

Distribution:  
Docket File: 50-286  
TR:RF L  
SEB:RF  
G. Arndt

OCT 17 1972

Docket No. 50-286

R. C. DeYoung, Assistant Director  
for Pressurized Water Reactors  
Directorate of Licensing

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC., INDIAN POINT STATION,  
UNIT 3, REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Plant Name: Indian Point, Unit 3  
Licensing Stage: OL  
Docket Number: 50-286  
Responsible Branch and Project Manager: PWR-1, H. Specter  
Requested Completion Date: October 20, 1972  
Applicant's response date necessary for completion of next  
action planned on project: January 18, 1973  
Description of Response: Questions  
Review Status: Awaiting Information

The second round review of the FSAR has been completed by the Structural Engineering Branch, Directorate of Licensing, and we find that additional information is required before we can complete our review. The additional information requested concerns structural aspects and is contained in the enclosure.

During the first round review 20 structural questions have been asked of which 18 have been answered by the applicant in a satisfactory manner.

R. R. Maccary, Assistant Director  
for Engineering  
Directorate of Licensing

Enclosure:  
Request for Additional Information  
for Indian Point, Unit 3

cc w/o encl:  
A. Giambusso, L  
W. G. McDonald, L

cc w/encl:  
S. H. Hanauer, DRTA  
J. Hendrie, L  
D. Vassalo, L  
L. Shao, L  
H. Specter, L  
A. Gluckmann, L

811190959 721017  
ADOCK 05000286

OFFICE	L:SEB <i>AG</i>	L:SEB <i>LA</i>	L:SEB <i>RM</i>			<i>Memo</i>
SURNAME	AGluckmann:sw x7341	LShao	RMaccary			
DATE	10-17-72	10-17-72	10-17-72			

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

INDIAN POINT, UNIT 3, DOCKET 50-286

CLASS I (SEISMIC) STRUCTURES AND CONTAINMENT

(Q2) REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL STRUCTURAL INFORMATION

Question 5.1

The answer to this question, and to the referenced question 5.18, does not cover the case of symmetrical buildings under seismic torsion. Indicate whether this effect was considered in the design of Class I (seismic) structures and if omitted, justify the omission.

Question 5.10

The answer to this question does not discuss the acceptance testing as recommended in Safety Guide 18. Describe the extent to which this Safety Guide will be followed in acceptance testing and justify any deviations from its recommendations.

New Question

If the spent fuel racks are considered to be Class I (Seismic) structures, describe the design criteria and the analytical methods used for them. State the design code that has been used and whether the maximum stresses are below the allowables for all loading conditions. State the criteria that have been used to establish the allowable strains.

OFFICE ▶					
SURNAME ▶					
DATE ▶					