

ArevaEPRDCPEm Resource

From: Tesfaye, Getachew
Sent: Friday, August 05, 2011 5:30 PM
To: 'usepr@areva.com'
Cc: Eul, Ryan; Lee, Samuel; Segala, John; Clark, Phyllis; Colaccino, Joseph; ArevaEPRDCPEm Resource
Subject: U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 502 (5960), FSAR Ch. 9
Attachments: RAI_502_SBPB_5960.doc

Attached please find the subject requests for additional information (RAI). A draft of the RAI was provided to you on July 29, 2011, and on August 4, 2011, you informed us that the RAI is clear and no further clarification is needed. As a result, no change is made to the draft RAI. The schedule we have established for review of your application assumes technically correct and complete responses within 30 days of receipt of RAIs. For any RAIs that cannot be answered within 30 days, it is expected that a date for receipt of this information will be provided to the staff within the 30 day period so that the staff can assess how this information will impact the published schedule.

Thanks,
Getachew Tesfaye
Sr. Project Manager
NRO/DNRL/NARP
(301) 415-3361

Hearing Identifier: AREVA_EPR_DC_RAIs
Email Number: 3308

Mail Envelope Properties (0A64B42AAA8FD4418CE1EB5240A6FED1382204A958)

Subject: U.S. EPR Design Certification Application RAI No. 502 (5960), FSAR Ch. 9
Sent Date: 8/5/2011 5:29:30 PM
Received Date: 8/5/2011 5:29:31 PM
From: Tesfaye, Getachew

Created By: Getachew.Tesfaye@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"Eul, Ryan" <Ryan.Eul@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Lee, Samuel" <Samuel.Lee@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Segala, John" <John.Segala@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Clark, Phyllis" <Phyllis.Clark@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Colaccino, Joseph" <Joseph.Colaccino@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"ArevaEPRDCPEm Resource" <ArevaEPRDCPEm.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"usepr@areva.com" <usepr@areva.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	795	8/5/2011 5:29:31 PM
RAI_502_SBPB_5960.doc	31226	

Options

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

Request for Additional Information No. 502(5960) Revision 0

8/05/2011

U. S. EPR Standard Design Certification
AREVA NP Inc.
Docket No. 52-020
SRP Section: 09.02.05 - Ultimate Heat Sink
Application Section: 09.02.05

QUESTIONS for Balance of Plant Branch 2 (SBPB)

09.02.05-37

OPEN ITEM

Follow-up to RAI 351, Question No. 09.02.05-31

Standard Review Plan (SRP) 9.2.5 Section III, paragraph 1 requires confirmation of the overall arrangement of the ultimate heat sink (UHS). The staff reviewed the information provided in Tier 1, Table 2.7.11-3, "Essential Service Water System (ESWS) Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria (ITAAC)," to confirm that the proposed ITAAC are adequate for EPR design certification. However, the staff found that some of the proposed ITAAC need further clarification. Based on the staff's review of the applicant's response to RAI 351, Question No. 9.2.5-31, the following were determined as unresolved and needed further clarification/resolution by the applicant:

With regard to applicant's response to parts (e) and (f), the applicant states that part of the ITAAC report will demonstrate "The period of record for the temperature data and the specific worst case periods used in the analysis, together with selection methods and validation techniques for the meteorological data." While the staff agrees with the importance of using and validating the worst case site-specific meteorological conditions, the Tier 1 ITAAC acceptance criteria for ITAAC 7.9 and 7.10 in Table 2.7.11-3 does not specifically state "assuming worst case site-specific meteorological conditions" but instead simply states "assuming the most limited design conditions (including the effects of concentrating impurities on the ESWS)." The ITAAC acceptance criteria should also specifically mention the "worst case (or most limiting) site-specific meteorological conditions" as the applicant described in their response, but did not describe in the actual ITAAC. Therefore, this issue is considered unresolved until the clarity of the ITAAC is corrected to be consistent with the applicant's response.