10 CFR 50.55a

John J. Cadogan, Jr Vice President, Nuclear Engineering

Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station P.O. Box 52034 Phoenix, AZ 85072 Mail Station 7602 Tel 623 393 4083

102-06797-JJC/RKR/DCE November 18, 2013

ATTN: Document Control Desk U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, DC 20555-0001

Dear Sirs:

Subject: Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station (PVNGS) Unit 3 Docket No. 50-530 Response to Request for Additional Information - American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Code, Section XI, Request for Approval of an Alternative to Flaw Removal and Characterization - Relief Request 51

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(a)(3)(i), Arizona Public Service Company (APS) requested the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) approve Relief Request 51, by letter number 102-06794, dated November 8, 2013 [Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML13317A070]. APS proposed an alternative to the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, Section XI requirements related to axial flaw indications identified in a Unit 3 reactor vessel bottom mounted instrument (BMI) nozzle. Specifically, APS proposed a half-nozzle repair and a flaw evaluation as alternatives to the requirements for flaw removal of IWA-4421 and flaw characterization of IWA-3300.

By email dated November 15, 2013, the NRC staff provided a request for additional information (RAI). The enclosure to this letter contains the APS response to the NRC RAI.

No commitments are being made to the NRC by this letter.

A member of the **STARS** (Strategic Teaming and Resource Sharing) Alliance Callaway • Comanche Peak • Diablo Canyon • Palo Verde • South Texas • Wolf Creek

ATTN: Document Control Desk U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Response to Request for Additional Information - Relief Request 51 Page 2

Should you need further information regarding this relief request, please contact Robert K. Roehler, Licensing Section Leader at (623) 393-5241.

Sincerely,

JJC/RKR/DCE/hsc

Enclosure: APS Response to Request for Additional Information (RAI) – Relief Request 51

cc:	M. L. Dapas	NRC Region IV Regional Administrator
	J. K. Rankin	NRC NRR Project Manager for PVNGS
	M. A. Brown	NRC Senior Resident Inspector for PVNGS

Enclosure

.

,

APS Response to Request for Additional Information (RAI) – Relief Request 51

•

Introduction

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(a)(3)(i) Arizona Public Service Company (APS) requested the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) approve Relief Request 51, by letter number 102-06794, dated November 8, 2013 [Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML13317A070]. APS proposed an alternative to the ASME Code requirements of Section XI related to axial flaw indications identified in a Unit 3 reactor vessel bottom mounted instrument (BMI) nozzle. Specifically, APS proposed a half-nozzle repair and a flaw evaluation as alternatives to the requirements for flaw removal of IWA-4421 and flaw characterization of IWA-3300.

By email dated November 15, 2013, the NRC staff requested additional information (RAI). The APS responses to the NRC RAI items are provided in this enclosure.

List of Attachments

- Attachment 1 Thermal Stress during Loss of Secondary Pressure Transient in the Lower Head of Palo Verde Reactor Vessel
- Attachment 2 Dominion Engineering, Inc., Calculation No. C-7789-00-2, Revision No. 1, Palo Verde Bottom Head Instrumentation Nozzle Stress Analysis

NRC RAI-1

Section 4.1 of Attachment 2 [of Relief Request 51] reported that the nil-ductility reference temperature (RT_{NDT}) of -60 Degrees Fahrenheit (°F) for the RPV bottom head [RVBH] is from Reference 1 of this Attachment. Please confirm that this value is from the Certified Material Test Report for the RVBH. If not, please justify the use of this RT_{NDT} value in this application.

APS Response

The RVBH is fabricated from two plates with different heat numbers. The RT_{NDT} value of -60°F is from the Certified Material Test Reports (CMTRs) for the RVBH with an adjustment in accordance with ASME Code, Section III, Article NB-2331(a1), (a2), (a3), as provided in UFSAR Table 5.2-5B, "PVNGS Unit 3 Fracture Toughness Data Reactor Vessel (Plates)" as described below.

The CMTRs provide data for both Unit 3 RVBH plate material heat numbers and indicate that the drop weight NDT (T_{NDT}) is -70°F for both heat numbers. In accordance with ASME Code, Section III, Article NB-2331, the RT_{NDT} is established as the greater of T_{NDT} and [$T_{Cv} - 60^{\circ}$ F], where T_{Cv} is the temperature at which the specified Charpy Impact test requirements of NB-2331(a2) are met. From the CMTRs, the Charpy Impact test requirements are met at -10°F for one heat number and 0°F for the other. Based on the above, the RT_{NDT} was conservatively established as -60°F (0°F – 60°F) in accordance with NB-2331(a3).

NRC RAI-2

A typical flaw evaluation in accordance with the American Society of Mechanical Engineers Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (ASME Code), Section XI requires consideration of emergency and faulted conditions in addition to the normal condition (e.g., Appendix A of the ASME Code, Section XI). The applied stresses for the flaw evaluation in Section 4.4 of Attachment 2 of Relief Request 51 are for the normal conditions only. Please address the flaw evaluation under the emergency and faulted conditions.

APS Response

Emergency and faulted conditions have been considered as described below, and were determined not to be significant to the results of the flaw evaluation.

Emergency Condition

The emergency condition is defined as the external piping loads applied to the BMI nozzle resulting from a postulated in-core instrumentation tubing leak. These thermal loads are applied to the new J-groove weld and weld pad at the relocated pressure boundary on the outer surface of the lower head. Since these loads would create

relatively minor stress changes at the inner surface of the lower head, they were not considered further in the current flaw evaluation of the remnant J-groove weld.

Faulted Conditions

The combined safe shutdown earthquake (SSE) and branch line pipe break (BLPB) represents one of two faulted conditions. These external loads are applied to the new J-groove weld and weld pad at the relocated pressure boundary on the outer surface of the lower head. Since these external loads would create relatively minor stresses at the inner surface of the lower head, they were not considered further in the current flaw evaluations of the remnant J-groove weld.

The second faulted condition is the loss of secondary pressure (LSP) transient described in the Palo Verde Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) Table 3.9.1-1. This transient is illustrated by the temperature and pressure time-history plots provided in Figure 1 of Attachment 1 to this enclosure.

The evaluation of this transient was performed in the same manner as the steady state (SS) + cooldown (CD) analysis submitted as part of the original submittal of Relief Request 51. The faulted condition stresses are added to the residual plus SS pressure and thermal stresses, as tabulated below. The maximum faulted condition, Loss of Secondary Pressure stresses, derived in Attachment 1 to this enclosure, occur at about 118 seconds into the transient (at the maximum through-wall temperature gradient) when the cold leg temperature is 344 °F and the pressure is less than 300 psia. It is therefore conservative to add the maximum thermal stresses for this transient to the SS pressure stresses.

Position	SS	SS LSP SS+LSF				
х		Hoop Stress				
(in.)	(ksi)	(ksi)	(ksi)			
0.0000	50.014	46.34	96.35			
0.2980	61.709	36.78	98.49			
0.5950	73.123	28.35	101.48			
0.8920	71.136	20.95	92.08			
1.1890	74.007	14.50	88.50			
1.4860	57.094	8.94	66.03			
1.7830	24.199	4.21	28.41			
2.0330	3.862	0.83	4.69			
2.2460	40.983	-1.66	39.32			

SS = Steady State

LSP = Loss of Secondary Pressure

Key portions of the flaw evaluations performed for the Residual + SS + CD normal condition stresses in Section 6-2 of Attachment 2 of Relief Request 51 are similarly provided here for the Residual + SS + Loss of Secondary Pressure faulted condition. The updated $K_i(a)$ stress intensity factor is 145.2 ksi \sqrt{in} . and the fracture toughness

Enclosure APS Response to Response to (RAI) – Relief Request 51

margin is 1.39, which is just slightly below the code required value of 1.41. Therefore, the elastic plastic fracture mechanics (EPFM) flaw evaluation for the loss of secondary pressure transient is presented below with the appropriate safety factors for faulted conditions.

Ductile Cr	ack Grow	th Stability	Criterion:	T _{app} <	T _{mat}						
At instabili	ty:			T _{app} =	T _{mat}						
	Safety	Factors	Kl* _p	Ki*s	KI*(a)	a _e	Kľ(a _e)	J _{app}	T _{app}	Stable?	
	Primary	Secondary	(ksi√in)	(ksi√in)	(ksi√in)	(in.)	(ksi√in)	(kips/in)			
	1.00	1.00	63.870	81.305	145.175	2.6334	163.625	0.882	3.025	Yes	
	1.25	1.00	79.838	81.305	161.143	2.7634	186.053	1.141	3.911	Yes	
	1.50	1.00	95.805	81.305	177.110	2.9071	209.735	1.450	4.970	Yes	
	5.00	1.00	319.350	81.305	400.655	6.3412	700.741	16.185	55.477	No	
	7.00	1.00	447.090	81.305	528.395	9.4968	1130.958	42.158	144.509	No	
	2.1737	2.1737	138.835	176.733	315.568	4.7208	476.215	J _{instability} 7.475	Т _{арр} 25.622	T _{mat} 25.622	
	at J _{mat} =	1.450	kips/in,	T _{mat} ≃	184.170			(Т	_{app} - T _{mat} =	0.000)
pplied J	Integral (Criterion:		J _{app} <	J _{0.1}						
			where,	J _{0.1} =	J _{mat} at ∆a	= 0.1 in.					
	Safety	Factors	KI* _₽	KI*s	KI*(a)	a _e	Kľ(a _e)	J _{app}	J _{0.1}	OK?	
	Primary	Secondary	(ksi√in)	(ksi√in)	(ksi√in)	(in.)	(ksi√in)	(kips/in)	(kips/in)		
	1.50	1.00	95.805	81.305	177.110	2.9071	209.735	1.450	2.701	Yes	

The applied tearing modulus (T_{app}) of 4.970 is less than the material tearing modulus (T_{mat}) of 25.622 and the applied J-integral (J_{app}) of 1.450 kips/in is less than the material J-integral $(J_{0.1})$ of 2.701 kips/in at a flaw extension of 0.1 inch. Therefore, these results demonstrate that both EPFM acceptance criteria are satisfied using a safety factor of 1.5 for primary loads and 1.0 for secondary loads.

NRC RAI-3

Appendix A to Attachment 2 [of Relief Request 51] documented the thermal stresses during cooldown which were obtained using a 2-dimensional axisymmetric finite element model (FEM). The NRC staff needs further clarification regarding the FEM results to gain confidence in the FEM model:

 Please confirm that the results shown in Figures A-1 to A-5 and Table A-3 are 1dimensional, i.e., the results (temperature and stresses) are the same for all points at inner diameter (ID), outer diameter (OD), or any surface that is defined by a specific depth of the RVBH. Demonstrate that the 1-dimensional results are realistic in this application.

APS Response

Yes, the results shown in Figures A-1 to A-5 and Table A-3 are 1-dimensional even though the model is constructed in 2-dimensions. The RVBH ID is exposed to the reactor coolant cooldown transient analyzed in Attachment 2 of Relief Request 51 (cooldown from T_c 565°F at 100°F/hr). The ID surfaces of the BMI nozzle halves are subject to a lesser cooldown rate when compared to the RVBH ID surface. The gap between the OD of the BMI nozzle halves and ID of the RVBH bore is filled with stagnant water. This limits heat transfer between the BMI nozzle halves and the RVBH wall. Since the boundary conditions and RVBH are symmetrical, the heat transfer in the RVBH is primarily in the radial direction. Accordingly, it is reasonable to simplify the thermal analysis as 1-dimensional.

 Please confirm that the temperature difference-time plot (right figure) in Figure A-2 is a plot of the maximum thermal gradient mentioned in Paragraph A.2 Item 4. If it is not, explain the significance of this parameter. Regardless of the confirmation, please identify the location (depth) where this temperature difference-time plot was obtained and explain the physical meaning of such a unique shape of the temperature difference-time plot.

APS Response

Yes, the temperature difference-time plot (right figure) in Figure A-2 is a plot of the maximum through wall temperature gradient for the RVBH, i.e., the plot of temperature difference (ID minus OD) of the modeled lower head noted as TEMP_4. The initial status of the entire lower head is assumed to have a uniform temperature of 565°F. During the 100°F/hr cooldown transient, the fluid bulk temperature of the reactor coolant drops to 70°F in 4.8 hours. Because the convection heat transfer coefficient at the inner surface of the lower head is much higher than that of the outer surface, the temperature on the inner surface drops faster than the outer surface at the beginning of the transient. After about 1.3 hours, the absolute value of the temperature difference reaches its maximum. After that, the temperature difference between ID and OD of the lower head starts to decrease and eventually approaches zero. After 4.8 hours, there is no further cooling of the inside surface and the temperature difference is driven by conduction from the warmer outer surface to the cooler inner surface. At a time point about 7 hours after the start of the cooldown transient, the lower head reaches a thermal balance at 70°F.

NRC RAI-4

Section 4.4 of Attachment 2 [of Relief Request 51] states, "Residual plus operating stresses are obtained from Reference [7]." Demonstrate that the residual stresses used in the flaw evaluation are consistent with what were approved by the NRC staff in

published safety evaluations (SEs), NUREGs, or other NRC documents. If this cannot be demonstrated, please provide Reference 7 to support this review.

APS Response

The requested Reference 7, Dominion Engineering, Inc., Calculation No. C-7789-00-2, Revision No. 1, *Palo Verde Bottom Head Instrumentation Nozzle Stress Analysis,* is provided in Attachment 2 of this enclosure. The document reports the results of a three dimensional elastic plastic finite element analysis (FEA) performed as part of a Westinghouse Owners Group (WOG) initiative on Bottom Mounted Instrument Nozzles related to WCAP 16468-NP, *Risk Assessment of Potential Cracking in Bottom Mounted Instrumentation Nozzles,* September 2005.

NRC RAI-5

Table 4-3 of Attachment 2 [of Relief Request 51] presents the hoop stresses at different depths of the RVBH wall for the steady state (SS), cooldown (CD), and their combined effect. The NRC staff has the following requests:

• Identify the loads that were considered in the SS condition (i.e., any of the three: pressure, steady state thermal load, and residual stresses). Repeat the similar identification for the CD condition.

APS Response

Attachment 2 of this enclosure provides the combined hoop and axial stresses from operating pressure, operating temperature and residual stresses.

The operating parameters used to represent the SS condition are as follows:

- Operating Pressure: 2235 pounds per square inch absolute (psia)
- o Operating Temperature (Cold Leg Temperature): 565°F
- Weld residual stresses from FEA simulation (where the hoop stresses are bounding)

The parameters used to calculate the CD condition used the same total stresses as defined for the SS condition above and included a cooldown transient of 100°F/hour.

• Confirm that the thermal state associated with the SS condition is the starting point of the CD condition.

APS Response

The starting temperature is 565°F, which is the same value used for the normal operating temperature at steady state conditions for the RVBH (Cold Leg Temperature).

• The stress pattern for the SS condition (Column 2 of Table 4-3 under SS) is very unusual. Please provide the corresponding stress components due to pressure, thermal, and residual stresses for each position (or depth) in Table 4-3. Explain the unusual zigzag stress pattern to demonstrate that it is not caused by modeling errors.

APS Response

Attachment 2 of this enclosure does not provide each stress component separately. The total stress at each nozzle node location is shown along its vertical axis from the top to the bottom of the weld. Below the weld, the FEA provides nodal stresses at the nozzle as well as the lower head material. It is at this location that the lower head hoop stresses drop by a larger amount than the nozzle nodes because the weld no longer restrains the bore. The lower head hoop stresses then increase to provide equilibrium in the local region of the lower head. This is the reason for the unusual zigzag stress pattern.

To investigate the sensitivity of the results to the stress field, the EPFM flaw evaluations were repeated using only nozzle stresses for Column 2 of Table 4-3. In this manner, the value of the stress at the eighth position changed from 3.862 to 37.480 ksi and the last stress changed from 40.983 to 23.501 ksi. When only nozzle stresses are considered in the flaw evaluations, the applied J-integral changed from 0.953 to 1.002 kips/in and the applied tearing modulus changed from 17.508 to 18.405. This demonstrates that the final results are relatively insensitive to the stresses near the crack tip.

• If residual stresses are not included in the SS condition, confirm that residual stresses are considered in the subsequent applied stress intensity factor (K) or applied J calculations (Tables 6-1 and 6-2 do not show explicitly the contribution due to residual stresses).

APS Response

Residual stresses are considered in the SS condition, which is combined with the normal operating pressure and temperature in Attachment 2 of this enclosure, as described earlier in this RAI. This total stress is utilized in subsequent applied stress intensity factor (K) and applied J calculations in the fracture mechanics evaluation.

NRC RAI-6

Section 4.1.4 of Attachment 2 [of Relief Request 51] presents the generic J-R curve used in the elastic plastic fracture mechanics (EPFM) evaluation. This J-R curve is based on the J model from Appendix D to NUREG-0744, Vol. 2, Rev. 1, "Resolution of the Task A-11 Reactor Vessel Materials Toughness Safety Issue," 1982. The generic J-R curve models for various low upper-shelf RPV materials are presented in RG 1.161, "Evaluation of Reactor Pressure Vessels with Charpy Upper-Shelf Energy Less Than 50 FT-LB," 1995. Please provide J-R curves based on both approaches to demonstrate that your J-R curve based on NUREG-0744, Vol. 2, Rev. 1 is not significantly different from the RG 1.161 model. Provide correction and reassess your final conclusion if the difference is significant. Please note that the database underlying the J-R model for RPV base metals in RG 1.161 contains not just low upper-shelf energy materials.

APS Response

The EPFM flaw evaluations performed to demonstrate that a remnant flaw in the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station Unit 3 bottom mounted instrument nozzle number 3 is acceptable for one fuel cycle utilized methodology previously approved by the NRC for Arkansas Nuclear One Unit 1 (ML042890174), Watts Bar Unit 1 (ML073532246), and Davis Besse (ML102571569). These submittals were based on the same NUREG-0744 J-R curve correlation and the same EPFM safety factors that were used in the present submittal for Palo Verde, which are higher than those specified in Regulatory Guide 1.161.

The basic differences between the NUREG-744 and RG 1.161 approaches are the J-R correlations and the EPFM safety factors.

J-R Curve correlations for a Charpy upper shelf energy value of 119 ft-lbs:

<u>NUREG-0744</u> J _{mat} = C(∆a) ^m	
C = 7.68 m = 0.45	$C1 = \exp[-2.44 + 1.13 \ln(CVN) - 0.00277T]$ $C2 = 0.077 + 0.116 \ln(C1)$ $C3 = -0.0812 - 0.0092 \ln(C1)$ C4 = -0.409
	MF = Margin factor

At a temperature of T = 565 °F, the RG 1.161 J-R curve constants are:

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
C1 = & 4.0364 \\
C2 = & 0.2389 \\
C3 = & -0.0940 \\
C4 = & -0.4090 \end{array}$$

Margin factors for the RG 1.161 approach are 0.749 for the Service Levels A (normal), B (upset), and C (emergency), and 1.0 for Service Level D (faulted). The following figure illustrates a lower J-integral resistance to ductile tearing curve provided by the RG 1.161 correlation for normal, upset, and emergency conditions compared to the NUREG-0744 correlation.



Equivalent safety factors are listed below for the two methodologies.

Operating Conditions	Evaluation Method	Primary Loads NUREG / RG	Secondary Loads NUREG / RG
Normal conditions:	Limited flaw extension	1.5 / 1.4 ⁽¹⁾	1.0 / 1.0
	Stable flaw extension	3.0 / 1.5 ⁽²⁾	1.5 / 1.0
Faulted conditions:	Limited flaw extension	1.5 / 1.0	1.0 / 1.0
	Stable flaw extension	1.5 / 1.0	1.0 / 1.0

(1) Equivalent safety factor derived from 1.15 * 1.1 (ratio of maximum accumulation pressure*/design pressure) * ~1.1 (ratio of design pressure/operating pressure) = ~1.4

(2) Equivalent safety factor derived from 1.25 * 1.1 (ratio of maximum accumulation pressure*/design pressure) * ~1.1 (ratio of design pressure/operating pressure) = ~1.5

* Regulatory Guide 1.161 defines the maximum accumulation pressure as the value from the plant Overpressure Protection Report, but not exceeding 1.1 times the design pressure, In order to address the different safety factors specified in the two standards, additional calculations have been performed using the complete RG 1.161 methodology (J-R curve and safety factors) to perform EPFM flaw evaluations for the residual + steady state + cooldown loads. In order to use the same analytical procedure for performing EPFM flaw evaluations, the RG 1.161 J-R curve is fitted to the same power law model that is used for the NUREG-0744 approach. The results of this evaluation are provided below:

							·····			
EPFM Eq	uations:		J _{mat} =	C(∆a) ^m		C =	3.69			
			T _{mat} =	(E/ _{Of} ²)*Cm	(∆a) ^{m-1}	m =	0.38			
			J _{ann} =	[Kl'(a,)] ² /E'	,					
			T _{app} =	(E/ _{Of} ²)*(dJ ₂	_{app} ∕da)					
Ductile C	rack Grow	th Stability	Criterion	T _{app} <	T _{mat}					
At instabil	ity:			T _{app} =	T _{mat}					
	Safety	Factors	KI* _p	Kl*s	Kl*(a)	ae	Kľ(a _e)	Japp	Tapp	Stable?
	Primary	Secondary	(ksi√in)	(ksi√in)	(ksi√in)	(in.)	(ksi√in)	(kips/in)		
	1.00	1.00	63.870	52.592	116.462	2.4733	127.209	0.533	1.897	Yes
	1.25	1.00	79.838	52.592	132.429	2.5905	148.040	0.722	2.569	Yes
	1.50	1.00	95.805	52.592	148.397	2.7229	170.073	0.953	3.390	Yes
	5.00	1.00	319.350	52.592	371.942	6.1554	640.920	13.539	48.146	No
	7.00	1.00	447.090	52.592	499.682	9.4411	1066.361	37.479	133.278	No
terate on	safety facto	r until T _{app} =	= T _{mat} to de	etermine J _{ins}	stability				Ŧ	-
	2 0414	2 0414	130 386	107 362	237 748	3 7410	319 384	J _{instability} 3 362	11,956	ι _{mat} 11.956
	at J _{mat} =	0.953	kips/in,	T _{mat} =	94.708	0.1110	010.001	 ۲)	- T _{mat} =	0.000
Applied J	l-Integral C	riterion:		J _{app} <	J _{0.1}					
			where,	J _{0.1} =	J _{mat} at ∆a	= 0.1 in.				
	Safety	Factors	KI* _P	KI*s	KI*(a)	a _e	Kľ(a _e)	J _{app}	J _{0.1}	OK?
	Primary	Secondary	(ksi√in)	(ksi√in)	(ksi√in)	(in.)	(ksi√in)	(kips/in)	(kips/in)	
	1.40	1.00	89.418	52.592	142.010	2.6681	161.109	0.856	1.542	Yes

These results demonstrate that both EPFM acceptance criteria are satisfied using safety factors of 1.5 and 1.0 (primary and secondary) for stabile flaw extension and 1.4 and 1.0 for limited flaw extension. The applied tearing modulus of 3.390 is less than the material tearing modulus of 11.956 (indicated in the J-T diagram on the following page) and the applied J-integral of 0.856 kips/in is less than the material J-integral of 1.542 kips/in at a flaw extension of 0.1 inch.

The results of this EPFM flaw evaluation demonstrate that using the J-R curve and safety factors in RG 1.161 confirms the acceptability of the current remnant flaw evaluations based on the NUREG-0744 material J-R curve and previously NRC approved safety factors.



J-T Diagram for EPFM Using Regulatory Guide 1.161

NRC RAI-7

Table 6-2 of Attachment 2 [of Relief Request 51] provides results for a number of parameters which were calculated during the EPFM evaluation. Please provide the flow stress σ_f at the operating temperature of 565 °F and a sample calculation for the applied tearing modulus T_{app} appeared in Column 9 of this table.

APS Response

The flow stress at 565 °F is 61.2 ksi, derived from the average of the minimum yield (42.4 ksi) and the minimum ultimate (80.0 ksi) strengths of the reactor vessel bottom head material. The applied tearing modulus with safety factors of 3 on primary loads and 1.5 on secondary loads, reported in Table 6-2 as 17.508, was calculated as follows:

Parameters	At Flaw Depth a	At Flaw Depth a - 0.01"	At Flaw Depth a + 0.01"	Units
а	2.073			in.
KI	116.46			ksi√in
КІр	63.87			ksi√in
Δa	0	-0.01	0.01	in.
E	27610			ksi
v	0.3			
$E' = E/(1-v^2)$	30341			ksi
σγ	42.4			ksi
συ	80.0			ksi
σf =0.5*(σy+σu)	61.2			ksi
a + Δa	2.073	2.063	2.083	in.
KI = KI √(a+∆a/a)	116.46	116.18	116.74	ksi√in
KIp = KIp √(a+∆a/a)	63.87	63.72	64.02	ksi√in
Klt = Kl -Klp	52.59	52.46	52.72	ksi√in
SFp	3	3	3	
SFs	1.5	1.5	1.5	
KI [*] p = SFp KIp	191.610	191.147	192.072	ksi√in
KI [*] s = SFs Kis	78.888	78.697	79.078	ksi√in
KI [*] = KI [*] p + KI [*] s	270.498	269.845	271.150	ksi√in
$ae = a + (1/6\pi) (Kl^*/\sigma y)^2$	4.2322	4.2118	4.2526	in.
KI'(ae) = KI [*] v(ae/a)	386.50	385.57	387.43	ksi√in
J _{app} = [KI' (ae)] ² / E'	4.923	4.900	4.947	kips/in
$T_{app} = (E/\sigma f^2) [(J_{app}(a+\Delta a) - J_{app}(a-\Delta a))/2\Delta a]$	17.508			

ATTACHMENT 1

THERMAL STRESS DURING LOSS OF SECONDARY PRESSURE TRANSIENT IN THE LOWER HEAD OF PALO VERDE REACTOR VESSEL

Thermal Stress during Loss of Secondary Pressure Transient in the Lower Head of Palo Verde Reactor Vessel

Purpose

The purpose of the analysis is to determine the maximum hoop thermal stress in the Palo Verde reactor vessel lower head developed during loss of secondary pressure transient in support of the response to RAI #2.

Methodology

- Generate a 2D axisymmetric finite element model to simulate a simplified reactor vessel lower head with an inner radius of 93.3 inches and a thickness of 6.5 inches (Reference [A.1]);
- 2. Perform thermal transient analysis for loss of secondary pressure condition to determine the temperature field of the reactor vessel lower head;
- 3. Get temperature field and thermal gradients for each time point;
- 4. Identify maximum thermal gradient across thickness and the time point of its occurrence;
- 5. Perform structural analysis, using temperature field identified in Step 4, to determine the thermal stress distribution through the thickness of the lower head.

Assumptions

- 1. The finite element model represents a perfect hemisphere. Any feature other than the sphere portion of the base metal of the lower head, such as cladding, weld, and penetration elements are not included;
- The fluid temperature data during Loss of Secondary Pressure transient are taken from Figure 5 of Reference [A.2] (see curve T_{COLD} in Figure 1). It has an approximately 22.5 °F/sec temperature drop rate during the first 100 seconds;
- 3. The initial condition of the lower head is assumed to be a uniformly distributed temperature of 565 °F.

Material Properties

Per Reference [A.1], the material of the reactor vessel lower head is SA-533 Gr. B Class 1 (C-Mn-Mo-0.4-0.7Ni). The material properties are taken from Reference [A.3] except the material densities are taken from Reference [A.5].

Temp.	Modulus of Elasticity	Thermal Expansion Coefficient (α)	Thermal Conductivity (k)	Specific Heat (C)	Density (ρ)
°F	×10 ⁶ , psi	×10 ⁻⁶ , 1/°F	Btu/hr-in-°F	Btu/lb-°F	lb/in ³
100	29.80	6.13	2.5833	0.1147	0.2839
200	29.50	6.38	2.5000	0.1169	0.2831
300	29.00	6.60	2.4250	0.1210	0.2823
400	28.60	6.82	2.3417	0.1251	0.2817
500	28.00	7.02	2.2667	0.1292	0.2809
600	27.40	7.23	2.1833	0.1333	0.2802
700	26.60	7.44	2.1083	0.1393	0.2794
Reference	[A.3]	[A.3]	[A.3]	Calculated	[A.5]

Table 1: Material Properties

Note: $C = K/(\rho \cdot T_d)$, where T_d is thermal diffusivity from the same source as thermal conductivity (k in the table).

Finite Element Model and Boundary Conditions and Results

Definition of the reactor coolant temperature history for Loss of Secondary Pressure transient is listed in Table 2 (see curve T_{COLD} in Figure 1 and Figure 5 of Reference [A.2]). The temperature data are input as bulk temperatures of the inner surface of the lower head in the thermal transient analysis.

	Loss of Secondary Pressure Transient								
No	Time (Sec)	Temp. (F)	No	Time (Sec)	Temp. (F)	No.	Time (Sec)	Temp. (F)	
1	0.00010	565.000	13	109.98600	343.322	25	255.06500	403.888	
2	6.87838	464.089	14	118.69400	344.362	26	291.30900	406.988	
3	14.58130	433.842	15	128.97200	349.265	27	324.68400	410.796	
4	21.16600	413.791	16	132.03300	354.534	28	363.84200	414.595	
5	25.18680	403.940	17	135.55700	364.369	29	403.01200	418.745	
6	33.54480	394.082	18	136.68700	379.834	30	459.56400	423.919	
7	41.89150	383.872	19	138.62900	374.215	31	519.01800	429.439	
8	50.26070	374.365	20	144.57000	384.746	32	566.89600	434.629	
9	62.97840	365.202	21	159.17400	389.291	33	601.68300	437.380	
10	74.32940	358.502	22	181.01800	394.174	34	622.35200	495.703	
11	89.96100	350.037	23	199.92500	397.656	35	639.72300	496.376	
12	102.76900	343.687	24	223.14600	400.428				

Table 2: Reactor Coolant Temperature during Loss of Secondary Pressure Transient

Enclosure APS Response to Response to (RAI) – Relief Request 51 Attachment 1



Figure 1: Plant Transient - Loss of Secondary Pressure

Enclosure APS Response to Response to (RAI) – Relief Request 51 Attachment 1

A convection coefficient of 1000 Btu/hr-ft²-°F is applied on the inner surface of the base metal of the lower head. This value is based on experiences from similar projects performed in the past. The convection coefficient on the outer surface of the lower head is assumed to be 0.150 Btu/hr-ft²-°F and the ambient air temperature is assumed to be 70°F during Loss of Secondary Pressure transient. The lower head is assumed to be initially under uniformly distributed temperature of 565°F.

Figure 2 shows Finite element model boundary conditions and the temperature field. Figure 3 shows the history of temperature vs. time and the history of temperature gradient between inside and outside surface of the lower head vs. time. Note that curves identified with TEMP_1, TEMP_2 and TEMP_3 in the left graph of this figure are temperature histories for node located on inner surface, at depth of 1.5 inches from inner surface, and on outer surface. Figure 4 shows radial and hoop thermal stresses in the lower head at the maximum temperature difference time point during Loss of Secondary Pressure transient (at time of 0.032971 hours, i.e. 118.694 seconds). Table 3 lists radial and hoop thermal stresses in a path across the thickness of the lower head (path is shown in Figure 2). Figure 5 provides graphs for the thermal stresses vs. depth from ID to OD of the lower head. Figure 6 shows the temperature vs. depth from ID to OD.

It is seen that the maximum hoop thermal stress on the inner surface of the lower head during Loss of Secondary Pressure transient is about 46 ksi.



Figure 2: Finite Element Model, Boundary Condition (Left) and Temperature field (Right)





Note: TEMP_1, TEMP_2, and TEMP_3 represents locations at inner surface, 1.5 inches from the inner surface, and the outer surface of the lower head, respectively. Units: °F for vertical axis, hours for horizontal axis.



Figure 4: Thermal Stress in Radial (Left) and Hoop (Right) Directions

Note: Thermal stresses are calculated based on temperature field at the time point, during Loss of Secondary Pressure transient, with maximum temperature difference between ID and OD of the lower head.

Enclosure APS Response to Response to (RAI) – Relief Request 51 Attachment 1

Palo Verde (Ri=93.35", Thk=6.5")							
Depth from ID to OD	Temperature (F)	SX [*] (psi)	SY [*] (psi), SZ [*] (psi				
0	377	17	46342				
1.3	483	843	12365				
2.6	539	903	-5281				
3.9	559	655	-10908				
5.2	564	335	-11999				
6.5	564	16	-11950				

Table 3: Maximum Thermal Stresses in Lower Head during Loss of Secondary Pressure Transient

Note: * The stresses are under spherical coordinate system. SX represents the stress in radial direction, and SY and SZ represent the stresses in the hoop directions.



Figure 5: Thermal Stress in Radial (Left) and Hoop (Right) Directions vs. Depth from ID to OD

Note: Thermal stresses are calculated based on temperature field at the time point, during Loss of Secondary Pressure transient, with maximum temperature difference between ID and OD of the lower head.

Enclosure APS Response to Response to (RAI) – Relief Request 51 Attachment 1



Figure 6: Temperature vs. Depth from ID to OD

Hardware, Software and Computer Files

Hardware and software

The EASI listed computer program ANSYS Release 14.0 (Reference [A.4]) is used in this calculation.

Verification tests of similar applications are listed as follows:

- Error notices for ANSYS Release 14.0 are reviewed and none apply for this analysis.
- Computer hardware used:
 - Dell Precision (Computer Name: MOCAO2, Service Tag #: 5VKT5S1) with Intel® Core™ i7-2640M CPU @ 2.80GHz, 2.80 GHz, 8.00 GB of RAM and Operating System is Microsoft Windows 7 Enterprise Version 2009 Service Pack 1.
 - o Name of person running tests: Jasmine Cao
- Date of tests:
 - October 27, 2013 on computer "MOCAO2" (Service Tag #: 5VKT5S1)
- Acceptability: Results shown in files vm5.out and vm28.out show that the test runs are acceptable.

Computer Files

The computer files for the installation test have been stored in in the ColdStor under /cold/General-Access/32/32-900000/32-9212942-000/official/ directory. The computer files for the thermal analysis are listed below:

Table 4: Computer Files

Name	Date modified	Туре	Size
E LSP_tr.inp	11/15/2013 5:20 PM	INP File	8 KB
post_pv_LSP.out	11/15/2013 5:22 PM	OUT File	14 KB
rpv_pv_LSP.out	11/15/2013 5:22 PM	OUT File	154 KB

References

References identified with an (*) are maintained within [PVNGS3] Records System and are not retrievable from AREVA Records Management. These are acceptable references per AREVA Administrative Procedure 0402-01, Attachment 8.

- [A.1]. *Report N001-0301-00214, Revision 007, "Reactor Vessel, Unit 3, Analytical Report, V-CE-30869, 30AU84."
- [A.2]. *Customer Document, N001-0301-00006, Rev. 06, OEM Document No. 00000-PE-110, Rev. 05, B3, OEM Title "General Specification for Reactor Vessel Assembly."
- [A.3]. ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, Section III, Subsection NB, 1971 Edition, through Winter 1973 Addenda.
- [A.4]. ANSYS Finite Element Computer Code, Version 14.0, ANSYS Inc., Canonsburg, PA.
- [A.5]. AREVA Document NPGD-TM-500 Rev. D, "NPGMAT, NPGD Material Properties Program, User's Manual (03/1985)"

ATTACHMENT 2

Dominion Engineering, Inc., Calculation No. C-7789-00-2, Revision No. 1, Palo Verde Bottom Head Instrumentation Nozzle Stress Analysis

	DOMINION E	NGINEERINC	G, INC.				
	11730 PLAZA AMERICA DRIVE #310	REST	RESTON, VIRGINIA 20190				
Title: Palo Verde Bottom Head Instrumenta Task No.: 77-89 Calculation No.: C-7789-00			rumentation Nozzle Stress Analysis				
Task No.:	: 77-89 Calculation No.:	C-7789-00-2	Revision No.:	l1 of 12			
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	гаде				
	Palo Verde Bottom Head Ins	trumentation No	ozzle Stress Ana	lysis			
				•			
	Recor	d of Revisions					
Rev.	Description	Prepared by Date	Checked by Date	Reviewed by Date			
0	Original Issue	M.R. Fleming 5/28/04	J.E. Broussard 5/28/04	J.E. Broussard 5/28/04			
1	Added explicit statements in Sections 3 and 4 that head temperature and operating pressure are assumed values. Interchanged "above" and "below" in first paragraph of Section 5.2. Corrected figure/table descriptions in Section 5.3 to account for orientation of BMI nozzle penetration. Introduced Section 5.5 regarding QA control of software; added Reference 5. Changed "Top" to "Bottom" in title of Table 5-2. Corrected "Uphill" and "Downhill" labels in Table 5-4. Provided closer view of weld region in Figures 5-2 to 5.5. Corrected	HL 7/26/04	J.E. BADUSSACD 7/24/04	J.E. SR0255114) 7/26/04			

The last revision number to reflect any changes for each section of the calculation is shown in the Table of Contents. The last revision numbers to reflect any changes for tables and figures are shown in the List of Tables and the List of Figures. Changes made in the latest revision, except for Rev. 0 and revisions which change the calculation in its entirety, are indicated by a double line in the right hand margin as shown here.

(now based on appropriate element selections per Westpost8). Replaced Westpost6 with Westpost8 in Attachment 2 (and Section 5.3).

	DOMINION ENGINEERING, INC.		
	11730 PLAZA AMERICA DRIVE #310RESTON, VIRGINIA 2	20190	
Title:	Palo Verde Bottom Head Instrumentation Nozzle Stress An	alysis	
Task No.:	77-89 Calculation No.: C-7789-00-2 Revision No.:	1	
		Page 2	of
	Table of Contents		
Sect.		Page	Last Mod.
			<u>Rev.</u>
1.0	Purpose	4	0
2.0	Summary of Results	4	0
3.0	Input Requirements	4	1
4.0	Assumptions	5	1
5.0	Analysis	6	1
6.0	References	12	1
	List of Tables		
Table	<u>No.</u>		<u>Last Mod.</u> <u>Rev.</u>
5-1	Nozzle Through Wall Hoop Stress at Selected Axial Locations		0
5-2	Nozzle Through Wall Axial Stress Along the Bottom of the Weld – Ele Coordinate System	ement-Orient	ed 1
5-3	a Nozzle ID and OD Hoop Stress (0.0° BMI Nozzle Case)		0
5-3	b Nozzle ID and OD Hoop Stress (26.6° BMI Nozzle Case)		0
5-3	c Nozzle ID and OD Hoop Stress (37.9° BMI Nozzle Case)		0
5-3-	d Nozzle ID and OD Hoop Stress (49.0° BMI Nozzle Case)		0
5-4	Change in Inner Diameter at Selected Axial Locations		1

	DOMINION EN	IGINEERING	, INC.	
J	1730 PLAZA AMERICA DRIVE #310	RESTO	DN, VIRGINIA 20190	
Title:	Palo Verde Bottom Head I	nstrumentation No:	zzle Stress Analysis	
Task No.:	77-89 Calculation No.:	C-7789-00-2	Revision No.: 1	
			Page	3 of <u>13</u>
	List	of Figures		
<u>Fig. No.</u>				Last Mod.
				<u>Rev.</u>
5-1	Bottom Head Instrumentation Nozzle	Node Numbering S	Scheme	0
5-2	Operating Plus Residual Hoop (SY) and	nd Axial (SZ) Stres	s (0.0° BMI Nozzle)	1
5-3	Operating Plus Residual Hoop (SY) as	nd Axial (SZ) Stres	s (26.6° BMI Nozzle)	1
5-4	Operating Plus Residual Hoop (SY) as	nd Axial (SZ) Stres	s (37.9° BMI Nozzle)	1
5-5	Operating Plus Residual Hoop (SY) and	nd Axial (SZ) Stres	s (49.0° BMI Nozzle)	1
5-6	Operating Plus Residual Axial Stress a System – 0.0° BMI Nozzle	at Bottom of Weld	- Element-Oriented Coo	rdinate 1
5-7	Operating Plus Residual Axial Stress a System – 26.6° BMI Nozzle	at Bottom of Weld	- Element-Oriented Coor	rdinate 1
5-8	Operating Plus Residual Axial Stress a System – 37.9° BMI Nozzle	at Bottom of Weld	- Element-Oriented Coor	rdinate 1
5-9	Operating Plus Residual Axial Stress a System – 49.0° BMI Nozzle	at Bottom of Weld	- Element-Oriented Coor	rdinate 1
	List of	Attachments		
<u>Att. No.</u>				<u>Last Mod.</u>

		East mou.
		<u>Rev.</u>
1	Palo Verde BMI Model Results Summaries	0
2	File "Westpost8.txt"	0

	11730 PLAZA AMER	ICA DRIVE #310	REST	ON, VIRGINIA 2	20190				
Title:	Palo Verde Bottom Head Instrumentation Nozzle Stress Analysis								
Task No.:	77-89	Calculation No.:	C-7789-00-2	Revision No.:	1				-
					Page	4	of _	13	_

1.0 <u>Purpose</u>

The purpose of this calculation is to document the results of finite element stress analyses of the Palo Verde bottom-mounted instrumentation (BMI) nozzle penetrations. In this analysis, a number of nozzle geometries spanning the range of BMI penetration angles in the Palo Verde reactor bottom head are investigated.

2.0 <u>Summary of Results</u>

Four BMI nozzle geometries were analyzed: the center penetration $(0.0^{\circ} \text{ nozzle})$, 26.6° nozzle, 37.9° nozzle, and outermost penetration (49.0° nozzle). The cases support the following conclusions:

- 1. The maximum nozzle ID hoop stresses are in the vicinity of the J-groove weld and are in excess of the corresponding axial stresses, suggesting that PWSCC cracking should be axially oriented.
- 2. Residual hoop stresses in the head shell region just beyond the J-groove weld are largely compressive.

3.0 Input Requirements

The following values are used in this calculation:

- 1. The local configuration of the J-groove weld attaching the BMI nozzles to the RPV bottom head. The details used for each model are taken from Combustion Engineering (CE) drawings (References <u>2a</u>, <u>2c</u>, <u>2f</u>, <u>2h</u>, <u>2k</u>, <u>2m</u>).
- 2. Detailed dimensions of the RPV bottom head and BMI nozzles. These values are taken from the set of CE drawings presented as Reference (2):

Nozzles:

- BMI Nozzle OD = 3.001 inches (in region of J-groove weld) Ref. (2d, 2i, 2n)
- BMI Nozzle ID = 0.750 inches (in region of J-groove weld) Ref. (2d, 2i, 2n)

Reactor Vessel:

- Cladding thickness = 0.16 inches Ref. (<u>2e</u>, <u>2i</u>)
- RPV Bottom Head Inner Radius (to cladding) = 93.19 inches Ref. (2e, 2j)
- RPV Head Thickness (minimum, excluding cladding) = 6.5 inches Ref. (<u>2e</u>, <u>2j</u>)
- 4. Operating pressure and temperature. An operating temperature and pressure of 565°F and 2,235 psig were used for the current analysis. As is noted in Section 4, these values were assumed for this analysis.

-												
	DOMINION ENGINE	ERING,	INC.									
	11730 PLAZA AMERICA DRIVE #310	RESTON	I, VIRGINIA 20190									
Title:	Title: Palo Verde Bottom Head Instrumentation Nozzle Stress Analysis											
Task I	No.:77-89 Calculation No.:7789-	<u>-00-2</u> F	Revision No.: <u>1</u>									
			Page _	5	of	13						
4.0	Assumptions											
The	following modeling assumptions were used for the BM	I nozzle moc	deling described in t	his calc	ulatio	n:						
1.	The range of clearance fits for the Palo Verde BMI a and (<u>2d</u>) (for Unit 1), (<u>2h</u>) and (<u>2i</u>) (for Unit 2), and analysis, the nominal 1.5 mil radial clearance fit was u	nozzles may 1d (<u>2m</u>) and 1sed.	be calculated from (<u>2n</u>) (for Unit 3).	Refere For th	nces (e curr	<u>2c)</u> rent						
2.	Based on experimental stress-strain data and certific below, the following room-temperature and 600°F el the elastic-perfectly plastic hardening laws described i	ed mill test astic limit v in Section 5.	report data for the alues were used in 1:	materi associa	als lis tion w	ted /ith						
	Material	<u>70°F</u>	<u>600°F</u>									
	Alloy 182 Welds (Original and Replacement)	75.0 ksi	60.0 ksi									
	Low-Alloy Steel Shell	70.0 ksi	57.6 ksi									
	Stainless Steel Cladding	40.0 ksi	28.9 ksi									
	The elastic limit values for the base materials (head s during the analysis, are based on the 0.2% offset yi values for the weld materials, which undergo large str of the reported yield and tensile strengths.	shell and clau eld strength ains during t	dding), which under for the material. he analysis, are base	rgo sma The ela ed on ai	Ill stra stic lin 1 aver:	iins mit age						
3.	Based on high temperature yield strength data for Allo scaling factors were applied to the Alloy 600 mult Section 5.1:	oy 600 bar in i-linear isoti	n Ref. (<u>6</u>), the follow ropic hardening cur	ving ten ve des	nperat cribed	ure in						
	• 70 °F: 1.15 • 1,600 °F: 0).29										
	• 600 °F: 1.00 • 2,300 °F: 0).05										
	• 1,200 °F: 0.83 • 3,500 °F: 0	1.05										
4.	Prior to the J-groove welding process, a stress relie uniform temperature to the model. The stress-stra stainless cladding have been selected such that the greater than 25 ksi, while the other materials relax to s	of pass at 1, in properties low alloy sufficiency tresses no gr	,100°F is performed s of the head, J-gr teel material relaxe reater than 30 ksi.	1 by ap oove w s to a	plying /eld, a stress	g a and no						
5.	For the J-groove weld simulation, two passes of weld pass. The model geometry was designed such that eac	ling were per h weld pass	rformed: an inner pairs approximately the	ass and e same	an ou volum	iter e.						
6.	The model geometries for each of the BMI nozz dimensions. In addition, as noted in Section 3, the minches per Reference $2i$) was used.	le cases we nimum dime	ere based on nomi ensioned bottom hea	nal as- ıd thick	desigr ness (ned 6.5						
7.	The BMI nozzle in each of the four cases was mode indicated in References $2d$ and $2h$) at which the nozz inches is neglected. Omission of the nozzle end fr presented in Figures 5-2 through 5-5, which show th	led such that le ID and O om the moc at both hoor	t the nozzle end (o DD are <i>not</i> equal to del is justified by the o (Sy) and axial (Sz	f length 0.750 a he stres 2) stress	nd 3.0 nd 3.0 ss resu ses deo	as)01 ilts cay						

11730 PLAZA AMERICA DRIVE #310			RES	STON, VIRGINIA 2	20190			
Title:	Palo '	Verde Bottom Head	Instrumentation 1	Nozzle Stress Ana	alysis			
Task No.:	77-89	Calculation No.:	C-7789-00-2	Revision No.:	1			
					Page	6	of	13

rapidly in the nozzle over a very short distance from the top of the weld, such that nozzle stresses have reached negligible levels at the end of the modeled length. This rapid reduction in stress is attributable to the comparably stiff BMI nozzles at Palo Verde (due to the high wall thickness/diameter ratio of the nozzles).

8. Operating pressure and temperature. An operating temperature and pressure of 565°F and 2,235 psig, respectively, were assumed for the current analysis.

5.0 Analysis

5.1 Finite Element Analyses

Finite element analyses of the BMI nozzles were performed for a total of four cases, selected to bracket the range of BMI penetration angles in the Palo Verde reactor vessel heads. The four BMI geometry cases analyzed are: 0.0° (penetration no. 1), 26.6° (penetration nos. 21 and 22), 37.9° (penetration no. 41), and 49.0° (penetration nos. 60 and 61). Figure 5-1 shows the element geometry and node numbering scheme for the 37.9° BMI nozzle model. The numbering scheme used for the BMI model is identical for all four cases considered in this calculation.

ANSYS finite element analyses were performed using a model based on work developed for commercial customers and described in a 1994 EPRI report on the subject of PWSCC of Alloy 600 components in PWR primary system service (Ref. <u>1</u>).

All nozzles were analyzed using 3D models. The model includes a sector of the alloy steel head with stainless steel cladding on the inside surface, the Alloy 600 nozzle, the Inconel buttering layer in the J-groove weld preparation (simulated as a single weld pass for this analysis), and the Inconel weld material divided into two "passes" of approximately equal volume. The stainless steel cladding and Inconel buttering layers were included in the model since these materials have significantly different coefficients of thermal conductivity compared to the carbon steel vessel head, and therefore influence the weld cooling process.

The boundary conditions on the conical surfaces are such that only radial deflections in the spherical coordinate system are permitted. The nozzles are modeled as being installed in holes in the vessel head using gap elements with an initial radial clearance of 1.5 mils (as discussed in Section 4.0).

	11730 PLAZA AMER	LICA DRIVE #310	REST	ON, VIRGINIA 20	0190			
Title:	Palo	Verde Bottom Head	Instrumentation No	ozzle Stress Ana	lysis			
Task No.:	77-89	Calculation No.:	C-7789-00-2	Revision No.:	1	-		
					Page	_7	of_	13

The current analysis model simulates the butter weld deposition process and the $1,100^{\circ}F$ thermal stress relief of the head shell and butter (prior to J-groove welding). The butter weld deposition process is simulated using a single pass; i.e., the butter region is deposited as a single ring of material. After completion of the butter deposition step, the entire model (with the exception of the nozzle and J-groove weld elements, which are not yet active in the model) is uniformly raised to $1,100^{\circ}F$. As noted below, the elastic limit material properties of the head shell and butter at $1,100^{\circ}F$ are reduced relative to those used in Reference (<u>1</u>) in order to simulate the stress relaxation caused by a multiple-hour stress relief at $1,100^{\circ}F$.

This analysis includes steps for weld depositing the butter and stress relieving the head and butter prior to the J-groove welding steps. In order to accurately model the stress relaxation in the weld region due to time at elevated temperature, the elastic limit for the Alloy 182 weld and stainless steel cladding at temperatures near $1,100^{\circ}F$ are reduced relative to curves used in the Reference (1) analyses. The reduced elastic limits are set at values consistent with the lower residual stress levels brought about by the multiple-hour stress relief. This reduction in elastic limit allows stresses in the pressurizer shell, cladding, and buttering to redistribute at the lower residual stress levels.

The welds (both the weld butter and J-groove weld) are modeled as rings of weld metal which are heated and cooled. As noted above, weld buttering is simulated as a single weld pass; the J-groove weld is simulated as two weld passes. The welding process is simulated by combined thermal and structural analyses. The thermal analysis is used to generate nodal temperature distributions throughout the model at several points in time during the welding process. These nodal temperatures are then used as input conditions to the structural analysis, which calculates the thermally induced stresses. Once welding is completed, a hydrostatic pressure load is applied to, then removed from, the wetted regions of the model at ambient temperature. Finally, the model is loaded with operating temperature and pressure.

The combination of thermal and structural analyses required the use of both thermal and structural finite element types, as follows:

• Thermal Analysis. For the 3-D thermal analysis, eight-node thermal solids (SOLID70) and null elements (Type 0) were used. Use of null elements between the nozzle and head penetration has the effect of limiting heat transfer between the nozzle and head to conduction through the J-groove region. This assumption was made because the head penetrations are counterbored both at the upper and lower

11730 PLAZA AMERICA DRIVE #310 RESTON, VIRGINIA 20190								
Title:	Palo V	/erde Bottom Head	Instrumentation No	ozzle Stress Ana	lysis			
Task No.:	77-89	Calculation No.:	C-7789-00-2	Revision No.:	1			
					Page _	8	_ of _	13

portions of the penetration, and because thermal communication between the surfaces that are nominally in contact was assumed to be poor.

• Structural Analysis. Eight-node 3-D isoparametric solid elements (SOLID45) and two-node interface elements (COMBIN40) were used for the 3-D structural analyses. The SOLID45 and COMBIN40 elements replaced the SOLID70 and null elements, respectively, which had been used for the thermal analysis. Degenerate four- and six-node solid elements were not used in areas of high stress gradient since they can lead to significant errors when used in these regions (7). Higher order elements were not used since they provide no greater accuracy for elastic-plastic analyses than the eight-node solids (7). Further details of the finite element modeling process are available in Reference (1).

In Reference (1), the analytical results of the finite element model were correlated with the experimental and field data that were available at the time. This study showed that the locations of observed cracking correlated well with regions of highest stress in the analytical model. Additionally, the measured ovality at EdF and Ringhals CRDM nozzles was found to correlate well with the analytically predicted ovality for these nozzles. Further details of the correlation between analytical and experimental/field data are available in Reference (1).

It is noted that the finite element model has been improved and refined since it was described in Reference (1). Among the improvements over the model described in Reference (1) are the following:

- 1. While the material properties used for the nozzle material continue to make use of multi-linear isotropic hardening, the material properties for the weld and weld buttering, head shell, and stainless steel cladding are now modeled using elastic-perfectly plastic hardening laws. Experience has shown that using multi-linear hardening properties in the analysis of materials that experience a high degree of plastic strain at elevated temperatures (such as those within the J-groove welds) results in significant work hardening once the material has cooled to lower temperatures. Using elastic-perfectly plastic hardening to occur, which yields more realistic stresses in the weld portions of the model.
- 2. The ability to refine the mesh in the various regions of the model. The model geometry used in this calculation makes use of approximately four times the mesh refinement in the J-groove weld areas as is shown in Reference (1), and uses greater mesh refinement in other areas of the model, such as the nozzle.

DOMINION ENGINEERING, INC.									
11730 PLAZA AMERICA DRIVE #310 RESTON, VIRGINIA 20190									
Title:	Palo	Verde Bottom Head	Instrumentation N	lozzle Stress An	alysis				
Task No.:	77-89	Calculation No.:	C-7789-00-2	Revision No.:	1				
					Page	9	_ of _	13	

3. The ability to perform four-pass welding, as an alternative to two passes. This feature produces more satisfactory results with J-groove welds that are deep compared to the wall thickness of the adjacent nozzle, such as for head vent and thermocouple RPV head penetrations.

In addition to these improvements, the finite element model has been modified for work specific to Westinghouse. In particular, the stress versus strain values for the multi-linear isotropic hardening used for the Alloy 600 nozzle material have been changed to be consistent with Alloy 600 cyclic stress-strain curve (CSSC) data obtained in Reference ($\underline{3}$). The curve input for the analytical model is found in Figure 2-29 of ($\underline{3}$), and is labeled "Reference Curve for Analysis." Because the CSSC curve in ($\underline{3}$) is for only one temperature (600 °F), the reference curve was scaled to a number of other temperatures as follows. At each of the five strain values used to define the multi-linear isotropic hardening behavior of the nozzle material at 600 °F, the corresponding stress was linearly scaled up or down according to the scaling factors listed in Section 4.0, which are based on high temperature yield strength data for Alloy 600 in Reference ($\underline{6}$). These scaling factors are consistent with the work performed using the version of the finite element model that is not specific to Westinghouse work. The ANSYS code that creates the finite element model with these changes has now been incorporated into DEI's "cirse.base" file. Version 2.4.6 of the cirse.base code was used for the four BMI cases considered in this calculation.

5.2 Analytical Results Summary

Summaries of the analytical results for each of the models analyzed are contained in Attachment 1 to this calculation. These summaries show the maximum hoop and axial stresses at the ID of the nozzle, at the "uphill" and "downhill" (closest to the center of the head) circumferential planes, as well as "below" the weld (axial portion of the nozzle including the weld region and extending through the head shell) and "above" the weld (axial portion of the nozzle extending into the RPV). Plots of the hoop (SY) and axial (SZ) stresses in each of the four BMI model cases are shown in Figures 5-2 through 5-5.

Figures 5-2 through 5-5 and Attachment 1 show that the maximum hoop stresses are in the vicinity of the J-groove weld, and are in excess of the corresponding axial stresses, suggesting that PWSCC cracking should be axially oriented. The results also show that operating plus residual stresses are influenced by penetration angle, with higher angles generally leading to higher maximum hoop and axial stresses.

	DOMINION ENGINEERING, INC.										
11730 PLAZA AMERICA DRIVE #310 RESTON, VIRGINIA 20											
Title:	Palo V	verde Bottom Head	Instrumentation N	lozzle Stress An	alysis						
Task No.:	77-89	Calculation No.:	C-7789-00-2	Revision No.:	1	_					
					Page _	10	of _	13			

5.3 Additional Post-Processing of Analysis Results

In addition to the condensed post-processing included in Attachment 1 to this calculation, further postprocessing was performed to determine the stresses and deflections at a number of other locations specified by Westinghouse personnel. The additional post-processing was performed using the file "Westpost8.txt," included as Attachment 2 to this calculation.

The results of the additional post-processing are presented in Tables 5-1 through 5-4 and in Figures 5-6 through 5-9. With the exception of Table 5-4, all data and stress plots are for the operating plus weld residual stress load condition. Table 5-1 presents the hoop stress distribution through the nozzle thickness at five specific axial locations for both the downhill and uphill sides of the nozzle. These locations are: 0.5" above the top of the weld, the top of the weld, the middle of the weld, the bottom of the weld, and 0.5" below the bottom of the weld. Table 5-2 presents the axial stress distribution through the nozzle thickness at the bottom of the weld, following the sweep of the weld from downhill to uphill. Data are tabulated for each of the nine circumferential planes in the model. For Table 5-2, the axial stress results are in an element-oriented coordinate system which follows the path of the weld; the axial stress results presented in Table 5-2 are normal to the path of the weld. Tables 5-3a through 5-3d present the hoop stress distribution along the ID and the OD of the four BMI nozzle geometries at both the downhill and uphill sides. Table 5-4 presents the weld residual deflection at the inner diameter of the nozzle at each of the nine circumferential planes in the model for four axial locations. These data are used to calculate the change in inner diameter at each of the locations. The four axial locations are presented as defined in Reference (4), and are as follows: Location 2 - 0.5" above the top of the uphill weld, Location 3 - top of the uphill weld, Location 4 - bottomof the uphill weld, and Location "X" - top of the downhill weld. Figures 5-6 through 5-9 are axial stress plots of the nozzle wall cross section at the bottom of the weld and following the sweep of the weld from uphill to downhill. As in Table 5-2, the stresses are in an element-oriented coordinate system which follows the path of the weld; the axial stress results presented are normal to the path of the weld.

5.4 Additional Files Stored Electronically

In addition to the condensed post-processing included in this calculation, more voluminous output results have been saved electronically in the following directories and filenames:

/data/t7789/PVB-0A/PVB-0A.nodelocs.txt /data/t7789/PVB-0A/PVB-0A.results.txt

11730 PLAZA AMERICA DRIVE #310

RESTON, VIRGINIA 20190

Title:	tle: Palo Verde Bottom Head Instrumentation Nozzle Stress Analysis								
Task No.:	77-89	Calculation No.:	C-7789-00-2	Revision No.:	1		·		_
					Page	11	of	13	

/data/t7789/PVB-26A/PVB-26A.nodelocs.txt /data/t7789/PVB-26A/PVB-26A.results.txt

/data/t7789/PVB-37A/PVB-37A.nodelocs.txt /data/t7789/PVB-37A/PVB-37A.results.txt

/data/t7789/PVB-49A/PVB-49A.nodelocs.txt /data/t7789/PVB-49A/PVB-49A.results.txt

These files (created using "Westpost6.txt"—see Attachment 2) have been transmitted to Westinghouse via e-mail and on CD-ROM on disk D-7789-00-1, Revision 0.

5.5 Quality Assurance Software Controls

The Palo Verde BMI nozzle analyses were performed on an HP J6700 workstation, under the HP-UX 11.0 operating system and ANSYS Revision 8.0, which is maintained in accordance with the provisions for control of software described in Dominion Engineering, Inc.'s (DEI's) quality assurance (QA) program for safety-related nuclear work (5).¹ In addition to QA controls associated with the procurement and use of the ANSYS software (e.g., maintenance of the ANSYS Inc. as an approved supplier of the software based on formal auditing and surveillance, formal periodic verification of ANSYS software installation), QA controls associated with all ANSYS batch input listings are also carried out by DEI. These include independent checks of a batch input listing each time it is used; review of all ANSYS Class 3 error reports and QA notices to assess their potential impact on a batch listing; and independent "check calculations" (e.g., comparison of model-computed nozzle and reactor vessel head stresses to theoretical closed-form solutions; confirmation that computed weld pass temperatures fell within target temperature ranges; and, for symmetric (0° nozzle angle) geometry cases, confirmation of the analysis is appropriate. The review of ANSYS error reports and QA notices as well as the project-specific check calculations are documented formally in a QA memo to the project file (this project is DEI Task 77-89).

¹ DEI's quality assurance program for safety-related work (DEI-002) commits to applicable requirements of 10 CFR 21, Appendix B of 10 CFR 50, and ASME/ANSI NQA-1. This QA program is independently audited periodically by both NUPIC (the Nuclear Procurement Issues Committee) and NIAC (the Nuclear Industry Assessment Committee).

		DOMINION ENGINEERING, INC. 11730 PLAZA AMERICA DRIVE #310 RESTON, VIRGINIA 20190
Title: Task N	No.:	Palo Verde Bottom Head Instrumentation Nozzle Stress Analysis 77-89 Calculation No.: C-7789-00-2 Revision No.: 1 Page 12 of 13
6.0	Ref	erences
1.	PWS	SCC of Alloy 600 Materials in PWR Primary System Penetrations, EPRI TR-103696, July 1994.
2.	Con geor	nbustion Engineering (CE) drawings of Palo Verde reactor vessel bottom head, nozzle and weld metry (182.25" ID PWR):
	Palo	Verde Unit 1:
	a.	CE Drawing E-78173-141-003, Revision 2, Lower Vessel Final Assembly
	b.	CE Drawing E-78173-151-001, Revision 3, Bottom Head Welded Assembly
	c.	CE Drawing E-78173-151-002, Revision 2, Bottom Head Penetrations
	d.	CE Drawing E-78173-184-001, Revision 4, Bottom Head Instrument Tubes
	e.	CE Drawing E-78173-171-003, Revision 7, General Arrangement
	Palo	Verde Unit 2:
	f.	CE Drawing E-79173-141-003, Revision 1, Lower Vessel Final Assembly
	g.	CE Drawing E-79173-151-001, Revision 4, Bottom Head Welded Assembly
	h.	CE Drawing E-79173-151-002, Revision 1, Bottom Head Penetrations
	i.	CE Drawing E-STD 11-184-033, Revision 4, Bottom Head Instrument Tubes
	j.	CE Drawing E-79173-171-003, Revision 1, General Arrangement
	<u>Palo</u>	Verde Unit 3:
	k.	CE Drawing E-65173-141-003, Revision 0, Lower Vessel Final Assembly
	1.	CE Drawing E-65173-151-001, Revision 1, Bottom Head Welded Assembly
	m	CE Drawing E-65173-151-002, Revision 0, Bottom Head Penetrations
	n.	CE Drawing E-STD 11-184-033, Revision 4, Bottom Head Instrument Tubes
3.	Ball Wes	, M. G., et al., "RV Closure Head Penetration Alloy 600 PWSCC," WCAP-13525, Revision 1, tinghouse Electric Corporation, 1992.

.

	11730 PLAZA AMER	ICA DRIVE #310	REST	ON, VIRGINIA 2	0190				
Title:	Palo V	/erde Bottom Head	Instrumentation No	zzle Stress Ana	alysis				
Task No.:	77-89	Calculation No.:	C-7789-00-2	Revision No.:	1				_
					Page	13	_ of _	13	

- 4. Incoming Correspondence IC-7736-00-3, Fax from Warren Bamford (Westinghouse) to John Broussard (Dominion Engineering, Inc.) defining diameter measurement elevations, dated January 8, 2002. (Note: This document was transmitted to DEI in support of work performed for Task 7736 and is filed in the Task 77-36 Project File.)
- 5. Dominion Engineering, Inc. Quality Assurance Manual for Safety-Related Nuclear Work, DEI-002, March 30, 2004.
- 6. Properties and Selection: Stainless Steels, Tool Materials, and Special-Purpose Metals, ASM Materials Handbook Volume 3, Ninth Edition, p. 218, 1980.
- 7. "Modeling and Meshing Guide," ANSYS 8.0 Documentation, ANSYS, Inc.

Enclosure - Attachment 2

Rev. 1

Table 5-1

	Percent		Downhill	Side Hoop S	stress (psi)			Uphill S	ide Hoop Str	ess (psi)	
Nozzle Angle	Through	0.5" Above	Top of	Middle of	Bottom of	0.5" Below	0.5" Above	Top of	Middle of	Bottom of	0.5" Below
	Wall	Weld	Weld	Weld	Weld	Weld	Weld	Weld	Weld	Weld	Weld
0.0	ID	-13 785	-22 532	3 690	14 725	21.851	-13 785	-22 532	3 690	14 725	21.851
0.0	13%	-10.954	-16.817	3,287	12 880	16 738	-10.954	-16 817	3 287	12 880	16 738
0.0	25%	-8 129	-10 764	3 571	15,636	14 306	-8 129	-10 764	3 571	15,636	14 306
0.0	38%	-5.627	-4.115	7.066	20,683	15 549	-5.627	-4 115	7.066	20 683	15 549
0.0	50%	-3.051	6.517	15.457	27,495	20.932	-3.051	6.517	15,457	27,495	20,932
0.0	63%	506	21.110	29.941	34,945	29.239	506	21,110	29 941	34 945	29,239
0.0	75%	4.150	36,194	50.007	45,980	30.834	4,150	36,194	50.007	45,980	30,834
0.0	88%	5,567	49.807	66.371	53,320	25.883	5,567	49.807	66.371	53,320	25,883
0.0	OD	4.627	50.014	71.136	24,199	23,501	4.627	50.014	71,136	24,199	23,501
26.6	ID	28,436	33.371	32,823	34.545	13.336	-4,885	-17.537	4.051	17.454	33,997
26.6	13%	21.943	25.422	31,560	30,609	7.624	-3,168	-12.577	8.001	15.315	23.645
26.6	25%	19.303	23.018	33.841	33.657	7.544	-2,670	-9.997	11.687	16,509	19,479
26.6	38%	18,959	24,180	36,204	38,896	9,804	-3,213	-6,705	16,393	18,479	18.093
26.6	50%	21,399	29,721	41,373	45,536	12,310	-3,979	1,468	23,807	23.652	19.803
26.6	63%	25,111	41,869	51,155	53,468	14,254	-4,907	17,001	33,269	29,996	24,913
26.6	75%	27,889	53,913	64,951	58,250	12,594	-5,801	32,050	45,804	42,756	33,263
26.6	88%	24,312	62,486	69,723	55,093	6,171	-6,269	43,321	55,175	39,909	43,541
26.6	OD	23,084	59,897	68,511	45,873	2,368	-9,486	39,386	59,288	2,734	48,174
37.9	ID	43,700	41,628	43,308	22,896	8,496	-3,299	-14,779	497	24,164	40,322
37.9	13%	33,720	35,393	41,289	18,700	2,371	-3,762	-11,034	5,395	18,608	29,175
37.9	25%	29,650	36,295	45,524	21,752	1,843	-4,510	-11,124	11,161	19,654	23,475
37.9	38%	29,230	37,927	49,070	26,647	3,042	-5,554	-10,863	18,046	21,264	20,742
37.9	50%	30,675	41,823	55,978	34,044	3,897	-6,533	-4,062	27,288	25,452	21,267
37.9	63%	35,377	49,496	66,014	43,807	4,576	-7,572	13,282	37,834	30,770	23,541
37.9	75%	40,949	57,373	77,036	50,263	823	-8,607	32,053	48,996	41,816	29,216
37.9	88%	47,721	59,023	75,126	47,473	-10,570	-9,183	36,231	52,487	30,749	34,317
37.9	OD	43,538	48,004	67,306	53,576	-18,301	-12,435	28,012	52,298	-1,327	34,890
49.0	ID	52,035	54,862	46,672	13,099	3,968	-4,271	-14,636	-5,445	29,289	44,282
49.0	13%	41,307	46,038	42,751	8,050	-2,553	-3,430	-11,770	1,033	18,711	31,099
49.0	25%	38,179	47,341	46,966	9,663	-3,051	-4,050	-14,478	7,740	19,185	24,444
49.0	38%	36,873	48,094	50,819	13,829	-1,315	-5,010	-15,617	16,413	22,231	20,904
49.0	50%	36,936	51,194	58,318	20,814	-209	-6,060	-8,234	27,662	25,663	20,136
49.0	63%	38,509	55,154	67,620	28,630	-552	-7,040	9,937	39,024	29,432	19,491
49.0	75%	39,441	57,180	74,629	37,256	-5,634	-7,613	31,203	46,212	37,072	21,984
49.0	88%	40,196	51,830	68,347	35,242	-19,341	-8,261	30,597	45,334	22,477	17,036
49.0	OD	33,717	37,236	61,176	46,778	-30,370	-10,584	17,751	48,644	-846	12,297

Nozzle Through Wall Hoop Stress at Selected Axial Locations

Note: Nozzle yield strength at 600°F operating temperature is 39.3 ksi.

Enclosure - Attachment 2

Table 5-2

Rev. 1

	Percent			Local	Axial Stress	(psi) at Circu	mferential Lo	cation		
Nozzle Angle	Through	Downhill								Uphill
	Wall	-90°	-67.5°	-45°	-22.5°	0°	22.5°	45°	67.5°	90°
0.0	ID	-35,191	-35,191	-35,192	-35,192	-35,192	-35,192	-35,192	-35,191	-35,191
0.0	13%	-36,030	-36,030	-36,030	-36,030	-36,030	-36,030	-36,030	-36,030	-36,030
0.0	25%	-32,602	-32,602	-32,602	-32,602	-32,602	-32,602	-32,602	-32,602	-32,602
0.0	38%	-28,709	-28,709	-28,708	-28,708	-28,708	-28,708	-28,708	-28,709	-28,709
0.0	50%	-23,744	-23,744	-23,743	-23,743	-23,743	-23,743	-23,743	-23,744	-23,744
0.0	63%	-15,472	-15,474	-15,472	-15,472	-15,472	-15,472	-15,472	-15,474	-15,472
0.0	75%	-3,073	-3,074	-3,071	-3,072	-3,072	-3,072	-3,071	-3,074	-3,073
0.0	88%	15,477	15,476	15,478	15,477	15,477	15,477	15,478	15,476	15,477
0.0	OD	5,743	5,739	5,739	5,740	5,740	5,740	5,739	5,739	5,743
26.6	ID	16,455	18,431	18,105	10,848	3,528	-1,815	-6,234	-14,229	-20,455
26.6	13%	10,611	10,577	9,478	4,289	-1,138	-5,508	-9,781	-17,664	-23,646
26.6	25%	5,134	4,458	3,109	-576	-4,619	-8,338	-12,149	-18,699	-23,267
26.6	38%	2,417	1,167	-321	-3,391	-6,722	-9,573	-12,375	-17,579	-21,088
26.6	50%	2,690	688	-1,315	-4,237	-6,630	-8,249	-9,917	-13,536	-15,970
26.6	63%	1,760	-37	-1,777	-2,942	-3,004	-3,047	-3,995	-6,962	-9,001
26.6	75%	1,962	615	275	917	3,530	6,644	8,501	7,775	6,913
26.6	88%	14,001	13,619	14,127	15,626	20,165	27,803	31,348	29,932	27,982
26.6	OD	9,472	8,712	9,735	11,435	11,385	9,411	5,877	3,298	1,353
37.9	ID	22,467	27,881	30,808	21,920	8,676	419	-935	-243	-1,120
37.9	13%	18,847	21,064	21,928	15,838	6,593	-675	-2,747	-4,691	-7,554
37.9	25%	15,116	15,755	15,308	10,770	4,290	-1,342	-3,254	-6,015	-8,560
37.9	38%	13,422	12,308	10,711	7,022	1,970	-2,234	-3,203	-5,848	-7,761
37.9	50%	13,266	10,371	7,997	4,640	676	-1,708	-1,298	-2,792	-3,761
37.9	63%	11,114	7,255	5,103	3,043	2,237	2,241	3,572	2,605	1,891
37.9	75%	9,782	5,652	3,664	2,951	6,095	10,311	14,452	15,495	16,117
37.9	88%	11,902	12,619	14,340	16,242	22,340	31,713	35,991	32,700	30,255
37.9	OD	14,345	13,454	11,893	13,226	13,497	11,057	7,472	4,207	1,092
49.0	ID	15,395	22,427	31,115	23,697	2,729	-7,304	-3,268	8,877	14,330
49.0	13%	12,338	16,144	22,301	19,687	6,300	-3,359	-1,519	3,811	3,958
49.0	25%	11,846	14,153	17,206	14,008	5,885	-999	206	3,573	4,689
49.0	38%	13,189	13,501	13,949	9,774	4,325	-494	1,013	4,270	6,413
49.0	50%	15,885	14,390	12,262	7,541	3,275	233	3,374	7,087	9,644
49.0	63%	16,391	12,615	9,035	5,557	3,919	4,348	8,349	12,178	14,454
49.0	75%	11,598	8,380	5,611	3,326	6,849	13,168	18,939	22,891	24,867
49.0	88%	5,484	7,941	10,517	13,606	22,285	35,276	37,657	32,909	29,861
49.0	OD	13,455	12,549	9,628	12,680	12,378	11,107	6,970	2,668	-2,693

Nozzle Through Wall Axial Stress Along the Bottom of the Weld -- Element-Oriented Coordinate System

C-7789-00-2

Table 5-3a

		Dowr	nhill Side		Uphill Side					
		Axial	ID Hoop	OD Hoop		Axial	ID Hoop	OD Hoop		
	Nodes	Height	Stress (psi)	Stress (psi)	Nodes	Height	Stress (psi)	Stress (psi)		
Nozzle Top	80001, 80009	0.00	16,457	7,289	1,9	0.00	16,457	7,289		
	80101, 80109	0.30	1,701	5,111	101, 109	0.30	1,701	5,111		
	80201, 80209	0.54	-13,785	4,627	201, 209	0.54	-13,785	4,627		
	80301, 80309	0.73	-22,054	6,339	301, 309	0.73	-22,054	6,339		
	80401, 80409	0.88	-25,439	22,325	401, 409	0.88	-25,439	22,325		
	80501, 80509	1.01	-25,618	35,694	501, 509	1.01	-25,618	35,694		
Weld Top	80601, 80609	1.11	-22,532	50,014	601, 609	1.11	-22,532	50,014		
	80701, 80709	1.40	-6,979	61,709	701, 709	1.40	-6,979	61,709		
	80801, 80809	1.70	4,693	73,123	801, 809	1.70	4,693	73,123		
	80901, 80909	2.00	3,690	71,136	901, 909	2.00	3,690	71,136		
	81001, 81009	2.29	4,615	74,007	1001, 1009	2.29	4,615	74,007		
	81101, 81009	2.59	8,205	57,094	1101, 1009	2.59	8,205	57,094		
Weld Bottom	81201, 81209	2.89	14,725	24,199	1201, 1209	2.89	14,725	24,199		
	81301, 81309	3.14	18,147	37,480	1301, 1309	3.14	18,147	37,480		
	81401, 81409	3.35	21,851	23,501	1401, 1409	3.35	21,851	23,501		
	81501, 81509	3.61	20,231	13,797	1501, 1509	3.61	20,231	13,797		
	81601, 81609	3.91	9,738	6,732	1601, 1609	3.91	9,738	6,732		
	81701, 81709	4.27	6,103	1,736	1701, 1709	4.27	6,103	1,736		
	81801, 81809	4.71	4,382	912	1801, 1809	4.71	4,382	912		
	81901, 81909	5.23	3,118	206	1901, 1909	5.23	3,118	206		
	82001, 82009	5.85	2,527	202	2001, 2009	5.85	2,527	202		
	82101, 82109	6.60	2,446	228	2101, 2109	6.60	2,446	228		
2	82201, 82209	7.48	2,505	274	2201, 2209	7.48	2,505	274		
ŝ	82301, 82309	8.55	2,526	281	2301, 2309	8.55	2,526	281		
2	82401, 82409	9.30	2,528	280	2401, 2409	9.30	2,528	280		
Nozzle Bottom	32501, 82509	10.06	2,499	277	2501, 2509	10.06	2,499	277		

Nozzle ID and OD Hoop Stress (0.0° BMI Nozzle Case)

Table 5-3b

		Dowr	hill Side			Uphi	ill Side	
		Axial	ID Hoop	OD Hoop		Axial	ID Hoop	OD Hoop
	Nodes	Height	Stress (psi)	Stress (psi)	Nodes	Height	Stress (psi)	Stress (psi)
Nozzle Top	80001, 80009	0.00	-2,426	-2,223	1,9	0.00	3,125	-2,523
	80101, 80109	0.83	-2,672	-298	101, 109	0.27	162	-3,897
	80201, 80209	1.50	-10,206	4,112	201, 209	0.49	-4,885	-9,486
	80301, 80309	2.03	5,781	10,010	301, 309	0.66	-12,518	-10,675
	80401, 80409	2.46	28,436	23,084	401, 409	0.80	-16,477	5,995
	80501, 80509	2.80	34,552	48,931	501, 509	0.91	-17,755	28,534
Weld Top	80601, 80609	3.07	33,371	59,897	601, 609	1.00	-17,537	39,386
	80701, 80709	3.35	29,802	68,922	701, 709	1.31	-14,008	66,712
	80801, 80809	3.63	30,558	67,159	801, 809	1.62	-3,563	73,838
	80901, 80909	3.91	32,823	68,511	901, 909	1.93	4,051	59,288
	81001, 81009	4.19	36,388	78,814	1001, 1009	2.24	8,021	39,518
	81101, 81009	4.47	38,921	60,206	1101, 1009	2.55	8,709	20,376
Weld Bottom	81201, 81209	4.74	34,545	45,873	1201, 1209	2.86	17,454	2,734
	81301, 81309	4.99	22,180	20,541	1301, 1309	3.11	29,151	29,529
	81401, 81409	5.17	13,336	2,368	1401, 1409	3.34	33,997	48,174
	81501, 81509	5.40	5,200	-3,461	1501, 1509	3.62	35,655	21,802
	81601, 81609	5.68	-776	2,634	1601, 1609	3.96	31,781	8,542
	81701, 81709	6.02	1,056	-150	1701, 1709	4.37	22,421	1,559
	81801, 81809	6.45	2,194	502	1801, 1809	4.86	3,972	-292
	81901, 81909	6.97	2,648	395	1901, 1909	5.45	544	-170
	82001, 82009	7.63	2,819	589	2001, 2009	6.16	2,254	457
	82101, 82109	8.43	3,380	-948	2101, 2109	7.01	2,731	458
	82201, 82209	9.43	4,173	-3,181	2201, 2209	8.04	2,935	304
	82301, 82309	10.66	4,433	-5,339	2301, 2309	9.28	3,522	199
	82401, 82409	11.42	3,548	1,180	2401, 2409	10.73	3,666	208
Nozzle Bottom	82501, 82509	12.18	2,828	56	2501, 2509	12.18	2,874	181

Nozzle ID and OD Hoop Stress (26.6° BMI Nozzle Case)

Table 5-3c

		Dowr	hill Side		Uphill Side					
		Axial	ID Hoop	OD Hoop		Axial	ID Hoop	OD Hoop		
	Nodes	Height	Stress (psi)	Stress (psi)	Nodes	Height	Stress (psi)	Stress (psi)		
Nozzle Top	80001, 80009	0.00	-3,564	-2,603	1,9	0.00	651	-3,725		
	80101, 80109	1.12	-3,571	-1,919	101, 109	0.25	-2,555	-6,490		
	80201, 80209	2.02	730	703	201, 209	0.46	-3,299	-12,435		
	80301, 80309	2.74	30,410	7,583	301, 309	0.62	-7,476	-10,789		
	80401, 80409	3.31	43,165	21,810	401, 409	0.75	-11,690	2,576		
	80501, 80509	3.77	43,700	43,538	501, 509	0.86	-14,064	21,760		
Weld Top	80601, 80609	4.14	41,628	48,004	601, 609	0.94	-14,779	28,012		
	80701, 80709	4.42	43,987	66,924	701, 709	1.26	-13,354	69,191		
	80801,80809	4.69	44,617	61,564	801, 809	1.58	-7,519	74,168		
	80901, 80909	4.97	43,308	67,306	901, 909	1.90	497	52,298		
	81001, 81009	5.24	44,038	76,958	1001, 1009	2.22	10,202	25,356		
	81101, 81009	5.51	38,226	60,103	1101, 1009	2.54	16,113	9,089		
Weld Bottom	81201, 81209	5.79	22,896	53,576	1201, 1209	2.86	24,164	-1,327		
	81301, 81309	6.03	13,248	831	1301, 1309	3.11	33,721	29,567		
	81401, 81409	6.22	8,496	-18,301	1401, 1409	3.37	40,322	34,890		
	81501, 81509	6.46	2,652	-19,265	1501, 1509	3.69	42,995	21,975		
	81601, 81609	6.75	722	-6,024	1601, 1609	4.08	40,637	7,484		
	81701, 81709	7.12	3,035	-398	1701, 1709	4.54	30,928	-1,532		
	81801, 81809	7.58	3,482	93	1801, 1809	5.10	13,118	-1,793		
	81901, 81909	8.16	3,272	385	1901, 1909	5.78	-1,786	-886		
	82001, 82009	8.88	3,026	138	2001, 2009	6.60	1,598	557		
	82101, 82109	9.78	3,136	-1,071	2101, 2109	7.58	3,956	714		
	82201, 82209	10.90	3,506	-1,616	2201, 2209	8.77	2,989	327		
	82301, 82309	12.31	3,537	-2,482	2301, 2309	10.21	2,902	205		
	<u>82401, 82409</u>	13.07	3,037	827	2401, 2409	12.02	3,210	235		
Nozzle Bottom	82501, 82509	13.83	2,551	168	2501, 2509	13.83	2,625	199		

Nozzle ID and OD Hoop Stress (37.9° BMI Nozzle Case)

Table 5-3d

		Dowr	hill Side			Uphi	ll Side	<u>jú</u>
		Axial	ID Hoop	OD Hoop		Axial	ID Hoop	OD Hoop
	Nodes	Height	Stress (psi)	Stress (psi)	Nodes	Height	Stress (psi)	Stress (psi)
Nozzle Top	80001, 80009	0.00	-3,722	-1,868	1, 9	0.00	621	-5,289
	80101, 80109	1.40	-6,680	-2,104	101, 109	0.21	-4,271	-10,584
	80201, 80209	2.53	9,655	-2,346	201, 209	0.38	-5,211	-15,056
	80301, 80309	3.43	39,134	3,915	301, 309	0.52	-7,466	-8,573
	80401, 80409	4.15	48,236	17,281	401, 409	0.63	-10,584	1,437
	80501, 80509	4.72	52,035	33,717	501, 509	0.72	-12,967	17,428
Weld Top	80601, 80609	5.19	54,862	37,236	601, 609	0.79	-14,636	17,751
	80701, 80709	5.51	55,735	60,921	701, 709	1.13	-14,658	66,848
	80801, 80809	5.83	50,873	55,490	801, 809	1.47	-12,418	71,984
	80901, 80909	6.16	46,672	61,176	901, 909	1.81	-5,445	48,644
	81001, 81009	6.48	38,565	69,994	1001, 1009	2.15	7,670	21,440
	81101, 81009	6.80	24,141	62,170	1101, 1009	2.49	21,677	2,532
Weld Bottom	81201, 81209	7.13	13,099	46,778	1201, 1209	2.83	29,289	-846
	81301, 81309	7.37	6,658	-12,381	1301, 1309	3.09	37,203	17,684
	81401, 81409	7.58	3,968	-30,370	1401, 1409	3.41	44,282	12,297
	81501, 81509	7.84	1,277	-21,886	1501, 1509	3.79	47,413	13,649
	81601, 81609	8.18	2,934	-4,790	1601, 1609	4.26	45,514	8,968
	81701, 81709	8.60	4,072	-778	1701, 1709	4.82	38,280	-4,341
	81801, 81809	9.12	3,860	176	1801, 1809	5.50	23,009	-5,588
	81901, 81909	9.79	3,187	338	1901, 1909	6.32	-1,728	-1,774
	82001, 82009	10.63	2,641	296	2001, 2009	7.31	-1,986	846
	82101, 82109	11.69	2,439	279	2101, 2109	8.51	4,724	969
	82201, 82209	13.02	2,588	311	2201, 2209	9.97	3,264	282
	82301, 82309	14.70	2,804	-686	2301, 2309	11.72	2,223	251
	82401, 82409	15.47	2,731	468	2401, 2409	13.98	2,705	275
Nozzle Bottom	82501, 82509	16.24	2,514	265	2501, 2509	16.24	2,588	227

Nozzle ID and OD Hoop Stress (49.0° BMI Nozzle Case)

Table 5-4

		Locat	tion 2			Locat	tion 4	Locati	on "X"
	 	0.5" Above	Uphill Weld	Locat	tion 3	Uphill	Weld	Downhi	ll Weld
	i !		эр	Uphill W	/eld Top	Bot	tom	T	op
	i '	Radial	Change in	Radial	Change in	Radial	Change in	Radial	Change in
	Circ	Deflection	Diameter	Deflection	Diameter	Deflection	Diameter	Deflection	Diameter
ļ	Location	(mils)	(mils)	(mils)	(mils)	(mils)	(mils)	(mils)	(mils)
Uphill	-90.0	0.47	0.94	0.17	0.34	0.85	1.70	0.17	0.34
	-67.5	0.47	0.94	0.17	0.34	0.85	1.70	0.17	0.34
	-45.0	0.47	0.94	0.17	0.34	0.85	1.70	0.17	0.34
	-22.5	0.47	0.94	0.17	0.34	0.85	1.70	0.17	0.34
0.0° Nozzle	0.0	0.47	0.94	0.17	0.34	0.85	1.70	0.17	0.34
	22.5	0.47	0.94	0.17	0.34	0.85	1.70	0.17	0.34
	45.0	0.47	0.94	0.17	0.34	0.85	1.70	0.17	0.34
	67.5	0.47	0.94	0.17	0.34	0.85	1.70	0.17	0.34
Downhill	90.0	0.47	0.94	0.17	0.34	0.85	1.70	0.17	0.34
Uphill	-90.0	23.10	0.16	19.75	-0.01	5.60	-0.34	3.97	-0.24
	-67.5	21.35	0.16	18.31	0.08	5.41	0.09	3.99	0.31
	-45.0	16.37	0.17	14.13	0.25	4.84	1.25	3.82	1.61
	-22.5	8.90	0.17	7.80	0.41	3.52	2.36	3.15	2.95
26.6° Nozzle	0.0	0.08	0.16	0.23	0.46	1.41	2.82	1.75	3.50
	22.5	-8.73	0.17	-7.39	0.41	-1.16	2.36	-0.20	2.95
	45.0	-16.20	0.17	-13.88	0.25	-3.59	1.25	-2.21	1.61
	67.5	-21.19	0.16	-18.23	0.08	-5.32	0.09	-3.68	0.31
Downhill	90.0	-22.94	0.16	-19.76	-0.01	-5.94	-0.34	-4.21	-0.24
Uphill	-90.0	32.09	0.09	28.08	-0.18	9.18	-3.40	0.50	-0.05
	-67.5	29.65	0.09	25.99	-0.11	8.79	-2.61	0.59	0.38
	-45.0	22.70	0.07	19.98	0.03	7.53	-0.73	0.85	1.63
	-22.5	12.29	0.04	10.90	0.17	4.99	1.29	1.40	2.99
37.9° Nozzle	0.0	0.02	0.04	0.11	0.22	1.06	2.12	1.82	3.64
	22.5	-12.25	0.04	-10.73	0.17	-3.70	1.29	1.59	2.99
	45.0	-22.63	0.07	-19.95	0.03	-8.26	-0.73	0.78	1.63
	67.5	-29.56	0.09	-26.10	-0.11	-11.40	-2.61	-0.21	0.38
Downhill	90.0	-32.00	0.09	-28.26	-0.18	-12.58	-3.40	-0.55	-0.05
Uphill	-90.0	39.29	0.20	34.97	-0.14	13.58	-4.82	-0.50	0.55
	-67.5	36.29	0.16	32.34	-0.10	12.92	-3.92	-0.46	0.79
	-45.0	27.75	0.07	24.80	-0.03	10.87	-1.60	-0.20	1.51
	-22.5	15.00	-0.01	13.46	0.03	6.93	0.90	0.33	2.15
49.0° Nozzle	0.0	-0.03	-0.06	0.02	0.04	0.97	1.94	1.20	2.40
	22.5	-15.01	-0.01	-13.43	0.03	-6.03	0.90	1.82	2.15
	45.0	-27.68	0.07	-24.83	-0.03	-12.47	-1.60	1.71	1.51
	67.5	-36.13	0.16	-32.44	-0.10	-16.84	-3.92	1.25	0.79
Downhill	90.0	-39.09	0.20	-35.11	-0.14	-18.40	-4.82	1.05	0.55

Change in Inner Diameter at Selected Axial Locations



Node Numbers Increase by 100 up the length of the tube and shell Node Numbers Increase by 1 along the tube and shell radius

Bottom Head Instrumentation Nozzle Node Numbering Scheme





Enclosure - Attachment 2 C-7789-00-2

Figure 5-3

Revision 1



Enclosure - Attachment 2

C-7789-00-2 Revision 1

Figure 5-4

Operating plus Residual Hoop (SY) and Axial (SZ) Stress 37.9° BMI Nozzle



Enclosure - Attachment 2 C-7789-00-2 Revision 1 16:06:53

Figure 5-5

Operating plus Residual Hoop (SY) and Axial (SZ) Stress 49.0° BMI Nozzle

Enclosure - Attachment 2 C-7789-00-2 Revision 1



Operating Plus Residual Axial Stress at Bottom of Weld - Element-Oriented Coordinate System - 0.0° BMI

Enclosure - Attachment 2 C-7789-00-2 Revision 1



Operating Plus Residual Axial Stress at Bottom of Weld - Element-Oriented Coordinate System - 26.6° BMI

Enclosure - Attachment 2 C-7789-00-2 Revision 1



Operating Plus Residual Axial Stress at Bottom of Weld - Element-Oriented Coordinate System - 37.9° BMI

Enclosure - Attachment 2 C-7789-00-2 Revision 1



Operating Plus Residual Axial Stress at Bottom of Weld - Element-Oriented <u>Coordinate System - 49.0° BMI</u>

Enclosure - Attachment 2 Document No.: <u>C-7789-00-2</u> Revision No.: 1 Attachment Page: <u>1 of 4</u> DESCRIPTION: FEA of Palo Verde BMI NOZZLES (0.0 DEG) REVISION A: Westinghouse Cyclic Stress-Strain Nozzle Props ANALYSIS DATE (YYMMDD): 20040524. ANSYS VERSION: 8.0 cirse.base MODEL VERSION: 2.4.6 TITLE: PV BMI (0.0d, 45.2k, 3.00/0.75, 0.000,A) Max. Hoop Stress (psi) Max. Axial Stress (psi) Downhill Uphill Downhill Uphill 817. 21851. I.S. Below Weld 21851. 817. I.S. Above Weld 16457. 16457. -576. -576. Midwall Below Weld 27495. 27495. Midwall Above Weld 12575. 12575. Max. Lateral Deflection: -.0000" Max. Ovality: 0.0000" ** Uphill side, above weld **
 Max Hoop
 @ Node
 1. Hoop:
 16457.
 Axial:
 -576.
 Ratio:-28.55

 Max Axial
 @ Node
 1.
 Axial:
 -576.
 Hoop:
 16457.
 Ratio:-28.55
 ** Uphill side, below weld ** Max Hoop @ Node 1401. Hoop : 21851. Axial: -11924. Ratio: -1.83 Max Axial @ Node 1901. Axial: 817. Hoop: 3118. Ratio: 3.82 ** Downhill side, above weld ** Max Hoop @ Node 80001. Hoop : 16457. Axial: -576. Ratio:-28.55 Max Axial @ Node 80001. Axial: -576. Hoop : 16457. Ratio:-28.55 ** Downhill side, below weld ** Max Hoop @ Node 81401. Hoop : 21851. Axial: -11924. Ratio: -1.83 Max Axial @ Node 81901. Axial: 817. Hoop : 3118. Ratio: 3.82 SYD=45172.HDALLOY=533.HPRESS=3110.OPRESS=2250.CTHK=0.1600STHK=6.6600SA=96.5200THETA= 0.00 TOR=1.5005 TIR=0.3750HCBORE=0.000HCBOTZ= 0.000LTIP=1.9000HGRATE= 75.TRIMFLAG=0.OTEMP=565.BUTTFIX=2.BOTZAUTO=0.HCBOTINC= 0.000PARATRIM=0.TRIMANG= 0.00FOURPASS=0.PRESSFLG=0.OTEMP=1. CYLSHELL=0. NOBUTTER=0. STRRLF=1. DD3= 0.6325 DD4= 0.8145 DD5= 0.8094 DD8= 1.1295 DD9= 1.1119 DD10= 0.4397 DD1= 1.0000 DD2= 1.2500 DDI= 1.0000 DD2= 1.2500 DD6= 1.0397 DD7= 0.8795 DD11=-0.3450 DDRF= 0.7824 UU1= 1.0000UU2= 1.2500UU3= 0.6325UU4= 0.8145UU5= 0.8094UU6= 1.0397UU7= 0.8795UU8= 1.1295UU9= 1.1119UU10= 0.4397 UU11=-0.3450 UURF= 0.7824 CIRC EXT=180. NRTUBE= 8. NCIRC= 8. NRWELD= 6. NRBUTT= 1. NRBASE= 6.NATTIP= 6.NACLAD= 2.NAWELD= 6.NAHOLE=10.NAEXTN= 2.GRAD1= 6.0GRAD2= 4.0GRAD3= 4.0GRAD4= 5.0GRAD5= 5.5GRAD6= 7.9GSTIF=0.50E+09 F REP= 0. W REP= 0.EMB FLAW= 0. Head Counterbore Unselect Flags (0-8 in order): 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. Tube Counterbore Unselect Flags (0-8 in order): 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. HGTARG=3350.0 PASS1MXT=3337.2 PASS2MXT=3362.6

Enclosure - Attachment 2 Document No.: <u>C-7789-0</u>0-2 Revision No.: ____ 1 Attachment Page: <u>2 of 4</u> DESCRIPTION: FEA of Palo Verde BMI NOZZLES (26.59 DEG) REVISION A: Westinghouse Cyclic Stress-Strain Nozzle Props ANALYSIS DATE (YYMMDD): 20040524. ANSYS VERSION: 8.0 cirse.base MODEL VERSION: 2.4.6 TITLE: PV BMI (26.6d, 45.2k, 3.00/0.75, 0.000, A) Max. Hoop Stress (psi) Max. Axial Stress (psi) Downhill Uphill Downhill Uphill 10586. I.S. Below Weld 38921. 35655. 8477. I.S. Above Weld 3125. -3457. 34552. -931. Midwall Below Weld 46568. 23807. Midwall Above Weld 29721. 1468. _____ Max. Lateral Deflection: 0.0261" Max. Ovality: 0.0039" ** Uphill side, above weld ** Max Hoop @ Node 1. Hoop : 3125. Axial: -3457. Ratio: -0.90 Max Axial @ Node 1. Axial: -3457. Hoop : 3125. Ratio: -0.90 ** Uphill side, below weld ** Max Hoop @ Node 1501. Hoop : 35655. Axial: 2908. Ratio: 12.26 Max Axial @ Node 1601. Axial: 8477. Hoop: 31781. Ratio: 3.75 ** Downhill side, above weld ** Max Hoop @ Node 80501. Hoop: 34552. Axial: -9428. Ratio: -3.66 Max Axial @ Node 80101. Axial: -931. Hoop: -2672. Ratio: 2.87 ** Downhill side, below weld ** Max Hoop @ Node 81101. Hoop : 38921. Axial: 572. Ratio: 68.04 Max Axial @ Node 81401. Axial: 10586. Hoop : 13336. Ratio: 1.26 HPRESS=3110. SYD=45172. HDALLOY=533. OPRESS=2250. SA=96.5200 CTHK=0.1600 STHK=6.6600 THETA=26.59 TOR=1.5005
 TIR=0.3750
 HCBORE=0.000
 HCBOTZ= 0.000
 LTIP=2.6000

 HGRATE= 75.
 TRIMFLAG=0.
 OTEMP=565.
 BUTTFIX=2.

 BOTZAUTO=0.
 HCBOTINC= 0.000
 PARATRIM=0.
 TRIMANG= 0.000
 FOURPASS=0. PRESSFLG=0. CYLSHELL=0. NOBUTTER=0. STRRLF=1. DD3= 0.8996 DD4= 1.1317 DD8= 1.1295 DD9= 1.1295 DD1= 0.9080 DD2= 1.1315 DD5= 0.8905 DD6= 1.1150 DD7= 0.8795 DD10= 0.4398 DD11=-0.3016 DDRF= 0.7338 UU2= 1.4975 UU3= 0.6803 UU4= 0.6694 UU8= 1.1295 UU9= 1.1032 UU1= 1.2739 UU5= 0.7894 UU7= 0.8795 UURF= 0.2373 UU6= 1.0194 UU10= 0.4398 UU11=-0.1187 NCIRC= 8. CIRC EXT=180. NRTUBE= 8. NRWELD= 6. NRBUTT= 1. NRBASE= 6. NATTIP= 6. NACLAD= 2. NAWELD= 6. NAHOLE=10. NAEXTN= 2. GRAD1= 6.0 GRAD2 = 4.0GRAD3= 4.0 GRAD4= 5.0 GRAD6= 7.9 GRAD5= 5.5 GSTIF=0.50E+09 F REP= 0. W REP= 0. EMB_FLAW= 0. Head Counterbore Unselect Flags (0-8 in order): 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. Tube Counterbore Unselect Flags (0-8 in order): 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. HGTARG=3350.0 PASS1MXT=3347.7 PASS2MXT=3354.0

Enclosure - Attachment 2

Document No.: <u>C-7789-00-2</u>

Revision No.: _____1

Attachment Page: <u>3 of 4</u>

DESCRIPTION: FEA of Palo Verde BMI NOZZLES (37.91 DEG) REVISION A: Westinghouse Cyclic Stress-Strain Nozzle Props ANALYSIS DATE (YYMMDD): 20040524. ANSYS VERSION: 8.0 cirse.base MODEL VERSION: 2.4.6 TITLE: PV BMI (37.9d, 45.2k, 3.00/0.75, 0.000, A) Max. Hoop Stress (psi) Max. Axial Stress (psi) Downhill Uphill Downhill Uphill I.S. Below Weld 44617. 42995. 16799. 20096. I.S. Above Weld 43700. 651. 19201. -2706. Midwall Below Weld 55978. 27288. Midwall Above Weld 41823. Ο. -----Max. Lateral Deflection: 0.0354" Max. Ovality: 0.0073" ** Uphill side, above weld ** Max Hoop @ Node 1. Hoop : 651. Axial: -3471. Ratio: -0.19 Max Axial @ Node 501. Axial: -2706. Hoop : -14064. Ratio: 5.20 ** Uphill side, below weld ** Max Hoop @ Node 1501. Hoop: 42995. Axial: 14196. Ratio: 3.03 Max Axial @ Node 1601. Axial: 20096. Hoop: 40637. Ratio: 2.02 ** Downhill side, above weld ** Max Hoop @ Node 80501. Hoop : 43700. Axial: 7472. Ratio: 5.85 Max Axial @ Node 80401. Axial: 19201. Hoop : 43165. Ratio: 2.25 ** Downhill side, below weld ** Max Hoop @ Node 80801. Hoop : 44617. Axial: -1712. Ratio:-26.06 Max Axial @ Node 81101. Axial: 16799. Hoop : 38226. Ratio: 2.28 HDALLOY=533. HPRESS-510 SA=96.5200 HPRESS=3110. OPRESS=2250. SA=96.5200 THETA=37.91 SYD=45172. CTHK=0.1600 STHK=6.6600 TOR=1.5005 TIR=0.3750HCBORE=0.000HCBOTZ= 0.000LTIP=3.0000HGRATE= 75.TRIMFLAG=0.OTEMP=565.BUTTFIX=2.BOTZAUTO=0.HCBOTINC= 0.000PARATRIM=0.TRIMANG= 0.00FOURPASS=0.PRESSFLG=0.CONSTRUCTION CYLSHELL=0. NOBUTTER=0. STRRLF=1. DD1= 0.8167 DD2= 1.0139 DD3= 0.9825 DD4= 1.2118 DD5= 0.8795 DD3= 0.9825 DD4= 1.2118 DD5= 0.8795 DD8= 1.1295 DD9= 1.1295 DD10= 0.4397 DD1= 0.8107 DD2= 1.0139 DD6= 1.1295 DD7= 0.8795 DD11=-0.2584 DDRF= 0.6718 UU1=1.3215UU2=1.5187UU3=0.5118UU4=0.5006UU6=1.0325UU7=0.8795UU8=1.1284UU9=1.0978 UU5= 0.8277 UU10= 0.4397 UU11=-0.0000 UURF= 0.0000 CIRC EXT=180. NRTUBE= 8. NCIRC= 8. NRWELD= 6. NRBUTT= 1.NRBASE= 6.NATTIP= 6.NACLAD= 2.NAWELD= 6.NAHOLE=10.NAEXTN= 2.GRAD1= 6.0GRAD2= 4.0GRAD3= 4.0GRAD4= 5.0GRAD5= 5.5GRAD6= 7.9GSTIF=0.50E+09

F REP= 0. W REP= 0.

EMB FLAW= 0.

Head Counterbore Unselect Flags (0-8 in order): 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. Tube Counterbore Unselect Flags (0-8 in order): 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. HGTARG=3350.0 PASS1MXT=3346.6 PASS2MXT=3355.3

Enclosure - Attachment 2 Document No.: <u>C-7789-00-2</u> Revision No.: _____1 Attachment Page: <u>4 of 4</u> DESCRIPTION: FEA of Palo Verde BMI NOZZLES (49.03 DEG) REVISION A: Westinghouse Cyclic Stress-Strain Nozzle Props ANALYSIS DATE (YYMMDD): 20040524. ANSYS VERSION: 8.0 cirse.base MODEL VERSION: 2.4.6 TITLE: PV BMI (49.0d, 45.2k, 3.00/0.75, 0.000, A) Max. Hoop Stress (psi) Max. Axial Stress (psi) Downhill Uphill Downhill Uphill 20399. I.S. Below Weld 55735. 47413. 28412. I.S. Above Weld 54862. 621. 32703. -1200.Midwall Below Weld 62227. 27662. Midwall Above Weld 51194. 0. Max. Lateral Deflection: 0.0416" Max. Ovality: 0.0099" ** Uphill side, above weld ** Max Hoop @ Node 1. Hoop : 621. Axial: -3368. Ratio: -0.18 Max Axial @ Node 401. Axial: -1200. Hoop : -10584. Ratio: 8.82 ** Uphill side, below weld ** Max Hoop @ Node 1501. Hoop : 47413. Axial: 24156. Ratio: 1.96 Max Axial @ Node 1601. Axial: 28412. Hoop : 45514. Ratio: 1.60 ** Downhill side, above weld ** Max Hoop @ Node 80601. Hoop: 54862. Axial: 18023. Ratio: 3.04 Max Axial @ Node 80401. Axial: 32703. Hoop: 48236. Ratio: 1.48 ** Downhill side, below weld ** Max Hoop @ Node 80701. Hoop: 55735. Axial: 18405. Ratio: 3.03 Max Axial @ Node 81001. Axial: 20399. Hoop: 38565. Ratio: 1.89 OPRESS=2250. THETA=49.03 SYD=45172. HDALLOY=533. HPRESS=3110.
 SYD=45172.
 HDALLOY=533.
 HPRESS=3110.

 CTHK=0.1600
 STHK=6.6600
 SA=96.5200
 TOR=1.5005 TIR=0.3750HCBORE=0.000HCBOTZ= 0.000LTIP=3.5000HGRATE= 75.TRIMFLAG=0.OTEMP=565.BUTTFIX=2.BOTZAUTO=0.HCBOTINC= 0.000PARATRIM=0.TRIMANG= 0.00FOURPASS=0.PRESSFLG=0.OTEMP=565.TRIMANG= 0.00 CYLSHELL=0. NOBUTTER=0. STRRLF=1. DD1= 0.7071 DD2= 0.8710 DD3= 1.0086DD4= 1.2719DD5= 0.8795DD8= 1.1295DD9= 1.1295DD10= 0.4397 DD6= 1.1295 DD7= 0.8795 DD11=-0.2005 DDRF= 0.5947 UU1=1.3189UU2=1.4828UU3=0.4519UU4=0.4687UU6=0.9909UU7=0.8795UU8=1.1288UU9=1.0817 UU5= 0.8288 UU10= 0.4397 UU11=-0.0000 UURF= 0.0000 CIRC EXT=180. NRTUBE= 8. NCIRC= 8. NRWELD= 6. NRBUTT= 1. NATTIP= 6.NACLAD= 2.NAWELD= 6.NAHOLE=10.GRAD1= 6.0GRAD2= 4.0GRAD3= 4.0GRAD4= 5.0 NRBASE= 6. GRAD2= 4.0 G GSTIF=0.50E+09 NAEXTN= 2. GRAD5= 5.5 GRAD6= 7.9 F REP= 0. W REP= 0. EMB FLAW= 0. Head Counterbore Unselect Flags (0-8 in order): 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. Tube Counterbore Unselect Flags (0-8 in order): 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. HGTARG=3350.0 PASS1MXT=3341.9 PASS2MXT=3357.9

Enclosure - Attachment 2 Document No.: <u>C-7789-00-2</u> Revision No.: <u>1</u> Attachment Page: <u>1 of 6</u>

```
RESU,,dbs,../
/PAGE,,,10000,200
/POST1
file,,rst,../
1
TW4=1.5 ! zoom in for weld plots
/GRAPHICS, FULL
CSYS,11
CLOCAL, 71, 1, 0, 0, NZ(1+NRTUBE) ! Local CSYS at lower tube edge
CSYS,11
RSYS,11
/COM,
/COM,
      _____
/COM, **** Get lateral deflection and ovality ****
     /COM,
/COM,
SET,,,,,T0+1.0
*DO, I, 0, ncirc, 1
  *DIM, DEFCOL%1%, TABLE, (NNUM23-1) /100+1
*ENDDO
RSYS,11
/COM,
/COM, ** Fill node axial distance vs. radial deflection table arrays
*DO, I, 0, ncirc, 1
  K=1
  *DO, J, I*10000+1, I*10000+NNUM23, 100
     DEFCOL%I%(K)=UX(J)
     DEFCOL%I%(K, 0) = NZ(J)
     K = K + 1
  *ENDDO
*ENDDO
*DO, I, 0, ncirc, 1
  DEFCOL%I%(0,1)=1.0
*ENDDO
/COM,
/COM, ** Interpolate to get deflection and ovality at desired locations
*DO, I, 0, ncirc, 0
  LOC2DEF(I+1)=DEFCOL%I%(NZ(NNUM1)-0.5)
  LOC3DEF(I+1) = DEFCOL%I%(NZ(NNUM1))
  LOC4DEF(I+1) = DEFCOL%I% (NZ (NNUM14))
  LOCXDEF(I+1) = DEFCOL%I%(NZ(ncirc*10000+NNUM1))
*ENDDO
*GET, FNAME, ACTIVE, 0, JOBNAM
/OUT,%FNAME%.W Data,out
/COM,
/COM,RADIAL DEFRADIAL DEFRADIAL DEFRADIAL DEF/COM,COL #@ LOC 2@ LOC 3@ LOC 4@ LOC "X"
*VWRITE, SEQU, LOC2DEF(1), LOC3DEF(1), LOC4DEF(1), LOCXDEF(1)
(F5.0, 3X, 5(F10.5, 3X))
/COM,
/COM,
          *****
/COM,
/COM,
     ------
/COM.
/OUT
/COM,
/COM,
     -----
               _____
/COM,
            **** Get gap force data ****
```

Enclosure - Attachment 2 Document No.: C-7789-00-2 Revision No.: _____1 Attachment Page: <u>2 of 6</u> /COM, -----/COM, SET,,,,,T0+4.0 ETABLE, GAPFORCE, SMISC, 2 ESEL, S, TYPE, , 2 ESEL, R, REAL, , 1 /OUT, %FNAME%.W Data, out, , APPEND /COM, Force in all gap elements in interference region PRETAB /COM, /COM, /OUT, NSLE NSEL, R, NODE, , 1+NRTUBE, (ncirc+1) *10000, 100 NSEL, A, NODE, , 1+NRTUBE DSYS,71 /OUT,%FNAME%.W_Data,out,,APPEND /COM, Location of all gap elements in interference region - Rel to tube bottom OD NLIST /COM, _____ /COM, /COM, /OUT, /COM, /COM, /COM, **** Get stress data **** /COM, /COM, NSEL,ALL ESEL, ALL ! Node 0.5" below downhill weld NTMP1=NODE (NX(1), NY(1), NZ(NNUM1)-0.5) NTMP2=NODE (NX (ncirc*10000+1), NY (ncirc*10000+1), NZ (ncirc*10000+NNUM1)-0.5) ! Node 0.5" below uphill weld NSEL, S, NODE, , NTMP1, NTMP1+NRTUBE NSEL, A, NODE, , NTMP2, NTMP2+NRTUBE /OUT, %FNAME%.W_Data, out,, APPEND /COM, Tube through-thickness stress at 0.5" below weld bottom PRNS, COMP /COM, /COM, _____ /COM, /OUT, NSEL, S, NODE, , NNUM1, NNUM2 NSEL, A, NODE, , ncirc*10000+NNUM1, ncirc*10000+NNUM2 /OUT,%FNAME%.W_Data,out,,APPEND /COM, Tube through-thickness stress at weld bottom PRNS,COMP /COM, /COM, _____ /COM, /OUT, NSEL, S, NODE, , NNUM9, NNUM10 NSEL, A, NODE, , ncirc*10000+NNUM9, ncirc*10000+NNUM10 /OUT,%FNAME%.W_Data,out,,APPEND /COM, Tube through-thickness stress at weld middle PRNS, COMP /COM, /COM, ______ /COM, /OUT,

Document No.: <u>C-7789-00-2</u> Revision No.: 1 Attachment Page: <u>3 of 6</u> 1 NSEL, S, NODE, , NNUM14, NNUM15, 1 NSEL, A, NODE, , ncirc*10000+NNUM14, ncirc*10000+NNUM15, 1 /OUT, %FNAME%.W_Data, out,, APPEND /COM, Tube through-thickness stress at weld top PRNS, COMP /COM, _____ /COM, /COM, /OUT, NSEL,ALL NTMP1=NODE (NX(1), NY(1), NZ(NNUM14)+0.5) ! Node 0.5" above downhill weld NTMP2=NODE (NX (ncirc*10000+1), NY (ncirc*10000+1), NZ (ncirc*10000+NNUM14)+0.5) ! Node 0.5" above uphill weld NSEL, S, NODE, , NTMP1, NTMP1+NRTUBE NSEL, A, NODE, , NTMP2, NTMP2+NRTUBE /OUT, %FNAME%.W Data, out,, APPEND /COM, Tube through-thickness stress at 0.5" above weld top PRNS, COMP /COM, /COM, _____ /COM, /OUT, NSEL, S, NODE, , 1, NNUM23, 100 NSEL, A, NODE, , ncirc*10000+1, ncirc*10000+NNUM23, 100 /OUT, %FNAME%.W Data, out,, APPEND /COM, Tube ID stresses at uphill and downhill PRNS, COMP /COM, /COM, /COM, Location of ID nodes relative to tube bottom OD $% \left(\mathcal{A}^{\prime}\right) =\left(\mathcal{A}^{\prime}\right) \left(\mathcal{A}^{\prime}\right)$ NLIST /OUT NSEL, S, NODE, , 1+NRTUBE, NNUM23+NRTUBE, 100 NSEL, A, NODE, , ncirc*10000+1+NRTUBE, ncirc*10000+NNUM23+NRTUBE, 100 /OUT, %FNAME%.W_Data, out,, APPEND /COM, /COM, /COM, Tube OD stresses at uphill and downhill PRNS, COMP /COM, /COM, /COM, Location of OD nodes relative to tube bottom OD NLIST /COM, /COM, /COM, /OUT, RSYS, SOLU NSEL, NONE NSEL, A, NODE, , NNUM14, NNUM15, 1 *REPEAT, ncirc+1, ,, ,10000, 10000 /OUT, %FNAME%.W Data, out,, APPEND /COM, Tube stresses along plane opposite top of weld (Element-oriented CS) PRNS, COMP /COM, /COM, _____ /COM, /OUT, nsel,all

Enclosure - Attachment 2

Enclosure - Attachment 2

Document No.: <u>C-7789-00-2</u>

Revision No.: <u>1</u>

Attachment Page: <u>4 of 6</u>

```
esel,all
dsys,0
csys,11
/show,pscr
pscr, color, 1
pscr, scale, .180
pscr, tranx, 60
pscr, trany, 200
pscr, rotate, 0
*CREATE, WELDPLOT
   /COM,
           This macro makes tube stress plots with the geometry of the rest of The model in the background. Use the following arguments for ARG1:
    /COM,
   /COM,
   /COM,
    /COM,
                ARG1 = 1
                                  (hoop plot)
                ARG1 = 3 (at a plot)
   /COM,
   /COM,
                                 (stress intensity plot)
   /COM,
                ARG2 = results co-ordinate system (RSYS)
   /COM,
    /COM,
   /COM, Set up for frontal view of model:
   /VIEW, 1, 1
   /ANG,1,VANG
   /DIST, 1, TW4*2.75*TOR
   /FOCUS,1,-8.02,Y,SQRT(FILLETR**2-Y**2)
   /DSC,1,OFF
   ESEL, S, LIVE
   NSLE
                           ! Select tube nodes and elements
   /TYPE,1,4
   /EDGE,1,1
                           ! Alternate contours for stress plot
   /PLOPTS, DEFA
                            ! Standard legend
   /PLOPTS, INFO, 1
                           ! !!!!!!!!!! Control style of EPLO
   /COLOR, DEFA
   /CVAL, 1, -10000, 0, 10000, 20000, 30000, 40000, 50000, 100000
   /graphics,power
                                                                   ! ADDED THIS !!
   avres,1
                                                                   ! ADDED THIS !!
   RSYS, ARG2
   *IF, ARG1, EQ, 1, THEN
      PLNS,S,Y ! Make hoop plot
   *ELSEIF, ARG1, EQ, 2, THEN
      PLNS,S,Z
                       ! Make axial plot
   *ELSE
      PLNS, S, INT ! Make stress intensity plot
   *ENDIF
   ESEL, ALL
   NSEL, ALL
   /graphics, full
*END
1
SET,,,,,T0+4.0
*USE,WELDPLOT,1,11
*USE,WELDPLOT,2,11
*USE,WELDPLOT, 3, 11
RSYS, SOLU
/pnum,type,1
/num,1
/color,num,blac,1
/view,1,-1
/type,1,4
/ang,1
```

Enclosure - Attachment 2 Document No.: <u>C-7789-00-2</u> 1 Revision No.: Attachment Page: <u>5 of 6</u> /vup,1,z /CVAL, 1, -10000, 0, 10000, 20000, 30000, 40000, 50000, 100000 /auto /edge,1 esel,s,mat,,1 *IF, THETA, LT, 40.0, THEN /view,1,-1,,+1 *ÈLSE /view,1,-1,,+2 *ENDIF /dsc,1,10 /type,1,4 /user /noera esel,all esel,u,elem,,1,NNUM14-1 *repeat, ncirc, ,, ,10000,10000 esel,u,elem,,NNUM14+100,10000 *repeat, ncirc,,,,10000,10000 /edge,1,1 nsel, none nsel,a,node,,nnum14,nnum15 *repeat, ncirc+1,,,,10000,10000 /type,1,0 plns,s,y /auto /edge,1 esel, s, mat, , 1 *IF, THETA, LT, 40.0, THEN /view,1,-1,,+1 *ELSE /view,1,-1,,+2 *ENDIF /dsc,1,10 /type,1,4 /user /noera esel,all esel, u, elem, , 1, NNUM14-1 *repeat,ncirc,,,,10000,10000 esel,u,elem,,NNUM14+100,10000 *repeat,ncirc,,,,10000,10000 /edge,1,1 nsel, none nsel,a,node,,nnum14,nnum15

/era

nsle

pldi

/era

nsle

pldi

/type,1,0 plns,s,z

/GRAPHICS, FULL *CREATE, WELDTAB ESEL, S, LIVE

*repeat,ncirc+1,,,,10000,10000

1

Enclosure - Attachment 2

Document No.: <u>C-7789-00-2</u>

Revision No.: <u>1</u>

Attachment Page: <u>6 of 6</u>

NSLE PRNS, S, COMP NSEL,ALL ESEL, ALL *END ŀ SET,,,,,T0+4.0 RSYS,SOLU /OUT,%FNAME%.results,txt *USE,WELDTAB /OUT,%FNAME%.nodelocs,txt DSYS,11 NLIST /OUT 1 FINISH /DELETE,WELDTAB /DELETE,WELDPLOT FINISH /exit,nosav