SMA 12109.01-R001

STUDY TO DEMONSTRATE THE GENERIC APPLICABILITY OF SRSS COMBINATION OF DYNAMIC RESPONSES FOR MARK III NUCLEAR STEAM SUPPLY SYSTEM AND BALANCE-OF-PLANT PIPING AND EQUIPMENT COMPONENTS

prepared for

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY NUCLEAR ENERGY DIVISION San Jose, California

Purchase Order 205-XI193

November, 1981



5160 Birch Street, Newport Beach, Calif. 92660 (714) 833-7552

D, S. Li

SMA 12109.01-R001

STUDY TO DEMONSTRATE THE GENERIC APPLICABILITY OF SRSS COMBINATION OF DYNAMIC RESPONSES FOR MARK III NUCLEAR STEAM SUPPLY SYSTEM AND BALANCE OF PLANT PIPING AND EQUIPMENT COMPONENTS

by

Robert P. Kennedy Thomas R. Kipp Robert D. Thrasher

APPROVED:

Kennedy

Robert P.

President

APPROVED:

FR Narver

Robert B. Narver Acting Manager, Quality Assurance

.

prepared for

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY NUCLEAR ENERGY DIVISION San Jose, California

Purchase Order 205-XI193

November, 1981



5160 Birch Street, Newport Beach, Calif. 92660 (714) 833-7552

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	I IST OF TABLES	÷
		-
		1
		V
	ACKNOWLEDGMENT	i
	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	1.1 Background	1
	1.2 Purpose and Scope	4
	1.2.1 Plants Represented 1-	4
	1.2.2 Locations Evaluated 1-	5
	1.2.3 Load Combinations Evaluated 1-	8
2	TECHNICAL APPROACH	1
	2.1 General Approach	1
	2.2 Specific Assumptions and Responses Time	
	History Criteria 2-	3
3	RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS	1
	3.1 General Presentation of Results	1
	3.2 Trends and Observations	6
	3.3 Effects of Time-Phasing on R _{FO} /SRSS 3-	7
4	CONCLUSIONS	1
5	REFERENCES	1

APPENDICES:

APPENDIX A -	Description of Response Locations
APPENDIX B -	Cumulative Distribution Function Curves from 167 Response Analyses
APPENDIX C -	Response Time History Pairs Used to Generate CDF Curves
APPENDIX D -	Analysis of Trends in Data Set

Section

<u>Title</u>

Page

i

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Title	Page
1-1	Mark III Containment Owners SRSS Subgroup	1-10
1-2	Mark III SRSS Evaluation Matrix	1-11
1-3	Balance-Of-Plant Piping Systems	1-12
3-1	CDF Analysis Results for NSSS - RPV and Internals	3-9
3-2	CDF Analysis Results for NSSS - Main Steam Piping	3-9
3-3	CDF Analysis Results for NSSS - Recirculation Piping	3-10
3-4	CDF Analysis Results for NSSS - Pipe Mounted Equipment .	3-10
3-5	CDF Analysis Results for NSSS - BOP Piping - Drywell	3-11
3-6	CDF Analysis Results for NSSS - BOP Piping - Containment (FS)	3-12
3-7	CDF Analysis Results for NSSS - BOP Piping - Containment (CBFS)	3-12
3-8	CDF Analysis Results for NSSS - BOP Piping - Containment (c)	3-13
3-9	CDF Analysis Results for NSSS - BOP Piping - Shield Building (FS)	3-13
3-10	CDF Analysis Results for NSSS - BOP Piping - Shield Building (CBFS) .	3-14
3-11	CDF Analysis Results for NSSS - BOP Piping - Auxiliary Building (c) .	3-14
3-12	CDF Analysis Results for NSSS - BOP Equipment - Drywell .	3-15
3-13	CDF Analysis Results for NSSS - BOP Equipment - Containment (FS)	3-15
3-14	CDF Analysis Results for NSSS - BOP Equipment - Containment (CBFS)	3-15
3-15	CDF Analysis Results for NSSS - BOP Equipment - Containment (c)	3-16
3-16	CDF Analysis Results for NSSS - BOP Equipment - Shield Building	3-16
3-17	CDF Analysis Results for NSSS - BOP Equipment - Shield Building (CBFS)	3-17
3-18	CDF Analysis Results for NSSS - BOP Equipment - Auxiliary Building (c) .	3-17
3-19	Effect of Strong Motion Definition on Response Ratios for Earthquake + SRV Cases	3-18
3-20	Fffect of CHUG Interval on Response Ratios for SRV + CHUG Cases	3-18

ii

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Title	Page
1-1	Free-Standing Steel Containment On Own Foundation	1-13
1-2	Concrete Containment on Integral Foundation with Auxiliary Building	1-14
1-3	Boiling Water Reactor Pressure Vessel and Internals	1-15
1-4	Typical Main Steam Piping System	1-16
1-5	Typical Recirculation Loop Piping System	1-17
1-6	Balance-Of-Plant Piping In Steel Containment Plants	1-18
1-7	Balance-Of-Plant Piping In Concrete Containment Plants	1-20
1-8	Feedwater Piping Isometric	1-22
1-9	Reactor Water Cleanup Piping Isometric	1-23
1-10	FPC & CU Refueling Water Piping Isometric	1-24
1-11	Low Pressure Core Spray Piping Isometric	1-25
1-12	High Pressure Core Spray Test Piping Isometric	1-26
1-13	High Pressusre Core Spray Pump Discharge Piping Isometric	1-27
1-14	Combustible Gas Control Piping Isometric	1-28
1-15	Residual Heat Removal Piping Isometric (Steel Containment)	1-29
1-16	Fire Protection Piping Isometric	1-30
1-17	Residual Heat Removal Piping Isometric (Concrete Containment)	1-31
1-18	Balance-Of-Plant Equipment In Steel Containment Plants	1-32
1-19	Balance-Of-Plant Equipment In Concrete Containment Plants	1-33
2-1	Method of Time Phased Response Combination	2-8
2-2	Response Combination of SRV + CHUG Loadings	2-9
2-3	Distribution of Load Combination Time-History Peak Response Ratio	2-10
2-4	Comparison of Peak Response Ratios When $A_1 > A_2$ And When $A_2 > A_1 \dots \dots \dots \dots \dots$	2-11

ŗ

LIST OF FIGURES (Continued)

Figure

<u>Title</u>

Page

3-1	Distribution of R ₅₀ /SRSS and R ₈₅ /SRSS for 167 Response Combinations
3-2	CDF of the R50/SRSS Response Parameter 3-20
3-3	CDF of the R85/SRSS Response Parameter 3-21
3-4	BOP Equipment CDF Curve, Containment Vessel Location 3-11
3-5	BOP Piping CDF Curve, HPCS Pump Discharge Line Location 3-6

NOMENCLATURE

Act	ron	ym

Definition

ABS	Absolute Summation					
вор	Balance-of-Plant					
BWR	Boiling Water Reactor					
CDF	Cumulative Distribution Function					
CHUG	CHUGGING Load Associated with LOCA					
IBA	Intermediate Break Accident					
LOCA	Loss-of-Coolant-Accident					
NEP	Non-Exceedance Probability					
NRC	Nuclear Regulatory Commission					
NSSS	Nuclear Steam Supply System					
OBE	Operational Basis Earthquake					
PDF	Probability Density Function					
R ₅₀	50% NEP Combined Response Value					
^R 85	85% NEP Combined Response Value					
SBA	Small Break Accident					
SRSS	Square-Root-Sum-of-the-Squares					
SRV1	Safety Relief Valve Discharge (1 Valve, 2nd Actuation)					
SRVADS	Safety Relief Valve Discharge (Automatic Depressuriza- tion System)					
SRVALL	Safety Relief Valve Discharge (All Valves)					
SSE	Safe Shutdown Farthquake					

۷

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This study to demonstrate the generic applicability of the SRSS combination of dynamic responses for Mark III Nuclear Steam Supply System and Balance-of-Plant piping and equipment components was funded by the following utilities under the auspices of the Mark III Containment Owners SRSS Subgroup:

- 1. Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.
- 2. Gulf States Utilities Co.
- 3. Houston Lighting and Power Co.
- 4. Illinois Power Co.
- 5. Mississippi Power and Light Co.

The technical data and response time histories used in conducting these analyses were provided by the General Electric Company and the following Architect-Engineer firms:

- 1. Gilbert Associates
- 2. Stone & Webster
- 3. Ebasco Services
- 4. Sargent & Lundy
- 5. Bechtel Corporation

Structural Mechanics Associates, Inc. gratefully acknowledges the effort of these firms in providing the necessary data and in the review of this report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has historically required that structural/mechanical responses due to various accident or anticipated loads and loads caused by natural phenomena (such as earthquakes) be combined when analyzing structures, systems and components important to safety. As a result, structures and components of nuclear power plant facilities are designed for a large number of load combinations which include both multiple dynamic loads and static loads. Peak responses from each of the dynamic loads are generally calculated elastically and combined to obtain a resultant peak combined dynamic response. The resultant is then added absolutely to the elastically calculated static response to obtain a combined maximum response which is then compared to code allowable stress or response levels.

The question of how the several multiple peak dynamic responses should be combined has been studied extensively over the past years with both the absolute summation (ABS) and square-root-sum-of-the-squares (SRSS) methods being historically employed.

The SRSS method for combining peak dynamic responses has been justified on several bases, including:

- 1. Reliability Basis
- 2. Optimum Design Basis
- 3. Dynamic Margin Basis
- 4. Statistical Basis

The statistical basis for the SRSS method is that the SRSS combined peak response should have as great a non-exceedance probability as that required for the individual responses being combined. Employing the statistical basis, this study is concerned with providing generic

vii

justification for the use of the SRSS method for piping and equipment components (both ASME and non-ASME) located within Mark III Boiling Water Reactor facilities.

The Newmark-Kennedy Criteria (Reference 2) were developed to provide a means for judging whether the statistical basis is met for the combination of peak responses from multiple dynamic loadings. The intent of the Newmark-Kennedy Criteria is to provide reasonable confidence that the SRSS combined response has an 84 percent non-exceedance probability (NEP) or greater when the individual responses are conservatively defined at the 84 percent NEP level or 1.15 times the median, whichever is greater.

The NRC has taken the position that loadings involving the combination of SSE + LOCA and the combination of <u>three or more multiple</u> dynamic responses may be combined by the SRSS method without further justification (Reference 11). Therefore, this study is concerned with providing justification for use of the SRSS method of response combination for the following three important loadings:

1. OBE + SRV
2. SSE + SRV
3. SRV + LOCA (SBA/IBA)

A series of demonstration analyses using 167 actual Mark III combination cases were conducted involving the generation of Cumulative Distribution Function (CDF) curves accounting only for time phasing of the individual responses. Conservative assumptions were made in establishing the relative time phasing between the earthquake and SRV responses and in the characterization of the repeatable nature of the CHUGGING load used to represent the LOCA. The results of these conservative analyses were then compared to the requirements of Newmark-Kennedy Criterion 2 for the justification of the use of the SRSS methodology. The response data included in these analyses were taken from a wide variety of response locations from six different Mark III plants and included responses associated with Nuclear Steam Supply System (NSSS)-RPV and internals, piping, and components, Balance-of-Plant (BOP) piping, and Balance-of-Plant equipment.

It was found that the non-exceedance probability associated with the SRSS calculated response tended to be lower for cases where the magnitude of the short duration, high-frequency response (i.e., SRV discharge) was predominant over the magnitude of the longer duration, low-frequency response (i.e., earthquake). The maximum exceedance of the 50 percent response value relative to the SRSS calculated response was less than 10 percent.

All 167 response combination analyses considered satisfy the requirements of Newmark-Kennedy Criterion 2 and therefore, the SRSS method of response combination is appropriate for the loadings investigated in this study. Further, it is concluded that the response history data sample was taken from a sufficient variety of response locations that the results may be considered to be generic and that the SRSS method is appropriate for the combination of responses for all locations within Mark III plants for the load combinations considered.

ix

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has historically required that structural/mechanical responses due to various accident or anticipated loads and loads caused by natural phenomena (such as earthquakes) be combined when analyzing structures, systems and components important to safety. As a result, structures and components of nuclear power plant facilities are designed for a large number of load combinations which include both multiple dynamic loads and static loads. Peak responses from each of the dynamic loads are generally calculated elastically and combined to obtain a resultant peak combined dynamic response. The resultant is then added absolutely to the elastically calculated static response to obtain a combined maximum response which is then compared to code allowable stress or response levels.

The question of how the several multiple peak dynamic responses should be combined has been studied extensively over the past years with both the absolute summation (ABS) and square-root-sum-of-the-squares (SRSS) methods being historically employed. The SRSS method for combining peak dynamic seismic responses was first proposed by Rosenblueth (Reference 1) in 1951 and, with a few well defined exceptions, has been accepted as the preferred method for response combination in the field of earthquake response of structures. As other transient dynamic loadings have been defined for nuclear facilities, it has become necessary to combine the peak responses from these as well. A number of studies (References 2 through 10) address the acceptability of combining multiple independent dynamic load time-histories using the SRSS method. Essentially these studies have concluded that there are several bases for accepting the SRSS combination of peak dynamic responses, including:

a. Reliability Basis

b. Optimum Design Basis

c. Dynamic Margin Basis

d. Statistical Basis

The statistical basis for the SRSS method states that the SRSS combined peak response value should have at least as great a non-exceedance probability (NEP) as the individual responses being combined.

The current NRC position (References 9 and 11) concerning combination of dynamic loads is as follows:

- 1. The SRSS response combination method cannot be universally applied without justification.
- 2. Such justification must be based upon a case investigation of response functions and not based on loading functions.
- 3. The SRSS combination of dynamic response may be used when it can be shown that approximately the SRSS value is at or exceeds the 84% NEP.
- 4. If SRSS combination cannot be justified for a given case, responses must be combined by absolute summation.

Criterion 2 of the Newmark-Kennedy criteria (Reference 2) provides an approach acceptable to the NRC to statistically demonstrate that approximately the SRSS response value is at or exceeds the 84% NEP. Reference 10 presents the results of a study which demonstrated that approximately the SRSS combined response has greater than an 84% NEP when the Newmark-Kennedy Criteria are satisfied. Newmark-Kennedy Criterion 2 is based upon the development of response level Cumulative Distribution Function (CDF) curves employing the response time-histories for the multiple dynamic loadings being combined and using appropriate assumptions concerning the range of possible time lags between these response time-histories. In order to justify the use of the SRSS

combination method, Newmark-Kennedy Criterion 2 requires the meeting of the following conditions:

- 1. Intensity of the individual dynamic loadings must be conservatively represented, being defined at approximately the 84th percentile or 1.15 times the median value, whichever is greater.
- 2. Assuming only time phasing randomness of the response parameters, approximately the SRSS calculated peak response value must be at or exceed the 50% NEP.
- 3. Assuming only time phasing randomness of the response parameters, approximately 1.2 times the SRSS calculated peak response value must be at or exceed the 85% NEP.

Stated simply, if it can be shown that approximately the SRSS calculated peak response is at or exceeds the median value (50% NEP) of time phased combinations of the dynamic responses and approximately 1.2 times the SRSS value is at or exceeds about one standard deviation beyond the median ($\approx 85\%$ NEP), it can be concluded that the SRSS value has at least as great a non-exceedance probability as that used to define the individual responses being combined. As stated above, this forms the statistical basis for accepting the SRSS method for combination of multiple dynamic responses.

In order to demonstrate the generic applicability of the SRSS response combination method for both ASME and non-ASME components for dynamic load combinations involving earthquake and certain hydrodynamic events for Mark III Boiling Water Reactor (BWR) plants, the Mark III Containment Owners SRSS Subgroup commissioned the statistical evaluation described in this report. The statistical analysis effort involved the development of 167 load combination CDF curves which have been constructed in accordance with methods acceptable to the NRC (Reference 8) and which are compared to the Newmark-Kennedy Criterion 2 requirements discussed above. Several important conclusions are drawn concerning trends noted in the CDF curves based upon the relationship between the responses being combined.

1.2 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of this study is to demonstrate by statistical means the applicability of the SRSS dynamic response combination method for piping and equipment associated with Mark III plants. It is intended that the results and conclusions drawn from this analytical effort will be generically applicable to both ASME and non-ASME components mounted at a variety of locations within a Mark III plant. Therefore, in defining the scope of effort for this program, great care has been taken by the Mark III Containment Owners SRSS Subgroup to assure that it is broad enough for the results to be considered generic.

1.2.1 Plants Represented

The Mark III Owners Subgroup consists of five utility companies representing five different Mark III nuclear power facilities which have been designed and constructed by five different Architect/Engineer firms. The makeup of the Owners Subgroup is shown in Table 1-1. The nuclear plants represented cover the three types of Mark III containment designs. These include:

- 1. Freestanding Steel Containment
- 2. Freestanding Steel Containment Concrete Backed
- 3. Concrete Containment

The nuclear power facilities represented also cover two foundation designs including:

- 1. Reactor Building Set on Own Foundation
- 2. Reactor Building Set on Integral Foundation with Auxiliary Building

A freestanding steel containment design set on its own foundation is schematically illustrated in Figure 1-1. A concrete containment design set on an integral foundation with the auxiliary building is similarly illustrated in Figure 1-2.

1.2.2 Locations Evaluated

In addition to covering a variety of Mark III containment designs, the SRSS evaluation program has been scoped to evaluate response data from numerous locations within the containment structure including locations associated with Nuclear Steam Supply System (NSSS) components, Balance-of-Plant (BOP) piping, and BOP equipment. The Mark III SRSS Evaluation Matrix is presented in Table 1-2 and is referred to throughout this report pertaining to data locations and load combinations considered in this study.

1.2.2.1 NSSS-RPV and Internals, Piping and Equipment

Response data associated with NSSS components have been gathered for selected locations within the Reactor Pressure Vessel (RPV) and its internals, for various piping elements of the Main Steam and Recirculation piping systems, and for selected pipe mounted equipment locations associated with the Main Steam and Recirculation piping loops. Each CDF curve represented in the evaluation matrix is identified by a location descriptor (i.e., 5-5) which defines the location and the response parameter (i.e., RPV Skirt, Vertical Force). The interested reader is directed to Appendix A which details the location and response parameter for each location descriptor given in the evaluation matrix. Figure 1-3 schematically depicts the reactor pressure vessel and internals of a boiling water reactor and identifies the data locations considered in this evaluation. Similarly, Figures 1-4 and 1-5 present simplified line drawings of typical Main Steam and Recirculation piping systems, respectively, and indicate the location of NSSS piping elements and pipe mounted equipment considered in this study.

From Table 1-2, it can be seen that response time-history data from 24 locations were used to generate 40 time phased response combination CDF curves associated with the NSSS components and piping. The NSSS response data provided by the General Electric Company were derived from the evaluation of equipment associated with the three different Mark III containment configurations (freestanding steel containment, freestanding steel containment-concrete backed, and concrete containment) designed by three different A-E's. At least 11 response

combinations were chosen for each of the three plants. The response time histories include reaction force (9 cases), bending moment (22 cases), and acceleration response (9 cases). The various locations, response parameters, and nuclear power facilities have been included to assure that the results of this evaluation are applicable to all NSSS systems within Mark III plants.

1.2.2.2 Balance-of-Plant Piping

A total of 82 response combination CDF curves have been prepared representing typical Balance-of-Plant piping systems including supports. Table 1-2 indicates that the response data from which the curves were generated represent 42 piping locations from ten different piping systems. The Architect-Engineer firms associated with each of the five nuclear plants represented by the Mark III Owners Subgroup have each provided representative response time-history data for two piping systems. A minimum of 12 response combinations were used from piping systems in each of the five plants. The ten piping systems used to represent typical BOP piping are listed in Table 1-3 together with the nominal diameter of each and the structure or structures to which they are anchored or supported. In addition, Figures 1-6 and 1-7 schematically illustrate the relative location of each system within the plant while Figures 1-8 through 1-17 present isometric line drawings of each piping loop identifying the response locations. Figure 1-6 depicts six piping systems associated with both freestanding steel and freestanding steel-concrete backed containment configurations while Figure 1-7 depicts four piping systems associated with concrete containment designs. Referring to Figures 1-6 and 1-7, it can be seen that the ten selected piping systems cover attachment locations, ranging from low to high within containment. The piping loops are each anchored to at least one of the major plant structures including the drywell, containment vessel (either freestanding steel, freestanding steel-concrete backed, or concrete), shield building, and/or auxiliary building. From Table 1-3, the size of the selected piping systems can be seen to range from the relatively small 3" FPC & CU Refueling Water line, to the intermediate 12" High Pressure Core Spray lines, to the relatively large 20" and 24" Residual Heat Removal lines.

Balance-of-Plant piping response time-histories for a wide range of response parameters including support reaction (8 cases), bending moment (37 cases), axial force (7 cases), shear force (14 cases), and acceleration (16 cases) were used. Again, the wide variety of piping locations, pipe diameters, anchoring structures, and response parameters were chosen to assure that the results obtained from this evaluation are generically applicable to piping found throughout Mark III Plants.

1.2.2.3 Balance-of-Plant Equipment

Typical balance-of-plant equipment are supported from, or closely coupled with, the major structural elements of the Mark III containment systems consisting of the drywell, containment vessel (including all three types), shield building, and auxiliary building. Typical equipment components can be divided into two types: relatively flexible equipment, and relatively rigid equipment. The response of relatively flexible equipment exhibits characteristics similar to that of piping systems which have already been considered. Under the category of Balance-of-Plant equipment, it is desired to study the response characteristics of relatively rigid equipment. Due to the relatively high fundamental frequency of rigid equipment components and the relatively low frequency of the structural elements, the response of such equipment to various dynamic loadings is very similar to the response of the structures (at the equipment support locations) to those same loadings. As a result, the statistical response combination evaluation for BOP equipment has been based upon the acceleration response of the important structural elements at equipment attachment points. It can be seen from Table 1-2 that the 45 CDF curves applicable to BOP equipment were generated from response time-histories representing 22 response locations. These are also depicted in Figures 1-18 and 1-19 which show that equipment response locations have been selected which cover a wide range of elevations (both high and low) for each of the structural elements. The BOP equipment response time-histories have been provided by the Architect-Engineer firms responsible for the five nuclear power facilities represented on the Mark III Containment Owners SRSS Subgroup

and have been selected as representing typical response associated with the three containment designs and two foundation designs currently employed for the construction of Mark III plants. At least five response combinations were chosen from each of the five plants.

1.2.3 Load Combinations Evaluated

For the Mark III operating system, the eight dynamic loading cases are:

OBE
 SRV
 OBE + SRV
 SSE + SRV
 SRV + LOCA (SBA/IBA)
 OBE + SRV + LOCA (SBA/IBA)
 SSE + SRV + LOCA (SBA/IBA)
 SSE + LOCA

The resultant peak response from each of these dynamic loads or dynamic load combinations is combined with the normal static loads (i.e., pressure, dead weight) by absolute summation.

Since Cases 1 and 2 involve only one dynamic loading, no justification for the method of dynamic load combination is necessary and therefore Cases 1 and 2 were not included in this study. In addition, as discussed in Reference 9, the NRC has taken the position that the probability of the simultaneous occurrence of the SSE and LOCA is extremely low and therefore, the dynamic responses for this load combination may be combined by the SRSS method. Similarly, the NRC has taken the position that the SRSS method of response combination may be employed for load cases involving the combination of three or more dynamic loadings since it is extremely unlikely that the peak response of three or more unrelated dynamic loadings will occur simultaneously (Reference 11). Since the NRC has accepted the SRSS combination of response for SSE + LOCA and for loadings involving three or more dynamic loads, Cases 6, 7, and 8 listed above were also not included in this evaluation effort. As a result, the statistical demonstration of the adequacy of the SRSS combination methodology for Mark III plants is centered around the evaluation of Load Cases 3, 4, and 5 in which the response from the Safety Relief Valve discharge (SRV) hydrodynamic loading is combined with the response from the Operational Basis Earthquake (OBE) or Safe Shutdown Earthquake (SSE) seismic events or the Loss-of-Coolant-Accident (LOCA). In this study, the LOCA is represented by the high frequency CHUG hydrodynamic loading.

The Mark III SRSS Evaluation Matrix (Table 1-2) presents the nine response combinations evaluated in this study to demonstrate the generic applicability of the SRSS response combination for Mark III plants. Three types of the SRV dynamic loading have been considered when combining the SRV loading with the two levels of earthquake and with the CHUG loading to form the critical load combinations addressed in this study. The three types of SRV are:

 $SRV_1 - SRV$ (1 Valve, 2nd Actuation)

SRV_{ADS} - SRV (Automatic Depressurization System)

SRV_{ALL} - SRV (All Valves)

These have all been included in order to provide results for a range of magnitudes of the short duration, high-frequency, hydrodynamic loading. Similarly, both OBE and SSE (defined in this study as 2 times the OBE) load combinations have been included in order to assess the effect of the magnitude of the longer duration, low-frequency, seismic event.

As mentioned at the beginning of this section, great care has been taken in the definition of the scope of this effort to assure the generic nature of the results. This goal has been achieved by the selection of a wide range of load combinations, piping and equipment locations, and response parameters together with the number and types of Mark III plants involved.

TABLE 1-1

Utility	Mark III Plant	Architect/Engineer
Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.	Perry	Gilbert Associates
Gulf States Utilities Co.	River Bend	Stone & Webster
Houston Lighting and Power Co.	Allens Creek	Ebasco Services
Illinois Power Co.	Clinton	Sargent & Lundy
Mississippi Power and Light Co.	Grand Gulf	Bechtel Corporation
General Electric Co.	Generic	
Structural Mechanics Associates, Inc. (Dynamic Analysis Consultant)		

.

MARK III CONTAINMENT OWNERS SRSS SUBGROUP

	NSSS						BOP	PIPIN	3					BOP	EQUIP	MENT			ч. -
	RPV & INTERNALS	MAIN STEAM PIPING	RECIRCULATION PIPING	PIPE MOUNTED EQUIPMENT	DRYWELL	CONTAINMENT (FREESTANDING STEEL)	CONTAINMENT (STEEL - CONCRETE BACKED)	CONTAINMENT (CONCRETE)	SHIELD BUILDING FREESTANDING STEEL)	SHIELD BUILDING (STEEL - CONCRETE BACKED)	AUXILIARY BUILDING (CONCRETE)	DRYWELL	CONTAINMENT (FREESTANDING STEEL)	CONTAINMENT (STEEL - CONCRETE BACKED)	CONTAINMENT (CONCRETE)	SHIELD BUILDING (FREESTANDING STEEL)	SHIELD BUILDING (STEEL - CONCRETE BACKED)	AUXILIARY BUILDING (CONCRETE)	TOTALS
OBE + SRV ₁	5-5	6-4 6-5 6-7	4-8 4-10 4-11 4-12	6-2 4-6	1-2 1-3 2-5 2-8		4-18 4-21	5-17 5-14		·4-17 4-15	5-7 5-10	1-9 1-13			5-23 2-9		4-25	5-29	28
OBE + SRV _{ALL}	5-4	6-5 6-6 6-9	4-9 4-12 4-13	6-3 4-7	1-1 1-4 2-6 2-7	3-1 3-3	4-20 4-19	2-2 2-3	3-8 3-6	4-14 4-16		1-6	3-12	4-23	2-9	3-10	4-25		29
OBE + SRV _{ADS}	5-5					3-1 3-3		5-16 5-18	3-4 3-7 3-6		5-11 5-12		3-11 3-12		5-23 5-26	3-9 3-10		5-29 5-22	18
SSE + SRV ₁	5-5	6-4 6-8 6-9	4-9	6-1 4-5	1-1 1-4 2-8		4-18	5-15 2-1 2-4		4-17	5-13				2-9 5-23		4-25		19
SSE + SRV _{ALL}	5-4	6-8	4-10 4-11	6-1	1-3 1-4 2-8		4-20	5-19 2-2 2-3		4-14	5-8	1-11		4-23	2-9			5-29	18 [`]
SSE + SRV _{ADS}						3-1 3-2			3-4				3-11			3-9			5
CHUG + SRV ₁	5-5 4-4		4-9	4-6	1-2 1-4 2-7 2-8			5-15 5-16			5-8 5-12	1-5		4-22	5-26 2-9		4-26	5-22	18
CHUG + SRV _{ADS}	5-6 4-3 4-2				- A - H	3-1 3-2		5-17 5-14	3-5 3-6		5-13 5-11		3-11 3-12		5-24 5-27	3-9 3-10		5-22	18
CHUG + SRV _{ALL}				6-3	1-1 1-4	3-1 3-2		5-16 5-20	3-4 3-5		5-7 5-9	1-9 1-12						5-21	14
Totals	10	10	11	9	20	10	6	18	10	ô	12	7	6	3	12	6	4	7	167

TABLE 1-2: MARK III SRSS EVALUATION MATRIX

TABLE 1-3

	Piping System	Nominal Diameter (in)	. Anchor/Support Structure(s)
1.	Feedwater Line	20	Drywell, Auxiliary Building
2.	Reactor Water Cleanup Line (RWCU)	4	Drywell
3.	FPC & CU Refueling Water Line	3	Containment (C), Drywell
4.	Low Pressure Core Spray Line (LPCS)	14	Drywell, Containment (C)
5.	HPCS Test Line	12	Containment (FS), Shield Building
6.	HPCS Pump Discharge Line	12	Shield Building, Drywell
7.	Combustible Gas Control Line (CGC)	4	Containment (CBFS), Drywell
8.	Residual Heat Removal Line (RHR)	24	Shield Building, Containment (CBFS)
9.	Fire Protection Line (FP)	6	Containment (C)
10.	Residual Heat Removal Line (RHR)	20	Auxiliary Building, Containment (C)

BALANCE-OF-PLANT PIPING SYSTEMS

Legend

(FS) Freestanding Steel Containment

- (CBFS) Freestanding Steel Containment Concrete Backed
 - (C) Concrete Containment



FIGURE 1-1. FREE-STANDING STEEL CONTAINMENT ON OWN FOUNDATION



FIGURE 1-2. CONCRETE CONTAINMENT ON INTEGRAL FOUNDATION WITH AUXILIARY BUILDING

•



FIGURE 1-3. BOILING WATER REACTOR PRESSURE VESSEL AND INTERNALS



FIGURE 1-4. TYPICAL MAIN STEAM PIPING SYSTEM



FIGURE 1-5. TYPICAL RECIRCULATION LOOP PIPING SYSTEM



FIGURE 1-6A. BALANCE-OF-PLANT PIPING IN STEEL CONTAINMENT PLANTS



FIGURE 1-6B. BALANCE-OF-PLANT PIPING IN STEEL CONTAINMENT PLANTS

1-19



FIGURE 1-7A. BALANCE-OF-PLANT PIPING IN CONCRETE CONTAINMENT PLANTS



FIGURE 1-7B. BALANCE-OF-PLANT PIPING IN CONCRETE CONTAINMENT PLANTS



1-22

ŧ







*



_ !

•

FIGURE 1-11. LOW PRESSURE CORE SPRAY PIPING ISOMETRIC


FIGURE 1-12. HIGH PRESSURE CORE SPRAY TEST PIPING ISOMETRIC



FIGURE 1-13. HIGH PRESSURE CORE SPRAY PUMP DISCHARGE PIPING ISOMETRIC



FIGURE 1-14. COMBUSTIBLE GAS CONTROL PIPING ISOMETRIC







FIGURE 1-16.

FIRE PROTECTION PIPING ISOMETRIC





FIGURE 1-18. BALANCE-OF-PLANT EQUIPMENT IN STEEL CONTAINMENT PLANTS



FIGURE 1-19. BALANCE-OF-PLANT EQUIPMENT IN CONCRETE CONTAINMENT PLANTS

2.0 TECHNICAL APPROACH

2.1 GENERAL APPROACH

~;

1.00

í

The demonstration of the applicability of the SRSS response combination method for Mark III piping and equipment is based upon the statistical argument which states that the SRSS peak combined response should have at least as high a non-exceedance probability (NEP) as that of the individual dynamic loadings being combined. For a given load combination and response location, Newmark-Kennedy Criterion 2 (Reference 2) is used to validate this premise based upon the generation of a Cumulative Distribution Function (CDF) curve for peak response considering appropriate assumptions concerning the relative time-phasing of the response time-histories being combined. When only time-phasing is considered, the resulting NEP of the SRSS response value is a conditional probability which is conditional upon assuming known peak individual response amplitudes. The Mark III suppression pool loads used in this study have been defined by the General Electric Company to be at the greater of approximately the 84th percentile or 1.15 times the median value in accordance with the requirements of the Newmark-Kennedy criteria. Similarly, the process used to establish seismic loadings for a given facility results in earthquake loads defined at approximately the 84th percentile or greater. This being the case, if it can be shown that approximately the SRSS combined value is at or exceeds the 50% NEP and approximately 1.2 times the SRSS combined value is at or exceeds the 85% NEP, the use of the SRSS method of response combination is then appropri-, ate. The emphasis in this study has been to demonstrate that the SRSS method of response combination for the loadings considered is applicable for all locations within Mark III nuclear facilities.

The response CDF curves presented in this report have been generated in accordance with the methodology outlined in NUREG/CR-1330 (Reference 8) and as illustrated in the following example. Figure 2-1schematically illustrates two response time-histories which potentially overlap in time and which then must be combined to obtain a peak combined response. It is judged that both of these two individual response time-histories have been conservatively represented, being defined at the 84th percentile or 1.15 times the median, whichever is greater. The relative time lag, τ , between the time-histories is assumed to be random with a specific uniform Probability Density Function (PDF) defining the possible values of this time lag. For a given value of τ , which defines a unique possible relationship between the response histories, the combined response is determined by algebraic summation of the individual responses over the duration of the combined loading. The peak combined response is then taken as the absolute value of the maximum combined response (either positive or negative). This procedure is repeated for a sufficient number of Monte Carlo trials each defining a different random value for τ consistent with the time-phasing PDF. By ordering the peak combined responses from each independent trial from the lowest to the highest, the best estimate of the non-exceedance probability (NEP) associated with the response from ordered trial n, is calculated to be:

 $NEP = \frac{n}{N+1}$ (100%) (2-1)

where N equals the total number of Monte Carlo trials. A total of 200 Monte Carlo trials were used in the generation of the CDF curves presented in this report. This number was found to be more than sufficient to accurately define the CDF curve over the region of interest (i.e., between the 10% and 90% NEP). The CDF curve then is the plot of the NEP versus the corresponding peak combined response value plotted for the 200 trials ordered from the lowest to the highest computed peak combined response. The computer program MODSTAG, which is a version of STAGAR code developed

for General Electric, was used to perform the necessary CDF computations. The time-history pairs used to generate the response combination CDF curves are included in Appendix C.

2.2 SPECIFIC ASSUMPTIONS AND RESPONSE TIME-HISTORY CRITERIA

. /

1

Several specific assumptions were made concerning the relative time-phasing of the SRV hydrodynamic loading and the seismic events and concerning the nature of the CHUG loading used to represent the LOCA. These assumptions were made to assure that the results of these analyses are conservative. In addition, the response time-histories used in the study were required to meet certain criteria to assure that only important and/or non-trivial response combinations were evaluated. The specific assumptions and response time-history criteria used are illustrated in the discussion which follows.

The OBE or SSE response time-histories generally cover a period of between 10 and 20 seconds which is long in comparison to the high frequency, short duration, hydrodynamic loads which typically range from 0.5 to 2.0 seconds duration. To cover the potential phasing between the seismic events and the SRV discharge, it has been conservatively assumed that the SRV response time-history must begin at some time during the strong motion portion of the earthquake response. For purposes of definition, the strong motion portion of the earthquake has been assumed to be the time frame between the first and last times that the response amplitude reaches approximately 50 percent of its peak value. Referring again to Figure 2-1, T_1 and T_{11} define the range of strong motion for the reference time-history and are used to establish the lower bound and upper bound time values for the PDF defining the possible beginning times of the combining time-history. It is clear that this approach is conservative in comparison to the alternative of allowing the SRV response time-history to begin at any time during the earthquake since the latter assumption would result in an increased probability that the SRV response would combine with a non-critical portion of the earthquake.

Only OBE response time-histories were provided for use in this study. However, since SSE + SRV is an important load case and since it is of interest to determine the effect of the magnitude of the low frequency response, the SSE response at a given location was established by multiplying the OBE response history by a factor of 2.0.

As previously mentioned, the CHUG time-history has been used to represent the Loss-of-Coolant-Accident (LOCA). The CHUG results from pressure pulses in the suppression pool which can be repeatable at relatively short time intervals ranging from about one to five seconds. Therefore, depending upon the length of the SRV used to define the SRV + CHUG event, the SRV response time-history may combine with more than one cycle of the CHUG. For conservatism, it has been assumed that the CHUG time-history repeats at one-second intervals. The amplitude of the repeated CHUG cycles tends to be highly random. However, since the amplitude of the CHUG time-history used for design purposes has been conservatively established, the design CHUG time-history has been used to conservatively represent all repeated cycles of the CHUG response rather than characterizing the repeated CHUG response by a random amplitude variation. The exact time-phasing of the CHUG time-history relative to the SRV time-history is random and the CHUG can begin either prior to or subsequent to the SRV. This randomnesss has been conservatively represented by assuming that the CHUG has an equal probability of initiating at any time within one second prior to the beginning of the SRV with repeated cycles occurring at one-second intervals. This conservative combination procedure is illustrated in Figure 2-2. The SRV time-history is assumed to begin at zero time while the first cycle of the repeatable CHUG history is assumed to have an equal probability (uniform PDF) of beginning at any time during the one second prior to the beginning of the SRV. As a result, the SRV will combine with at least one, and maybe more than one, cycle of the CHUG.

Two criteria were established by which the time-histories to be included in this study were to be screened. These criteria, which were specified to assure conservatism of the results and to assure that only important load combination cases were investigated, are listed as follows:

- The duration of the individual time-histories should be computed well beyond the time of peak response such that the response amplitude at the end of the history is less than about 50% of the peak value.
- The ratio of the peak response values of any two response time-histories being combined should generally be less than approximately 3 with ratios on the order of 4 or 5 acceptable in a few cases.

The first time-history criterion was included to assure that the combination of near peak excursions occurring subsequent to the time of peak response are properly included in the calculation of peak combined response. The peak combined response is frequently associated with a time other than the times when the peak individual responses occur. This can be illustrated by again referring to Figure 2-1 where it can be seen that combined response at time X exceeds the combined response associated with the peak response of either time-history.

~. *2*

. .

.

)

1

The second time-history criterion is the more important of the two to this evaluation effort assuring that trivial load combinations were not included in the demonstration data set. It can be seen from the table below that the amount of conservatism introduced by the Absolute Sum (ABS) method of response combination over that of the SRSS method is dependent upon the ratio of the peak value of the individual responses being combined. This ratio is represented by A'/A" where A' is defined as the peak value of the predominant response and A" is defined as the peak value of the lesser response.

A'/A"	1.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	10.0	20.0	50.0
ABS/SRSS	1.414	1.342	1.265	1.213	1.177	1.095	1.049	1.020

If the peak amplitudes of two responses being combined are equal (A'/A'' = 1.0) the ABS method introduces the maximum factor of conservatism of 1.414 over that of the SRSS method of response combination. For peak amplitude ratios of 3.0 and 5.0, the factor of conservatism reduces to 1.265 and 1.177, respectively. As the amplitude ratio increases further, the factor of conservatism introduced by the ABS method continues to reduce asymptotically approaching 1.0. Therefore, for large peak amplitude ratios, the difference between the response values computed by ABS and SRSS is small. As a result, cases with peak amplitude ratios, A'/A", greater than about 5.0 were not included in this study. The second time-history criterion was specified in order that there would be a significant difference between the ABS and SRSS combined response values for all cases studied. Figure 2-3 presents the distribution of the peak response amplitude ratios for the 167 response combinations evaluated in this study. It can be seen that for 28 of the combinations the amplitude ratio was between 1.0 and 1.1 while better than 87% of the load combinations evaluated exhibited an amplitude ratio less than 3.0 and only 2.4% (4 cases) exhibited a ratio greater than 4.0.

In addition, defining A_1 as the peak amplitude of the longer duration, lower frequency response, and A_2 as the peak amplitude of the shorter duration, higher frequency response, it was of interest in this study to assure that cases were selected where A_1 was greater than A_2 and where A_2 was greater than A_1 . Figure 2-4 presents the distribution of the amplitude ratio A_1/A_2 for the 114 cases where A_1 was greater than A_2 and the amplitude ratio A_2/A_1 for the 53 cases where A_2 was greater than A_1 . It can be seen that for over 30% of the cases the peak amplitude of the higher frequency response was greater than the peak amplitude of the lower frequency response. In both cases $(A_1 > A_2 \text{ and } A_2 > A_1)$, it can be seen that only important cases exhibiting a significant difference between ABS and SRSS combined response were investigated.

Conservative assumptions have been made concerning the approach used to generate the response combination CDF curves, the restraints placed on the time-lag relationship between the SRV and earthquake events, and the representation of the amplitude and repeatable nature of the CHUG loading. Therefore, the conclusions of this study are conservatively biased.

ì



2-8

í

. م

SRV Loading

÷

Í



Random Time Variable (uniform)



FIGURE 2-2.

RESPONSE COMBINATION OF SRV + CHUG LOADINGS



FIGURE 2-3. DISTRIBUTION OF LOAD COMBINATION TIME-HISTORY PEAK RESPONSE RATIO



FIGURE 2-4. COMPARISON OF PEAK RESPONSE RATIOS WHEN $A_1 > A_2$ AND WHEN $A_2 > A_1$

2-11

ł

3. RESULTS

3.1 GENERAL PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

A total of 167 response combination CDF curves have been generated for the appropriate response combinations and a wide variety of response locations within six different Mark III plants. A total of nine load combinations involving two levels of earthquake, three types of SRV actuation and the CHUG load were investigated as shown in the Mark III SRSS Evaluation Matrix (Table 1-2). In addition to covering several important load combinations for which justification of the SRSS method was desired, the selection of the nine cases resulted in the response combination of time-histories exhibiting a relatively wide range of frequency content. The combinations included both cases where the low frequency response was predominant and cases where the high frequency response was predominant.

The 167 response combinitation cases as defined in Table 1-2 also represent three major categories of piping and equipment found in a Mark III nuclear power facility including:

- Nuclear Steam Supply System-RPV and Internals, Piping, and Components
- 2. Balance-of-Plant Piping including supports
- 3. Balance-of-Plant Equipment

· _ /

Hypothesis testing was conducted to investigate the nature of the 167 sample data set. It was found that the mean value and standard deviation remained stable when comparing the results from the entire data set to the results from each of the three major categories. The mean value and standard deviation were also stable when comparing the results from the entire set to the results from each of the three response combinations (OBE + SRV, SSE + SRV and SRV + CHUG) and from two classifications of response parameters (Acceleration, Force and Moment).

Therefore, the results of this study are presented as a uniform data set consisting of 167 samples. It was also found that the results from both the entire data set as well as randomly selected smaller sets tended to be normally distributed. Based upon the hypothesis testing and the normal distribution of the results, 167 samples are considered to represent a very good estimate of the behavior of the whole population of possible samples.

The data are presented in a tabular form which summarizes the key response values and the response value ratios obtained from the CDF evaluation of each load combination. The 167 CDF curves are included as Appendix B of this report and are numbered and identified in accordance with the SRSS Evaluation Matrix (Table 1-2). Similarly, the time-history pairs used to generate the CDF curves are included as Appendix C and are numbered consistent with the corresponding CDF curve from Appendix B. It should be noted that SSE time histories were taken as 2 times the corresponding OBE time history for this study.

Tables 3-1 through 3-18 present the tabulated results from the response combination analyses associated with each of the 18 equipment/ location category columns of the Evaluation Matrix. For each response combination analysis, the location identifier, which is consistent with the Matrix, is given together with the associated response parameter (i.e., vertical force, moment, acceleration). The loading is also specified along with the peak response amplitudes associated with the two time-histories combined. The results are then presented in terms of 1) the computed SRSS peak response value and its non-exceedance probability (NEP) from the response combination analysis, 2) the 1.2xSRSS value and its NEP, 3) the ratio of the 50% NEP value (R_{50}) to the SRSS value, 4) the ratio of the 85% NEP value (R_{85}) to the SRSS value, and 5) the ratio of the absolute sum (ABS) value to the SRSS response value. Since Newmark-Kennedy Criterion 2 has been employed as the basis for acceptability of the SRSS response combination method, the response ratios, $(R_{50}/SRSS$ and $R_{85}/SRSS$), are of prime importance. Additional insight into the behavior of the load combination can also be attained by referring to the appropriate CDF curve presented in Appendix B.

Reiterating the requirements of Newmark-Kennedy Criterion 2 for the combination of conservatively defined loads; the SRSS method of response combination is applicable if,

- 1. There is estimated to be less than approximately a 50% conditional probability that the actual peak combined response exceeds approximately the SRSS calculated peak response, and
- 2. There is estimated to be less than approximately a 15% conditional probability that the actual peak combined response exceeds approximately 1.2 times the SRSS calculated peak response.

In order to meet Part 1 of Newmark-Kennedy Criterion 2, the ratio R_{50} /SRSS must be approximately equal to or less than 1.0. Similarly, in order to meet Part 2, the ratio R_{85} /SRSS must be approximately equal to or less than 1.2. The response ratios are underlined in Tables 3-1 through 3-18 for those cases for which R_{50} exceeds the SRSS value by more than one percent and for which R_{85} exceeds 1.2 times the SRSS value. These exceedances, which are discussed further in Section 3.3, are primarily due to the conservatisms introduced by the characterization of the CHUG response and the phasing relationship established between the earthquake and SRV responses.

Figure 3-1 presents histograms of the distribution of the $R_{50}/SRSS$ and $R_{85}/SRSS$ response ratios for the entire set of response combination analyses. Cumulative Distribution Functions (CDF) for these ratios are presented in Figures 3-2 and 3-3, respectively. It can be seen that the ratio $R_{85}/SRSS$ is less than 1.2 for 163, or 97.6%, of the 167 load combination cases. For the remaining four cases, the actual 85% NEP value exceeds 1.2 times the calculated SRSS response value by 2.3% or less with the maximum value of $R_{85}/SRSS$ for the 167 cases being 1.228. Figure 3-1 also shows that the ratio $R_{85}/SRSS$ tends to be approximately normally distributed. The mean value, \overline{x} , of $R_{85}/SRSS$ for the 167 cases was computed to be 1.048 with a standard deviation, σ , of 0.085. Based upon the properties of a normal distribution, one would expect 96.3% of the cases to have a ratio $R_{85}/SRSS$ less than 1.2 with this mean and

standard deviation. This expectation is close to the 97.6% observed for the 167 cases investigated in this study.

Even assuming very conservative distribution-free confidence limits, the number of observations required so that the confidence is γ that at least $100x(1-\alpha)$ % of the distribution will be less than the largest observation of the sample is given by:

$$n = \frac{\log (1 - \gamma)}{\log (1 - \alpha)}$$
(3-1)

Thus, the percentage of the distribution at any confidence level γ which is less than the largest observation is given by:

$$\log (1 - \alpha) = \log \frac{(1 - \gamma)}{n}$$
 (3-2)

Using Equation 3-2, there is a 90% confidence that 98.6% of all samples would have a ratio R_{85} /SRSS less than 1.228. Based upon these observations, one would conclude that all 167 Mark III SRSS response combination cases satisfy Part 2 of Newmark-Kennedy Criterion 2 which is that the ratio R_{85} /SRSS should be approximately 1.2 or less.

Similarly, Figure 3-1 and the table below show that $R_{50}/SRSS$ is less than or equal to 1.0 for 83.2% of the 167 load combination cases. In addition, the 50% NEP value is less than 1.01 times the SRSS calculated response value for 89.8% of the cases and is less than 1.05 times the SRSS value for 95.8% of the cases investigated.

		Value	of R ₅₀ /SRSS		
• •	<u><</u> 1.0	<u><</u> 1.01	<u><</u> 1.03	<u><</u> 1.05	< 1.10
Number of Cases % of All Cases	139 83.2	150 89.8	156 93.4	160 95.8	167 100.0

The highest ratio of R_{50} /SRSS involved the combination of response from an SRV_{ADS} + CHUG loading. It can be seen from Figure 3-1 that the R_{50} /SRSS ratio also tends to be normally distributed. The mean value of R_{50} /SRSS for the 167 cases evaluated was calculated to be 0.930 with a standard deviation of 0.069. Based upon the properties of a normal distribution, one would expect 84.4% of the cases to have a ratio R_{50} /SRSS less than 1.0 and 99.3% of all cases to have a ratio less than 1.1. Again, assuming very conservative distribution-free confidence limits, there is a 90% confidence that 98.6% of all samples would have a ratio R_{50} /SRSS less than 1.095 which is the largest ratio of all 167 samples tested. Based upon these observations, one would also conclude that all 167 Mark III SRSS response combination cases satisfy Part I of the Newmark-Kennedy Criterion 2 which is that the ratio R_{50} /SRSS should be approximately 1.0 or less.

All 167 response combination cases considered in this SRSS justification effort meet the load definition requirement of the Newmark-Kennedy Criteria and satisfy both Part 1 and Part 2 of Newmark-Kennedy Criterion 2. The cases considered cover a sufficiently wide variety of plants, response locations, response parameters, and categories of equipment such that the results may be considered to be generic. It is therefore concluded that the SRSS method of response combination is applicable for all locations within Mark III plants when considering the combination of responses resulting from the following loadings:

OBE + SRV
SSE + SRV
SRV + LOCA (SBA/IBA)

The acceptability of the SRSS response combination of these loadings is in addition to the following for which the SRSS combination method has previously been accepted by the NRC and does not require further justification.

SSE + LOCA
Any combination involving 3 or more dynamic responses.

3.2 TRENDS AND OBSERVATIONS

The results of the 167 response combinations were broken down into several subsets in order to determine if any particular trends were to be noted. The subsets included breakdowns by:

- 1. Load Combination (OBE+SRV, SSE+SRV, SRV+CHUG)
- 2. Response Quantity (Acceleration, Force and Moment)
- 3. Equipment Category (NSSS System, BOP Piping, BOP Equipment)
- Ratio of A₂/A₁ (Ratio of Higher Frequency Amplitude to Lower Frequency Amplitude)

The detailed analyses of these subsets are included as Appendix D of this report. As mentioned above, no particular trends were noted for subsets 1 through 3. For these subsets, the mean values and standard deviations were stable and the results exhibited the characteristics of a normal distribution. The analysis of subset 4 indicated that the response ratio R_{50} /SRSS was influenced by the ratio of the peak amplitude of the higher frequency response to the amplitude of the lower frequency response (A_2/A_1). It was found that the SRSS method of response combination is a conservative approach for cases where A_2/A_1 is less than 2.0, with the degree of conservatism decreasing with increasing values of A_2/A_1 . The SRSS method was also found to be an accurate approach for the computing of combined response for cases where A_2/A_1 is greater than 2.0.

3.3 <u>EFFECTS OF TIME-PHASING ON R₅₀/SRSS</u>

A conservative assumption was made pertaining to the relative time-phasing of the earthquake and SRV time-histories. This conservatism lies in the definition of the "strong motion" portion of the earthquake as being the time frame between the first and last time the earthquake amplitude reached 50% of its peak value. In order to assess the affect of this assumption, the 15 earthquake plus SRV cases where the 50% NEP combined response value exceeded the SRSS calculated response by more than one percent were reevaluated defining the strong motion portion of the earthquake as being the time frame between the first and last time the response amplitude exceeded 10% of its peak value. Such a definition, constitutes a less restrictive but yet, conservative assumption.

This change in the definition of earthquake strong motion resulted in a reduction in the value of the R_{50} /SRSS and R_{85} /SRSS combined response ratios. The response ratios for the 15 cases are presented in Table 3-19 for both the 50% amplitude and 10% amplitude definitions of strong motion. It can be seen that the reduction of the R_{50} /SRSS response ratio ranges from one to nine percent and that only nine cases exhibit an R_{50} /SRSS ratio greater than 1.0. This is in contrast to 28 cases for which the R_{50} /SRSS value exceeded 1.0 when the 50% amplitude strong motion definition was used. The highest ratio of R_{50} /SRSS was less than 1.05 using the 10% amplitude strong motion definition. Similarly, the highest value of the R_{85} /SRSS response ratio is only 1.219 and is the only case where R_{85} /SRSS exceed 1.2. The comparative Cumulative Distribution Function (CDF) curves for the earthquake + SRV case exhibiting the highest value for the R_{5n} /SRSS response ratio are shown in Figure 3-4.

Conservative assumptions were also made concerning the repeatable nature of the CHUG response. As noted, the CHUG loading is known to be repeatable at intervals from one to five seconds. The conservatism

lies in the use of the minimum one-second interval for this study. To assess the affect of this conservatism, the two SRV + CHUG response combination cases where the 50% NEP combined response value exceeded the SRSS calculated response by more than one percent were reevaluated establishing the interval between the beginning of adjacent CHUG cycles to be two seconds. This definition of the CHUG cycle interval also constitutes a less restrictive, but yet conservative, assumption.

As shown in Table 3-20, the use of this less restrictive assumption results in a significant reduction in the R_{50} /SRSS response ratio. The reduction of R_{50} /SRSS is on the order of 13 percent such that no SRV + CHUG cases results in a value of R_{50} /SRSS greater than 1.0. The comparative Cumulative Distribution Function curves for the SRV + CHUG case exhibiting the highest response ratio are shown in Figure 3-5.

	_		Peak Respon	se Amplitude							
Location	Response	Loading	AMP 1	AMP2	SRSS	NEPSRSS	1.2 SR55	NEP1.25RSS	R ₅₀ /SRSS	R ₈₅ /SRSS	ABS/SRSS
5-5	Vert. Force	OBE+SRV-1	4.302 E+05	2.668 E+05	5.062 E+05	53.2%	6.075 E+05	90.2%	.988	1,149	1,377
5-4	Vert. Force	OBE+SRV-ALL	4.430 E+04	8.770 E+04	9.833 E+04	63.0%	1.180 E+05	96.1%	,954	1.092	1.343
5-5	Vert. Force	OBE+SRV-ADS	4.302 E+05	2.966 E+05	5.225 E+05	78.6%	6,270 E+06	97.1%	.900	1.041	1.391
5-5	Vert. Force	SSE+SRV-1	8.604 E+05	2.668 E+05	9.008 E+05	77.7%	1.081 E+06	97.4%	.955	1.031	1.251
5-4	Vert. Force	SSE+SRV-ALL	8.860 E+04	8.779 E+04	1.247 E+05	75.7%	1.497 E+05	97.8%	.910	1.037	1.414
5-5	Vert. Force	SRV-1+CHUG	2.668 E+05	2.643 E+05	3.755 E+05	71.0%	4.507 E+05	90.6%	.839	1.126	1.414
5-6	Vert. Force	SRV-ADS+CHUG	6.855 E+04	7.246 E+04	9.975 E+04	75.5%	1.197 E+05	94.2%	.819	1.070	1.414
4-4	Moment	SRV-1+CHUG 12	1.612 E+06	4.105 E+05	1.663 E+06	42.5%	1.996 E+06	99.4%	1.010	1,075	1.216
4-3	Vert. Force	SRV-ADS+CHUG10	4.871 E+04	1.673 E+04	5.150 E+04	62.6%	6.180 E+04	98.3%	.961	1.060	1,271
4-2	Horiz. Force	SRV-ADS+CHUG10	9.672 E+04	3.811 E+04	1.040 E+05	75.2%	1.247 E+05	97,5%	.946	1.056	1.296

TABLE 3-1 CDF ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR NSSS - RPV AND INTERNALS

TABLE 3-2 CDF ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR NSSS - MAIN STEAM PIPING

NUCLEAR	STEAM SUPPLY ST	STEM: MAIN STE	AM PIPING								
· 1		Π	Peak Respons	e Amplitude				L.c.	0 10005	D /5055	400 / 505 6
Location	Response	Loading	AMP 1	AMP2	SRSS	NEPSRSS	1.2 SR55	1,2SRSS	к ₅₀ / SKSS	R85/3833	ABS/ SKSS
6-4	Moment	OBE+SRV-1	1.150 E+05	9,488 E+04	1.491 E+05	78.8%	1.789 E+05	96.7%	.878	1.032	1.408
6-5	Moment	OBE+SRV-1	1.217 E+05	8.025 E+04	1.458 E+05	73.7%	1.749 E+05	95.2%	.880	1,071	1,385
6-7	Moment	OBE+SRV-1	1.735 E+05	1.268 E+05	2.149 E+05	71.7%	2.579 E+05	96.2%	.864	1.074	1.397
6-5	Noment	OBE+SRV-ALL	1.217 E+05	1.233 E+05	1.732 E+05	66.4%	2.079 E+05	96.5%	.948	1.088	1.414
6-6	Noment	DBE+SRV-ALL	1.261 E+05	8.666 E+04	1.530 E+05	76.6%	1.836 E+05	94.5%	.891	1.069	1.391
6-9	Moment	DBE+SRV-ALL	5.071 E+04	6.574 E+04	8,303 E+04	37.9%	9.963 E+04	94.2%	1.030	1.137	1,403
6-4	Moment	5SE+SRV-1	2.300 E+05	9,488 E+04	2.488 E+05	85.0%	2.986 E+05	99.0%	.924	.993	1,306
6-8	Moment	SSE+SRV-1	1.310 E+05	4,974 E+04	1.401 E+05	91.7%	1.681 E+05	99.0%	.935	.955	1,290
6-9	Moment	SSE+SRV-1	1.014 E+05	6.014 E+04	1.179 E+05	79.7%	1.415 E+05	97.2%	.863	1.046	1,370
6-8	Moment	SSE+SRV-ALL	1.310 E+05	9.703 E+04	1.630 E+05	84.1%	1,956 E+05	98.5%	.850	.998	1.399

٠

T			Peak Respons	se Amplitude			1.0.0000			n /spss	ABC/SBCC
Location	Response	Loading	AMP 1	AMP2	SRSS	NEPSRSS	1.2 5855	LEF1,2SRSS	n ₅₀ / 3835	n ₈₅ / 3833	AD373833
4-8	Moment	OBE+SRV-1	8.714 E+04	3.019 E+04	9.222 E+04	94.1%	1.107 E+05	> 99.5%	.945	.945	1.272
4-10	Moment	OBE+SRV-1	5.639 E+04	3.786 E+04	6.792 E+04	94.5%	8.150 E+04	97.8%	.830	.896	1,388
4-11	Moment	OBE+SRV-1	4.735 E+04	2.297 E+04	5.263 E+04	86.8%	6.315 E+04	97.8%	. 900	.979	1.336
4-12	Moment	OBE+SRV-1	5.941 E+04	2.209 E+04	6.338 E+04	90.6%	7.606 E+04	98.7%	.937	.937	1,286
4_9	Moment	OBE+SRV-ALL	1.240 E+04	1.888 E+04	2.259 E+04	71.0%	2.711 E+04	96.7%	.920	1.050	1.385
4-12	Moment	OBE+SRV-ALL	5.941 E+04	2.377 E+04	6.399 E+04	91.1%	7.679 E+04	99.3%	.928	.953	1.300
4-13	Moment	OBE+SRV-ALL	1.274 E+04	6.975 E+03	1.452 E+04	83.7%	1.743 E+04	98.0%	.877	1.003	1.358
4-9	Moment	SSE+SRV-1	2.480 E+04	1.002 E+04	2.675 E+04	86.1%	3.210 E+04	> 99.5%	.927	.980	1.302
4-10	Moment	SSE+SRV-ALL	1.128 E+05	5.133 E+04	1.239 E+05	97.2%	1.487 E=05	99.4%	.910	.910	1.325
4-11	Moment	SSE+SRV-ALL	9.470 E+04	4.738 E+04	1.059 E+05	90,7%	1.271 E+05	99,2%	.894	.961	1.342
4-9	Moment	SRV-1+CHUG	1.002 E+04	2.681 E+03	1.037 E+04	82.5%	1.245 E+04	98.4%	.966	1.002	1.225

TABLE 3-3 CDF ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR NSSS - RECIRCULATION PIPING

TABLE 3-4 CDF ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR NSSS - PIPE MOUNTED EQUIPMENT

			Peak Respor	ise Amplitude			1 0 0000				100 10000
Location	Response	Loading	AMP 1	AMP2	SRSS	NEPSRSS	1.2 5855	NEP1.25RSS	× ₅₀ /5855	R85/3833	AR212K22
4-6	Acceleration	OBE+SRV-1	.2424	. 1089	.2657	96.5%	. 3189	> 99.5%	.912	.912	1.320
4-7	Acceleration	OBE+SRV-ALL	.5128	.4048	.6533	93.1%	.7840	99.4%	.785	. 886	1,405
4-5	Acceleration	SSE+SRV-1	.04252	.01204	.04419	96.1%	.05303	99.5%	.962	.962	1.235
4-6	Acceleration	SRV-1+CHUG	.1089	.03110	.1133	88.9%	.1359	> 99.5%	, 962	.981	1,236
6-2	Acceleration	OBE+SRV-1	.1557	.2730	. 3143	59.6%	. 3771	93.6%	. 967	1.129	1,364
6-3	Acceleration	OBE+SRV-ALL	.08918	.1236	.1524	61,8%	.1829	97.1%	.972	1.092	1.396
6-1	Acceleration	SSE+SRV-1	.2858	3038	.4171	70.6%	. 5005	97.0%	.875	1.077	1,414
6-1	Acceleration	SSE+SRV-ALL	.2858	.5637	.6320	46,9%	.7584	95.1%	1.008	1,115	1,344
6-3	Acceleration	SRV-ALL+CHUG	.1236	.07681	.1455	78.7%	.1746	98.6%	.869	1.030	1.377

BOP PIP	ING: DRYWELL							•			
Location	Response	Loading	Peak Respons	se Amplitude	SRSS	NEPSOSS	1.2 SRSS	NEP1 25855	R ₅₀ /SRSS	R ₈₅ /SRSS	ABS/SRSS
			ABP 1	AMPZ	1					<u> </u>	
1-2	Force	OBE+SRV-1	1.171 E+04	9.267 E+03	1,493 E+04	60.4%	1.792 E+04	86.9%	.924	1,191	1,405
1-3	Moment	OBE+SRV-1	5.994 E+03	7.669 E+03	9.734 E+03	44.2%	1.168 E+04	82.6%	1.020	1.222	1.404
1-1	Moment	OBE+SRV-ALL	5,259 E+03	3,382 E+03	6.253 E+03	72.3%	7.503 E+03	95,5%	.883	1.040	1.382
1-4	Moment	OBE+SRV-ALL	1.768 E+01	3,178 E+01	3,637 E+01	60.8%	4.364 E+01	96.6%	.972	1,082	1,360
1-1	Moment	SSE+SRV+1	1.052 E+04	8.107 E+03	1,328 E+04	67.0%	1.594 E+04	91.9%	.940	1.076	1.403
1-4	Moment	SSE+SRV-1	3,536 E+01	3,222 E+01	4.784 E+01	67.3%	5.741 E+01	94.9%	.912	1.098	1,413
1-3	Moment	SSE+SRV-ALL	1.199 E+04	1,113 E+04	1.636 E+04	65.1%	1.963 E+04	92.1%	.913	1,124	1.413
1-4	Moment	SSE+SRV-ALL	3.536 E+01	3.178 E+01	4.754 E+01	69.7%	5.705 E+01	97.1%	.925	1.079	1,412
1-2	Force	SRV-1+CHUG	9.267 E+03	5,041 E+03	1.055 E+04	81.4%	1.266 E+04	99,1%	.878	1.009	1.356
1-4	Moment	SRV-1+CHUG	3.222 E+01	2.206 E+01	3.905 E+01	70,3%	4.686 E+01	96.9%	.877	1.103	1,390
1-1	Moment	SRV-ALL+CHUG	3.382 E+03	6.084 E+03	6.961 E+03	55.2%	8.353 E+03	98.2%	. 989	1,081	1,360
1-4	Moment	SRV-ALL+CHUG	3.178 E+01	2,206 E+01	3.869 E+01	58.8%	4.642 E+01	92.5%	. 971	1.112	1.392
2-5	Moment	OBE+SRV-1	5.772 E+02	1.924 E+02	6.084 E+02	92.7%	7.301 E+02	99.0%	.949	.949	1,265
2-8	Force	OBE+SRV-1	4.546 E+00	3.020 E+00	5.458 E+00	91.0%	6.549 E+00	99,1%	.833	.872	1,386
2-6	Moment	OBE+SRV-ALL	8.709 E+01	3.737 E+01	9.477 E+01	> 99.5%	1.137 E+02	> 99,5%	.919	.919	1,313
2-7	Moment	OBE+SRV-ALL	7.366 E+01	2,588 E+01	7,788 E+01	90.8%	9.345 E+01	99,5%	.946	.946	1,270
2-8	Force	SSE+SRV-1	9.092 E+00	3,020 E+00	9.508 E+00	88.0%	1.150 E+01	> 99.5%	.949	.949	1.264
2-8	Force	SSE+SRV-ALL	9.092 E+00	2.159 E+01	2,343 E+01	79.0%	2.811 E+01	98.4%	.941	1.020	1,310
2-7	Moment	SRV-1+CHUG	5.692 E+00	1.526 E+00	5.893 E+00	65.6%	7.072 E+00	98.0%	.966	1.056	1.225
2-8	Force	SRV-1+CHUG	3.020 E+00	2.888 E+00	4,137 E+00	69.6%	4.965 E+00	98.1%	.940	1.075	1.414

TABLE 3-5 CDF ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR BOP PIPING - DRYWELL

3-11

:

TABLE 3-6 CDF ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR BOP PIPING - CONTAINMENT (FREESTANDING STEEL)

		Π	Peak Respon	se Amplitude		NCD	2202 6 1	NED.	22921 .9	R. JSRSS	ABS/SRSS
Location	Response	Loading	AMP 1	AMP2	2822	NEPSRSS	1.2 3833	1,25RSS	~50 ^{, 3K33}	<u></u>	
3-1	Acceleration	OBE+SRV-ALL	.04968	.1236	.1332	46.4%	.1599	96.2%	1.024	1.143	1,311
3-3 3-1	Force Acceleration	OBE+SRV-ALL OBE+SRV-ADS	.1604 E+03 .04968	.6244 E+03 .1126	,6427 E+03 ,1231	53.4% 27.2%	.7713 E+03	94.2%	<u>1.056</u>	1.151	1.318
3-3 3-1	Force Acceleration	OBE+SRV-ADS SSE+SRV-ADS	.1604 E+03 .09940	.5275 E+03 .1126	.5513 E+03 .1502	16.1% 47.4%	.6616 E+03 .1802	97.9% 90.8%	<u>1.057</u> 1.009	1.102 1.166	1.248
3-2	Acceleration	SSE+SRV-ADS	.1166	.2599	.2848	41.0% 67.7%	.3418	95,8% 88,6%	<u>1.029</u> .894	1,119 1,172	1.402
3-1 3-2	Acceleration	SRV-ADS+CHUG	.2599	.1370	.2938	65.2%	. 3526	87.1%	.946	1,188	1,351
3-1 3-2	Acceleration Acceleration	SRV-ADS+CHUG SRV-ALL+CHUG	.1236 .3599	.08660 .1370	.1509 .3851	69.4% 76.0%	.1811 .4621	95.0% 97.0%	.923 .939	1.043	1.393

TABLE 3-7 CDF ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR BOP PIPING - CONTAINMENT (CONCRETE BACKED)

BOP PIPI	NG: CONTAINMEN	T (CONCRETE BACK	:ED)								
		Laudian	Peak Respon	se Amplitude	2292	NED	1 2 5055	NEP	R. ISPSS	R. JSRSS	ARS/SRSS
Location	Response	Loading	AMP1	AMP2	3833	SRSS	1.2 3833	1.2SRSS	K507 5K55	N85/ 0100	10375105
4-18	Force	OBE+SRV-1	4.744 E+01	2.496 E+01	5.361 E+01	86.5%	6.433 E+01	98.3%	.885	.988	1,351
4-21	Force	OBE+SRV-1	1.083 E+02	3,972 E+01	1.154 E+02	85.5%	1.384 E+02	98.7%	.939	,983	1.283
4-20	Moment	OBE+SRV-ALL	7,879. E+01	6.361 E+01	1.013 E+02	63.3%	1.215 E+02	93.1%	.952	1,118	1.406
4-19	Force	OBE+SRV-ALL	9,183 E+01	5,909 E+01	1.092 E+02	75.6%	1.310 E+02	97.7%	.895	1.056	1,382
4-18	Force	SSE+SRV-1	9.488 E+01	2,496 E+01	9.811 E+01	92.6%	1.177 E+02	> 99.5%	.967	.967	1.222
4-20	Moment	SSE+SRV-ALL	1.576 E+02	6.361 E+01	1.700 E+02	85.8%	2.039 E+02	> 99.5%	.927	. 982	1,301

BOP PIPI	NG: CONTAINMENT	(CONCRETE)									
Location	Response	Loading	Peak Respons	se Amplitude	SRSS	NEPSRSS	1.2 SRSS	NEP1.2SRSS	R ₅₀ /SRSS	R ₈₅ /SRSS	ABS/SRSS
5-17 5-14	Moment Force	OBE+SRV-1 OBE+SRV-1	6,297 E+02 7,350 E+01	6.724 E+02 6.448 E+01	9.212 E+02 9.777 E+01	89.9% 97.6%	1.105 E+03	98.4% 98.9%	.777	.930	1.414
5-16 5-18	Moment Moment	OBE+SRV-ADS	1.979 E+03 1.387 E+03	2.226 E+03 7.936 E+02	2.979 E+03	50.0% 94.5%	3.574 E+03	91.0% 98.7%	1.000	1,154	1,412
5-15 5-19	Force Force	SSE+SRV-1	8.792 E+01 4 966 E+02	8.771 E+01 4 415 E+02	1.242 E+02	62.9% 42.5%	1.490 E+02 7 974 F+02	89,2% 77,5%	.966	1,172	1.414
5-16 5-15	Moment	SRV-1+CHUG	8.038 E+02 8.771 E+01	4.639 E+02 7 205 E+01	9.281 E+02	70.9%	1.114 E+03	98.5% 89.9%	.921	1,064	1,365
5-14 5-17	Force	SRV-ADS+CHUG	4.588 E+01 3.501 E+02	4.623 E+01	6.513 E+01	64.4%	7.816 E+01	93,7%	.956	1.120	1,414
5-16 5-20	Moment	SRV-ALL+CHUG	3.472 E+02	4.639 E+02	5.794 E+02	56,2%	6,953 E+02	97.4%	.982	1,152	1,400
2-2	Moment	OBE+SRV-ALL	8.405 E+03	8.619 E+03	1.209 E+04	74.5% 92.9%	3.360 E+01 1.451 E+04	> 99.5%	.763	1,059 .920	1.414
2-3 2-1	Moment Moment	OBE+SRV-ALL SSE+SRV-1	3.467 E+03 2.246 E+03	5.822 E+03 3.117 E+03	6.776 E+03 3.842 E+03	78.0% 77.0%	8,131 E+03 4.610 E+03	97.3% 94.4%	.899 .914	1,040 1.067	1,371 1,396
2-4 2-2	Force Moment	SSE+SRV-1 SSE+SRV-ALL	3.094 E+03 1.680 E+04	2,553 E+03 8.619 E+03	4.011 E+03 1.903 E+04	90.3% 93.7%	4.814 E+03 2.284 E+04	98.5% 99.0%	.771 .892	.917 .892	1.408 1.346
2-3	Moment	SSE+SRV-ALL	6.934 E+03	5.822 E+03	9,054 E+03	82.2%	1.086 E+04	96.0%	.766	1.019	1.409

TABLE 3-8 CDF ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR BOP PIPING - CONTAINMENT (CONCRETE)

TABLE 3-9 CDF ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR BOP PIPING - SHIELD BLDG. (FREESTANDING STEEL)

			Peak Respon	se Amplitude			1 0 0000		0 /0055	0 /5055	ADC/CDCC
Location	Response	Loading	AMP 1	AMP2	SRSS	NEPSRSS	1.2 SR55	NEP1.2SRSS	K50/ SK55	к ₈₅ / 5к35	MD3/ 5K35
3-8	Force	OBE+SRV-ALL	2.616 E+02	8.601 E+02	8.990 E+02	43.4%	1.079 E+03	> 99.5%	1.009	1.073	1.248
3-6	Acceleration	OBE+SRV-ALL	.05667	.1995	.2074	19.8%	.2489	96.8%	1.059	1.137	1,235
3-4	Acceleration	OBE+SRV-ADS	.07475	.1502	.1678	65.2%	.2013	96.6%	.949	1.075	1.341
3-7	Moment	OBE+SRV-ADS	3.962 E+02	1,129 E+03	1.197 E+03	26.3%	1.436 E+03	97.5%	<u>1.035</u>	1.114	1.274
3-6	Acceleration	OBE+SRV-ADS	.05667	.1021	.1168	41.0%	.1401	93.8%	<u>1.042</u>	1.154	1,359
3-4	Acceleration	SSE+SRV-ADS	.1495	.1502	.2119	74.8%	.2543	96.6%	.932	1.053	1,414
3-5	Acceleration	SRV-ADS+CHUG	.1653	.1518	.2244	30.9%	.2693	88.7%	1.061	1,170	1,413
3-6	Acceleration	SRV-ADS+CHUG	.1021	.1178	.1559	24.4%	.1871	79.1%	1.095	1.216	1.411
3-4	Acceleration	SRV-ALL+CHUG	.3428	.2457	.4218	74.6%	. 5061	91.6%	.931	1.070	1,395
3-5	Acceleration	SRV-ALL+CHUG	2589	.1518	. 3001	56.5%	. 3601	91.3%	.967	1,135	1,369

TABLE 3-10 CDF ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR BOP PIPING - SHIELD BLDG. (CONCRETE BACKED) .

BOP PIPIN	NG: SHIELD BUI	LDING (CONCRETE	BACKED)	······································							
			Peak Respon	se Amplitude							
Location	Response	Loading	AMP1	AMP2	SRSS	NEPSRSS	1.2 SRSS	NEP1.2SRSS	R ₅₀ /SRSS	R ₈₅ /SRSS	ABS/SRSS
4-17	Moment	OBE+SRV-1	1.200 E+03	1.307 E+03	1.774 E+03	72.3%	2.129 E+03	97.3%	.946	1.051	1.413
4-15	Moment	OBE+SRV-1	2.756 E+03	2.743 E+03	3.888 E+03	79.8%	4.666 E+03	99.2%	.921	1.024	1.414
4-14	Force	OBE+SRV-ALL	1.062 E+03	1.038 E+03	1.485 E+03	84.5%	1.782 E+03	97.8%	.871	. 992	1.414
4-16	Force	OBE+SRV-ALL	1.408 E+03	1.073 E+03	1.770 E+03	85.9%	2.124 E+03	97.8%	.832	. 980	1.402
4-17	Moment	SSE+SRV-1	2.400 E+03	1.307 E+03	2.733 E+03	90.8%	3.279 E+03	99.4%	.878	.933	1.356
4-14	Force	SSE+SRV-ALL	2.124 E+03	1.038 E+03	2.364 E+03	96.5%	2.837 E+03	> 99.5%	. 898	. 898	1.338

.•

TABLE 3-11 CDF ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR BOP PIPING - AUXILIARY BLDG. (CONCRETE)

	· · ·		Peak Response Amplitude		6056						T
Location	Response	Loading	AMP1	AMP2	SRSS	NEPSRSS	1.2 SRSS	NEP1, 2SRSS	R ₅₀ /SRSS	R ₈₅ /SRSS	ABS/SRSS
5-7	Force Z-Axis	OBE+SRV-1	5.085 E+02	3.928 E+02	6.425 E+02	73.5%	7.711 E+02	96.2%	.891	1.047	1.403
5-10	Moment Y-Axis	OBE+SRV-1	1.235 E+04	1.217 E+04	1.734 E+04	72.1%	2.081 E+04	92.6%	.924	1.080	1.414
5-11	Moment Z-Axis	OBE+SRV-ADS	4.067 E+03	3.245 E+03	5.203 E+03	81.3%	6.244 E+03	95.6%	.855	1.028	1.405
5-12	Force Y-Axis	OBE+SRV-ADS	2.157 E+03	1.836 E+03	2.833 E+03	82.6%	3.399 E+03	\$5.1%	.853	1.015	1.409
5-13	Force Y-Axis	SSE+SRV-1	6.798 E+02	5.215 E+02	8.568 E+02	80.6%	1.028 E+03	93.7%	.833	1.036	1.402
5-8	Moment Y-Axís	SSE+SRV-ALL	4.634 E+03	4.996 E+03	6.814 E+03	78.7%	8.177 E+03	91.1%	.914	1.065	1.413
5-8	Moment Y-Axis	SRV-1+CHUG	2.496 E+03	1.837 E+03	3.099 E+03	82.6%	3.719 E+03	98.3%	.826	1.020	1.398
5-13	Force Y-Axis	SRV-ADS+CHUG	3.101 E+02	2.265 E+02	3.840 E+02	71.2%	4.608 E+02	94.1%	.881	1.105	1.397
5-12	Force Y-Axis	SRV-1+CHUG	8.340 E+02	4.711 E+02	9.579 E+02	78.3%	1.149 E+03	97.2%	. 898	1.044	1.362
5-11	Moment Z-Axis	SRV-ADS+CHUG	3.245 E+03	2.971 E+03	4.400 E+03	75.5%	5.280 E+03	91.4%	.895	1.110	1.413
5-7	Force Z-Axis	SRV-ALL+CHUG	2.584 E+02	2.484 E+02	3.584 E+02	76.4%	4.301 E+02	94.0%	.849	1.059	1.414
5-9	Moment Z-Axis	SRV-ALL+CHUG	1.802 E+03	1.500 E+03	2.345 E+03	85.2%	2.814 E+03	97.6%	.802	. 995	1.408

3-14

.

TABLE 3-12	CDF	ANALYSIS	RESULTS	FOR BOP	P EQUIPMENT	-	DRYWELL
------------	-----	----------	---------	---------	-------------	---	---------

BOP EQUI	PMENT: DRYWELL										
	Bachance	Loading	Peak Response Amplitude		2202	NED	1.2 5855	NEP1 acare	Rea/SRSS	Rar/SRSS	ABS/SRSS
Location	kesponse	Loading	AMP1	AMP2	3833	- SBSS		1.25855		.85	
1-9	Vert. Accel.	OBE+SRV-1	.1307	. 1419	. 1929	51.5%	. 2315	90.6%	.995	1.159	1.413
1-13	Tang. Accel.	OBE+SRV-1	. 1220	.09524	, 1548	38.6%	. 1857	80.7%	1.063	<u>1.228</u>	1.403
1-6	Vert. Accel.	OBE+SRV-ALL	. 1323	. 2004	.2401	45.6%	. 2882	89.9%	1.008	1.141	1.386
1-11	Radial Accel.	SSE+SRV-ALL	.2224	.2323	. 3216	67.1%	. 3859	95.8%	.907	1.073	1.414
1-5	Radial Accel.	SRV-1+CHUG	.08744	.1112	. 1415	49.4%	. 1698	90.3%	1.001	1.158	1.404
1-9	Vert. Accel.	SRV-ALL+CHUG	. 1689	. 1140	. 2038	68.7%	.2445	94.5%	.885	1.108	1.388
1-12	Vert. Accel.	SRV-ALL+CHUG	. 1139	. 1698	. 2045	77.0%	. 2454	93.7%	.834	1.063	1.387

TABLE 3-13 CDF ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR BOP EQUIPMENT - CONTAINMENT (FREESTANDING STEEL)

BOP EQUI	BOP EQUIPMENT: CONTAINMENT (FREESTANDING STEEL)													
		Π	Peak Response Amplitude			r		I.						
Location	Response	Loading	AMP 1	AMP2	SRSS	NEPSRSS	1.2 SRSS	NEP1.2SRSS	R ₅₀ /SRSS	R_5/5855	AB2/2K22			
3-12	Acceleration	OBE+SRV-ALL	.04807	. 1463	. 1540	45.0%	. 1848	97.7%	1.009	1.090	1.262			
3-11	Acceleration	DBE+SRV-ADS	.04980	. 1085	. 1194	20.4%	. 1433	91.5%	1.069	1.164	1.326			
3-12	Acceleration	DBE+SRV-ADS	.04807	.09030	. 1023	50.0%	. 1228	95.3%	1.000	1.123	1.353			
3-11	Acceleration	SSE+SRV-ADS	.09960	. 1085	.1473	39.8%	. 1767	84.6%	1.024	1.195	1.413			
3-11	Acceleration	SRV-ADS+CHUG	. 1085	.08894	. 1403	69.5%	. 1684	89.7%	.924	1.137	1.407			
3-12	Acceleration	SRV-ADS+CHUG	.09030	.07944	. 1203	74.5%	. 1443	95.1%	.894	1.084	1.411			

TABLE 5-14 CDF AMALYSIS RESULTS FOR BOP EQUIPMENT - CONTAINMENT (CONCRETE BACKED)

BOP EQUI	BOP EQUIPMENT: CONTAINMENT (CONCRETE BACKED)													
		I	Peak Respon	se Amplitude			1 0 0000		D /CDCC	0 /6066	ADC /CDCC			
Location	Response	Loading	AMP 1	AMP2	SRSS	NEPSRSS	1.2 5855	LEP1.2SRSS	*50/3K35	K85/3K35	A83/3K33			
4-23	Acceleration	OBE+SRV-ALL	. 1595	. 1246	. 2024	88,3%	.2429	98.8%	.807	.963	1.404			
4-23	Acceleration	SSE+SRV-ALL	. 3190	.1246	. 3425	92.8%	.4110	> 99,5%	.931	.931	1.295			
4-22	Acceleration	SRV-1+CHUG	.03228	.009459	.03364	96.6%	.04036	> 99,5%	. 9 60	. 962	1.241			

			Peak Response Amplitude					1]	1
Location	Response	Loading	AMP 1	AMP2	SRSS	NEPSRSS	1.2 SRSS	NEP1.2SRSS	R ₅₀ /SRSS	R ₈₅ /SRSS	ABS/SRSS
										1	
5-23	Horiz.Accel.(NS)	08E+SRV-1	. 1256	. 1253	. 1774	66.9%	.2129	95.5%	.926	1.096	1.414
5-23	Horiz.Accel.(EW)	OBE+SRV-ADS	.1305	.1716	.2156	70.7%	. 2587	95.3%	.917	1.104	1.401
5-26	Vert. Accel.	OBE+SRV-ADS	. 1539	. 1073	. 1876	98.7%	.2251	99.3%	.820	.820	1.392
5-23	Horiz.Accel.(NS)	SSE+SRV-1	. 2512	. 1253	. 2807	81.1%	. 3369	97.2%	.895	1.021	1.341
5-26	Vert. Accel.	SRV-1+CHUG	.03080	.02030	.03689	49.0%	.04427	92.5%	1.003	1.123	1.385
5-24	Vert. Accel.	SRV-ADS+CHUG	.06312	.03540	.07237	92.7%	.08684	99.3%	.872	.954	1.361
5-27	Heriz. Accel.	SRV-ADS+CHUG	.04947	.04650	.06789	89.6%	.08147	> 99.5%	.797	.947	1.414
2-9	Radial Accel.	OBE+SRV-1	. 1406	. 1434	.2008	80.2%	.2410	90.8%	.816	1.018	1.414
2-9	Radial Accel.	OBE+SRV-ALL	. 1406	. 3336	. 3620	62.0%	.4344	96.3%	.974	1.064	1.310
2-9	Radial Accel.	SSE+SRV-1	. 2812	. 1434	.3157	91.9%	. 3788	96.2%	.891	.891	1.345
2-9	Radial Accel.	SSE+SRV-ALL	. 2812	. 3336	.4363	78.1%	. 5236	95.7%	. 880	1.022	1.409
2-9	Radial Accel:	SRV-1+CHUG	. 1434	.02964	. 1464	92.6%	. 1757	100.0%	.979	.991	1.182

TABLE 3-15 CDF ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR BOP EQUIPMENT - CONTAINMENT (CONCRETE)

TABLE 3-16 CDF ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR BOP EQUIPMENT - SHIELD BLDG. (FREESTANDING STEEL)

BOP EQU	BOP EQUIPMENT: SHIELD BUILDING (FREESTANDING STEEL)													
			Peak Response Amplitude		1	1	T	1	r		T			
Location	Kesponse	Loading	AMP1	AMP2	SRSS	NEPSRSS	1.2 SRSS	NEP1,2SRSS	R ₅₀ /SRSS	R ₈₅ /SRSS	ABS/SRSS			
3-10	Acceleration	OBE+SRV-ALL	.07810	. 2273	.2403	65.8%	. 2884	98.7%	.954	1.059	1.271			
3-9	Acceleration	OBE+SRV-ADS	.06402	.1105	. 1277	36.9%	.1532	88.9%	1.032	1.176	1.367			
3-10	Acceleration	OBE+SRV-ADS	.07810	. 1389	. 1594	49.1%	. 1912	92.6%	1.002	1.144	1.361			
3-9	Acceleration	SSE+SRV-ADS	. 1280	.1105	. 1691	54.8%	: 2030	89.2%	.987	1.134	1.410			
3-9	Acceleration	SRV-ADS+CHUG	.1105	.04624	.1198	81.0%	.1437	98.1%	.936	1.015	1.308			
3-10	Acceleration	SRV-ADS+CHUG	.1389	. 02830	. 1418	70.4%	. 1701	100.0%	.983	1.020	1.179			

BOP EQU	IPMENT: SHIELD	BUILDING (CONCRI	ETE BACKED)								
			Peak Response Amplitude					1			1
Location	Response	Loading	AMP1	AMP2	SRSS	NEPSRSS	1.2 SRSS	NEP1,2SRSS	R ₅₀ /SRSS	R ₈₅ /SRSS	ABS/SRSS
								1 .			
4-25	Acceleration	OBE+SRV-1	. 1073	.1710	. 2019	49.9%	.2423	95.0%	1.001	1.108	1.378
4-25	Acceleration	OBE+SRV-ALL	. 1073	.2371	. 2602	35.8%	. 3123	94.9%	1.029	1.116	1.324
4-25	Acceleration	SSE+SRV-1	.2146	.1710	.2744	71.5%	. 3293	94.5%	.925	1.093	1.405
4-26	Acceleration	SRV-1+CHUG	.01326	.002607	.01351	87.2%	.01622	100.0%	.981	.991	1.174

TABLE 3-17 CDF ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR BOP EQUIPMENT - SHIELD BLDG. (CONCRETE BACKED)

TABLE 3-18 CDF ANALYSIS FOR BOP EQUIPMENT - AUXILIARY BLDG. (CONCRETE)

BOP EQU	BOP EQUIPMENT: AUXILIARY BUILDING (CONCRETE)													
			Peak Response Amplitude			[Les						
Location	Response	Loading	AMP1	AMP2	SRSS	NEPSRSS	1.2 SR55	NEP1,2SRSS	R50/SKSS	R ₈₅ /SRSS	ABS/SRSS			
								1		1	1			
5-29	Vert. Slab Accel	OBE+SRV-1	. 3490	.1184	.3685	87.7%	. 4422	99.2%	.947	.947	1.268			
5-29	Vert. Slab Accel	OBE+SRV-ADS	. 3490	. 1718	. 3890	83.7%	. 4668	97.7%	. 897	1.001	1.339			
5-22	Vert. Wall Accel	OBE+SRV-ADS	.1116	.03237	. 1162	94.1%	. 1394	> 99.5%	.960	.960	1.239			
5-29	Vert. Slab Accel	SSE+SRV-ALL	. 6980	.4508	.8309	86.6%	.9971	94.9%	.840	.986	1.383			
5-22	Vert. Wall Accel	SRV-1+CHUG	.02510	.01060	.02725	78.5%	.03270	96.9%	.951	1.008	1.310			
5-22	Vert. Wall Accel	SRV-ADS+CHUG	.03237	.01060	.03406	84.5%	.04087	99.2%	.956	.999	1.262			
5-21	Horiz. Accel.	SRV-ALL+CHUG	.01521	.00350	.01561	94.8%	.01873	100.0%	.975	.980	1.199			
		R ₅₀ /	SRSS	R ₈₅ /	ŚRSS									
----------	---------------	-------------------	---------------	-------------------	---------------									
Location	Loading	50% Amplitude	10% Amplitude	50% Amplitude	10% Amplitude									
6-9	OBE + SRV-ALL	1.030	.942	1.137	1.084									
1-3	OBE + SRV-1	1.020	.983	1.222	1.149									
3-1	OBE + SRV-ALL	1.024	.999	1.143	1.110									
3-1	OBE + SRV-ADS	1.056	1.020	1.151	1.129									
3-3	OBE + SRV-ADS	1.057	1.025	1.102	1.092									
3-2	SSE + SRV-ADS	1.029	1.022	1.119	1.119									
5-19	SSE + SRV-ALL	1.048	1.019	1.221	1.219									
3-6	OBE + SRV-ALL	1.059	1.038	1.137	1.101									
3-7	OBE + SRV-ADS	1.035	1.025	1.114	1.113									
3-6	OBE + SRV-ADS	1.042	1.011	1.154	1.122									
1-13	OBE + SRV-1	1.063	.991	1.228	1.198									
3-11	OBE + SRV-ADS	1.069	1.047	1.164	1.156									
3-11	SSE + SRV-ADS	1.024	.976	1.195	1.160									
3-9	OBE + SRV-ADS	1.032	.994	1.176	1.104									
4-25	OBE + SRV-ALL	1.029	1.017	1.116	1.086									

TABLE 3-19

EFFECT OF STRONG MOTION DEFINITION ON RESPONSE RATIOS FOR EARTHQUAKE + SRV CASES

TABLE 3-20 EFFECT OF CHUG INTERVAL ON RESPONSE RATIOS FOR SRV + CHUG CASES

		R ₅₀ /SRSS		R ₈₅ /SRSS	
Location	Loading	l Sec.Interval	2 Sec. Interval	1 Sec. Interval	2 Sec. Interval
3-5 3-6	SRV-ADS + CHUG SRV-ADS + CHUG	1.061 1.095	.933 .956	1.170 1.216	1.149 1.178



FIGURE 3-1. DISTRIBUTION OF R₅₀/SRSS AND R₈₅/SRSS FOR 167 RESPONSE COMBINATIONS





CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION FOR THE R₈₅/SRSS RESPONSE PARAMETER FIGURE 3-3.



FIGURE 3-4. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, CONTAINMENT VESSEL LOCATION 3-11 OBE + SRV-ADS LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL ACCELERATION (G)



FIGURE 3-5. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, HPCS PUMP DISCHARGE LINE LOCATION 3-6 SRV-ADS + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, ACCELERATION (G)

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The applicability of the SRSS response combination methodology for Mark III plants has been established by comparison of the response ratios R_{50} /SRSS and R_{85} /SRSS obtained from the CDF analyses with the requirements of Newmark-Kennedy Criterion 2.

It was found that the response ratios for the 167 response combinations tended to be normally distributed and that the 167 cases represented a very good measure of the behavior of the whole population. For better than 83% of the cases, $R_{50}/SRSS$ was less than 1.0 and was less than 1.01 and 1.05 for almost 90% and 96% of the cases, respectively. The maximum value of $R_{50}/SRSS$ was found to be only 1.095. Similarly, the response ratio $R_{85}/SRSS$ was less than 1.2 for almost 98% of the cases with the maximum value of $R_{85}/SRSS$ being 1.228.

The effect of the conservative assumption concerning the definition of earthquake strong motion on the resulting R_{50} /SRSS and R_{85} /SRSS response ratios was investigated for the 15 earthquake + SRV response combination cases where the 50% NEP response value exceeded the SRSS calculated response by more than one percent. Using a less restrictive but yet conservative definition for earthquake strong motion, it was found that the R_{50} /SRSS ratio for these cases reduced from one to nine percent. Similarly, the effect of the conservative assumption concerning the time interval between repeated CHUG cycles was also investigated for the two SRV + CHUG response combination cases where the 50% NEP response value exceeded the SRSS calculated response by more than one percent. Again, using a less restrictive but yet conservative time interval, the R_{50} /SRSS ratio reduced by approximately 13 percent.

Had these two less restrictive but conservative assumptions been used throughout the study, R_{50} /SRSS would be less than 1.0 for almost 95% of the cases. In no case, would the 50% NEP response value exceed the SRSS calculated response by more than five percent with the maximum value of R_{50} /SRSS being only 1.047. Similarly, the response ratio R_{85} /SRSS would be less than 1.2 for better than 99% of the cases with the maximum value of R_{85} /SRSS being 1.219.

Based upon the conservatively biased results of these analyses and the observed trends, it is concluded that the SRSS method of response combination is justified for all 167 response combination cases evaluated in this study. It is further concluded, that the SRSS method is conservative in most cases, is a realistic approach for those cases where the high frequency response is predominant, and is in no case, unconservative. The 167 response combination cases evaluated in this study represent a generic data set. Therefore, it is also concluded that the use of the SRSS response combination method for both ASME and non-ASME components is generically applicable for all locations within Mark III plants for the loadings considered.

5. REFERENCES

- 1. E. Rosenblueth, "A Basis for Aseismic Design", Ph.D. Thesis, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, 1951.
- 2. R. P. Kennedy and N. M. Newmark, "Bases for Criteria for Combination of Earthquake and Other Transient Responses by the Square-Root-Sumof-the-Squares Method", NEDO-24010-2, December, 1978.
- A. K. Singh, S. W. Tagart and C. V. Subramanian, "Technical Basis for the Use of the Square-Root-Sum-of-the-Squares (SRSS) Method for Combining Dynamic Loads for Mark II Plants", NEDE-24010-P, July, 1977.
- 4. A. K. Singh and C. V. Subramanian, "SRSS Application Criteria as Applied to Mark II Load Combination Cases", NEDO-24010-1, October, 1978.
- 5. Testimony of Robert P. Kennedy concerning Load Combination Methodology, Public Service Company of Oklahoma Construction Permit Hearings, Docket Nos. 50-566, 50-567, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, February, 1979.
- R. P. Kennedy, R. D. Campbell, K. L. Merz and R. B. Narver, "Combining Multiple Dynamic Responses by the Square-Root-Sum-of-the Squares Method", Engineering Decision Analysis Company, Inc., EDAC 134-240.7R, May, 1978.
- 7. C. V. Subramanian and R. P. Kennedy, "Executive Summary Report and Supplement, Technical Basis for the SRSS Method of Combining Dynamic Responses", April, 1978.
- 8. "Review of Methods and Criteria for Dynamic Combinations in Piping Systems", Brookhaven National Laboratory, NUREG/CR-1330, April, 1980.
- 9. R. K. Mattu, "Methodology for Combining Dynamic Responses", Nuclear Regulatory Commission, NUREG-0484, Revision 1, May, 1980.

REFERENCES (Continued)

- R. P. Kennedy, W. H. Tong and N. M. Newmark, "Study to Demonstrate the SRSS Combined Response Has Greater than 84 Percent Non-Exceedance Probability When the Newmark-Kennedy Criteria Are Satisfied", NEDO-24010-03, August, 1979.
- 11. Meeting between the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Mark JII Containment Owners SRSS Subgroup held in Bethesda, Maryland, on April 14, 1981.

APPENDIX A

DESCRIPTION OF RESPONSE LOCATIONS

The locations and descriptions of the following points are given for the various plants as they occur on the Mark III SRSS Evaluation Matrix (left to right).

I. Nuclear Steam Supply System (NSSS)

A. RPV & Internals

Location	Description
5-4	Shroud Support, Vertical Force (1bs)
5-5	RPV Skirt, Vertical Force (lbs)
5-6	Core Plate, Vertical Force (lbs)
4-2	RPV Skirt, Horizontal Force (lbs)
4-3	Core Plate, Vertical Force (lbs)
4-4	Shroud Support, Horizontal Moment (in-1bs)

B. Recirculation Piping and Pipe Mounted Equipment

<u>Location</u>	Description
4-5	Pump C.G., Acceleration (G)
4-6	Flow Control Valve, Acceleration (G)
4-7	Discharge Valve, Acceleration (G)
4-8	Pump Inlet, Node 22, Moment (ft-lbs)
4-9	Elbow, Node 46, Moment (ft-lbs)
4-10	Tee, Node 64, Moment (ft-1bs)
4-11	Elbow, Node 90, Moment (ft-1bs)
4-12	Pipe Element, Node 93, Moment (ft-1bs)
4-13	Sweepolet, Node 144, Moment (ft-1bs)

C. Main Steam Piping and Pipe Mounted Equipment

Location	Description
6-1	SRV C.G., Node 148, Acceleration (G)
6-2	SRV C.G., Node 164, Acceleration (G)
6-3	MSIV C.G., Node 176, Acceleration (G)
6-4	MSIV Inlet, Node 37, Moment (in-1bs)
6-5	Elbow, Node 39, Moment (in-lbs)
6-6	Pipe Element, Node 40, Moment (in-1bs)
6-7	Elbow, Node 67, Moment (in-lbs)
6-8	Sweepolet, Node 96, Moment (in-1bs)
6-9	Sweepolet, Node 128, Moment (in-lbs)

A-1

II. Balance-of-Plant Piping

A. <u>Drywell</u>

Location	Description
1-1	Feedwater Line, Node 300, Moment (ft-1bs)
1-2	Feedwater Line, Node 285, Support Force (1bs)
1-3	Feedwater Line, Node 168, Moment (ft-1bs)
1-4	RWCU Piping, Node 30, Moment (ft-1bs)
2-5	FPC & CU Refueling Water Line, Node 45, Moment (ft-lbs)
2-6	FPC & CU Refueling Water Line, Node 120, Moment (ft-lbs)
2-7	FPC & CU Refueling Water Line, Node 525, Moment (ft-1bs)
2-8	FPC & CU Refueling Water Line, Node 450, Axial Force (1bs)

B. Containment (Freestanding Steel) and Shield Building

Location	Description	· ·
3-1	HPCS Test Line between Containment Vessel and Shield Building, Accel. (G)	
3-2 3-3	HPCS Test Line Support at Containment Vessel,	Acceleration (G) Support Force (lbs)
3-4	HPCS Pump Discharge Line betw and Containment Vessel, Acce	veen Drywell leration (G)
3-5 3-7 3-8	HPCS Pump Discharge Line between Containment Vessel and Shield Building	Acceleration (G) Moment (ft-lbs) Force (lbs)
3-6	HPCS Pump Discharge Line, Support Point on Shield Building, Acceleration (G)	

Balance-of-Plant Piping (Continued) II.

C. Containment (Freestanding Steel - Concrete Backed) and Shield Building

2

<u>Location</u>	Description	
4-14	Residual Heat Removal Line, Support Reaction (lbs)	Node 4
4-15	Residual Heat Removal Line, Moment Y-Axis (ft-1bs)	Element 9
4-16	Residual Heat Removal Line, Shear Y-Axis (lbs)	Element 11
4-17	Residual Heat Removal Line, Moment Y-Axis (ft-1bs)	Element 15
4-18	Combustible Gas Control Line, Support Reaction (lbs)	Node 42
4-19	Combustible Gas Control Line, Shear Y-Axis (lbs)	Element 15
4-20	Combustible Gas Control Line, Moment Y-Axis (ft-1bs)	Element 26
4-21	Combustible Gas Control Line, Axial Force (lbs)	Element 40
Containment	(Concrete) and Auxiliary Building	

D.

Location Description 2-1 Low Pressure Core Spray Line, Node 92, Moment (ft-1bs) Low Pressure Core Spray Line, Node 110, Moment (ft-lbs) 2-2 2-3 Low Pressure Core Spray Line, Node 132, Moment (ft-lbs) 2-4 Low Pressure Core Spray Line, Node 126, Axial Force (1bs)

II. Balance-of-Plant Piping (Cont.)

D. Containment (Concrete) and Auxiliary Building

Location	Description
5-7	RH-10 Line, Node 66, Force Z-Axis (1bs)
5-8	RH-10 Line, End I of Element 20, Moment Y-Axis (in-lbs)
5-9	RH-10 Line, End I of Element 20, Moment Z-Axis (in-1bs)
5-10	RH-10 Line, End J of Element 28, Moment Y-Axis (in-1bs)
5-11	RH-10 Line, End J of Element 28, Moment Z-Axis (in-1bs)
5-12	RH-10 Line, Node 7, Force Y-Axis (lbs)
5-13	RH-10 Line, Node 42, Force Y-Axis (lbs)
5-14	FP-18 Line, Node 42, Force Y-Axis (1bs)
5-15	FP-18 Line, Node 95, Force Y-Axis (lbs)
5-16	FP-18 Line, End I of Element 24, Moment Y-Axis (in-1bs)
5-17	FP-18 Line, End J of Element 52, Moment Y-Axis (in-1bs)
5-18	FP-18 Line, End J of Element 76, Moment Y-Axis (in-1bs)
5-19	FP-18 Line, Node 105B, Force X-Axis (lbs)
5-20	FP-18 Line, Node 60B, Force Y-Axis (lbs)

III. Balance-of-Plant Equipment

A. Drywell

.

Location	Description	
1-5 1-6	Drywell Elevation 160 ft.,	Radial Acceleration (G) Vertical Acceleration (G)
1-9	Drywell Elevation 133 ft.,	Vertical Acceleration (G)
$\left. \begin{array}{c} 1-11 \\ 1-12 \\ 1-13 \end{array} \right\}$	Drywell Elevation 95 ft.,	Radial Acceleration (G) Vertical Acceleration (G) Tangential Acceleration (G)

B. Containment (Freestanding Steel) and Shield Building

Location	Description
3-9	Shield Building, 176 ft., Vertical Acceleration (G)
3-10	Shield Building, 216 ft., Vertical Acceleration (G)
3-11	Containment Vessel, 179 ft., Vertical Acceleration (G)
3-12	Containment Vessel, 162 ft., Vertical Acceleration (G)

C. Containment (Freestanding Steel - Concrete Backed) and Shield Building

Location	, Description
4-22	Containment Vessel, 604 ft., Vertical Acceleration (G)
4-23	Containment Vessel, 665 ft., Vertical Acceleration (G)
4-25	Shield Building, 606 ft., Vertical Acceleration (G)
4-26	Shield Building, 663 ft., Vertical Acceleration (G)

III. Balance-of-Plant Equipment (Continued)

..

D. Containment (Concrete) and Auxiliary Building

Location	Description	· · · ·
2-9	Containment Shell, 120 ft10 Radial Acceleration	in.
5-21 5-22 5-29	Auxiliary Building, 734 ft.	Horizontal Accel. (G) Vertical Wall Accel. (G) Vertical Slab Accel. (G)
5-23 5-24	Containment Building, 770 ft.) Horizontal Accel. (G) } Vertical Wall Accel. (G)
5-26	Containment Building, 856 ft.	Vertical Wall Accel. (G)
5-27	Drywell, 778 ft.	Horizontal Accel. (G)

APPENDIX B

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION CURVES

FROM 167 RESPONSE ANALYSES



FIGURE B-1. NUCLEAR STEAM SUPPLY SYSTEM CDF CURVE, RPV SKIRT OBE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL FORCE (LBS)

. LOCATION 5-5

.

P (R<R.)



i





.



FIGURE B-4 NUCLEAR STEAM SUPPLY SYSTEM CDF CURVE, RPV SKIRT SSE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL FORCE (LBS)



FIGURE B-5. NUCLEAR STEAM SUPPLY SYSTEM CDF CURVE, SHROUD SUPPORT, LOCATION 5-4 SSE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL FORCE (LBS)









1

FIGURE B-8. NUCLEAR STEAM SUPPLY SYSTEM CDF CURVE, CORE PLATE SRV-ADS + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL FORCE (LBS) . LOCATION 5-6

P (R<R,)



FIGURE B-9. NUCLEAR STEAM SUPPLY SYSTEM, CORE PLATE , LOCATION 4-3 SRV-ADS + CHUGIO LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL FORCE (LBS)

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION











i (

FIGURE B-12.NSSS MAIN STEAM PIPING CDF CURVE, LOCATION 6-5 OBE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT (IN-LBS)

3

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION



FIGURE B-13. NSSS MAIN STEAM PIPING CDF CURVE, LOCATION 6-7 OBE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT (IN-LBS)

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION

P (R < R,) 8. P (1.2×SRSS) 0.80 -P (SRSS) PROBABILITY 0.40 0.60 COMBINED RESPONSE VALUE NEP 50.07 1.643 #105 85.07 1.885 ×105 68.47 SRSS 1.732 m10⁵ 98.57 2.079 #105 1.2×5855 2.450 ×105 ABS. SUM 0.20 2**#SRSS** SRSS 8 0 160.00 R-VALUE 180.00 ×10³ 120.00 140.00 200.00 220.00 240.00

. •

FIGURE B-14. NSSS MAIN STEAM PIPING CDF CURVE, LOCATION 6-5 OBE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT (IN-LBS)

.

×.



. .

· 1



FIGURE B-15. NSSS MAIN STEAM PIPING CDF CURVE, LOCATION 6-6 OBE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT (IN-LBS)



FIGURE B-16. NSSS MAIN STEAM PIPING CDF CURVE, LOCATION 6-9 OBE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT (IN-LBS)

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION



FIGURE B-17. NSSS MAIN STEAM PIPING CDF CURVE, LOCATION 6-4 SSE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT (IN-LBS)

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION



. _____


γ.



FIGURE B-20. NSSS MAIN STEAM PIPING CDF CURVE, LOCATION 6-8 SSE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT (IN-LBS)

. ć.



•



· <





Ç

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION



Ł







FIGURE B-26. NSSS RECIRCULATION PIPING PIPE ELEMENT. LOCATION 4-12 OBE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT (FT-LBS)

. }

· . .

.

4





FIGURE B-27. NSSS RECIRCULATION PIPING SWEEPOLET . LOCATION 4-13 OBE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT (FT-LBS)



1

•

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION P (R<R.) 1.00 F (1.2 SRSS) 0.80 PROBABILITY 0.40 0.60 COMBINED RESPONSE VALUE NEP 50.07 1.128 #105 85.0% 128 #105 97.27 239 ×105 **SR33** 1.487 #105 1.2×\$8\$\$ 99.47 ABS. SUM 1.641 #105 0.20 . 2×5R55 **SBSS** 00. 960.00 1120.00 1200.00 R-VALUE * 1040.00 1360.00 1,580.00 1440.00 1520.00

×10²

.

FIGURE B-29. NSSS RECIRCULATION PIPING TEE . LOCATION 4-10 SSE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT (FT-LBS)

. .





FIGURE B-30. NSSS RECIRCULATION PIPING ELBOW . LOCATION 4-13 SSE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT (FT-LBS)

and the second second

A CONTRACT STREET CONTRACT STREET STREET



P (R<R_g)



FIGURE B-32. NSSS MAIN STEAM PIPING CDF. CURVE. LOCATION 6-2 OBE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION. ACCELERATION (G)

 $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{i$

Contract and the contract of the second 2





SRSS

0.16

0.14 0 R-VALUE

デート さんしゃく とうさん ショントロービー くうし しゃく マン・モート くうしょう

FIGURE B-34.NSSS MAIN STEAM PIPING CDF CURVE, LOCATION 6-3 OBE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, ACCELERATION (G)

0.12

00.

0.08

0.10

2**mSRSS**

0.18

0.22

0.20

「アインデーを入っている」を見ていた。 そうたい たいたい しょうしょう





FIGURE B-36.NSSS MAIN STEAM PIPING CDF CURVE, LOCATION 6-1 SSE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, ACCELERATION (G)

とうし むきがく たくく たきにたた かっていたい

CARRENCE SIGNER CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR



.





シントン コーマンビー しゃくさく メラトレーマー・デート



P (R<R.)





 S
S • 7 ٢ A state of the state

1



FIGURE B-41. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE. FEEDWATER LINE, LOCATION 1-2 OBE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, SUPPORT FORCE (LBS)



1

5

.

2

FIGURE B-42. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, FEEDWATER LINE, LOCATION 1-3 OBE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, PIPE MOMENT MB3 (FT-LBS)

- 2

£

1 >

.

 $[-\delta_{i}] = [-\delta_{i}] + [-\delta_{i}]$

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION



FIGURE B-43. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, FPC + CU REFUELING WATER LINE, LOCATION 2-5 OBE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, PIPE MOMENT Y (FT-LBS)

P (R<R,)



FIGURE B-44. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE. FPC + CU REFUELING WATER LINE. LOCATION 2-8 OBE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION. AXIAL SUPPORT (LBS)

Ł

and the first of the second state of the secon

t<u>____</u>__ ↓ ↓ . -5 Registration of the Registration



P (R<R,)



FIGURE B-46. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, RWCU PIPING, LOCATION 1-4 OBE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, PIPE MOMENT MB3 (FT-LBS)

.

- .

.

Standard States and St

ζ.





FIGURE B-47. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, FPC + CU REFUELING WATER LINE, LOCATION 2-6 OBL + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, PIPE MOMENT Y (FT-LBS)



•

FIGURE B-48.BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, FPC + CU REFUELING WATER LINE, LOCATION 2-7 OBE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, PIPE MOMENT Y (FT-LBS)



FIGURE B-49, BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, FEEDWATER LINE, LOCATION 1-1 SSE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, PIPE MOMENT MB3 (FT-LBS)

ς.

ŝ



FIGURE B-50. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, RWCU PIPING, LOCATION 1-4 SSE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, PIPE MOMENT MB3 (FT-LBS)

ζ.

ı.

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION



FIGURE B-51. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, FPC & CU REFUELING WATER LINE, LOCATION 2-8 SSE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, AXIAL SUPPORT (LBS)



P (R<R₀)

FIGURE B-52. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, FEEDWATER LINE, LOCATION 1-3 SSE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, PIPE MOMENT MB3 (FT-LBS)



FIGURE B-53. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, RWCU PIPING, LOCATION 1-4 SSE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, PIPE MOMENT MB3 (FT-LBS)



FIGURE B-54. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, FPC & CU REFUELING WATER LINE, LOCATION 2-8 SSE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, AXIAL SUPPORT (LBS)


FIGURE B-55. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, FEEDWATER LINE, LOCATION 1-2 SRV-1 + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, SUPPORT FORCE (LBS)



FIGURE B-56. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, RWCU PIPING, LOCATION 1-4 SRV-1 + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, PIPE MOMENT MB3 (FT-LBS)



FIGURE B-57. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, FPC + CU REFUELING WATER LINE, LOCATION 2-7 SRV-1 + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, PIPE MOMENT Y (FT-LBS)





FIGURE B-58. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, FPC + CU REFUELING WATER LINE, LOCATION 2-8 SRV-1 + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, AXIAL SUPPORT (LBS)



FIGURE B-59. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, FEEDWATER LINE, LOCATION 1-1 SRV-ALL + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, PIPE MOMENT MB3 (FT-LBS)



FIGURE B-60. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, RWCU PIPING, LOCATION 1-4 SRV-ALL + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, PIPE MOMENT MB3 (FT-LBS)



FIGURE B-61. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, HPCS TEST LINE, LOCATION 3-1 OBE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, ACCELERATION (G)



FIGURE B-62. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, HPCS TEST LINE, LOCATION 3-3 OBE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, SUPPORT FORCE (LBS)

1



FIGURE B-63. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, HPCS TEST LINE, LOCATION 3-1 OBE + SRV-ADS LOAD COMBINATION, ACCELERATION (G)



FIGURE B-64. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, HPCS TEST LINE, LOCATION 3-3 OBE + SRV-ADS LOAD COMBINATION, SUPPORT FORCE (LBS)



FIGURE B-65.BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, HPCS TEST LINE, LOCATION 3-1 SSE + SRV-ADS LOAD COMBINATION, ACCELERATION (G)







FIGURE B-67. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, HPCS TEST LINE, LOCATION 3-1 SRV-ADS + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, ACCELERATION (G)



FIGURE B-68. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, HPCS TEST LINE, LOCATION 3-2 SRV-ADS + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, ACCELERATION (G)



FIGURE B-69. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, HPCS TEST LINE, LOCATION 3-1 SRV-ALL + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, ACCELERATION (G)

P (R<R,)

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION



FIGURE B-70. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE. HPCS TEST LINE. LOCATION 3-2 SRV-ALL + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION. ACCELERATION (G)



FIGURE B-71. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, COMBUSTION GAS SUPPLY LINE, LOCATION 4-18 OBE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, SUPPORT REACTION (LBS)

1





FIGURE B-73. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE. COMBUSTION GAS SUPPLY LINE. LOCATION 4-20 OBE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT Y (FT-LBS)





FIGURE B-74. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, COMBUSTION GAS SUPPLY LINE, LOCATION 4-19 OBE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, SHEAR Y (LBS)



FIGURE B-75. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, COMBUSTION GAS SUPPLY LINE, LOCATION 4-18 SSE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, SUPPORT REACTION (LBS)



FIGURE B-76. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, COMBUSTION GAS SUPPLY LINE, LOCATION 4-20 SSE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT Y (FT-LBS)



FIGURE B-77 BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, FP-18 LINE, LOCATION 5-17 OBE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT Y-AXIS (IN-LBS)

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION





FIGURE B-79. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, LOW PRESSURE COOLANT SUPPLY LINE, LOCATION 2-2 OBE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, PIPE MOMENT Y (FT-LBS)





FIGURE B-81. BOP PIPING COF CURVE, FP-18 LINE, LOCATION 5-16 OBE + SRV-ADS LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT Y-AXIS (IN-LBS)



FIGURE B-82. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, FP-18 LINE, LOCATION 5-18 OBE + SRV-ADS LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT Y-AXIS (IN-LBS)

:



CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION

P (R<R₀)



FIGURE B-84. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE. LOW PRESSURE COOLANT SUPPLY LINE, LOCATION 2-1 SSE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, PIPE MOMENT Y (FT-LBS)

3





FIGURE B-86. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, FP-18 LINE, LOCATION 5-19 SSE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, FORCE X-AXIS (LBS)





FIGURE B-88. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, LOW PRESSURE COOLANT SUPPLY LINE, LOCATION 2-3 SSE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, PIPE MOMENT Y (FT-LBS)

• E 1



FIGURE B-89. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE. FP-18 LINE. LOCATION 5-15 SRV-1 + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION. FORCE Y-AXIS (LBS)

. (

. .



FIGURE B-90. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, FP-18 LINE, LOCATION 5-16 SRV-1 + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT Y-AXIS (IN-LBS)

• • • •

•

•


FIGURE B-91. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, FP-18 LINE, LOCATION 5-17 SRV-ADS + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT Y-AXIS (IN-LBS)

٤

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION

,t





4

FIGURE B-92. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, FP-18 LINE, LOCATION 5-14 SRV-ADS + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, FORCE Y-AXIS (LBS)

.



FIGURE B-93 BOP PIPING COF CURVE, FP-18 LINE, LOCATION 5-16 SRV-ALL + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT Y-AXIS (IN-LBS)

...

FICK FORE



P (R<R_e)





S,



FIGURE B-95. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, HPCS PUMP DISCHARGE LINE LOCATION 3-8 OBE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, FORCE (LBS)

. 1



FIGURE B-96. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, HPCS PUMP DISCHARGE LINE LOCATION 3-6 OBE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, ACCELERATION (G)

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION





FIGURE 8-97, BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, HPCS PUMP DISCHARGE LINE LOCATION 3-4 OBE + SRV-ADS LOAD COMBINATION, ACCELERATION (G)

}

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION





FIGURE B-98. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, HPCS PUMP DISCHARGE LINE LOCATION 3-7 OBE + SRV-ADS LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT (FT-LBS)







FIGURE B-100. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, HPCS PUMP DISCHARGE LINE LOCATION 3-4 SSE + SRV-ADS LOAD COMBINATION, ACCELERATION (G)

P (R<R,)



FIGURE B-101. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, HPCS PUMP DISCHARGE LINE LOCATION 3-5 SRV-ADS + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, ACCELERATION (G)

· .



FIGURE B-102. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, HPCS PUMP DISCHARGE LINE LOCATION 3-6 SRV-ADS + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, ACCELERATION (G)



FIGURE B-103. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE. HPCS PUMP DISCHARGE LINE LOCATION 3-4 SRV-ALL + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION. ACCELERATION (G)



FIGURE B-104. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, HPCS PUMP DISCHARGE LINE LOCATION 3-5 SRV-ALL + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, ACCELERATION (G)

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION P (R<R,) 80 -P (1.2×SRSS) 0.80 -P (SRSS) PROBABILITY 0.40 0.60 COMBINED RESPONSE VALUE NEP 50.07 1.878 #103 85.0% 1.865 #103 72.37 38**3**5 H103 1.774 97.37 1.2×5835 2.129 ×103 ABS. SUN 2.507 ×103 0.20 2×SBSS SRSS 8 -100.00 120.00 0 160.00 R-VALUE 180.00 ×10 200.00 220.00 240.00 140.00

~

FIGURE B-105. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, RESIDUAL HEAT REMOVAL LINE LOCATION 4-17 OBE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT Y (FT-LBS)



FIGURE B-106. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, RESIDUAL HEAT REMOVAL LINE LOCATION 4-15 OBE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT Y (FT-LBS)

L



FIGURE B-107. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, RESIDUAL HEAT REMOVAL LINE LOCATION 4-14 OBE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, SUPPORT REACTION (LBS)





FIGURE B-108. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, RESIDUAL HEAT REMOVAL LINE LOCATION 4-16 OBE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, SHEAR Y (LBS)



FIGURE B-109. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, RESIDUAL HEAT REMOVAL LINE LOCATION 4-17 SSE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT Y (FT-LBS)



FIGURE B-110. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE. RESIDUAL HEAT REMOVAL LINE LOCATION 4-14 SSE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, SUPPORT REACTION (LBS)



FIGURE B-111. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, RH-10 LINE, LOCATION 5-7 OBE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, FORCE Z-AXIS (LBS)



P(R<R₀)





FIGURE B-113.BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, RH-10 LINE, LOCATION 5-11 OBE + SRV-ADS LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT Z-AXIS (IN-LBS)

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION







FIGURE B-115. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, RH-10 LINE, LOCATION 5-13 -SSE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, FORCE Y-AXIS (LBS)



P (R<R,)





FIGURE B-117. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, RH-10 LINE, LOCATION 5-8 SRV-1 + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT Y-AXIS (IN-LBS)



FIGURE B-118. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, RH-10 LINE, LOCATION 5-12 SRV-1 + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, FORCE Y-AXIS (LBS)



FIGURE B-119. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, RH-10 LINE, LOCATION 5-13 SRV-ADS + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, FORCE Y-AXIS (LBS)



FIGURE B-120. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, RH-10 LINE, LOCATION 5-11 SRV-ADS + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT Z-AXIS (IN-LBS)



FIGURE B-121. BOP PIPING COF CURVE, RH-10 LINE, LOCATION 5-7 SRV-ALL + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, FORCE Z-AXIS (LBS)



FIGURE B-122. BOP PIPING CDF CURVE, RH-10 LINE, LOCATION 5-9 SRV-ALL + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, MOMENT Z-AXIS (IN-LBS)



P (R<R₀)



FIGURE B-123. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE.DRYWELL LOCATION 1-9 OBE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION. VERTICAL ACCELERATION (G)





FIGURE B-124. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, DRYWELL LOCATION 1-13 OBE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, TANGENTIAL ACCELERATION (G)

с с



FIGURE B-125.BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, DRYWELL LOCATION 1-6 OBE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL ACCELERATION (G) -



P (R<R_a)




FIGURE B-127. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, DRYWELL LOCATION 1-5 SRV-1 + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, RADIAL ACCELERATION (G)

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION



FIGURE B-128. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, DRYWELL LOCATION 1-9 SRV-ALL + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL ACCELERATION (G)

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION





FIGURE B-129. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, DRYWELL LOCATION 1-12 SRV-ALL + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL ACCELERATION (G)



FIGURE B-130. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, CONTAINMENT VESSEL LOCATION 3-12 OBE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL ACCELERATION (G)



FIGURE B-131. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, CONTAINMENT VESSEL LOCATION 3-11 OBE + SRV-ADS LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL ACCELERATION (G)

P (R<R₀)



FIGURE B-132. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, CONTAINMENT VESSEL LOCATION 3-12 OBE + SRV-ADS LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL ACCELERATION (G)



FIGURE B-133. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, CONTAINMENT VESSEL LOCATION 3-11 SSE + SRV-ADS LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL ACCELERATION (G)

· · ·



FIGURE B-134. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, CONTAINMENT VESSEL LOCATION 3-11 SRV-ADS + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL ACCELERATION (G)

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION

P (R<R,) 1.00 -P (1.2×SRSS) 0.80 -P (SRSS) PROBABILITY 0.40 0.60 COMBINED RESPONSE VALUE NEP 1.075 ×10-1 50.07 85.07 .303 ×10-1 .203 ×10-1 74.57 SRSS 1.2×SR55 1.443 ×10-1 95.17 1.697 ×10-1 ABS. SUM 0.20 **#SRSS** SRSS 0.80 0.90 1.00 1.10 1.20 1.30 R-VALUE ×10⁻¹ 1.40 1.50 1.60

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION

FIGURE B-135. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, CONTAINMENT VESSEL LOCATION 3-12 SRV-ADS + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL ACCELERATION (G)

P (R<R,)



FIGURE B-136. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, CONTRINMENT VESSEL LOCATION 4-23 OBE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, RADIAL ACCELERATION (G)

E.

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION



FIGURE B-137. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE. CONTAINMENT VESSEL LOCATION 4-23 SSE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION. RADIAL ACCELERATION (G)





FIGURE B-138. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, CONTAINMENT VESSEL LOCATION 4-22 SRV-1 + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL ACCELERATION (G)

A state of the sta

the contract of the second

 $\mathcal{E}_{1}^{(1)} = \mathcal{E}_{1}^{(1)}$, $\mathcal{E}_{2}^{(1)} = \mathcal{E}_{2}^{(1)}$, $\mathcal{E}_{2}^{(1)} = \mathcal{E}_{2}^{(1)}$

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION



FIGURE B-139. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, CONTAINMENT BUILDING LOCATION 5-23 OBE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, HORIZONTAL ACCELERATION (G)

P (R<R.)



ŝ

FIGURE B-140. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, CONTAINMENT VESSEL LOCATION 2-9 OBE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, RADIAL ACCELERATION (G)

 $\xi = -\xi_{1} + \xi_{2} + \xi_{1} + \xi_{2} +$

•







FIGURE B-141. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE.CONTAINMENT VESSEL LOCATION 2-9 OBE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION. RADIAL ACCELERATION (G)



ŧ,

ĸ,

ŧ

FIGURE B-142. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE. CONTAINMENT BUILDING LOCATION 5-23 OBE + SRV-ADS LOAD COMBINATION. HORIZONTAL ACCELERATION (G)

4

Č

í., *i*,

2

Contraction (1997) 1997 (1997)

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION

£



FIGURE B-143. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, CONTAINMENT BUILDING LOCATION 5-26 OBE + SRV-ADS LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL WALL ACCELERATION (G)





FIGURE B-144. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, CONTAINMENT VESSEL LOCATION 2-9 SSE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, RADIAL ACCELERATION (G)

Z.

¢

£

ς



FIGURE B-145. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, CONTAINMENT BUILDING LOCATION 5-23 SSE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, HORIZONTAL ACCELERATION (G)



FIGURE B-146. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, CONTAINMENT VESSEL LOCATION 2-9 SSE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, RADIAL ACCELERATION (G)

i,

and the second and the second s







FIGURE B-147. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, CONTAINMENT BUILDING LOCATION 5-26 SRV-1 + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL WALL ACCELERATION (G)





FIGURE B-149. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, CONTAINMENT BUILDING LOCATION 5-24 SRV-ADS + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL WALL ACCELERATION (G)

1

P(R<R₀)



FIGURE B-150. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, CONTAINMENT BUILDING LOCATION 5-27 SRV-ADS + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, HORIZONTAL ACCELERATION (G)

٠



FIGURE B-151. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, SHIELD BUILDING LOCATION 3-10 OBE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL ACCELERATION (G)



FIGURE B-152, BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, SHIELD BUILDING LOCATION 3-9 OBE + SRV-ADS LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL ACCELERATION (G)

<

5

4 · · ·

Υ.



P (R<R,)



FIGURE B-153. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, SHIELD BUILDING LOCATION 3-10 OBE + SRV-ADS LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL ACCELERATION (G)



.

P (R<R₀)



t

FIGURE B-154. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, SHIELD BUILDING LOCATION 3-9 SSE + SRV-ADS LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL ACCELERATION (G)

.



FIGURE B-155. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, SHIELD BUILDING LOCATION 3-9 SRV-ADS + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL ACCELERATION (G)

•



FIGURE B-156. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, SHIELD BUILDING LOCATION 3-10 SRV-ADS + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL ACCELERATION (G)

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION



FIGURE B-157. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, SHIELD BUILDING LOCATION 4-25 OBE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, RADIAL ACCELERATION (G)

P (R<R,)



FIGURE B-158. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, SHIELD BUILDING LOCATION 4-25 OBE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, RADIAL ACCELERATION (G)



FIGURE B-159. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, SHIELD BUILDING LOCATION 4-25 SSE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, RADIAL ACCELERATION (G)

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION



FIGURE B-160. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, SHIELD BUILDING LOCATION 4-26 SRV-1 + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL ACCELERATION (G)



÷



FIGURE B-161. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, AUXILIARY BUILDING LOCATION 5-29 OBE + SRV-1 LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL SLAB ACCELERATION (G)





FIGURE B-162. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, AUXILIARY BUILDING LOCATION 5-29 OBE + SRV-ADS LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL SLAB ACCELERATION (G)

.


FIGURE B-163. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, AUXILIARY BUILDING LOCATION 5-22 OBE + SRV-ADS LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL WALL ACCELERATION (G)

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION



FIGURE B-164. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, AUXILIARY BUILDING LOCATION 5-29 SSE + SRV-ALL LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL SLAB ACCELERATION (G)

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION





FIGURE B-165. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, AUXILIARY BUILDING LOCATION 5-22 SRV-1 + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL WALL ACCELERATION (G)

CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION



FIGURE B-166. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, AUXILIARY BUILDING LOCATION 5-22 SRV-ADS + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, VERTICAL WALL ACCELERATION (G)





FIGURE B-167. BOP EQUIPMENT CDF CURVE, AUXILIARY BUILDING LOCATION 5-21 SRV-ALL + CHUG LOAD COMBINATION, HORIZONTAL ACCELERATION (G)

P (R < R₀)

APPENDIX C

RESPONSE TIME HISTORY PAIRS USED

TO GENERATE CDF CURVES



.

· · · · · ·









• •





 \circ







, · · ·



..





t





•











ġ.









,NPTS = 2393, DT





...**.**

ć

¢



÷.

? :

ζ

1








•

.



·) • , . , . .



Ş >







The second second contract of the second second

•

:3

ć









\$



Ļ



. . .

\$





.

: } -**~**. 1 14 .

. . .













÷











.













¢



÷.



-

.

-





;






• •



FIGURE C-35A. NSSS RECIRCULATION PIPING DISCHARGE VALVE. LOCATION 4-7 OBE LOADING - RECORD 703 - ACCELERATION (G) .NPTS = 2183. DT = .0100



















· · ·











4

· 4



;









 $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$

-

the the second s



•

·~ ×



;

(\leq



and the second of the second of the second second

)

١

-



· ``







FIGURE C-47B. BOP PIPING TIME HISTORIES, FPC 4 CU REFUELING WATER LINE.LOCATION 2-6 SRV-ALL LOADING- RECORD 736 - PIPE MOMENT Y (FT-LBS), NPTS = 597, DT = .0025

)



•

ς.

J





FIGURE C-48B. BOP PIPING TIME HISTORIES, FPC 4 CU REFUELING WATER LINE.LOCATION 2-7 SRV-ALL LOADING- RECORD 737 - PIPE MOMENT Y (FT-LBS) , NPTS = 597, DT = .0025



1 +

I.












1





٠





















a l

i





...

)



14.564

11











· (

(





Ĺ











÷



ŧ

1





,



)

;







ł




•











99⁹⁷



í





÷

1

t





. . .







1. ۰,







· . 📢











١,



• 1

)

· (1





•



4.) -



.

.













. • •



•

•


























NPTS = 524 DT = .0021

.







.....

ì





i



ł









NONENT

Ŕ



















· · · · ·



.














· · · · ·

¢

•





¢



ς

7=







(a) (1) €

ς





. .



- <

\$



Ł.



,



:



NPTS = 3324, DT = .003



FIGURE C-113B. BOP PIPING, RH-10 LINE, NODE MJ-28, LOCATION 5-11 SRV-ADS LOADING - RECORD 1045 - MOMENT Z-AXIS (IN-LBS), NPTS = 628, DT = .00133



÷.



, 1

۸.





NPTS = 601, DT = .00133



i

÷.



Ń

ŧ,

NPTS = 785, DT = .00133







.



L



NPTS = 628, DT = .00133





NPTS = 628, DT = .00133





ţ



.







i






•







ì





\$

i









· .



ş

•



· · · · ·





ð



. -





-











. . .

.







-



- RECORD 10



, · · · .









·










•

















· · ·







. .





N





- -







[•]

















۰.





• .





1 .



1



K

(

••• ·



• • • • • • •

4






ç



\$

- Andrew Andr

÷



5

.



F

1



the second s





0.58

0.64

0.72

0.80

-0.12

0.00

0.08

0.16

0.24

0.32





· · . . •

Ξ.

. ..

• •

APPENDIX D

ANALYSIS OF TRENDS IN THE DATA SET

APPENDIX D

As noted in Section 3.2, the 167 sample data set was broken down into several smaller subsets in order to determine if any trends were to be noted and to be sure that each response combination case could properly be considered as part of a single uniform data set. The entire set of data was broken down by:

- 1. Load Combination
- 2. Response Quantity

3. Equipment Category

4. Ratio A₂/A₁

where A_2 represents the peak amplitude of the short duration, higher frequency response and A_1 the peak amplitude of the long duration, lower frequency response. This appendix presents a detailed analysis of these data subsets.

D.1 Breakdown by Load Combination

Figure D-1 presents histograms of the $R_{50}/SRSS$ response ratio for the three loadings considered in this study. Of the 167 total response combination cases investigated, only 17 resulted in an actual 50% NEP response value which exceeded the SRSS calculated response by more than 1% (the maximum variance being 9.5%). Of these, 12 were associated with an OBE + SRV case (75 total cases), 3 were associated with an SSE + SRV case (42 total cases), and 2 were associated with an SRV + CHUG case (50 total cases). The mean and standard deviations of the ratio $R_{50}/SRSS$ for each of the three load combinations are all similar and one can easily accept the hypothesis that the results for the three load cases are all part of a single uniform data set.

D.2 Breakdown by Response Quantity

The response data supplied by the Architect/Engineer firms covered a variety of response parameters including acceleration, axial forces, shear forces, bending moments and support reactions. Figure D-2

presents histograms of the $R_{50}/SRSS$ response ratio comparing the distributions for the 70 cases involving acceleration response and the 97 cases involving force or moment response. It can be seen that there is a slight trend toward higher values of $R_{50}/SRSS$ from the acceleration response data. The mean value of the $R_{50}/SRSS$ response parameter from the 70 acceleration response samples is 0.952 while the standard deviation is 0.070. These are in comparison with mean and standard deviation values of 0.913 and 0.063, respectively, for the 97 sample force and moment response distribution. It can also be seen that of the 17 cases for which R_{50} exceeded the SRSS calculated response value by more than one percent, 12 were evaluations of acceleration response data. It should be noted that acceleration is a less important design quantity and that high frequency acceleration response is not generally important to stress.

It will be subsequently shown that the ratio A_2/A_1 (where A_2 is the high frequency, short duration peak amplitude, and A_1 is the lower frequency, longer duration peak amplitude) does influence the ratio $R_{50}/SRSS$ to a reasonable extent. This ratio A_2/A_1 was often greater for the acceleration cases than for the force and moment cases as shown below:

	Number of Cases					
-	Total	A ₂ /A ₁ <0.5	0.5 < A ₂ /A ₁ < 1.0	$1.0 \le A_2/A_1 \le 2.0$	A ₂ /A ₁ >2.0	
Acceleration	70	17	22	21	10	
Force & Moment	97	22	53	17	5	

The ratio A_2/A_1 was less than 1.0 in 77% of the force and moment cases but was less than 1.0 for only 56% of the acceleration cases. In contrast, this ratio was greater than 2.0 in only 5% of the force and moment cases but was greater than 2.0 for 14% of the acceleration cases. This trend is expected since acceleration response frequently exhibits higher frequency content while force, moment, or stress response may not. The trend that shows a slightly greater ratio of $R_{50}/SRSS$ for acceleration responses is judged to be totally due to the difference in the ratio A_2/A_1 . Even with this slight trend, statistical hypothesis testing demonstrates the acceptability of the hypothesis that the ratio $R_{50}/SRSS$ for acceleration data and for force or moment data are all part of a single uniform data set.

D.3 Breakdown by Equipment Categories

Figure D-3 presents a comparison of the $R_{50}/SRSS$ response ratio histograms broken down into the categories of NSSS, BOP piping, and BOP equipment. One notes 2 out of 40 cases exceeding 1.01 for the NSSS, 11 out of 82 cases exceeding 1.01 for the BOP piping, and 5 out of 45 cases for BOP equipment. The BOP piping and equipment cases also have higher mean response ratios than for the NSSS cases. Again, this trend appears to be due to ratios of A_2/A_1 contained in each of the cases as shown below:

		Number of Cases				
	Total	A ₂ /A ₁ <0.5	0.5 < A ₂ /A ₁ <1.0	$1.0 \le A_2/A_1 \le 2.0$	A ₂ /A ₁ >2.0	
NSSS	40	16	15	9	0	
BOP Piping	82	10	46	16	10	
BOP Equipment	45 <u></u>	13	14	13	5	

The ratio A_2/A_1 is less than 1.0 for 78%, 68% and 60% of the NSSS, BOP piping, and BOP equipment cases, respectively. Also, A_2/A_1 exceeds 2.0 for none of the NSSS cases and for 12% and 11% of the BOP piping and BOP equipment cases, respectively. The higher number of cases in which A_2/A_1 exceeds 1.0 results in the higher mean ratios of $R_{50}/SRSS$ and the higher number of cases in which this ratio exceeds 1.01.

The ratio of R_{50} /SRSS for the NSSS cases, BOP piping cases, and BOP equipment cases are all part of a single uniform data set as demonstrated by statistical hypothesis testing.

D.4 Breakdown by Ratio A₂/A₁

Table D-1 tabulates the number of cases in which $R_{50}/SRSS$ exceeds 1.01, and 1.05 versus A_2/A_1 ratios. Figure D-4 presents a comparison of the $R_{50}/SRSS$ response ratio histograms for four different ranges of the ratio A_2/A_1 (less than 0.5, 0.5 to 1.0, 1.0 to 2.0, and greater than 2.0). The mean value, \overline{x} , of R_{50} /SRSS for the 39 cases where $A_2/A_1 < 0.5$ is 0.944 and the standard deviation, σ , is 0.026. The SRSS method of response combination is always conservative for these cases. The comparatively small standard deviation of the distribution is a result of the small variation between the most likely response for these cases (peak of low frequency response alone) and the SRSS calculated value; the variation being small due to the peak amplitude ratio of the two responses being combined. For the three ranges where the high frequency response is of more importance, the mean value of R_{50} /SRSS definitely increases with increasing ratios of A $_2$ /A $_1$ ranging from 0.895 to 1.012. For cases where A_2/A_1 is less than 2.0, the SRSS response combination method provides a conservative bias which decreases with increasing values of A₂/A₁ while for cases where A_2/A_1 exceeds 2.0, the SRSS method provides a negligibly unconservative bias but even so, on the average, constitutes a very accurate means of computing combined dynamic response. As expected, the standard

deviations of these distributions are higher as the peak amplitudes of the responses being combined are more nearly equal and lower as the amplitude of either response history becomes more predominant.

When A_2/A_1 is less than 0.5 so that the low-frequency response amplitude (A1) is predominant over the high-frequency response amplitude (A_2) , the CDF curve takes the form of a step function with the 50% NEP value and often the 85% NEP value being equal to the peak amplitude of the low frequency response. The non-exceedance probability associated with the SRSS value, P(SRSS), is generally much greater than 50% and the non-exceedance probability associated with 1.2 times the SRSS calculated response, P(1.2 SRSS), is always much greater than 85%. This characteristic can be seen in Figure B-137 in Appendix B which was generated by the time phased response combination of the response histories shown in Figures C-137A and C-137B from Appendix C. When $A_2/A_1 \le 0.5$, the SRSS response combination method is very conservative. The most probable response combination would be obtained by using A_1 only (i.e., ignoring A_2 because the short duration record is not likely to combine with a significant peak of the long duration record when the long duration record predominates).

When the low-frequency and high-frequency response amplitudes are approximately equal ($A_1 \approx A_2$), the CDF curve is characterized by a normal "S" shape. For such cases, the non-exceedance probability P(SRSS) is nearly always greater than 50% and P(1.2 SRSS) is high generally being much greater than 85%. Figure B-14 represents the combination of two nearly equal peak OBE and SRV₁ responses. Since the magnitude of the high frequency SRV response is significant, the peak combined response will nearly always occur during the time when the SRV is active and thus the peak combined response will occur when a significant peak of the earthquake response combines with one of the peaks (positive or negative) of the SRV response. Hence, $A_1 \approx A_2$, the SRSS response combination method is generally conservative.

For cases where the high-frequency amplitude is somewhat greater than the low-frequency amplitude $(1.0 < A_2/A_1 < 2.0)$, the value of P(SRSS) is approximately equal to 50% and the value of P(1.2 SRSS) remains high, being generally much greater than 85%. An example of a case of this type is shown in Figure B-157 which is a combination of OBE and SRV₁ responses. Again, the peak combined response will certainly occur during the active portion of the SRV. Hence, when $1.0 \le A_2/A_1 \le 2.0$, the SRSS method generally leads to a combined response very close to the R₅₀ response.

When A_2/A_1 exceeds 2.0, the ratio of $R_{50}/SRSS$ marginally exceeds 1.0 in many of the cases. This ratio has a 90% probability of being between about 0.94 and 1.08 for these cases. The probability P(1.2 SRSS) remains high being generally much greater than 85%. An example of a case of this type is shown in Figure B-131. For this case, the peak combined response again clearly occurs during the time that the SRV is active. When A_2/A_1 exceeds 2.0, the SRSS method of response combination is slightly unconservative on the average when compared to the R_{50} combined response but remains a perfectly adequate response combination method even in these cases.

The data set did not include any cases where the amplitude of the high-frequency response exceeded three times the amplitude of the lower frequency response. For such cases, the SRSS calculated response approaches that computed by absolute summation.

In no case, was the conservatively computed ratio R_{50} /SRSS greater than 1.095. Thus, all 167 cases meet Newmark-Kennedy Criterion 2 and responses can be combined by SRSS.

TABLE D-1

EFFECT OF A2/A1 RATIO ON R50/SRSS

1

	Number of Cases				
A2/A1	TOTAL	R ₅₀ /SRSS > 1.01	R ₅₀ /SRSS > 1.05		
·< 0.5	39	0	0		
0.5 - 1.0	75	3	2		
1.0 - 2.0	38	6	1		
> 2.0	15	8	4		
TOTAL	167	17	7		







Acceleration Response



FIGURE D-2. COMPARISON OF R₅₀/SRSS FOR ACCELERATION RESPONSE AND FOR FORCE AND MOMENT RESPONSE



FIGURE D-3. COMPARISON OF R₅₀/SRSS FOR MAJOR COMPONENT CATEGORIES



FIGURE D-4. COMPARISON OF R_{50} /SRSS FOR FOUR RANGES OF A_2/A_1