

50-275/323

NRC DISTRIBUTION FOR PART 50 DOCKET MATERIAL

FILE NUMBER

PSAR/FSAR AMDT DIST.

TO:
Mr. John F. Stolz

FROM:
Pacific Gas & Elec. Company
San Francisco, California
Philip A. Crane, Jr.

DATE OF DOCUMENT
12/1/77

DATE RECEIVED
12/5/77

LETTER
 ORIGINAL
 COPY

NOTORIZED
 UNCLASSIFIED

PROP

INPUT FORM

NUMBER OF COPIES RECEIVED
1516 NR0

DESCRIPTION

(1-P)

PLANT NAME: Diablo Canyon Units 1 & 2
RJL 12/6/77

ENCLOSURE

Consists of responses to two NRC questions on the Unit No. 1 structural integrity test.....

(3-P)

*40 ENCL **

FOR ACTION/INFORMATION

ASSIGNED AD: (LTR)	<i>VASSALLO</i>
BRANCH CHIEF:	<i>STOLZ</i>
PROJECT MANAGER:	<i>ALLISON</i>
LICENSING ASST: (LTR)	<i>HYLTON</i>

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REG FILE	LAINAS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NRC RDR	IPPOLITO
I & E	F. ROSA
OELD (LTR)	GAMMILL (2)
P. COLLINS	VOLLNER (LTR)
HOUSTON	BUNCH
HELTEMES	J. COLLINS
CASE (LTR)	KREGER
MIPC (LTR)	<i>R. KIRKWOOD</i>
KNIGHT (LTR)	
BOSNAK	
SIHWEIL	
PAWLICKI	
ROSS (LTR)	
NOVAK	
ROSZTOCZY	
CHECK	
TEDESCO (LTR)	
BENAROYA	


EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

LPRD: <i>SAN LUIS OBISPO CA</i>
TIC
NSIC
ACRS 16 CYS SENT CATEGORY <i>A</i>

CONTROL NUMBER

MISC 4

773400061



REGULATORY DOCKET COMPANY

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

PG&E + 77 BEALE STREET, 31ST FLOOR • SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94106 • (415) 781-4211

JOHN C. MORRISSEY
VICE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL COUNSEL

MALCOLM H. FURBUSH
ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL

CHARLES T. VAN DEUSEN
PHILIP A. CRANE, JR.
HENRY J. LAPLANTE
RICHARD A. CLARKE
JOHN B. GIBSON
ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL



GILBERT L. HARRICK
GLENN WEST, JR.
CHARLES W. THIBBELL
DANIEL E. GIBSON
JOSEPH I. KELLY
HOWARD V. GOLUB

EDWARD J. MCDANNEY
ARTHUR L. HILLMAN, JR.
ROBERT GINSBACH
DAN GRAYSON LUSBOCK
JACK F. FALLIN, JR.

SENIOR COUNSEL

JOSHUA BAR-LEV
ROBERT L. BORDON
LEIGH S. CASSIDY
BRIAN S. DEATON
JOSEPH S. ENGLERT, JR.
JOHN N. FRYE
KATHY DRAMAM
PETER W. HANSCHEN
JUAN M. JAYO
F. RONALD LAUPHEIMER
MEREK E. LIPSON
JAMES C. LOGBDON
RICHARD M. MOSE
ROBERT R. RICKETT
SHIRLEY A. SANDERSON
JACK W. SHUCK
SHIRLEY WOO

J. PETER BAUMBARTNER
STEVEN P. BURKE
BERNARD J. DELLABANTA
WILLIAM M. EDWARDS
DONALD ERICKSON
BARBARA A. GOODE
ANNETTE GREEN
ROBERT L. HARRIS
KERRIT R. KUBITZ
THEODORE L. LINDBERG, JR.
RICHARD F. LOOKE
RICHARD L. MEISS
DOUGLAS A. OGLESBY
IVOR E. SAMSON
SUE ANN SCHIFF
DAVID J. WILLIAMSON
BRUCE R. WORTHINGTON

ATTORNEYS

Mr. John F. Stolz, Chief
Light Water Reactors Branch No. 1
Division of Project Management
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Re: Docket No. 50-275-OL
Docket No. 50-323-OL
Diablo Canyon Units 1 & 2

Dear Mr. Stolz:

Attached to this letter are our responses to the two questions on the Unit 1 structural integrity test which were enclosed in your letter of August 24, 1977.

Kindly acknowledge receipt of the above material on the enclosed copy of this letter and return it to me in the enclosed addressed envelope.

Very truly yours,

Philip A. Crane, Jr.

Enclosures
CC w/enc.: Service List

773400061



1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025

1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025

1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
DIABLO CANYON SITE, UNIT NO. 1
CONTAINMENT STRUCTURE STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY TEST

Additional Information Requested by
USNRC Letter Dated August 24, 1977

Item 10

Your response to Item 7 did not provide any factual data from actual structural integrity tests upon which the conclusion could be drawn that the 20% margin of error for calculated displacements is indeed acceptable as you concluded. Furthermore, since your response to Item 2 suggests that the establishing of the 20% margin of error was based on a study of some data it is necessary that this data be provided to the staff to justify your conclusion. While the 20% margin of error may prove to be quite adequate you must provide an adequate basis, preferably from the structural integrity test of other containments, upon which such a margin can be established.

Response

We considered several factors affecting prediction accuracy:

a) Residual stress due to concrete shrinkage

A minimum shrinkage strain ϵ_s of 0.0002 inches per inch was assumed. The resulting compressive strain in reinforcing is relieved when concrete is cracked during the test, causing additional displacement Δ_s .

$$\Delta_s = \epsilon_s R = 0.0002 \times 876 = 0.175''$$


(R = 876" = radius of hoop reinforcing)

b) Measurement Errors

The measurement accuracy is 1/32". If errors of this magnitude are made at zero and 54 psi pressure, the total error is $\Delta_e = 1/16'' = 0.063''$

c) Temperature Variations

10°F temperature difference results in radial expansion of
 $\Delta_t = (\epsilon_t) (t) (R) = 5.5 \times 10^{-6} \times 10 \times 884 = 0.049''$



Where:

ϵ_t = concrete thermal expansion coefficient

t = temperature differential

R = Containment radius

d) Out of Roundness Adjustment

"As-built" deviations of the containment shell from a circular shape were a maximum of four inches. Relatively large shape adjustments were expected as the structure sought a circular configuration under pressure. We assumed the average of the six measurements at each level to represent radial displacement and deviations from the average to represent shape adjustments. But with only six measurements over a 460 foot circumference, inward and outward adjustments might not average out. Thus we felt it reasonable to allow 1/8" to account for this "out of roundness" adjustment.

The total of these factors is 0.412". This represents 44 percent of the maximum calculated radial displacement of the containment which seemed excessive. Therefore a study of other containment integrity tests was made to determine if more stringent limits might reasonably be established.

This study showed the 20% margin used on the Robert E. Ginna test was the most stringent limit successfully met. Considering that the most adverse simultaneous occurrence of all factors was unlikely it is reasonable to combine them on a square root-sum of squares basis. The maximum error in this case is 0.225" which represents a 24% margin. Taking this and the successful Ginna experience into account a 20% margin was adopted.

Item 11

In your response to Item 9 you made several statements on Page 5 in the paragraph entitled "Strains, Stresses" which need explanation:

- (1) The purpose of the structural integrity test is to verify the behavior of the structure predicted by the analysis. Consequently, some acceptance standard should be set up prior to the structural integrity test being performed. Your statement that "no such standards were set for strain gage readings and no attempt was made to predict them". should be explained.



1 2 3

4 5 6

- (2) You indicated that some readings were used for evaluation of the structural performance and others rejected. The report also contains a statement that the readings which have been used "appear consistent with other recorded data and credible..." This statement suggests that you are in possession of some additional information or "recorded data" which you used as an acceptance standard.

You are requested to provide the above noted specific information.

Response

- (1) Our study of other tests showed only very general correlation between strain gage readings and the test variables. We observed large differences in readings of gages with theoretically identical stress and erratic stress variations with changing internal pressure. Large margins of error compromising the test objectives would be needed to allow for these discrepancies. For this reason, we concluded it was not practical to set meaningful acceptance criteria beforehand, without the benefit of a thorough evaluation and interpretation of the strain gage test data as well as consideration of the other data obtained during the test such as displacement and cracking patterns. We feel the basic objective of strain gage instrumentation - a complete evaluation of strain distribution - has been accomplished.
- (2) The statement "appear consistent with other recorded data and credible..." refers to a good correlation between strains observed from two or more independent measurements and calculated values. A sample of such a correlation was given in the table on Page 7 of our response, where strain gage measurements at elevations 161 and 236 compare closely with the corresponding displacement measurements at the same elevations.

All such data is given in our test report, except that the strain gage data is given for the maximum pressure of 54 psi only. We made 23 separate strain gage data runs which provided a complete time history of readings at each gage. Malfunctioning gages could be readily identified by erratic changes of readings throughout the test and thus their credibility evaluated.

