

MAR 25 1974

Iowa Electric Light and Power Company  
ATTN: Mr. C. W. Sandford  
Vice President  
General Office  
Cedar Rapids, Iowa

Docket No. 50-331

Gentlemen:

Thank you for your letter dated March 7, 1974, which forwarded a report pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55(e). Your report will be reviewed and evaluated and, should we require additional information concerning this matter, we will contact you.

Your cooperation concerning this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Original signed by  
J. G. Davis

John G. Davis, Deputy Director  
for Field Operations  
Directorate of Regulatory Operations

bcc: PDR  
LPDR  
NISC  
TIC  
RO Files  
DR Central Files  
RO:III JGKepler w/o encl

MISC 49

OFFICE >	RO:FS/EB	RO:FS/EB,C	RO:DD/FO		
SURNAME >	SEBryan:das	JGThornburg	JGDavis		
DATE >	3/21/74	3-22-74	JG		

# IOWA ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY

General Office  
CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA

C. W. SANDFORD  
VICE PRESIDENT

March 7, 1974

IE-74-200

Dr. Donald F. Knuth  
Directorate of Regulatory Operations  
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission  
Washington, D. C. 20036

Re: Duane Arnold Energy Center #1  
Subject: Reactor Building Rail Tracks  
File: Q-623

Dear Dr. Knuth:

This letter is to provide additional information relating to the need for additional support for one portion of the rail track inside the reactor building for DAEC. This matter was first reported to your Region III office on February 1, 1974.

During normal review of the design calculations for the structural design of the reactor building, it was determined that the design basis for that portion of track supported by steel beams was inadequate in that the steel beams are of insufficient size to adequately carry a 100 ton spent fuel cask and car. Review of the design calculations for the portion of the rail track supported by precast concrete T beams (area over the torus) confirmed the adequacy of these members to support the load.

Re-evaluation of the sizing of the steel beams demonstrated the need to reinforce eight beams. Reinforcing beams will be installed prior to the arrival of the cask following the first refueling.

An analysis of the consequences of the facts described above indicated that although the permissible strength of the beams would have been exceeded under the anticipated load, the yield point of the beams would not have been exceeded. For this reason, no safety consequences are involved.

Yours very truly,

  
C. W. Sandford

Executive Vice President

CWS:ar

c.c. Mr. L. Root  
Mr. J. Wallace  
Mr. G. Hunt  
Mr. J. Ward  
Mr. G. Cook  
Mr. J. Newman  
Mr. J. Keppler  
Mr. L. Rosetta  
Mr. M. Muir