the APR1400 NSSS design.

19 First, I will talk about the design
20 overview of the NSSS systems. Then I will talk
21 about the -- briefly major NSSS systems such as
22 reactor coolant system, safety injection system and
23 so on. Then I will explain more detail about the
24 unique design features adopted in the APR1400.
25 Those safety injection tank with fluidic device and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 pressurizer pilot-operated safety relief valve. I
2 will spend some time on these design features
3 later. And finally, I will summarize my
4 presentation.

5 First, design overview. NSSS design of
6 APR1400 is identical to that of Shin Kori Unit 3 in
7 Korea recently under the power ascension tests. It
8 is similar to the System 80+ certified design
9 except for unique design features as explained by
10 Dr. Lee. And it is consistent with the regulations
11 of the United States of America and it adopts the
12 industry codes and standards applicable in the
13 United States.

14 Regulatory basis. APR1400 complies
15 with the NRC regulation documents such as the Code
16 of Federal Regulation, Regulatory Guides and so on.
17 It complies with the rules and regulations in
18 effect as of September 2014 of the United States.

19 Major NSSS systems. The RCS, the
20 reactor coolant system is arranged as two loops
21 with a reactor vessel, two steam generators, four
22 reactor coolant pumps and pressurizer.

23 This is the RCS schematic diagram.
24 It's already explained. The reactor is composed of
25 the reactor vessel: reactor internals, including

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the upper guide structure assembly and the core
2 support barrel assembly; and the reactor core,
3 including the fuel assembly and control element
4 assembly.

5 Reactor coolant pump is a motor-driven,
6 single-stage centrifugal pump. The pump takes
7 suction from the bottom and discharge through
8 radially. The flexible coupling is provide the
9 connect the pump shaft with the motor. The pump
10 flywheel is towards to increase the rotating
11 inertia of the pump, provide sufficient coastdown
12 flow following loss of power to the pumps. RCP
13 shaft seal system has three-stage mechanical seals.
14 This is cooled by seal injection water and high-
15 pressure water cooler.

16 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Sir, please back up
17 two slides.

18 MR. RO: Okay.

19 MEMBER SKILLMAN: On this slide where
20 have these internals been used before?

21 MR. RO: These internals is to -- used
22 for to guide the flow paths, or it's -- and it also
23 used for the support the fuel assembly and so on.

24 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Okay. Thank you.
25 Has this design of internals been used anywhere

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 else?

2 MR. RO: Yes, I explain we use this
3 design for the Shin Kori Unit 3 and 4, but that's
4 almost the same design concept is used for the
5 OPR1000, as Dr. Lee mentioned.

6 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Same diameter? Same
7 material --

8 (Simultaneous speaking.)

9 MR. RO: Oh, it's a different.

10 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Oh, different?

11 MR. RO: Yes.

12 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Okay. Oh, so has
13 this exact design been used before?

14 MR. RO: As far as the Shin Kori Units
15 3 and 4 the geometry is the same, but the OPR1000
16 is different.

17 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Okay. Geometry is
18 the same. That means the same material
19 thicknesses, the same section thicknesses, the same
20 lengths of ligaments, the same support system from
21 the ledge of the reactor vessel?

22 MR. RO: As far as I know is all same,
23 but I think it's better to check with my expert --

24 (Simultaneous speaking.)

25 MEMBER SKILLMAN: I think that would be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a good idea.

2 MR. RO: -- designs.

3 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: I should remind,
4 if you think that any question that we ask you has
5 to do -- would result in you having to disclose
6 proprietary information, you have to let us know --

7 MR. RO: Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: -- so that we can
9 delay that to further time.

10 MR. RO: Yes. But all my materials
11 include -- does not include any non -- proprietary
12 information.

13 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Yes, I would like
14 that question to stand. The question is where have
15 these internals been used before? The gentleman
16 basically communicated these are identical and have
17 been used before. And I would like to know that
18 that is accurate. Do you understand what I'm
19 asking?

20 MR. RO: Yes, sir.

21 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Thank you.

22 MEMBER REMPE: Well, Dick, I think he
23 said that the geometry is different than the
24 OPR1000, but it's identical to Shin Kori 3 and 4,
25 which is under construction, but he wanted to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 check. So I think it's a little different than
2 what you characterized the response.

3 And so, the materials as well as the
4 geometry differences would be of interest, please.

5 MR. RO: Okay. I will check --

6 MEMBER REMPE: Thank you.

7 MR. RO: -- if there's any difference
8 between the Shin Kori 3 and 4 and the APR1400.

9 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Thank you. Oh, let's
10 go to the reactor coolant pump.

11 MR. RO: Okay.

12 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Three-stage seal.

13 MR. RO: Yes.

14 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Is this seal in use
15 today?

16 MR. RO: Yes, it's the same seals used
17 in the single seal pump.

18 MEMBER SKILLMAN: So are there any
19 changes to the materials of construction or to the
20 seal face design?

21 MR. RO: So, any changes?

22 PARTICIPANT: No, we didn't --

23 (Simultaneous speaking.)

24 MR. RO: No, I don't think that we
25 change any design for the seal.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Same reactor
2 flywheel, same pump flywheel, same design, same
3 material?

4 MR. RO: Same design, yes.

5 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Okay. Thank you.

6 MR. RO: The pressurizer provides the
7 RCS pressure and volume control. It has sufficient
8 capacity to accommodate pressure and volume changes
9 due to operational transients without opening the
10 safety valves. There are four pilot-operated
11 safety relief valves on the top of the pressurizer.
12 The POSRV provides the overpressure protection and
13 manual rapid depressurization of RCS to initiate
14 feed-and-bleed operation in the total loss of
15 feedwater event.

16 Steam generator is a vertical U-tube
17 recirculation type heat exchanger.

18 MEMBER STETKAR: Your pressurizer does
19 not have simple spring-loaded safety valves, right?
20 They're all pilot-operated valves?

21 MR. RO: Right, all pilot-operated
22 valves.

23 MEMBER BLEY: Excuse me. The gentleman
24 running the computer over there, your papers are
25 hitting the microphone. Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. RO: And tube material is alloy
2 690. And this material is highly resistant to the
3 primary water stress corrosion cracking. An
4 integral economizer is employed on the cold leg
5 side of heat exchanger to enhance thermal
6 effectiveness. Flow restricter is installed at the
7 steam generator outlet nozzles to limit the steam
8 flow in the unlikely event of a main steam line
9 break.

10 MEMBER REMPE: Excuse me, Dr. Ro. On
11 the steam generator I'd like to ask a question
12 similar to what my colleague Mr. Skillman asked.
13 Is the length of this steam generator -- is the
14 size of it similar to what's being installed in
15 Shin Kori 3 and 4? And is it larger than what was
16 installed in the OPR1000, or is it the same?

17 MR. RO: It's the same. It's larger
18 than the steam generator of the OPR1000, but --

19 MEMBER REMPE: Okay.

20 MR. RO: -- as far as the Shin Kori 3
21 and 4 is concerned, it's the same size.

22 MEMBER REMPE: And we'll be discussing
23 later some of the testing done to support the Shin
24 Kori 3 and 4, I hope, on the steam generator.

25 MEMBER CORRADINI: I think the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 colleagues are asking about lessons learned, so I
2 guess the closest thermal power plant is Palo
3 Verde. So to me that would be my question. I
4 guess I'd ask a link to an operating plant that's
5 in the country, which I think is closest to Palo
6 Verde in terms of thermal power. So that's, I
7 guess, the logical connection.

8 MEMBER REMPE: Right, but it's higher
9 in thermal power, so I assume it's bigger than
10 what's at Palo Verde.

11 MEMBER CORRADINI: By only 87
12 megawatts.

13 MR. RO: It's bigger than the steam
14 generator of the Palo Verde.

15 MEMBER CORRADINI: Yes, but Palo Verde
16 is 3,913, right?

17 MR. RO: Thirty-nine thirteen --
18 (Simultaneous speaking.)

19 MEMBER CORRADINI: And this is 4,000.

20 MR. RO: This is 4,000, right.

21 MEMBER REMPE: But he said the steam
22 generator is bigger than Palo Verde, though, too.

23 MEMBER CORRADINI: Yes, OCR is --

24 MEMBER REMPE: No, I believe he said --
25 is it bigger or the same size as Palo Verde?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. RO: It's bigger than the steam
2 generator at Palo Verde.

3 MEMBER CORRADINI: Ah.

4 MR. RO: It's bigger than the --
5 naturally bigger than the OPR1000 steam generator.

6 MEMBER CORRADINI: Okay.

7 MR. RO: Yes.

8 MEMBER REMPE: Yes, thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: But T-HOT is 615
10 Fahrenheit --

11 MR. RO: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: -- versus 621. Is
13 that what -- I think that's Palo Verde is.

14 MR. RO: Right. Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: And so the
16 generator had to be a little bigger. And why did
17 you choose 615? Is that the URD thing from --

18 (Simultaneous speaking.)

19 MR. RO: Yes, URD requires the lower
20 temperature than 621, but we cannot meet the URD
21 requirements, though, because the -- it cause very
22 -- had low efficiency in the carbon relationship
23 because the low pressure of the steam generator.
24 So we compromise the -- regarding the temperature.
25 And because the 690 is quite good at the stress

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 corrosion cracking, so we don't think we have to
2 reduce the temperature much.

3 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Yes, URD was 605,
4 right?

5 MR. RO: Yes, right.

6 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Yes.

7 MR. RO: URDs are usually primary
8 stocking.

9 Okay. Then next is safety injection
10 system. The main functions of the safety injection
11 system is to provide emergency core cooling and
12 reactivity and inventory control. SIS also
13 supplies the safety injection flow for feed-and-
14 bleed operation. SIS consists of four mechanically
15 and electrically separate trains. The borate water
16 from the in-containment refueling water storage
17 tank is injected directly to the reactor vessel.

18 MEMBER CORRADINI: Since we've been --
19 we were discussing similar things yesterday, the
20 SIT is a word for -- is similar to the
21 accumulators?

22 MR. RO: Yes. I will explain later.

23 MEMBER CORRADINI: Okay. And then
24 eventually probably in closed session I'd be
25 curious about the actuation pressure. In closed

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 session.

2 MR. RO: Okay.

3 MEMBER CORRADINI: And one last
4 question. The in-vessel refueling water storage
5 tank is literally around the whole outside of the
6 containment?

7 MR. RO: Right.

8 MEMBER CORRADINI: Interesting.

9 MR. RO: Is anyone to -- safety
10 injection tank is inside containment.

11 MEMBER CORRADINI: Yes, I know that.

12 MR. RO: But I --

13 MEMBER CORRADINI: We can wait later.

14 MR. RO: Okay.

15 MEMBER CORRADINI: I just wanted to
16 make sure that SIT is the same thing in other
17 vernacular as an accumulator.

18 MR. RO: Yes.

19 MEMBER CORRADINI: Okay. Thank you.

20 MR. RO: This slide shows the SIS flow
21 diagram. As I said, the SIS is composed of four
22 separate trains and each train contains one safety
23 injection tank with a fluidic device, safety
24 injection pump, valves and connecting pipes. The
25 pump takes suction from the IRWST and is sucked to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the reactor vessel through DVI nozzle.

2 Shutdown cooling system function is to
3 remove decay heat and residual heat in the RCS.
4 The shutdown cooling system consists of two
5 mechanically and electrically separated trains.
6 Shutdown cooling pump is interchangeable with
7 containment spray pump. SCS suction line relief
8 valves provide RCS low temperature overpressure
9 protection.

10 This slide shows the SCS flow diagram.
11 As mentioned, the SCS is composed of two separate
12 trains identical and each train has the shutdown
13 cooling pump, mini-flow exchanger, shutdown cooling
14 heat exchanger, valves and pipes. Shutdown cooling
15 flow comes from the hot leg and returns to the
16 reactor vessel through DVI nozzle. Those valves
17 are the SCS suction line relief valves for RCS low
18 temperature overpressure protection.

19 Chemical and volume control system.
20 The major functions of chemical and volume control
21 system is to provide RCS inventory control,
22 chemistry control and reactivity control. In
23 addition, CVCS provides auxiliary spray to the
24 pressurizer and seal injection to the RCPs.

25 This slide shows the CVCS flow diagram.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The letdown flow from RCS heads through the
2 regenerated heat exchanger and letdown heat
3 exchanger. Then the temperature, letdown
4 temperature drops to the operating temperature of
5 the purification system. Then the letdown flow
6 passes through the letdown orifices and letdown
7 control valves. Then the pressure is also reduced
8 to the operating pressure of the purification
9 system. Then the letdown flow passes through the
10 filters and ion exchanger and enters to the volume
11 control tank.

12 The charging pump normally takes the
13 suction from the volume control tank and discharge
14 to the reactor coolant system through charging
15 nozzle. A portion of the charging flow is diverted
16 to the RCPs or seal injection. When all the
17 centrifugal charging pumps are not available and not
18 operable, then auxiliary charging pump is used for
19 seal injection.

20 Unit design features. Safety injection
21 tank with a fluidic device is an accumulation tank
22 with a passive device that provides inherent
23 reliability without the need for any active
24 components. It controls the injection flow rates
25 during refill and re-flood phases in the event of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 large break LOCA, and thus it ensures effective use
2 of SIT water during LBLOCA.

3 The fluidic device is installed at the
4 bottom part of the SIT. And fluidic device has a
5 supply port at the center and four control ports
6 around the supply port. Supply port is connected to
7 a stand pipe.

8 I brought the fluidic device scaled down
9 model. Let's take a look at --

10 MEMBER REMPE: Watch it on top.

11 MR. RO: It's a little bit heavy.

12 (Laughter.)

13 MEMBER REMPE: Okay.

14 MR. RO: Typical flow pattern inside the
15 vortex chamber is shown in these figures. The
16 vortex chamber is lower part of the fluidic device.
17 The SIT water enters through the supply port, flows
18 into the vortex chamber through the supply nozzles.
19 There are four supply nozzles in the fluidic device.
20 The SIT water enter through the four control ports,
21 flows into vortex chamber directly through the
22 control nozzles. When the SIT water is only
23 injected through the control nozzles, then the water
24 is injected tangentially, so it establishing a
25 strong swirling flow. That cause -- the resistance

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in the vortex chamber is high.

2 That means we have a small flow rate
3 during -- when the SIT water is only injected
4 through the control nozzles. However, when the SIT
5 water is delivered through both supply nozzles and
6 control nozzles, then the flow from the supply
7 nozzle and the flow from the control nozzle collide
8 each other. That results in no minimal swirling
9 flow. That cause reduce the resistance. That means
10 we have -- we're going to have the large flow rate.

11 First full-scale test was performed by
12 the Korea Atomic Energy Research Institute in Korea.
13 And this figures shows the full-scale test facility
14 located at the Korea Atomic Energy Research
15 Institute. A series of tests were
16 performed to evaluate and verify the performance of
17 SIT with fluidic device. Results show that the
18 repeatability was confirmed and pressure loss
19 coefficient is not much affected by initial pressure
20 and manufacturing tolerances. And the design
21 requirements including the pressure loss coefficient
22 are met for both large and small flow injections.
23 The design requirements were determined based on the
24 various large break LOCA analysis, and the results -
25 - the details will be explained tomorrow's session

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 relate to the safety analysis.

2 Topical report for fluidic device design
3 has been submitted on January 2013. As mentioned,
4 advanced TR safety evaluation was issued last week.

5 Next is the pilot-operated safety relief
6 valve.

7 MEMBER RICCARDELLA: Excuse me for a
8 second. Did the OPR1000 have this fluidic device?

9 MR. RO: No.

10 MEMBER RICCARDELLA: It didn't? So it's
11 brand new with the APR1400?

12 MR. RO: Yes, brand new for APR1400.

13 MEMBER RICCARDELLA: Thank you.

14 MEMBER CORRADINI: So this is a unique
15 feature only to this? Only to this design?
16 APR1400. Excuse me.

17 MR. RO: Yes. Yes, it's --

18 MEMBER CORRADINI: So Shin Kori has it
19 also?

20 MR. RO: Right, Shin Kori.

21 MEMBER CORRADINI: So maybe just to be
22 clear, the testing for the SIT was done in support
23 of Shin Kori?

24 MR. RO: Right.

25 MEMBER CORRADINI: Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. RO: Yes.

2 MEMBER CORRADINI: That's what I was
3 guessing. Okay. Thank you.

4 MR. RO: So all the test results are
5 included in this topical report.

6 MEMBER CORRADINI: Sure. Okay. Thank
7 you.

8 MR. RO: The pilot-operated safety
9 relief valve has high seat tightness, low
10 possibility of chattering and is reliable for steam,
11 water and two-phase discharge. However, the
12 installation and the maintenance are a little bit
13 complicated. The POSRV provides the overpressure
14 protection by automatic actuation of spring-loaded
15 pilot valves and rapid depressurization by manual
16 actuation of motor-operated pilot valve.

17 This figure shows the POSRV assembly.
18 The PSORV assembly is composed one main valve and
19 two spring-loaded pilot valves and two motor-
20 operated pilot valves. The spring-loaded pilot
21 valve is actuated automatically for overpressure
22 protection when the RCS pressure exceeds the opening
23 set pressure. And spring-loaded pilot valve
24 includes one motor-operated isolation valve and one
25 manual isolation valve. Motor-operated pilot valves

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 are actuated manually for rapid depressurization.
2 Two valves are installed in series. Those are
3 normally closed and power removed.

4 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: I assume that this
5 arrangement gets rid of the set point drift problem
6 that these valves have had in the past?

7 MR. RO: Yes, we have some set point
8 drift problem for the PSV.

9 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Yes.

10 MR. RO: So instead of using the PSV we
11 adopt the pilot-operated safety lift valve to -- so
12 we think that this POSRV is better for the drifting
13 or the tightness.

14 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Okay.

15 MR. RO: Okay. In summary, APR1400 NSSS
16 design complies with -- we think complies with the
17 U.S. NRC regulatory requirements. And the SIT with
18 fluidic device is an innovative design which ensures
19 effective use of SIT water. And the SIT with
20 fluidic device was verified in full-scale test
21 facility, as I've shown before, as well as the pre-
22 operational test of Shin Kori Unit 3 that was done
23 last -- or the two months -- two years ago. So we
24 confirm that the fluidic device perform correctly.
25 The POSRV provides dual functions of overpressure

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 protection and rapid depressurization.

2 Okay. Thank you for your attention.

3 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Thank you.

4 MEMBER BROWN: I have a question. Is
5 that okay, Ron?

6 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Sure.

7 MEMBER BROWN: Back on the -- oh, on the
8 POSRV's rapid depressurization, how many are
9 required to achieve -- you've got four installed.
10 How many are required to get the rapid
11 depressurization required for the injection systems
12 and all the rest of the safety systems? All four of
13 them or just two of them, or what?

14 MR. RO: That depends on the scenario
15 that we can --

16 MEMBER BROWN: Worst case scenario --

17 MR. RO: Worst case --

18 MEMBER BROWN: -- you need rapid, rapid
19 depressurization. How many valves do you need to
20 operate?

21 MR. RO: So -- okay.

22 MEMBER BROWN: Is my question clear?

23 MR. RO: Yes.

24 MEMBER BROWN: Okay.

25 MR. RO: Okay. I understand your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 question but --

2 MEMBER BROWN: Okay. I just wanted to
3 make sure.

4 MR. RO: I'm remember how many --

5 MEMBER BROWN: I'm an electrical guy,
6 not a mechanical one.

7 MR. RO: -- valves are used for some
8 specific scenario --

9 MEMBER BROWN: Okay.

10 MR. RO: -- but I think someone can help
11 us. Dr. Oh, can you help us?

12 DR. OH: Yes, this is Andy Oh from KHNP
13 Westinghouse Office. And as far as I know, the
14 POSRV is approved, but in terms of the successful
15 feed-and-bleed we need require the two open for the
16 POSRV. And also in addition for the SIT pumps we
17 have four SIT pumps, but in two SIT pumps can
18 succeedently from the feed-and-bleed based on our --
19 the EOP standard analysis.

20 MEMBER BROWN: So that means you need
21 two --

22 DR. OH: Two.

23 MEMBER BROWN: -- to accomplish all the
24 functions --

25 DR. OH: Right.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER BROWN: -- within your injections
2 and other operations?

3 DR. OH: Right, sir.

4 MEMBER BROWN: Okay.

5 MEMBER SKILLMAN: I would like to build
6 on that question, please. My memory is that under
7 ASME Section 3 Class 1 your reactor coolant system
8 boundary must be protected by spring valves. In
9 other words, a standard valve with a spring. These
10 are actually pilot-operated springs. So I'm
11 wondering how in the United States this valve is
12 acceptable under ASME Section 3. Can someone answer
13 that question, please?

14 MEMBER STETKAR: In particular if those
15 little manual valves are closed, the safety valve
16 isn't going to open.

17 MEMBER SKILLMAN: On all of the
18 pressurizers in the United States there are two
19 springs --

20 (Simultaneous speaking.)

21 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Let me finish.

22 MR. RO: The PSORV has two -- dual
23 function, as I explained. It can be opened by
24 automatically and --

25 MEMBER SKILLMAN: This is a code

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 question.

2 MR. RO: Yes, your question is code
3 question. Right.

4 MEMBER SKILLMAN: And so my question is
5 why are these four valves acceptable in lieu of at
6 least two spring code safeties?

7 MR. RO: Yes, as far as I know, I heard
8 from my expert the pilot-operated safety valve meet
9 the ASME Code requirements.

10 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Well, I will challenge
11 that and would like to understand.

12 MR. RO: Okay. I will check with my
13 expert regarding your question. And then I will
14 convey our response sometime later.

15 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Yes, sir.

16 MR. RO: Okay?

17 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: I think in BWRs
19 they are pilot-operated relief valves, spring-loaded
20 pilot-operated relief valves.

21 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Well, I have a little
22 bit of experience with this and I'm curious what the
23 answer will be relative to the code. This is a code
24 question.

25 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Any more questions?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER RAY: Yes, going back to slide 9,
2 I guess I've been deliberating on something that
3 appears there that I wanted to ask about.

4 It says the shaft seal system is cooled
5 by seal injection water and high-pressure water
6 cooler. And I'm trying to understand how it works.
7 Will we be looking at that in some more detail in
8 the future to understand how these two -- seal
9 injection water, I understand that. High-pressure
10 water cooler, I may understand that, but I'm not
11 sure I understand the two of them taken together.

12 MR. RO: Yes, the seal injection water,
13 it comes from the CVCS, the charging pump. So it's
14 evident, apparent. But the high-pressure water
15 cooler is a kind of heat exchanger. Does the clean
16 water pass the secondary side to cool the seal
17 injected, injected seal. So it's kind of the heat
18 exchanger cooled by the water system.

19 MEMBER BLEY: Doesn't it cool the
20 reactor coolant that's passing through the seal?

21 MR. RO: Would you say again?

22 MEMBER BLEY: Well --

23 MEMBER STETKAR: Harold, if you replace
24 that "and" on that slide with an "or."

25 MEMBER RAY: Well, okay, John. You've

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 looked at this maybe, and that might solve my
2 problem, but I do understand needing to cool leak-
3 off before it becomes -- before it flashes, if we're
4 talking about leak-off water. But I'm not sure why
5 it's a high-pressure water cooler. And I do
6 understand seal injection which normally inject cold
7 water and the leak-off is already some cooled. You
8 don't have to have a high-pressure cooler. So I'm
9 trying to understand how this works. And more
10 importantly, what the failure modes are.

11 MR. RO: Okay.

12 MR. SISK: Perhaps if I can, the purpose
13 of today -- and I really appreciate these types of
14 questions, but I do want to recognize because I
15 think the question came up, we do intend to come
16 back with the chapter reviews, with the technical
17 reviews to go into more detail of everything you're
18 hearing today. And so this is an opportunity, if
19 you will, to present the general issues. Certainly
20 we want to hear the questions and concerns, but as I
21 guess we said earlier, we will be back. We will be
22 able to provide you with more details on these --

23 (Simultaneous speaking.)

24 MEMBER RAY: Well, that's fine, Rob. I
25 just -- because it was there and I kept thinking

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 about it and thinking about it, I couldn't figure
2 out what does it mean? But you can answer later.
3 That's fine.

4 MR. SISK: Well, but I do want to
5 encourage the question, because we certainly benefit
6 from that. We'll be better prepared for it at
7 follow-up meeting so that you have the information
8 you need.

9 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Since you've made that
10 introduction or that invitation, let me ask one
11 more. Comes from many years basically running
12 engineering at a PWR, smaller than this, but almost
13 identical in some features.

14 What provision have you made in your
15 design to be able to inspect the reactor coolant
16 pump rose?

17 MR. RO: Rose?

18 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Rose. Not the
19 diffuser. The rotor. Rotors so big around, seven
20 vanes, cast material, difficult to access, but
21 sometimes accessible through the primary piping.

22 So my question is, is there a way to
23 inspect the rotor without having to remove the
24 motor, remove the top works, remove the seal and
25 remove the barrel? Because all of those are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 separate stages to get to the rotor.

2 MR. RO: Okay. I understand.

3 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Thank you.

4 MR. RO: So I think next time we will
5 explain --

6 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Thank you.

7 MR. RO: -- what's on the matter.

8 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Yes, sir. Thank you.

9 MR. RO: Okay. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Thank you. Okay.
11 We're told that there is somebody on the outside
12 line, so we're getting that open now.

13 Are there any folks in the audience who
14 would like to make a comment?

15 (No audible response.)

16 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: There's good news
17 and bad news. The good news is we're way ahead of
18 schedule. The bad news is that we're way ahead of
19 schedule. Because the proprietary meeting is not
20 until the afternoon and because of the docket we
21 pretty -- because of the schedule we have to pretty
22 much fix -- stick to that schedule, I think. Right?

23 (Simultaneous speaking.)

24 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: We don't? Okay.

25 MEMBER STETKAR: We haven't finished the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 public session.

2 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Oh, good. Well,
3 we're about to finish it.

4 MEMBER BLEY: Ron, I want to make sure
5 you heard what John said. This is Subcommittee --

6 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Yes.

7 MEMBER BLEY: -- so you can adapt the
8 schedule.

9 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: I've been suitably
10 chastised.

11 MR. SISK: We still have a few more
12 presentations yet. We're not done.

13 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Wait a minute. I'm
14 just looking at the schedule. Okay. Thank you.

15 Next?

16 (Simultaneous speaking.)

17 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Oh, that's -- I
18 think we really need one. Okay. So we'll take a
19 15-minute break.

20 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
21 went off the record at 10:20 a.m. and resumed at
22 10:36 a.m.)

23 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Okay. Can we start
24 up again? Thanks.

25 MR. JEON: Good morning, ladies and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 gentlemen. My name is Sangyoun Jeon from KEPCO
2 Nuclear Fuel. I will present about the fuel design
3 for APR1400 system.

4 I have divided my talk into five main
5 parts. Firstly, I will explain about some
6 introductions including the PLUS7 fuel development
7 and the regulatory bases. PLUS7 is the name of the
8 fuel design for APR1400. And secondly, I will
9 explain about the PLUS7 fuel design for design
10 characteristics and the design verification. And
11 then I will move onto the PLUS7 irradiation
12 experience. After that I will explain the stages of
13 the PLUS7 licensing. And finally, I will summarize
14 my presentation.

15 Okay. Let's start with the
16 introduction. The PLUS7 fuel design was jointly
17 developed with Westinghouse for APR1400 in Korea
18 from 1999 to 2002. And the PLUS7 fuel was developed
19 to improve the fuel performance compared to Guardian
20 fuel. Guardian is the standard fuel design for
21 System 80+. And KEPCO and KHNP submitted PLUS7
22 topical report and technical report to NRC for
23 APR1400 DC licensing. This is the document number
24 of the topical report for PLUS7 fuel design. And
25 this is the document number for -- of the technical

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 report for fuel assembly seismic and LOCA analysis.

2 MEMBER CORRADINI: Just so I -- I'd ask
3 to those topical reports. So if I were to look to
4 look at CHF casting, do I go to those topical
5 reports, or a different --

6 MR. JEON: We have separate topical
7 report for the CHF test.

8 MEMBER CORRADINI: Okay. But you're not
9 going to discuss that in your presentation?

10 MR. JEON: I have a -- I will touch a
11 little bit --

12 MEMBER CORRADINI: Okay.

13 MR. JEON: -- about that in -- yes.

14 MEMBER CORRADINI: Thank you.

15 MR. JEON: Yes, the PLUS7 fuel design
16 was developed to comply with the following Code of
17 Federal Regulations, NRC regulatory documents and
18 the industrial code and standard.

19 To move on, I will explain about the
20 PLUS7 fuel design. This figure shows overall
21 configuration of the PLUS7 fuel design. The PLUS7
22 fuel consists of one top nozzle with easy removal
23 features and one bottom nozzle with a debris
24 filtering feature and one top inconel grid for
25 reduced rod bow and one bottom inconel grid for high

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 burnup capability. And there is one protective grid
2 for debris filtering feature. And there are nine
3 mid grid for high-seismic capability, high thermal
4 performance with mixing vane and fretting wear
5 resistance with a conformal spring and the dimple.
6 All those components are connected by four heat
7 guiding dimples and instrumentation cue. The 236
8 high burnup fuel rods are included -- inserted into
9 the each cell of the -- those space grid.

10 The PLUS7 fuel incorporated the proven
11 Guardian structure and the proven Westinghouse type
12 fuel features to improve the fuel performance. This
13 table shows the design improvement of the PLUS7 fuel
14 compared to the Guardian fuel. The PLUS7 use the
15 ZIRLO cladding material for high burnup capability.
16 We optimize the fuel rod diameter and implemented
17 the axial blanket to enhance the neutron economy.
18 And we developed a conformal spring and the dimples
19 to increase the fretting wear resistance. The
20 Guardian fuel use a cantilever spring and arched
21 dimple.

22 We also developed the straight strap for
23 highly seismic capability and we implemented the
24 mixing vane to enhance thermal performance. And we
25 developed assembled top nozzle for easy removable

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and we developed the small hole and the slot bottom
2 nozzle to increase the debris filtering efficiency.

3 From now on I will explain some detail
4 of the each design improvement. For the high burnup
5 capability we use the ZIRLO cladding tube and we
6 develop the variable pitch plenum spring. And for
7 the neutron economy we developed the optimized fuel
8 rod and the axial blanket.

9 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: So the ZIRLO -- is
10 there any thought to using the next generation
11 optimized ZIRLO, or whatever it's called, for the
12 cladding?

13 MR. JEON: For this PLUS7 design we used
14 the standard ZIRLO.

15 For the thermal margin -- for the
16 enhanced thermal margin we developed the mixing
17 vane, and the mixing vane is attached at the top of
18 the inner strap of the middle grid. And for the
19 high seismic capability we developed a straight
20 strap grid instead of the wavy strap grid.

21 For the fretting wear resistance we
22 developed the conformal spring and the dimples to
23 increase the contact area between fuel rod and the
24 spring and the dimples. The Guardian fuel had a
25 cantilever spring and arched the dimple, which has

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the small contact area between fuel rod and the
2 spring and dimples.

3 For the debris filtering efficiency we
4 developed the small flow hole and the slot bottom
5 nozzle to increase the debris filtering efficiency.
6 Guardian fuel has the large flow hole bottom nozzle.

7 MEMBER CORRADINI: So we will later talk
8 about testing relative to this difference?

9 MR. JEON: Yes.

10 MEMBER CORRADINI: Okay. Thank you.

11 MR. JEON: Now I'd like to move onto the
12 design verification of the PLUS7 fuel. We performed
13 out-of-pile test and the in-reactor verification
14 test. For the out-of-pile test we performed the
15 fuel assembly mechanical test, fuel assembly
16 hydraulic test and the critical heat flux test. For
17 the in-reactor verification test we performed the
18 pool side examination and the hot cell examination.

19 For the out-of-pile test we performed
20 the mechanical and the hydraulic test using the
21 FACTS and the VIPER test facilities located at
22 Westinghouse Columbia Plant. And the critical heat
23 flux test was performed using Heat Transfer Research
24 Facility located at Columbia University. Based on
25 the fuel assembly mechanical and hydraulic test

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 result the mechanical and the hydraulic performance
2 of the PLUS7 fuel was verified. And we developed
3 the KCE-1 CHF correlation based on the critical heat
4 flux test result. And the correlation was applied
5 to the PLUS7 design analysis.

6 MEMBER CORRADINI: So this is where I
7 was going to ask my question. When were those tests
8 done?

9 MR. JEON: Excuse me.

10 MEMBER CORRADINI: When were the
11 critical heat flux tests performed? When.

12 MR. JEON: It was 2000.

13 MEMBER CORRADINI: Oh, okay. Sixteen
14 years ago? Okay. Because the facility doesn't
15 exist anymore.

16 MR. JEON: Right.

17 MEMBER CORRADINI: That's why I'm --

18 MR. JEON: Yes, this facility was, yes -
19 -

20 MEMBER CORRADINI: Okay.

21 MR. JEON: -- closed.

22 MEMBER CORRADINI: Thank you. So just a
23 follow-on. So from the standpoint -- that's -- I
24 guess it kind of goes back to -- you don't have to
25 go back to the slides, but going back to your PLUS7

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 mixing vanes -- so that mixing vane design in your
2 grid spacers are from at last 16 years ago?

3 MR. JEON: Yes.

4 MEMBER CORRADINI: Okay. Thank you.

5 MR. JEON: And this is the document
6 number of the topical report for the KCE-1
7 correlation.

8 For the in-reactor verification test the
9 four lead test assemblies were manufactured and
10 loaded at Ulchin Unit 3 from Cycle 5 to Cycle 7.
11 And the four commercial surveillance assemblies were
12 selected from the commercially supplied fuels at
13 Yonggwang Unit 5 Cycle 5. And we performed the pool
14 side examination and the hot cell examination after
15 the LTA and the CSA irradiation. Based on the pool
16 side examination and the hot cell examination
17 results it was confirmed that the measured data
18 after the addition were within the design limit of
19 the PLUS7 fuel design.

20 Now I will present about the PLUS7
21 irradiation experience.

22 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Before you do that I
23 would like to ask this question. In the design
24 description; and this is Section 352 of the design
25 description, I'm going to read a sentence and try to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 understand what you've presented.

2 "A CEA is composed of 12 fingers full
3 strength, 4 fingers full strength and 4 fingers part
4 strength CEAs. Neutron absorbing material is used
5 for full strength rods or boron carbide pellet and
6 so on."

7 What you've shown is four fingers.
8 Where are the 12-finger CEAs used in this design?

9 MR. JEON: The 12 fingers are inserted
10 into the four different fuel assemblies in the core.
11 There are several fuel assemblies in the core. So
12 12- fingers CEA will be inserted into the 4 fuel
13 assemblies.

14 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Four locations?

15 MR. JEON: Yes, four --

16 MR. JEONG: The design of fuel
17 assemblies the exactly same. The same fuel
18 assemblies inserted in the -- loaded in the core.
19 The 12 fingers is -- go -- inserted into 3, or 4
20 CEAs for assemblies. So three assemblies are
21 connected with the fingers.

22 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Could you go back to
23 your plan view of your grid, your spacer grid?

24 You're showing just four locations there
25 for your absorbing rods. So I'm trying to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 understand the 4 versus 12 versus 3. So perhaps you
2 could clarify that.

3 MR. SANGYOUN JEON: Yes, four CEA, the
4 one CEA with four fingers will be inserted in just
5 one -- into the one fuel assembly.

6 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Yes.

7 MR. JEON: And the 12-finger CEAs will
8 be inserted into the -- there will be one fuel
9 assembly right here and one fuel assembly here and
10 one fuel assembly here and one fuel assembly here.

11 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Yes.

12 MR. JEON: So one, two, three, four fuel
13 assembly has 12 type 2 assemblies. So 12- finger
14 CEA will be inserted into those 4 fuel assembly.

15 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Oh, now I understand.
16 Okay. I was trying to understand whether you had
17 fuel assemblies that had four or fuel assemblies
18 that
19 had --

20 MR. JEON: Twelve.

21 MEMBER SKILLMAN: -- 12. Now I
22 understand. Thank you. Okay. Thanks.

23 MR. JEON: Okay. So based on the out-
24 of-pile test and the in-reactor verification test
25 results more than 4,000 PLUS7 fuel assemblies were

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 supplied since 2006. And we supplied 4,250 fuel
2 assemblies to 13 reactors in Korea in the 18-month
3 cycle. And the maximum fuel rod discharge burnup
4 is 59,000 megawatt metric ton uranium. And recently
5 we manufactured 302 fuel assemblies for UAE project
6 and those fuel assemblies are ready to ship for
7 Barakah Unit 1.

8 MEMBER SKILLMAN: One more question,
9 please. What was the basis of the choice for an 18-
10 month fuel cycle versus a 24-month fuel cycle?

11 MR. JEON: Originally the -- we designed
12 with a 15-month cycle in Korea at the beginning of
13 the fuel development stage. And we increased the
14 fuel cycle from 15 months to 18 months to increase
15 the economy. But right now we are trying to
16 increase the fuel cycle from 18 months to 24 months,
17 but it's not implemented yet in Korea. So currently
18 we are supplying the fuel with an 18-month cycle.

19 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Thank you.

20 MR. JEON: Okay. Now I explain about
21 the licensing status of the PLUS7 fuel design.
22 KEPCO and KHNP submitted the PLUS7 topical report
23 and the fuel assembly seismic technical report in
24 2014. The NRC audit was performed for fuel assembly
25 seismic technical report in 2015, last year, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 there were some issues related to fuel assembly EOL
2 seismic analysis. So currently the KEPCO and the
3 KHNP is working on the fuel assembly EOL test and
4 the seismic analysis and the issues will be resolved
5 by end of July 2017 based on the additional test and
6 analysis results.

7 So in summary, the PLUS7 fuel assembly
8 design was joined developed with Westinghouse for
9 APR1400 in Korea, and this PLUS7 design evaluation
10 was performed to comply with Code of Federal
11 Regulations and the NRC regulatory document. And
12 the PLUS7 fuel was verified through the out-of-pile
13 test, critical heat flux test and the in-reactor
14 verification test. And the fuel assembly EOL
15 seismic analysis related issues will be resolved by
16 end of July 2017 based on the additional test and
17 analysis result. More than 4,000 PLUS7 fuel
18 assemblies were supplied since 2006 and excellent
19 in-reactor performance was demonstrated up to now.

20 Thank you for your attention.

21 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Questions?

22 (No audible response.)

23 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Thank you.

24 MR. KIM: Hello. I will start?

25 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KIM: Good morning. My name is
2 Yonggun Kim and in KEPCO-AE System Design Group.
3 This is a honor for me to have an opportunity to
4 introduce the containment system for APR1400.

5 This presentation is started with the
6 introduction. And next the design features for
7 containment system in APR1400 will be introduced.
8 And it will be closed with a conclusion.

9 This presentation is to present an
10 overview of the design features for the APR1400
11 standard design regarding the 3 system.

12 Well, APR1400 containment system design
13 are based on relevant regulatory requirements such
14 as the general design criteria, regulatory guides,
15 standard review plans and general standards.

16 Following are the design features I will
17 introduce in this presentation for containment
18 system for APR1400. The containment P/T analysis,
19 containment spray system, containment isolation
20 system, containment hydrogen control system, and the
21 last one is design features to address GSI-191.

22 First, the containment P/T analysis.
23 For APR1400 containment P/T analysis GOTHIC
24 containment/RCS model is used with conservative
25 break flow models and wall heat transfer model.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Cases for the P/T analysis include 5 cases for LOCA
2 and 10 cases for secondary system pipe breaks.
3 Based on the P/T analysis the peak containment
4 pressure is calculated as 51.1 psig, and the
5 containment is designed with a pressure of 60 psig.
6 So there is a 10 percent pressure margin in APR1400
7 containment design.

8 Also, the P/T analysis results show that
9 containment pressure system has sufficient heat
10 removal capacity to reduce and maintain the
11 containment pressure below 50 percent of the peak
12 pressure within 24 hours after the postulated
13 accident.

14 And next is the containment spray
15 system. The containment spray system for APR1400
16 has functions that reduce the containment pressure
17 and temperature following a main steam line break or
18 LOCA and removes fission products from containment
19 atmosphere following LOCA.

20 MEMBER POWERS: I want to acquaint you
21 with the kinds of questions that we'll have with
22 respect to the second statement. It will be
23 important for us to understand -- I don't expect an
24 answer right now because these are fairly detailed
25 questions. It will be important for us to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 understand what the droplet size distribution is and
2 the trajectory analysis on those droplet sizes, the
3 droplet agglomeration coefficients that are used and
4 that. We will also need to know of any additives in
5 the material. It would be useful to know the spray
6 header types, coverage, angle and that sort of
7 thing.

8 MR. KIM: Well, that type of
9 informations are described in the DCD or at the
10 end. The spray pattern standards, spray droplet
11 size are confirmed by the test from vendor for the
12 nozzle.

13 MEMBER POWER: That will be important
14 for us to explore --

15 MR. KIM: Yes.

16 MEMBER POWER: -- those topics and in
17 substantial detail to understand your second bullet
18 there.

19 MR. KIM: Yes. Well, if we can have a
20 chance for those issues, then we can provide the
21 detailed information.

22 MEMBER POWERS: Yes, a difficulty we run
23 into a lot is claims are made about the droplet size
24 distribution based on a single spray nozzle from the
25 manufacturer.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KIM: Yes.

2 MEMBER POWERS: And of course a single
3 spray nozzle does not account for the fact that
4 other spray nozzles are injecting droplets that
5 agglomerate. And so you have bigger droplets and
6 bigger droplets are less efficient than little
7 droplets.

8 MR. KIM: Well, this system has two 100
9 capacity divisions, each separated physically and
10 mechanically. And in each division there are one
11 containment spray pump, one heat exchanger, and
12 nozzles. In addition, APR1400 containment spray
13 system has emergency containment spray backup
14 system, shortly ECSBS, for severe accident
15 management.

16 This is a schematic diagram for APR1400
17 containment spray system. In APR1400 since the
18 containment spray pump and shutdown cooling pump in
19 the same division are interchangeable to each other.
20 So the shutdown cooling pump can backup the
21 containment spray pump during the accident when the
22 containment spray pump is not available.

23 And this is the -- it's just ECSBS.
24 During a severe accident ECSBS can provide spray
25 water from external water source to the containment

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 using fire engine truck when all spray pumps
2 including the shutdown cooling pump and the IRWST
3 are not available.

4 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Would you comment
5 please on the approximate capacity of the backup
6 spray system?

7 MR. KIM: So about the 750 gpm.

8 MEMBER SKILLMAN: And what is the full
9 spray flow of the normal containment spray?

10 MR. KIM: Five thousand gpm per pump.

11 MEMBER SKILLMAN: So it's just a little
12 bit over 10 percent?

13 MR. KIM: Right. And it's based on the
14 analysis of the civil standards.

15 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Thank you.

16 MR. KIM: You're welcome.

17 And APR1400 introduced a isolation
18 system. APR1400 containment isolation system is
19 designed to meet the 10 CFR 50, Appendix A, GDC 55,
20 56 and 57 to confine the release of any
21 radioactivity from containment following postulated
22 DBA.

23 These configurations are examples for
24 containment isolation system design. These examples
25 show that one check valve or one -- one automatic

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 isolation valve inside containment and one automatic
2 isolation valve outside containment are provided in
3 relevant system in accordance with GDC 55 and 56.
4 And according to the GDC 57, two automatic isolation
5 valves are provided outside containment.

6 And next is containment hydrogen control
7 system. In APR1400 the hydrogen concentration in
8 containment is controlled by the passive
9 autocatalytic recombiners, shortly power and
10 igniters. And the -- it is totally in the
11 containment in the IRWST and the hydrogen is
12 controlled below the plant by volume during severe
13 accident. And the figure, the upper figure is power
14 design and the lower figure is the igniters. The
15 igniter is -- this picture is taken from the
16 reference plant.

17 MEMBER POWERS: These passive devices
18 are open during normal operation?

19 MR. KIM: Excuse me? Pardon?

20 MEMBER POWERS: Is there air circulation
21 through those --

22 MR. KIM: Circulation.

23 MEMBER POWERS: -- during normal
24 operations?

25 MR. KIM: During normal operation air

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 circulation is accomplished by the ECSBS system in
2 containment.

3 MEMBER CORRADINI: I think he's asking
4 is it open? Are these passive autocatalytic
5 recombiners open to the containment during normal
6 operation?

7 MR. KIM: Right. The power you mean.
8 Right.

9 MEMBER POWERS: We'll be interested in
10 understanding the poisoning on these surfaces.

11 MR. KIM: Poisons?

12 MEMBER POWERS: Yes.

13 MR. KIM: Well, actually the power is
14 tested about the poison in the -- during the
15 accident. And so, I believe that this is qualified
16 for that kind of issue.

17 MEMBER POWERS: We'll be interested in
18 that qualification because of them that have been
19 done that I'm aware of are pathetic representations
20 of the environment in a real accident.

21 MR. KIM: Well, next is the design
22 features to address the GSI-191.

23 MEMBER CORRADINI: We're all ears.

24 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Could we go back for a
25 second to Dr. Powers' question? The question really

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is what is in your containment atmosphere during
2 normal operations? You're running with boric acid
3 concentration in your reactor coolant system.

4 MR. KIM: The concentration of hydrogen
5 you mean?

6 MEMBER SKILLMAN: No. In your reactor
7 coolant system you're running with some boron?

8 MR. KIM: Right. Yes.

9 MEMBER SKILLMAN: A thousand ppm, twelve
10 hundred ppm? You're critical as you go through your
11 fuel cycle 18 months, 24 months. You're holding
12 rods and you're dropping boron. Right?

13 MR. KIM: Yes.

14 MEMBER SKILLMAN: What happens if you
15 get a pinhole leak, a very, very, very tiny leak, a
16 reactor coolant pump seal is weeping just ever so
17 little, just enough to put boric acid in your
18 containment environment and it's being circulated by
19 your containment cooling system, your normal
20 containment cooling system? Where is that boron
21 going? And what is in these autocatalytic
22 recombiners? What is it, palladium, platinum?

23 MR. KIM: Yes, platinum.

24 MEMBER SKILLMAN: What happens when the
25 boron gets in there? So, that's Dr. Powers'

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 question. What if that material is poisoned and
2 you're depending on it for post-LOCA hydrogen
3 control? And it's something we've all dealt with.
4 We understand that issue.

5 And so, what Dr. Powers is really saying
6 is when you show that your PARs have been tested,
7 how do you know your platinum palladium recombiner
8 material, which is granular, has not been poisoned
9 by years and years of sitting in what you think is a
10 clean environment when it reality that environment
11 has poisoned your PARs? It happens.

12 MEMBER POWERS: Dr. Powers is probably
13 equally concerned about off-gassing from all the
14 organics in the system.

15 MR. KIM: Well, I think that the answer
16 can be provided after our discussion. So I can
17 answer the question at the next meeting.

18 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Thank you.

19 MR. KIM: Yes.

20 MR. JEONG: Basically for the PAR is
21 every 18 months there's an inspection and issue
22 related to health. So --

23 MEMBER STETKAR: Please talk into your
24 microphone.

25 MR. JEONG: Their performance will be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 verified the base on regular basis for that over
2 every outages.

3 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: I think you have to
4 speak louder.

5 MR. JEONG: Yes, and also there some
6 hole in RCS that will be collected to the sumps.
7 And also the operator can notify that there's some
8 leakage in them. There is some -- prepared on this
9 and action will be taken. But there is not
10 significant impact to the PARs in the case, so we
11 expected.

12 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Well, we'll be
13 interested in this topic when we have the detailed
14 review.

15 MR. JEONG: Okay.

16 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Thank you.

17 MR. KIM: Next is design features to
18 address GSI-191. Before starting into discussion of
19 the design features for GSI-191, I would like
20 explain the flow path to IRWST sump strainer during
21 LOCA for APR1400.

22 Well, during LOCA containment spray pump
23 and the SI pump takes suction from the IRWST. The
24 injected water and the sprayed water are then
25 collected in the containment flow and the water on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the floor is affording whole volume tank right here.
2 And finally, the water returns to the IRWST through
3 the spillway. And then the returned water is taken
4 by the CS pumps and the SI pumps via the strainers
5 on the sumps. This is the flow path and circulation
6 operation of APR1400 during LOCA. And for your
7 information there are four sumps in the IRWST.

8 Now I introduce the --

9 MEMBER CORRADINI: May I just ask?

10 MR. KIM: Yes.

11 MEMBER CORRADINI: So this is the -- no,
12 I've got it over here. This is the outer annular
13 IRWST ring --

14 MR. KIM: Right.

15 MEMBER CORRADINI: -- right, that we're
16 looking at. It's a cross-section.

17 MR. KIM: A cross-section.

18 MEMBER CORRADINI: So the logic of this
19 is you capture all the spray water that comes in up
20 to some angle and then it essentially just flows
21 back in?

22 MR. KIM: Yes.

23 MEMBER CORRADINI: To what you call the
24 HVT?

25 MR. KIM: Yes, right.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER CORRADINI: So the thought
2 process is it's to essentially recirculate this?

3 MR. KIM: Right.

4 MEMBER CORRADINI: Okay.

5 MR. KIM: Yes.

6 MEMBER CORRADINI: All right. I just
7 wanted to make sure I understood the diagram. Thank
8 you.

9 MEMBER SKILLMAN: I would like to ask
10 further. I've seen in the design description the
11 HVT. What is the relationship? Do have a plan view
12 that shows the HVT in relation to the IRWST?

13 MR. KIM: Yes, we have the plan view.
14 And you can see the more -- the figures in the
15 technical report for GSI-191. The plan view is kind
16 of the secure --

17 (Simultaneous speaking.)

18 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Okay.

19 MR. KIM: Yes, --

20 (Simultaneous speaking.)

21 MEMBER SKILLMAN: It appeared as though
22 the IRWST was, if I can use the word, "in-board"
23 from the skin of the containment by several meters,
24 or a meter or two, and the HVT was between the IRWST
25 and the containment wall.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KIM: Yes.

2 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Is that the basic
3 layout?

4 MR. KIM: Yes, right.

5 MEMBER BLEY: When you say it's in the -
6 - I think you said in the technical reference --

7 MR. KIM: Technical report.

8 MEMBER BLEY: Technical report?

9 MR. KIM: Yes, right.

10 MEMBER BLEY: Okay.

11 MR. KIM: Yes, it's submitted already
12 to --

13 (Simultaneous speaking.)

14 MEMBER BLEY: And it's the one on the
15 containment, or is it a technical report? Which one
16 is it?

17 MR. KIM: For GSI-191.

18 MEMBER BLEY: Oh, for GSI?

19 MR. KIM: Yes.

20 MEMBER BLEY: Okay.

21 MEMBER SKILLMAN: We can look over
22 there. Thank you. Okay.

23 MEMBER CORRADINI: So somewhere later,
24 not today, I'm sure it will be later, I'm very
25 curious about how much of the return water goes to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 dead volumes that don't go back to your HVT.

2 MR. KIM: Yes, the --

3 MEMBER CORRADINI: But not today.

4 MR. KIM: -- the whole volume, right?

5 MEMBER CORRADINI: But not today. I
6 just -- but that's the reason I'm trying to
7 understand your drawing.

8 MR. KIM: This also in the technical
9 report.

10 MEMBER CORRADINI: I'm sure everything's
11 there.

12 MR. KIM: So now I introduce APR1400
13 design features for GSI-191. Actually, according to
14 the Regulatory Guide 1.182, Revision 4, and NEI 04-
15 07, the following evaluations was conducted, and the
16 result of the evaluations are described in the
17 technical report.

18 Well, for debris generation; so we are
19 following the guidance of the NEI 04-07, we selected
20 the RCS hot leg break as the most limiting break
21 location. Since the APR1400 design use reflective
22 material insulation, shortly RMI, inside
23 containment, so generated debris would be the RMI
24 and coatings and latent debris. But the RMI is --
25 no question there's debris because of -- is -- it

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 has -- density is high and so valency to sump
2 strainer is very low, so it will not be transported
3 to the sump strainer.

4 And for chemical effect --

5 MEMBER STETKAR: Mr. Kim, I have a
6 question. Your documentation says RMI is used for
7 reactor coolant system --

8 MR. KIM: Inside the containment.

9 MEMBER STETKAR: Yes.

10 MR. KIM: Yes.

11 MEMBER STETKAR: Are your main steam and
12 feedwater lines inside the containment also RMI?

13 MR. KIM: Yes.

14 MEMBER STETKAR: Okay. Thank you.

15 MEMBER POWERS: Your containment coating
16 is epoxy?

17 MR. KIM: Pardon?

18 MEMBER POWERS: The containment coating
19 is epoxy?

20 MR. KIM: Containment?

21 PARTICIPANT: Coating.

22 MR. KIM: Coating?

23 PARTICIPANT: The coating on
24 containment.

25 MR. KIM: Yes, to cover it. And coating

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 -- the containment liner is coverance. And as -- I
2 think that --

3 MEMBER CORRADINI: But the coating -- I
4 assume IOZ is some sort of zinc oxide coating?
5 That's what we're trying to understand.

6 MR. KIM: Coating the wall is coated
7 with epoxy and inorganic zinc.

8 MEMBER POWERS: Inorganic zinc primer.

9 MR. KIM: Yes, primer.

10 MEMBER POWERS: And then that's coated
11 with an epoxy?

12 MR. KIM: Yes.

13 MEMBER POWERS: Do you know what epoxy
14 it is?

15 MR. KIM: The type of epoxy, you mean?

16 MEMBER CORRADINI: You can get back to
17 us if you don't know.

18 MR. KIM: Yes, I think that others --
19 because they can answer that.

20 MR. SISK: We'll provide the details on
21 that in our next get together.

22 MEMBER POWERS: Whatever. Just
23 understand the direction of our questions on this.
24 That's really what we're doing. In fact, the whole
25 issue of qualified coatings has to -- qualified and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 non-qualified coatings.

2 MR. KIM: We qualified all coatings in
3 the containment coating.

4 MEMBER POWERS: That may be true, but
5 there will be a certain inventory of unqualified
6 coatings and we'll need to understand both the
7 qualification test and the what the inventory of
8 unqualified coatings is.

9 MR. KIM: Well, for chemical effect it
10 was evaluated using the methodology in WCAP-16530-
11 NP-A. And this WCAP report is referenced in the
12 Regulatory Guide 1.82.

13 And for debris head loss evaluation
14 APR1400 design conservatively assumes that all the
15 generated coatings and latent debris and chemical
16 precipitates are transported directly to a single
17 sump. And the allowable head loss for debris head
18 loss tests at the sump strainer is two feet-water
19 and the debris head was -- the test results is 0.81
20 feet head loss at the sump strainer. Therefore, the
21 test results satisfied the lower head loss with
22 sufficient margin.

23 In the evaluation of the NPSHa for the
24 ECCS pumps APR1400 design credits the containment
25 accident pressure for the IRWST temperature greater

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 than 212 Fahrenheit degree. With the assumption of
2 that the containment accident pressure is equal to
3 the IRWST liquid vapor pressure.

4 For the ESSC pump NPSHa required APR1400
5 design used --

6 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Could we back, please?
7 Was any consideration given to not using containment
8 accident pressure in this design, either by
9 elevation of the pumps or by any other reasonable
10 engineering methodology?

11 MR. KIM: Well, we don't think about any
12 consideration like that.

13 MEMBER CORRADINI: So I think what
14 Member Skillman is asking is we would prefer a
15 hardware change to using CAP credit.

16 MR. KIM: Yes. So we don't think about
17 now -- current design.

18 MEMBER STETKAR: You should be aware
19 that the ACRS is on record of --

20 MR. KIM: Yes, I understand.

21 MEMBER STETKAR: -- not endorsing
22 containment accident pressure.

23 MR. KIM: Yes.

24 MEMBER STETKAR: So this will be a point
25 of contention in your design with us. We're on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 written record for many, many years.

2 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Is CAP used in Shin
3 Kori 3 and 4?

4 MR. KIM: Yes.

5 MR. SISK: Appreciate the comment.

6 MEMBER STETKAR: It's a warning shot
7 across the bow, but it's a big warning shot.

8 (Laughter.)

9 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Carbide-bladed buzz
10 saw.

11 MEMBER RAY: Well, let me just add one
12 thing, which is people have made changes as a result
13 of what John Stetkar just related to you. So it has
14 had an effect in some cases in the past, the concern
15 that we have about relying on CAP.

16 MR. KIM: Well, we explain NPSHa
17 effective. APR1400 design used NPSHa required
18 effective in accordance with the report of SECY-11-
19 0014. And 21 percent margin was considered for the
20 effect of the uncertainty factor.

21 The table shows that NPSH effective of
22 calculation result. The SI pump has 22 feet-water
23 and CS pump has 17.5 feet over NPSHa effective.
24 Using these, NPSH are effective NPSH margin for
25 APR1400 ECCS pump calculated, and these are provided

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in this table. SI pump has NPSH margin over 1.73
2 feet-water. And for CS pump 3 feet-water margin is
3 exist.

4 Well, the --

5 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: If you were to not
6 use CAP, what would these numbers look like?

7 MR. KIM: It's based on the calculation
8 methodology of the -- over 212 Fahrenheit degree.
9 We consider that the containment pressure and the
10 vapor pressures are equal. And that is the basis.
11 And it is the minimum. The results is the minimum
12 NPSH margin considered methodology.

13 MEMBER CORRADINI: So I think what Dr.
14 Ballinger was asking is how much delta-P are you
15 using for CAP credit? That's what I think you're
16 asking.

17 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Yes.

18 MR. KIM: If we don't consider the CAP
19 credit, then we need about 40 or 30 feet -- yes,
20 about 30 feet.

21 MEMBER CORRADINI: Thirty feet of water?

22 MR. KIM: Thirty feet maximum is
23 required.

24 MEMBER CORRADINI: Okay.

25 MR. KIM: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Let me ask this: The
2 flow rates that you show for safety injection and
3 for core spray --

4 MR. KIM: Yes.

5 MEMBER SKILLMAN: -- do you require all
6 of that flow to meet your accident containment and
7 fuel conditions? In other words, if you were to
8 back down the SI pump flow from 1,235 gallons a
9 minute to say 1,000 or 950, you would significantly
10 reduce your NPSH requirement just because of the way
11 those pumps are designed. Would you then be able to
12 meet your requirement, your cooling requirement
13 without the application of CAP credit?

14 MR. KIM: The flow through the core, you
15 mean, right?

16 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Well, I fully
17 understand. I'm saying do you need that much?

18 MEMBER CORRADINI: He's asking do you
19 need that much of a flow rate?

20 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Could you knock that -
21 - could you throttle or put in passive devices so
22 that you --

23 MR. SISK: If we can, I -- I understand
24 the question --

25 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Answer it later?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. SISK: -- and I understand the
2 process. We're going to go back and take a look at
3 your comment relative to CAP, what the options are,
4 what sort of --

5 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Thank you.

6 MR. SISK: -- what alternative you would
7 consider.

8 MEMBER SKILLMAN: Thank you.

9 MR. SISK: We'll do that at a later
10 time, if we can.

11 MEMBER SKILLMAN: That's fine. Thank
12 you very much.

13 MR. KIM: So I will go to next page. So
14 regarding the containment accident pressure we have
15 a RAI for this, and we are currently working on the
16 consultive estimation of NPSH margin certainty and
17 the risk calculation for assessing the plant risk
18 associated with crediting containment accident
19 pressure in the NPSH assessment.

20 Well, the next is the ex-vessel
21 downstream effect. For the ex-vessel downstream
22 effect evaluation the sump strainer bypass test was
23 performed and the test results show that 1.67
24 kilogram of the latent fiber debris is bypassed
25 through for sump strainers. Using this bypassed

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 fiber debris and other debris ex-vessel downstream
2 effect evaluation was performed on each component in
3 the ECCS system in accordance with WCAP-16406-P-A.

4 SI pump and CS pump will be qualified by
5 the pump vendor. And for heat exchangers no
6 plugging is expected, however, the wear and the
7 performance will be confirmed by the heat exchanger
8 vendor. For other components such as valves,
9 orifices, nozzles and so on no blockage and no
10 settling is expected. And wear is expected to be
11 negligible.

12 And for in-vessel downstream effect
13 according to the WCAP report of 16793-NP KHNP
14 performed the in-vessel downstream effect test for
15 APR1400 to confirm the plant-specific effect on fuel
16 assemblies during post-LOCA with the debris latent
17 through it. The test results show that the maximum
18 pressure drop through fuel assembly is within the
19 allowable pressure drop with a sufficient margin.

20 And for LOCADM analysis the results for
21 deposit thickness and peak cladding temperature
22 satisfy the acceptable criteria of 50 mils for
23 thickness and 800 Fahrenheit degree for cladding
24 temperature.

25 So final is conclusion. The APR1400

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 containment system is designed to meet the U.S.
2 regulatory requirements. The design features
3 regarding GSI-191 have been evaluated in accordance
4 with the NRC Regulatory Guide 1.82, Revision 4.

5 So we believe that the containment integrity and the
6 plant safety are maintained with sufficient margin
7 during postulated accident conditions.

8 These are all in this presentation.
9 Thank you for your listening.

10 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Thank you.
11 Questions from members?

12 MEMBER POWERS: I noticed that in your
13 testing for GSI-191 you were using as material
14 calcium phosphate. Does that suggest that you will
15 buffer your sumps with phosphoric -- with sodium
16 phosphate?

17 MR. SISK: We'll discuss that further
18 later. I think the tests were done using the
19 standard mix that the industry has been using for --

20 (Simultaneous speaking.)

21 MEMBER POWERS: Yes, but it makes some
22 sense to use calcium phosphate if you're not going
23 to use phosphate as a buffer.

24 MR. SISK: Understood. We'll get back
25 with the details on that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER POWERS: And that's fine. That
2 is perfectly okay. I just want to make sure you
3 know what kind of questions we're going to ask.

4 MR. SISK: Yes. Appreciate it. Thank
5 you very much.

6 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: While we wait,
7 other questions?

8 MEMBER STETKAR: Just to help you out on
9 ACRS -- this is not a comprehensive list, but if you
10 want a set of references to ACRS letters on CAP --
11 I'll give you some dates anyway. May 19th, 2010.
12 February 17th, 2011. Those are -- you can look them
13 up. December 24th, 2013. And April 21st, 2014. I
14 may have missed a couple, but that will give you
15 some general kind of contemporary things. There's
16 an earlier history, but that's at least within the
17 last six years. I tried to limit it to the bodies
18 who are currently in the room.

19 MR. SISK: Thank you. And we will --
20 we'll take a look at the history and we'll be
21 discussing it with the staff. As noted, it's an
22 RAI. And we'll be talking more about that as the
23 days go forward. Thank you.

24 MEMBER POWERS: That's great.

25 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: So I think the line

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is open. Is anybody out on the line? If you are,
2 could you make yourself know?

3 MR. LEWIS: Marvin Lewis, member of the
4 public.

5 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Good morning,
6 Marvin. Care to make a statement?

7 MR. LEWIS: Yes, I'm glad I was able to
8 get through to this one. Unhappily the ACRS
9 yesterday I wasn't able -- meeting -- I wasn't able
10 to get through to.

11 Yes, I'm very interested in this. It
12 sounds like Korea has a few reactors going. And I'm
13 just wishing them luck. Thank you. That's all.

14 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Thank you, Marvin.

15 Is there anybody else out there that
16 would like to make a statement?

17 (No audible response.)

18 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Hearing none, can
19 we close the line?

20 Are there any people in the audience
21 that would like to make a statement?

22 (No audible response.)

23 CHAIRMAN BALLINGER: Hearing none, the
24 closed session is this afternoon, so we can break
25 for one hour and be back at 12:35, please. We're

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 recessed.

2 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
3 went off the record at 11:35 a.m.)
4
5
6
7
8
9

APR1400 STANDARD DESIGN CERTIFICATION REVIEW

ACRS APR1400 Information Briefing

Jeffrey Ciocco
Lead Project Manager
Office of New Reactors

April 20, 2016

AGENDA

- The APR1400 Application
- The APR1400 Topical Reports
- The APR1400 Design Certification Review

APR1400 APPLICATION

- KHNP & KEPCO Design Certification (DC) Part 52 application submission on 12/23/14 (ML15006A098) contains:
 - Design Control Document (DCD)
 - Tier 1 & Tier 2; Public & Non-Public Versions
 - Environmental Report
 - Technical Reports (~ 60); Public and Non-Public Versions; Incorporated by Reference (IBR) & Non IBR
 - Design Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria (ITAAC)
- The Public website <http://www.nrc.gov/reactors/new-reactors/design-cert/apr1400.html> contains the application and the review schedule.

APR1400 APPLICATION

SIGNIFICANT APR1400 DC APPLICATION DATES

- KHNP KEPCO Application Letter (ML15006A098): 12/23/2014
- Letter of Receipt to KHNP KEPCO (ML14357A347): 02/02/2015
- 80 Fed. Reg. 5792 Receipt of Application: 02/03/2015
- Letter of Docketing to KHNP KEPCO (ML15041A348): 03/04/2015
- 80 Fed. Reg. 13035 Notice of Docketing: 03/12/2015
- Schedule Letter to KHNP KEPCO (ML15091A241): 06/02/2015
- Schedule Letter to KHNP KEPCO (ML16067A165): 03/07/2016

APR1400 APPLICATION

	Document Title	Accession #	Doc Date	Docket #	Availability	Sensitivity
Publicly Available - Non Security Related Information (Non SR)	Submittal Letter	ML 15006A037	12/23/2014	52-046	Public	Non-Sensitive
	Environmental Report	ML 15006A038	12/23/2014	52-046	Public	Non-Sensitive
	Tier1	ML 15006A039	12/23/2014	52-046	Public	Non-Sensitive
	Chapter 01 - Introduction and General Description of the Plant	ML 15006A040	12/23/2014	52-046	Public	Non-Sensitive
	Chapter 02 - Site Characteristics	ML 15006A041	12/23/2014	52-046	Public	Non-Sensitive
	Chapter 03 - Design of Structures, Systems, Components, and Equipment	ML 15006A042	12/23/2014	52-046	Public	Non-Sensitive
	Chapter 04 - Reactor	ML 15006A043	12/23/2014	52-046	Public	Non-Sensitive
	Chapter 05 - Reactor Coolant System and Connecting Systems	ML 15006A044	12/23/2014	52-046	Public	Non-Sensitive
	Chapter 06 - Engineered Safety Features	ML 15006A045	12/23/2014	52-046	Public	Non-Sensitive
	Chapter 07 - Instrumentation and Controls	ML 15006A046	12/23/2014	52-046	Public	Non-Sensitive
	Chapter 08 - Electric Power	ML 15006A047	12/23/2014	52-046	Public	Non-Sensitive
	Chapter 09 - Auxiliary Systems	ML 15006A048	12/23/2014	52-046	Public	Non-Sensitive
	Chapter 10 - Steam and Power Conversion System	ML 15006A049	12/23/2014	52-046	Public	Non-Sensitive
	Chapter 11 - Radioactive Waste Management	ML 15006A050	12/23/2014	52-046	Public	Non-Sensitive
	Chapter 12 - Radiation Protection	ML 15006A051	12/23/2014	52-046	Public	Non-Sensitive
	Chapter13 - Conduct of Operations	ML 15006A052	12/23/2014	52-046	Public	Non-Sensitive
	Chapter14 - Verification Programs	ML 15006A053	12/23/2014	52-046	Public	Non-Sensitive
	Chapter15 - Transient and Accident Analyses	ML 15006A054	12/23/2014	52-046	Public	Non-Sensitive
	Chapter16 - Technical Specifications	ML 15006A055	12/23/2014	52-046	Public	Non-Sensitive
	Chapter17 - Quality Assurance and Reliability Assurance	ML 15006A056	12/23/2014	52-046	Public	Non-Sensitive
	Chapter18 - Human Factors Engineering	ML 15006A057	12/23/2014	52-046	Public	Non-Sensitive
	Chapter19 - Probabilistic Risk Assessment and Severe Accident Evaluation	ML 15006A058	12/23/2014	52-046	Public	Non-Sensitive

APR1400 APPLICATION

	Document Title	Accession #	Doc Date	Docket #	Availability	Sensitivity
Non-Publicly Available - Security Related Information (SRI)	Tier1	Non-Public	12/23/2014	52-046	Non-Public	Security Related Info
	Chapter 01 - Introduction and General Description of the Plant	Non-Public	12/23/2014	52-046	Non-Public	Security Related Info
	Chapter 03 - Design of Structures, Systems, Components, and Equipment	Non-Public	12/23/2014	52-046	Non-Public	Security Related Info
	Chapter 05- Reactor Coolant System and Connecting Systems	Non-Public	12/23/2014	52-046	Non-Public	Security Related Info
	Chapter 06 - Engineered Safety Features	Non-Public	12/23/2014	52-046	Non-Public	Security Related Info
	Chapter 09 - Auxiliary Systems	Non-Public	12/23/2014	52-046	Non-Public	Security Related Info
	Chapter 11 - Radioactive Waste Management	Non-Public	12/23/2014	52-046	Non-Public	Security Related Info
	Chapter 12 - Radiation Protection	Non-Public	12/23/2014	52-046	Non-Public	Security Related Info
	Chapter19 - Probabilistic Risk Assessment and Severe Accident Evaluation	Non-Public	12/23/2014	52-046	Non-Public	Security Related Info

APR1400 TOPICAL REPORTS

- 1) There are 5 Topical Reports “Incorporated by Reference” (IBR) into the APR1400 DCD (see next slide).
- 2) The Quality Assurance Program Description (QAPD) Topical Report Safety Evaluation is completed and publicly available.
- 3) Staff are conducting the detailed licensing reviews for the remaining 4 Topical Reports.
- 4) A Safety Evaluation Report (SER) will be prepared for each Topical Report.
- 5) The SERs will be reviewed by KHNP and presented for approval to the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (ACRS).

APR1400 TOPICAL REPORTS

List of Topical Reports

Report Number ⁽¹⁾	Title	DCD Tier 2 Section
APR1400-F-A-TR-12004-P APR1400-F-A-TR-12004-NP	Realistic Evaluation Methodology for Large-Break LOCA of the APR1400, Rev. 0	6.2.1.5.1, 15.6
APR1400-F-C-TR-12002-P APR1400-F-C-TR-12002-NP	KCE-1 Critical Heat Flux Correlation for PLUS7 Thermal Design, Rev. 0	4.4, 15.0~15.6
APR1400-F-M-TR-13001-P APR1400-F-M-TR-13001-NP	PLUS7 Fuel Design for the APR1400, Rev. 0	4.2, 4.4
APR1400-K-Q-TR-11005-NP	QAPD for the APR1400 DC, Rev. 4	17.1, 17.2, 17.3, 17.5
APR1400-Z-M-TR-12003-P APR1400-Z-M-TR-12003-NP	Fluidic Device Design for the APR1400, Rev. 0	6.3.2.1

(1) P – denotes document is proprietary.
NP – denotes document is non-proprietary.

APR1400 DC REVIEW

The 6-Phase DC Review Schedule Completion Dates:

- Phase 1 - PSER and RAIs 02/01/2016 [completed]
- Phase 2 - SER with OIs 11/16/2016 [underway]
- Phase 3 - ACRS Review of SER with OI 06/20/2017
- Phase 4 - Advanced SER with No OI 12/15/2017
- Phase 5 - ACRS Review of Draft FSER with No OI 06/27/2018
- Phase 6 - FSER with No OI 09/12/2018
- Rulemaking 05/15/2019
- Environmental Assessment 08/31/2018


APR1400 DC REVIEW

- Phase 1 review is completed (PSERs and RAIs)
- Phase 2 review is in the 10th month
- Environmental Review is underway
- RAIs are being issued, responded, evaluated, & dispositioned
- Utilizing public meetings, audits, and inspections in the review process

SUMMARY

- The Phase 2 Safety Evaluations with Open Items and associated Topical Report Safety Evaluations will be presented to the ACRS in Phase 3 of the review process.

Overview of the APR1400 DC Project



KEPCO/KHNP
Apr. 20~21, 2016

Contents

- **Introduction**
 - **NPPs in Korea**
 - **Project History**
- **Design Features and General Arrangement**
- **Design Review Status**
- **Summaries**

Contents

● Introduction

- NPPs in Korea
- Project History


- Design Features and General Arrangement
- Design Review Status
- Summaries

Nuclear Power Plants in Korea

In Operation	24 Units	21,716 MW
Under Construction	4 Units	5,600 MW
Planning	6 Units	8,600 MW



Project Organization



Project History and Progress

- [Mar. 2009] Submittal of the Intent of APR1400 DC Application to US NRC
- [Apr. 2010~Oct. 2014] Performed total 18 PARMs
- [Dec. 2014] Submittal of the APR1400 DC application to the US NRC
- [Mar. 2015] Receive the Docketing letter of APR1400 DC application
- [Apr. 2015] Receive the First RAIs[Ch. 2 & 3]
- [Jan. 2016] Finished Phase I Review



NRC NEWS
Office of Public Affairs, Headquarters
Washington, DC. 20555-0001
www.nrc.gov ■ opa.resource@nrc.gov

No: 15-012
CONTACT: Scott Burnell, 301-415-8200

March 4, 2015

NRC To Begin Full Certification Review of APR1400 Reactor

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has [docketed for review](#) Korea Electric Power Corp. and Korea Hydro and Nuclear Power's application to certify the APR1400 reactor design for use in the United States.



Contents

- Introduction
 - NPPs in Korea
 - Project History
- **Design Features & General Arrangement**
- Design Review Status
- Summaries

Development history of APR1400

- Development of Advanced Power Reactor 1400 (1992~2002)
- Licensing agreement with ABB-CE

EPRI URD/EURD
Sys. 80+
(CE, 1300MWe)



ADF/PDF
Latest Codes &
Standards

Improved OPR 1000

- In Operation - SKN 1/2, SWN 1/2

OPR 1000

- In Operation
 - Hanbit 3/4 ('95/'96)
 - Hanul 3/4 ('98/'99)
 - Hanbit 5/6 ('02/'02)
 - Hanul 5/6 ('04/'05)

NSSS Design

Palo Verde #2 (CE, 1300MWe)

Core Design

ANO #2 (CE, 1000MWe)

APR1400 Design Features

- **APR1400 referenced Shin Kori Units 3&4.**
- **APR1400 is an essentially complete design**
 - Construction completed in Korea (Shin Kori Units 3 & 4)
 - OL for Shin Kori Unit 3 issued on October 2015
 - Criticality reached on December 2015
 - Under-construction in UAE (Barakah Units 1 - 4)
 - OL for Barakah Unit 1 scheduled for October 2016


SKN 3&4, Korea



Barakah 1&2, UAE



Design Features of the APR1400



- **Design Life Time : 60 Years for Class 1 Major Equipment**
- **Power : 4000MWth / 1400MWe**
- **Two-Loop : 2 HLs, 2 SGs, 4 RCPs, 4 CLs, 1 Pzr**
- **Primary Operating condition:**
 - Pressure : 2250psia
 - HL/CL Temp. : 615/555 °F
- **Secondary Operating condition:**
 - Pressure : 1000psia
 - MF/MS Temp. : 450/545 °F
- **Pzr Free volume : 2400 ft³**
- **SG U-tube : 13102/SG, I690**

APR1400 for NRC DC(1/2)

Basic approach of design change for NRC DC

- **Retain reference plant design (SKN 3&4)**
 - To take advantage of proven safety and performance
- **Meet US NRC Regulation Guidance effective on Aug. 2014**
 - Six month before the target docketing date

APR1400 for NRC DC(2/2)

Special Design Considerations for NRC DC

■ Enhance SBO coping capability

- Gas turbine generator for AAC source, 16 hr battery(Train C/D), FLEX implementation

■ Improve the tolerance to the beyond design basis

- Analysis of aircraft impact by 10CFR50.150
- Application of LOLA (loss of large area) design requirement
- Application of physical security requirement

■ Robust design for the design base accidents

- GSI-191 for LBLOCA
- Diverse reactor protection systems for common cause failures
- Application of FEM model to seismic design

Design Differences between APR1400 and System 80+

Containment

- **System80+** : Spherical Steel
- **APR1400** : Cylindrical PS Concrete

Thermal Power

- **System80+** : 3,931 MWt
- **APR1400** : 4,000 MWt

Hot-leg Temp.


- **System80+** : 621F
- **APR1400** : 615F

Meeting (Apr.20-21, 2010)

Safety Injection System

- **System80+** : 4 train SIS + DVI
- **APR1400** : 4 train SIS + DVI + Fluidic Device

SIS: safe injection system
 DVI: direct vessel injection
 POSRV: pilot operated safety relief valve
 IHA: integrated head assembly
 CFS: core flooding system
 PAR: passive autocatalytic recombiner
 IVR: in-vessel retention
 ERVC: external reactor vessel cooling



RCS OPP / RD System

- **System80+** : 4 PSV + 2 SDS
- **APR1400** : 4 POSRV

RV Upper Structure



- **System80+** : Conventional
- **APR1400** : IHA

Severe Accident

- **System80+** : CFS
- **APR1400** : CFS + PAR, IVR/ERVC



General Arrangement (1/4)

Plant General Arrangement




General Arrangement (3/4)

RCS Arrangement Plane



General Arrangement (4/4)

Quadrant Arrangement of Aux. Building



SIP : Safety Injection Pump
 SCP : Shutdown Cooling Pump
 CSP : Containment Spray Pump
 CCWP : Component Cooling Water Pump

Contents

- Introduction
 - NPPs in Korea
 - Project History
- Design Features and General Arrangement
- **Design Review Status**
- Summaries

Design Review Status

Task	Description	Target Date
Phase I	PSER and RAI Completed	Feb. 2016 Jan. 29 2016
Phase II	SER with Open Items	Nov. 2016
Phase III	ACRS Review of SER with Open Items	Jun. 2017
Phase IV	Advanced SER with No Open Items	Dec. 2017
Phase V	ACRS Review of Advanced SER with No Open Items	Jun. 2018
Phase VI	Final SER with No Open Items	Sep. 2018

Interaction with NRC

■ Regular meeting

- ✓ Bi-Weekly PM Conference Call
- ✓ Bi-Weekly Conference Call for PRA Issues
- ✓ Bi-Weekly Conference Call for Ch.3 Issues
- ✓ Bi-Weekly Conference Call for Ch.15
- ✓ Bi-Weekly Conference Call for Ch.9

■ Clarification meeting

- ✓ Phone call or face-to-face meeting frequently

■ Drop-in meeting

- ✓ Staff in WDCC visits NRC to coordinate issues

■ Audit

- ✓ Design documents, Piping, Computer code V/V. etc.

■ QA inspection

- ✓ GSI-191 issue : 4 findings
- ✓ Computer codes : 4 observations

Contents

- Introduction
 - NPPs in Korea
 - Project History
- Design Features and General Arrangement
- Design Review Status
- **Summaries**


Summaries

- **The APR1400 adopted proven technologies from the operation of OPR1000.**
- **The APR1400 used safety analysis codes and methodologies of the certified System 80+.**
- **The APR1400 standard design approval was issued by Korean regulatory authority in 2002.**
 - The first two units of the APR1400, Shin-Kori Units 3 & 4, are being constructed and their commercial operations are under preparation.
- **The APR1400 is an essentially complete design.**



Thank you

APR1400 NSSS Design




KEPCO/KHNP
April 20~21, 2016

Contents

- **NSSS Design Overview**
- **Major NSSS Systems**
 - **Reactor Coolant System**
 - **Safety Injection System**
 - **Shutdown Cooling System**
 - **Chemical & Volume Control System**
- **Unique Design Features**
 - **Safety Injection Tank with Fluidic Device**
 - **Pressurizer Pilot Operated Safety Relief Valve**
- **Summary**

NSSS Design Overview




NSSS Design Overview

- **NSSS Design of APR1400**
 - is identical to that of Shin-Kori Unit 3 in the Republic of Korea, recently under the power ascension tests
 - is similar to the System 80+ Certified Design except for unique design features
 - is consistent with the regulations of the United States of America
 - adopts the industry codes and standards applicable in the United States of America

NSSS Design Overview

- **Regulatory Bases of APR1400**
 - **Compliance with US NRC regulation documents**
 - **Code of Federal Regulations**
 - **Regulatory Guides**
 - **Standard Review Plan, NUREG-0800**
 - **Generic Letters and Bulletins**
 - **Compliance with the rules and regulations in effect as of September 2014 of the United States of America**


Major NSSS Systems




Reactor Coolant System (RCS)

● RCS Configuration

- 2-loop
- Reactor Vessel
 - Integrated Head Assembly
- Steam Generators : 2
- Reactor Coolant Pumps : 4
- Pressurizer
 - POSRVs : 4
- Main piping
 - Hot leg pipes : 2
 - Cold leg pipes : 4
 - Suction pipes : 4
 - Surge line : 1




RCS Schematic Diagram




Reactor

- **Reactor Vessel**
- **Reactor Internals**
 - **Upper Guide Structure Assembly**
 - **Core Support Barrel Assembly**
- **Reactor Core**
 - **Fuel Assembly**
 - **Control Element Assembly**




Reactor Coolant Pump

- **Motor driven, Single-stage Centrifugal Pump**
 - Bottom suction and radial discharge
- **Flexible Coupling of Shaft to the Motor**
 - Low vibration and noise
- **Pump Flywheel**
 - Sufficient coastdown flow following loss of power to the pumps
- **RCP Shaft Seal System**
 - Three stage mechanical seals
 - Cooled by seal injection water and high pressure water cooler



Pressurizer

- **RCS Pressure and Volume Control**
 - Sufficient capacity to accommodate pressure and volume changes due to operational transients without opening the safety valves
- **Four Pilot Operated Safety Relief Valves (POS RVs)**
 - Overpressure protection of RCS
 - Manual rapid depressurization of RCS to initiate Feed-and-Bleed operation in a total loss of feedwater event




<Top view>



Steam Generator

- **Vertical, U-tube, Recirculation type**
- **Alloy 690 U-tubes**
 - Resistant to primary water stress corrosion cracking
- **Integral Economizer**
 - Enhance thermal effectiveness
- **Flow Restrictor**
 - Limit steam flow in the unlikely event of a main steam line break



1. Steam Nozzles
2. Steam Dryers
3. Steam Separators
4. Recirculation Nozzle
5. Downcomer Feedwater Nozzle
6. Heat Transfer Tubes
7. Economizer
8. Lancing Hole
9. Blowdown Nozzles
10. Economizer Feedwater Nozzles
11. Primary Outlet Nozzles
12. Primary Inlet Nozzle


Safety Injection System

- **System Function**


- Emergency Core Cooling
- Reactivity and Inventory Control
- Feed-and-Bleed Operation

- **SIS Design**


- SIS consists of four mechanically and electrically separated trains.
- Borated water is injected directly to the reactor vessel.
- Borated water source is taken from In-containment Refueling Water Storage Tank (IRWST).



SIS Flow Diagram



Shutdown Cooling System (SCS)




- **System Function**

- Decay Heat Removal

- **SCS Design**

- SCS consists of two mechanically and electrically separated trains.
- Shutdown Cooling Pump is interchangeable with Containment Spray Pump.
- SCS suction line relief valves provide RCS low temperature overpressure protection.

SCS Flow Diagram




Chemical & Volume Control System (CVCS)

- **System Function**


- RCS Inventory (Volume) Control
- RCS Chemistry Control
- Reactivity Control
- Other Functions
 - Auxiliary spray to the pressurizer
 - Seal injection to the RCPs

- **CVCS Design**

- CVCS consists of charging pumps, auxiliary charging pump, regenerative heat exchanger (HX), letdown HX, filters, ion exchangers, volume control tank, valves, etc.




CVCS Flow Diagram



Unique Design Features

- ◆ Safety Injection Tank with Fluidic Device
- ◆ Pressurizer Pilot Operated Safety Relief Valve




Safety Injection Tank with Fluidic Device

- **Safety Injection Tank (SIT) with Fluidic Device**
 - is an accumulation tank partially filled with borated water and pressurized with nitrogen
 - provides inherent reliability to achieve a desired injection flow scheme without the need for any active components
 - controls injection flow rates during refill and reflood phases
 - ensures effective use of SIT water

Working Principles of Fluidic Device

● Structures of SIT with Fluidic Device


- Fluidic Device is installed at the bottom part of the SIT.
- Fluidic Device has a supply port at the center and four control ports around the supply port.
- Supply port is connected to a stand pipe.



Working Principles of Fluidic Device

● Typical Flow Pattern inside the Vortex Chamber

- SIT water entered through the supply port flows into the vortex chamber through four supply nozzles.
- SIT water entered through the four control ports flows directly into the vortex chamber through four control nozzles.
- When SIT water is only injected through the control nozzles, SIT water is injected tangentially into the vortex chamber, establishing a strong swirling flow.
- When SIT water is delivered through both the supply and control nozzles, the flows through each supply nozzle and a neighboring control nozzle collide each other, resulting in no swirling flow.



Performance Test of Fluidic Device

- Full scale test by Korea Atomic Energy Research Institute in Korea



Summary of Performance Test


- **A series of tests were performed to evaluate and verify the performance of SIT with Fluidic Device of APR1400.**
 - Repeatability with regard to the performance was confirmed.
 - Pressure loss coefficient is not materially affected by initial pressure and manufacturing tolerances.
 - Design requirements including the pressure loss coefficient are met for both large and small flow injections.
- **Topical Report for Fluidic Device Design for the APR1400 (APR1400-Z-M-TR-12003-NP) has been submitted on January 2013. Advanced TR Safety Evaluation is issued on April 2016.**

Design Features of POSRV

- **Design Characteristics of Pilot Operated Safety Relief Valve (POSRV)**
 - High seat tightness
 - Low possibility of chattering
 - Reliable for steam, water and two-phase discharge
 - Complicated installation and maintenance
- **POSRV Function**
 - Overpressure protection by automatic actuation of spring loaded pilot valves
 - Rapid depressurization by manual actuation of motor operated pilot valves


POSRV Assembly

- **Main Valve (1)**
- **Spring Loaded Pilot Valve (SLPV) (2)**
 - Automatic actuation for overpressure protection
 - Motor operated isolation valve
 - Normally open
 - Power removed
 - Closed in case of SLPV stuck open
 - Manual isolation valve
 - Isolation for SLPV test and maintenance
 - Locked open
- **Motor Operated Pilot Valve (2)**
 - Manual actuation for rapid depressurization
 - Two valves installed in series
 - Normally closed
 - Power removed



VS99 : Main Valve
VS66 : Spring Loaded Pilot Valve
PDE : Motor Operated Pilot Valves
M : Motor Operated Valve
V₁ : Pilot Discharge
P₁ : Impulse Line

Summary




Summary

- **APR1400 NSSS design complies with US NRC regulatory requirements.**
- **APR1400 SIT with Fluidic Device is an innovative design which ensures effective use of the SIT water. The SIT with Fluidic Device was verified in full scale test facility as well as in the pre-operational test of Shin-Kori Unit 3.**
- **The POSRV adopted in APR1400 provides dual functions of overpressure protection and rapid depressurization.**

Thank you



APR1400 System Design (Fuel Design)



KEPCO/KHNP
Apr. 20~21. 2016

Contents

- **Introduction**
 - **PLUS7 Fuel Development**
 - **Regulatory Bases**
- **PLUS7 Fuel Design**
 - **PLUS7 Design Characteristics**
 - **PLUS7 Design Verifications**
- **PLUS7 Irradiation Experience**
- **PLUS7 Licensing Status**
- **Summary**

Introduction

(Ref. : APR1400-F-M-TR-13001-P Rev.0)

Introduction (PLUS7 Fuel Development)

- PLUS7 fuel design was jointly developed with Westinghouse for APR1400 in Korea (1999~2002).
- PLUS7 fuel was developed to improve the fuel performance compared to Guardian.

(Guardian : Standard fuel design for System80+)

- KEPCO/KHNP submitted PLUS7 Topical Report and Technical Report to NRC for APR1400 DC licensing.
 - PLUS7 Fuel Design : APR1400-F-M-TR-13001-P Rev.0
 - Seismic/LOCA Analysis : APR1400-Z-M-NR-14010-P Rev.0

Introduction (Regulatory Bases)


PLUS7 fuel design was developed to comply with following code of federal regulations, NRC regulatory documents, and industrial code and standards.

- **Code of Federal Regulations**
 - **10 CFR 50 Appendix A. GDC 10 Reactor Design**
- **NRC Regulatory Documents**
 - **NUREG-0800, SRP 4.2 Fuel System Design**
 - **IN 2012-09 Irradiation Effects on Fuel Assembly Spacer Grid Crush Strength, etc.**
- **Industrial Code and Standards**
 - **ASME B&PV Code Section III**
 - **ANSI ANS 57.5 Plant Design Conditions, etc.**

PLUS7 Fuel Design

(Ref. : APR1400-F-M-TR-13001-P Rev.0)

PLUS7 Fuel Design (Characteristics)




PLUS7 Fuel Design (Characteristics)

- PLUS7 incorporated the proven Guardian structure and the proven Westinghouse type fuel features to improve fuel performance.

Items		Guardian	PLUS7	Improvements
Cladding		Zry-4	ZIRLO	High Burnup Capability
Rod Diameter		0.382"	0.374"	Enhanced Neutron Economy
Axial Blanket		No	Yes	
Mid Grid	Spring	Cantilever	Conformal	Increased Fretting Wear Resistance
	Dimple	Arched	Conformal	
	Strap	Wavy	Straight	High Seismic Capability
	Mixing Vane	No	Yes	Enhanced Thermal Performance
Top Nozzle		Separated	Assembled	Easy Removable
Bottom nozzle		Large Hole	Small Hole & Slot	Increased Debris Filtering Efficiency


PLUS7 Fuel Design (Characteristics)

High Burnup Capability and Neutron Economy



Guardian


- High Burnup Capability
 - ZIRLO™ Cladding
 - Variable Pitch Plenum Spring
- Neutron Economy
 - Optimized Rod OD
 - Axial Blanket



PLUS7

PLUS7 Fuel Design (Characteristics)


Enhanced Thermal Margin and High Seismic Capability



PLUS7 Fuel Design (Characteristics)


Enhanced Fuel Integrity - Fretting Wear Resistance

Guardian



- Cantilever Spring and Arched Dimple
 - Lower Fretting Wear Resistance

PLUS7





- Conformal Spring and Dimple
 - Improve Fretting Wear Resistance

PLUS7 Fuel Design (Characteristics)

Enhanced Fuel Integrity - Debris Filtering Efficiency

Guardian



PLUS7 Fuel Design (Verification)

- **Out-of-Pile Tests**
 - **Fuel Assembly Mechanical Tests**
 - Load-Deflection, Strength, Vibration, Impact, etc.
 - **Fuel Assembly Hydraulic Tests**
 - Pressure Drop, Flow-Induced Vibration, Long-Term Wear, etc.
 - **Critical Heat Flux Test**
 - Critical Heat Flux
- **In-Reactor Verification Tests**
 - **PSE(Pool Side Examination)**
 - **Hot Cell Examination**

PLUS7 Fuel Design (Verification)

- **Out-of-Pile Tests**
 - **PLUS7 fuel assembly mechanical and hydraulic tests were performed using test facilities(FACTS, VIPER, etc.) located at Westinghouse Columbia Plant.**
 - **Critical heat flux test was performed using HTRF(Heat Transfer Research Facility) located at Columbia University.**
 - **Based on the fuel assembly mechanical and hydraulic test results, the mechanical and hydraulic performance of PLUS7 fuel design was verified.**
 - **KCE-1 correlation was developed based on the critical heat flux test results and the correlation was applied to PLUS7 design analysis. (KCE-1 Topical Report : APR1400-F-C-TR-12002-P Rev.0)**

PLUS7 Fuel Design (Verification)

- **In-Reactor Verification Tests (LTA and CSA Program)**
 - **4 LTAs(Lead Test Assemblies) were manufactured and loaded at Ulchin Unit 3 Cycle 5 ~ Cycle 7.**
 - **4 CSAs(Commercial Surveillance Assemblies) were selected from commercially supplied fuels at Yonggwang Unit 5 Cycle 5.**
 - **PSE(Pool Side Examination) and hot cell examination has been successfully completed after the LTAs and CSAs irradiation.**
- **Based on the PSE and hot cell examination results, it was confirmed that the measured data were within the design limit of PLUS7 fuel design.**

PLUS7 Irradiation Experience

(Ref. : APR1400-F-M-TR-13001-P Rev.0)

PLUS7 Irradiation Experience

- Based on the out-of-pile test and in-reactor verification test results, more than 4,000 PLUS7 fuel assemblies were supplied since 2006.
- Status of Commercial Supply for PLUS7 Fuel
 - Supplied 4,250 fuel assemblies(1,003,000 fuel rods) to 13 reactors in KOREA with 18 month cycle
 - Maximum Fuel Rod Discharge Burnup : 59,547 MWD/MTU
 - 302 fuel assemblies are ready to ship for Barakah Unit 1

PLUS7 Licensing Status

(Ref. : APR1400-Z-M-NR-14010-P Rev.0)

PLUS7 Licensing Status

- **KEPCO/KHNP submitted PLUS7 Topical Report and fuel assembly seismic Technical Report in 2014.**
- **NRC Audit was performed for fuel assembly seismic Technical Report in 2015 and there were some issues related to fuel assembly EOL seismic analysis(IN 2012-09).**
- **KEPCO/KHNP is working on the fuel assembly EOL test and seismic analysis, and the issues will be resolved by end of July 2017 based on the additional test and analysis results.**


Summary

Summary

- **PLUS7 fuel assembly design was jointly developed with Westinghouse for APR1400 in Korea(1999~2002).**
- **PLUS7 design evaluation was performed to comply with code of federal regulations and NRC regulatory documents.**
- **PLUS7 fuel design was verified through the out-of-pile tests, critical heat flux tests, in-reactor verification tests.**
- **Fuel assembly EOL seismic analysis related issues will be resolved by end of July 2017 based on the additional test and analysis results.**
- **More than 4,000 PLUS7 fuel assemblies were supplied since 2006 and excellent in-reactor performance was demonstrated.**




THANK YOU !

APR1400 System Design (Containment System)



KEPCO/KHNP
Apr. 20~21. 2016

Contents

-  **Introduction**
-  **APR1400 Design Features**
-  **Conclusion**

1. Introduction

This presentation is to present an overview of the design features for the APR1400 standard design regarding the containment systems.

1. Introduction

□ Regulatory Bases

- Containment P/T Analyses
 - 10CFR50 Appendix A, GDC 16, 38, 50
 - NUREG-0800 (SRP 6.2.1) Containment Function Design
 - ANSI/ANS 56.4 Recommendations for P/T Analysis Methodology
- Containment Spray System
 - 10CFR50 Appendix A, GDC 2, 4, 5, 17, 38, 39, 40
- Containment Isolation System
 - 10CFR50 Appendix A, GDC 52, 54, 55, 56, 57
 - RG 1.11(Rev.1), RG 1.141(Rev.1), RG 1.155
- Containment Hydrogen Control System
 - 10CFR50 Appendix A, GDC 41, 42, 43, 10CFR50.34(f)(2)(ix), 10CFR50.44
 - RG 1.7 (Rev.3)
- Design Features to Address GSI-191
 - RG 1.82 (Rev.4), GL 2004-02, NEI 04-07, Safety Evaluation for NEI 04-07

2. APR1400 Design Features

2.1 Containment P/T Analyses

2.2 Containment Spray System

2.3 Containment Isolation System

2.4 Containment Hydrogen Control System

2.5 Design Features to Address GSI-191

2.1 Containment P/T Analyses

□ Analysis Model

- GOTHIC Containment/RCS Model
- Conservative Break flow model & Wall Heat transfer model
- Case Analyses
 - LOCA : 5 cases (Hot leg / cold leg break, Slot break)
 - Secondary system pipe breaks : 10 cases (CSS or MSIV single failure)

□ Analysis Results

- The containment is designed to have a minimum 10% of pressure margin.
 - Calculated peak pressure of 51.1 psig, and the containment design pressure of 60 psig
- Containment pressure is well reduced and maintained at less than 50% of the peak pressure within 24 hours after the postulated accident.
 - Containment pressure at 24 hours : 42.4% of the peak pressure
 - Containment spray system has sufficient heat removal capability to reduce the containment pressure during the accident.

2.2 Containment Spray System


❑ Function

- Containment pressure and temperature reduction following MSLB or LOCA
- Fission products removal from containment atmosphere following LOCA

❑ Configuration

- Two 100 % capacity divisions
- In each division, a containment spray(CS) pump, a CS heat exchanger, a CS pump mini-flow heat exchanger, CS header, CS nozzles, valves and associated I&C
- An emergency containment spray backup system (ECSBS) for severe accident management

❑ Schematic Diagram for CS System (Division I)



2.3 Containment Isolation System

❑ Function


- Means of isolating fluid systems that pass through containment penetrations to confine release of any radioactivity from containment following postulated DBA

❑ Configuration

- Isolation design is achieved by applying acceptable common criteria (GDC 55, 56, 57) to penetrations in many different fluid systems and by using containment pressure to provide a CIAS.
- APR1400 DCD Tier 2 Figure 6.2.4-1

2.3 Containment Isolation System

□ Configuration examples according to GDC requirements




2.4 Containment Hydrogen Control System

❑ Function

- Control hydrogen concentration in containment and IRWST below 10% by volume during severe accident


❑ Configuration

- 30 Passive Autocatalytic Recombiners (PARs) in containment and inside the IRWST vent stack
 - Self-actuated, No power supply and operator action is needed.
- 8 Hydrogen Igniters (HIs)
 - ac-powered glow plug
 - Manual actuation in the MCR/RSR
 - Non-class 1E, but supplied from Class 1E bus with electrical isolation device to enhance the reliability of HIs
 - SBO : AAC generator supplies power.
 - Non-class 1E dedicated DC battery for complete loss of ac power



2.5 Design Features to Address GSI-191

❑ Flow Path to IRWST Sump Strainer during LOCA for APR1400



2.5 Design Features to Address GSI-191

❑ GSI-191 Evaluation

- Debris Generation
- Chemical Effect
- Debris Head Loss
- ECCS Pump NPSHa
- Ex-vessel Downstream Effect
- In-vessel Downstream Effect

❑ Evaluation Report

- APR1400-E-N-NR-14001-P/NP, “Design Features to Address GSI-191”

2.5 Design Features to Address GSI-191

❑ GSI-191 Evaluation : Debris Generation

- According to the guidance of NEI 04-07, RCS hot-leg line (diameter of 42 in) break is selected, and this break location bounds variations in debris generation by size, quantity, and type of debris from other break locations.
 - Generated debris : RMI, coatings (epoxy, IOZ), latent debris (fiber, particle), concrete, aluminum
- For conservatism, APR1400 is assuming that all generated coatings and all latent debris are transported to the sump in the IRWST.

❑ GSI-191 Evaluation : Chemical Effect

- WCAP-16530-NP-A , Rev.0 methodology referenced in RG 1.82
- APR1400 is considering plant specific LOCA conditions, and determines conservative quantities of chemical precipitates during 30 days mission time with the WCAP-16530-NP-A , Rev.0 methodology.
 - AlOOH (398.2 lbm), $\text{NaAlSi}_3\text{O}_8$ (9.5 lbm), $\text{Ca}_3(\text{PO}_4)_2$ (1.5 lbm)

2.5 Design Features to Address GSI-191

❑ GSI-191 Evaluation : Debris Head Loss

- APR1400 design conservatively assumes that all of break-generated coatings, latent debris, and chemical precipitates are transported directly to a single sump. (Flow conditions : 1 SIP + 1 CSP)
- Allowable head loss : 2 ft-water (for NPSH evaluation)
- Debris head loss test was performed with assumptions (i.e. effective strainer area, test fluid temperature), and the test result (0.81 ft-water) shows that the allowable head loss (2 ft-water) which is used for NPSH evaluation has sufficient margin.

2.5 Design Features to Address GSI-191

❑ GSI-191 Evaluation : ECCS Pump NPSHa

- $NPSHa = h_{atm} + h_{static} - h_{loss} - h_{vapor}$
- Containment Accident Pressure (CAP) in APR1400 standard design
 - $T_{IRWST} > 212^{\circ}F$, $h_{atm} = h_{vapor}$
 - $T_{IRWST} < 212^{\circ}F$, $h_{atm} =$ initial containment pressure before LOCA
 - In the evaluation of the NPSHa for ECCS pumps, APR1400 standard design credits the CAP for the IRWST temperature greater than 212°F with the assumption of that the CAP is equal to the IRWST liquid vapor pressure.

2.5 Design Features to Address GSI-191

□ GSI-191 Evaluation : ECCS Pump NPSHa

- $NPSH_{\text{reff}} = (1 + \text{uncertainty}) NPSH_{\text{r3\%}}$
 - Uncertainty factors are considered based on guidance in SECY-11-0014.
 - 21% margin is applied for effects of uncertainty factors.
 - $NPSH_{\text{reff}}$ for CSP and SIP will be verified through ASME QME-1.
 - $NPSH_{\text{reff}}$ calculation results

Pump	Flowrate (gpm)	$NPSH_{\text{r3\%}}$ (ft-water)	$NPSH_{\text{reff}}$ (ft-water)
SI Pump	1,235	18.23	22
CS Pump	5,425	14.4	17.5

- NPSH evaluation results (Minimum margin at high temperature)

Pump	$NPSH_a$ (ft-water)	$NPSH_{\text{reff}}$ (ft-water)	Margin (ft-water)
SI Pump	23.73	22.0	1.73
CS Pump	20.50	17.5	3.00

2.5 Design Features to Address GSI-191

❑ GSI-191 Evaluation : ECCS Pump NPSHa

- Containment Accident Pressure (RAI 25-7844 Q06.02.02-6)
 - ACRS recommends that best estimate analyses with explicit consideration of uncertainties should be performed to evaluate the available NPSH margins for the limiting LOCA event and a range of ECCS operating configurations. (Correspondences btw ACRS and NRC)
 - SECY-11-0014 (Jan. 31, 2011), “Use of containment accident pressure in analyzing emergency core cooling system and containment heat removal system pump performance in postulated accidents”
 - APR1400 is working on the conservative estimation of the NPSH margin uncertainty, and the risk calculation for assessing the plant risk associated with crediting containment accident pressure in the NPSH assessment.

2.5 Design Features to Address GSI-191

❑ GSI-191 Evaluation : Ex-vessel Downstream Effect

- Strainer Bypass Testing (Scale-down test)
 - Filter bag is used to collect bypassed fiber.
 - Bypassed fiber debris mass : 1.67 kg (through 4 sump strainers)
- Ex-vessel downstream effects assessment (WCAP-16406-P-A, Rev.1)
 - SI pump and CS pump evaluation will be qualified according to ASME QME-1-2007 endorsed by RG 1.100, Rev.3.
 - CS heat exchanger and CS mini-flow heat exchanger Evaluation
 - No plugging due to larger tube ID and enough tube velocity
 - Performance and Wear : Vendor will confirm.
 - Evaluation on valves, orifice, spray nozzles, pipes, instrument tubing, and chemical effects
 - No blockage, no debris settling, and negligible wear are expected in APR1400 standard design.

2.5 Design Features to Address GSI-191

❑ GSI-191 Evaluation : In-vessel Downstream Effect

- WCAP-16793-NP, Rev.2
- In-vessel downstream test
 - Hot-leg break, Cold-leg break, Cold-leg break after hot-leg switchover
 - Mock-up Fuel Assembly (FA) of PLUS7 : ½ full length
 - The amount of bypass fiber per FA : 6.93 g/FA < 15 g/FA limit
 - The test results show that the maximum pressure drop through the FA is within the allowable pressure drop with sufficient margin.
- LOCADM analyses
 - The analyses results for deposit thickness, and peak cladding temperature satisfy the acceptance criteria (50 mils, 800°F)
- A sufficient driving force is available to maintain an adequate flow rate, and the long-term core cooling capability is adequately maintained in the APR1400.

3. Conclusion

- The APR1400 containment system complies with US regulatory requirements.
- The design features regarding GSI-191 have been evaluated in accordance with the NRC RG 1.82, Rev.4.
- The containment integrity and the plant safety are maintained with sufficient design margins during any postulated accident conditions.