

AEC DISTRIBUTION FOR PART 50 DOCKET MATERIAL  
(TEMPORARY FORM)

CONTROL NO: 13115  
FILE: \_\_\_\_\_

FROM: Pacific Gas & Electric Co San Francisco, Calif. Jr. F.T. Earls		DATE OF DOC 12-27-74	DATE REC'D 12-30-74	LTR x	TWX	RPT	OTHER
TO: O.D. Parr		ORIG none signed	CC	OTHER	SENT AEC PDR <u>XXX</u>		SENT LOCAL PDR <u>XXX</u>
CLASS	UNCLASS XXX	PROP INFO	INPUT	NO CYS REC'D 1	DOCKET NO: <u>50-275/323</u>		

DESCRIPTION:  
Ltr re our request dtd 12-6-74....trans the following.....  
  
Dist Per Wilson  
PLANT NAME: Diablo Canyon

ENCLOSURES:  
Requested info concerning the Seismic response of typical Design Class I structures systems and components.....  
  
(1 cy encl rec'd)  
**ACKNOWLEDGED**

FOR ACTION/INFORMATION 1-6-75 JB

BUTLER (L) W/ Copies	SCHWENCER (L) W/ Copies	ZIEMANN (L) W/ Copies	REGAN (E) W/ Copies
CLARK (L) W/ Copies	STOLZ (L) W/ Copies	DICKER (E) W/ Copies	LEAR (L) W/ Copies
✓ PARR (L) W/ Copies	VASSALLO (L) W/ Copies	KNIGHTON (E) W/ Copies	
KNIEL (L) W/ Copies	PURPLE (L) W/ Copies	YOUNGBLOOD (E) W/ Copies	

**DO NOT REMOVE**

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

<u>REG FILE</u> AEC-PDR OGC, ROOM P-506A MUNTZING/STAFF CASE GIAMBUSSO BOYD MOORE (L) (BWR) DEYOUNG (L) (PWR) SKOVHOLT (L) GOLLER (L) P. COLLINS DENISE REG OPR FILE & REGION 2 MORRIS STEELE	<u>TECH REVIEW</u> SCHROEDER ✓ MACCARY KNIGHT PAWLICKI ✓ SHAO STELLO HOUSTON NOVAK ROSS IPPOLITO TEDESCO LONG LAINAS BENAROYA VOLINER	<u>DENTON</u> GRIMES ✓ GAMMILL KASTNER BALLARD SPANGLER  <u>ENVIRO</u> MULLER DICKER KNIGHTON YOUNGBLOOD REGAN PROJECT LDR  <u>HARLESS</u>	<u>LIC ASST</u> DIGGS (L) GEARIN (L) GOULBOURNE (L) KREUTZER (E) LEE (L) MAIGRET (L) REED (E) SERVICE (L) SHEPPARD (L) SLATER (E) SMITH (L) TEETS (L) WILLIAMS (E) ✓ WILSON (L) (Ltr)	<u>A/T IND</u> BRAITMAN SALTZMAN B. HURT  <u>PLANS</u> MCDONALD CHAPMAN DUBE w/ input E. COUPE  D. THOMPSON (2) KLECKER EISENHUT  ✓ C. Stepp (2)
---	--	---	---	---

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

- |  |                                 |                                |  |
|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| ✓ 1 - LOCAL PDR <u>San Luis Obispo, Calif.</u> | 1 - TIC (ABERNATHY) (1)(2)(10)  | 1 - NATIONAL LABS              | ✓ 2 - PDR SAN/LA/XXX                   |
| 1 - NSIC (BUCHANAN)                            | 1 - ASLBP (E W Bldg, Rm 529)    | 1 - W. PENNINGTON, Rm E-201 GT | 1 - BROOKHAVEN NAT LAB                 |
| 1 - ASLB                                       | 1 - B&M SHINEBROOK, Rm E-201 GT | 1 - CONSULTANTS                | 1 - G. ULRIKSON, ORNL                  |
| 1 - Newton Anderson                            | 1 - NEWMARK BLUME-AGSABIAN      |                                | 1 - AGMED (RUTH GUSMAN)<br>Rm B-127 GT |
| ✓ 16 - ACRS XXXXXXXX Sent                      |                                 |                                | 1 - R. D. MUELLER, Rm E-201<br>GT      |

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

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

FREDERICK T. SEARLS  
VICE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL COUNSEL

JOHN C. MORRISSEY  
ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL

WILLIAM B. KUDER

WILLIAM E. JOHNS

MALCOLM H. FURDUSH

CHARLES T. VAN DEUSEN

MALCOLM A. MACKILLOP

PHILIP A. CRANE, JR.

HENRY J. LAPLANTE

RICHARD A. CLARKE

JOHN D. GIBSON


ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL

December 27, 1974

NOEL KELLY  
GILBERT L. HARRICK  
EDWARD J. MCDANNEY  
GLENN WEST, JR.  
ARTHUR L. HILLMAN, JR.  
CHARLES W. THIBELLE  
ROBERT OHLBACH  
DANIEL E. GIBSON  
DAN GRAYSON LUSBRACK  
SENIOR COUNSEL

JOSEPH I. KELLY  
BERNARD J. DELLASANTA  
JACK F. FALLON, JR.  
HOWARD V. GILUS  
DONALD L. FREITAS  
JAMES C. LOOSDON  
JOSEPH S. ENGLERT, JR.  
LOUIS F. BENDFIELD  
ROBERT L. BORDON  
DENNIS C. SULLIVAN  
KATHY GRAMAM  
ROBERT L. HARRIS  
IVOR E. SANDY  
LINDA S. FRIEGMAN  
J. PETER DAUMGARTNER  
ROBERT N. SCHIFF  
RICHARD L. MEISS  
F. RONALD LAUPHEIMER  
ANNETTE GREEN  
MARSHALL LAFER  
ATTORNEYS

Mr. Olan D. Parr, Chief  
Light Water Reactors Project  
Branch 1-3  
Directorate of Licensing  
Office of Regulation  
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission  
Washington, D. C. 20545



Re: Dockets 50-275-OL  
50-323-OL

Dear Mr. Parr:

In response to your request for additional information dated December 6, 1974, the seismic response of typical Design Class I structures, systems, and components at Diablo Canyon has been determined using the modified input response spectra specified in your letter and damping values given in AEC Regulatory Guide 1.61.

The modified input spectra were derived from the acceleration time histories for the Parkfield - 5, 1966, N85E component and the Castaic, 1971, S69E component, each normalized to a peak ground acceleration of 0.5g. The spectral content of these records is considered representative of the vibratory ground motion expected at a site with foundation material similar to Diablo Canyon and generated from a nearby source.

A comparison of these modified spectra with the spectra and damping used in the Diablo Canyon design confirms the seismic design adequacy of typical Class I structures, systems and components at Diablo Canyon. The detailed results of this work are included in the attachment to this letter.

Very truly yours,

13115

Attachment (15)  
CC w/attachment: See Page 2

*F. T. Searls*



1

2

3

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

6. 7. 8. 9. 10.

11. 12. 13. 14. 15.

16. 17. 18. 19. 20.

21. 22. 23. 24. 25.

26. 27. 28. 29. 30.

31. 32. 33. 34. 35.

36. 37. 38. 39. 40.

41. 42. 43. 44. 45.

46. 47. 48. 49. 50.

51. 52. 53. 54. 55.

56. 57. 58. 59. 60.

61. 62. 63. 64. 65.

66. 67. 68. 69. 70.

71. 72. 73. 74. 75.

76. 77. 78. 79. 80.

81. 82. 83. 84. 85.

86. 87. 88. 89. 90.

91. 92. 93. 94. 95.


96. 97. 98. 99. 100.

Mr. Olan D. Parr

2

December 27, 1974

CC w/attachment: Mrs. Elizabeth E. Apfelberg  
Richard L. Black, Esq.  
Elizabeth S. Bowers, Esq.  
Mr. Glenn O. Bright  
Mr. William P. Cornwell  
Mr. Frederick Eissler  
Mr. John J. Forster  
Mr. Lonnie Valentine  
Mr. Angelo Giambusso  
Nathaniel H. Goodrich, Esq.  
Dr. William E. Martin  
Alan S. Rosenthal, Esq.  
Secretary - Attn.: Docketing and Service Section  
Mrs. Sandra A. Silver  
Andrew Skaff, Esq.  
James R. Yore, Esq.




## DIABLO CANYON UNITS 1 AND 2

INVESTIGATION OF EFFECT ON SEISMIC DESIGN USING  
PARKFIELD-5, 1966, N85E AND CASTAIC, 1971, S69E  
RECORDS (SCALED TO 0.5G PEAK ACCELERATION) AS INPUT1. INTRODUCTION

The time-histories of the Parkfield-5, 1966, N85E component and the Castaic, 1971, S69E component are plotted in Figures 1 and 2. The time-histories are scaled to have a peak acceleration of 0.5g. These components (normalized to 0.5g) will hereafter be referred to as simply Parkfield-5 and Castaic. The Double Design Earthquake (DDE, as defined in the FSAR) response spectra for 5% damping is compared with 7% damping response spectra for the Parkfield-5 and Castaic records in Figure 3. The particular choice of damping values for spectral comparison is based on the damping value used in the DDE analysis (5%) and that recommended by AEC Regulatory Guide 1.61 (7%) for reinforced concrete structures such as the containment structure.

Table 1 provides information on the period ranges where the various spectra envelope the others. It is apparent from Table 1 that for structures, systems, and equipment having significant natural modes with periods in the ranges:  $T < 0.08$  sec and  $0.34 < T < 1.0$  sec, the Parkfield-5 or Castaic ground motions may induce a greater response than the DDE. All of the Category I concrete structures, viz., the entire containment structure, including the interior structure, and the auxiliary building, have significant periods in the range  $0.08 < T < 0.34$  sec and thus their seismic design is not likely to be governed by Parkfield-5 or Castaic ground motions. The steel structure above the fuel handling area in the auxiliary building has periods in the range of 0.35 sec to 0.52 sec and its seismic response could possibly be governed by Parkfield-5 or Castaic ground motions. However, as discussed in Section 5, 2% damping was used for bolted steel structures in the DDE analysis whereas Regulatory Guide 1.61 recommends 7%.

In the next section, the results of a dynamic analysis of the containment structure with Parkfield-5 as input ground motion are compared with those from the DDE analysis. Section 3 gives a comparison of floor response spectra for selected points in the containment structure. Section 4 discusses the






effects on NSSS components. Section 5 compares analysis results from Parkfield-5 and DDE on the auxiliary building. Section 6 discusses Design Class I tanks located at grade elevation.

## 2. CONTAINMENT STRUCTURE

The same analysis procedure as described in Section 3.7 of the FSAR was used. The axisymmetric finite element model of the containment structure and the foundation rock mass is shown in Figure 3.7-5 of the FSAR. The input boundary motions corresponding to Parkfield-5 free field ground motion are derived by the same deconvolution procedure described in Section 3.7 of the FSAR. The comparison of the response spectrum of the original free field motion and that of the recomputed surface motion is made in Figure 4.

Natural mode periods and mode shapes were found to be identical as in the previous DDE analysis. These are given, respectively, in Table 3.7-1 and Figure 3.7-6 of the FSAR. In computing the responses for Parkfield-5, damping of 7% of critical was used for the concrete structure vs. the 5% used in the DDE response computations.

Table 2 through 5 compare the analysis results using the Parkfield-5 motion with corresponding responses obtained using the DDE motion. The responses compared are maximum absolute accelerations, displacements, total shears and total overturning moments. Except for the acceleration at the base slab, the Parkfield-5 responses of the containment structure are much less, or in the case of nodal point 38, only very slightly greater than the corresponding DDE responses. The higher acceleration response at the base slab for Parkfield-5 is to be expected since the peak acceleration in ground adjacent to the slab is specified as 0.5g for Parkfield-5 compared to 0.4g for DDE. The natural periods of the containment structure are all less than 0.25 sec. Noting from Figure 3 that for  $T < 0.30$  sec the Parkfield-5 and Castaic response spectra are in approximately similar relation to the DDE spectrum, and that the natural mode periods of the containment structure are all less than 0.30 sec, one may also conclude that the Castaic responses of the containment structure would be generally in the same proportion to the DDE responses as are the Parkfield-5 responses.



### 3. FLOOR RESPONSE SPECTRA - CONTAINMENT STRUCTURE

Acceleration time-histories at several nodal points of the containment structure model were derived. Acceleration response spectra for Parkfield-5 using 3%, and in some cases 4% damping were calculated at the following nodal points (see Figure 3.7-5 of the FSAR for the location of nodal points).


<u>Nodal Point</u>	<u>Elevation</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
14	231.0'	Dome spring line
19	140.0'	Top of interior structure
32	111.0'	Interior structure
34	120.5'	Exterior structure
47	88.5'	Base slab

Figures 5 through 11 compare these response spectra with DDE floor response spectra for 1/2% and 1% damping, respectively, at corresponding nodal points. Damping of 1/2% was used in seismic (DDE) analysis of piping systems vs. the 3% damping value suggested by AEC Regulatory Guide 1.61 for large piping systems under SSE. Similarly, 1% damping was used in seismic (DDE) analysis of NSSS components vs. 4% damping now accepted by AEC-DRL for the Westinghouse NSSS. The DDE floor response spectra given in FSAR section 3.7 are smoothed versions of the corresponding computer generated plots used in Figure 5 through 11.

It is immediately apparent from Figures 5 through 11 that except for  $T < 0.075$  sec at NP 47, the Parkfield-5 floor response spectra are always much lower than the DDE floor response spectra. Making the same argument as made at the end of previous section, the above conclusion can be assumed to be valid for the Castaic component also.

### 4. NSSS COMPONENTS

The nuclear steam supply system is supported in the containment (interior) structure and applicable response spectra are those at NP 47 and NP 19 for the steam generators and reactor coolant-pumps (Figure 3.7-5, FSAR). The following are the fundamental period ranges of some of the important components of NSSS.



<u>Component</u>	<u>Period Range, sec.</u>
Steam Generator	0.11 - 0.12
Reactor Coolant Pump	0.13 - 0.14
Reactor Vessel	0.06


1% damping was used in the NSSS seismic analysis for DDE. However, 4% damping in the SSE seismic analysis has been accepted by AEC-DRL for the Westinghouse NSSS. Thus, using the spectra in Figures 10 and 11, it may be concluded that the Steam Generators and Reactor Coolant Pumps are likely to see smaller seismic forces under Parkfield-5 motion than under the DDE motion. The reactor vessel is supported on the interior concrete structure at elevation 102. Comparing maximum absolute accelerations for Parkfield-5 and the DDE (see Table 2, NP 38) indicates that seismic forces on the reactor vessel are essentially the same for either seismic input. Similar conclusions may also be made for the Castaic component on the same basis as the conclusion made in the previous sections.

#### 5. AUXILIARY BUILDING

The same analysis procedure as described in Section 3.7 of the FSAR was used. The model for the auxiliary structure is shown in Figure 3.7-13 of the FSAR. The natural mode periods and mode shapes of the structure were found to be identical to those obtained for the DDE analysis. The natural periods are given in Table 3.7-8. In the DDE analysis, 2% damping was used in the steel portion of the structure (Mass No. 6 in Figure 3.7-13 of FSAR) and 5% damping in the concrete portion of the structure. In the present analysis, Parkfield-5 ground motion is used as input and 7% damping is used for both the concrete and steel portions of the structure (the steel structure has bolted connections) in accordance with AEC Regulatory Guide 1.61.

The results of the present analysis are compared with those from the DDE analysis in Tables 6 through 10. The DE analysis results are given in Tables 3.7-9 through 3.7-13 of the FSAR and the DDE responses are simply twice the DE responses.

The results presented in Tables 6 through 10 show that at no point in the structure does the Parkfield-5 ground motion govern the seismic design of the auxiliary building. This is explained by the fact that the dominant



natural mode period of the concrete structure is 0.105 sec where Figure 3 and Table 1 show DDE response spectrum controlling. The steel structure periods are in the range of 0.35-0.52 sec, in which either Parkfield-5 or Castaic spectra controls. However, 2% damping was used in the DDE analysis and if the 2% damping DDE response spectrum is compared with the 7% Parkfield-5 response spectrum, the DDE response spectrum is found to be controlling.

Noting that the steel structure's dominant period in the E-W direction is 0.516 and observing from Figure 3 that the Castaic response spectrum is substantially above the Parkfield-5 response spectrum, it was felt that the steel structure's response in the E-W direction may be controlled by Castaic. An approximate modal analysis, using the intermediate results (periods, mode shapes, and modal participation factors) of the Parkfield-5 computer analysis, was made for the Castaic ground motion. It was found that the Castaic responses were almost equal to (actually 5% smaller) the DDE responses. For example, the absolute acceleration of Mass No. 6 (see Figure 3.7-13 of FSAR) was 1.03g for Castaic compared to 1.10g for DDE.

Thus one may conclude that neither Parkfield-5 nor Castaic governs the seismic design of the auxiliary building.

#### 6. DESIGN CLASS I TANKS

The Design Class I tanks located at grade respond at periods greater than 3 seconds. Therefore their seismic design is governed by the DDE (see Figure 3).






TABLE 1. COMPARISON OF RESPONSE SPECTRA

Period (T) range	Governing Spectrum	$\left\{ \frac{S_a(P-5) \text{ or } S_a(C), 7\% \text{ Damping}}{S_a(DDE), 5\% \text{ Damping}} \right\}_{\max}$
T < 0.08 sec	Parkfield-5	1.39
0.08 < T < 0.34	DDE	< 1
0.34 < T < 0.41	Parkfield-5	1.34
0.41 < T < 1.0	Castaic	1.30




TABLE 2. MAXIMUM ABSOLUTE ACCELERATIONS,  
CONTAINMENT STRUCTURE

Structure	Nodal Point*	Elevation ft	Maximum Absolute Acceleration in g	
			PARKFIELD-5	DDE Analysis
Exterior Structure	2	301.64	1.207	2.083
	8	274.37	1.069	1.736
	10	258.27	0.985	1.567
	14	231.00	0.789	1.177
	17	205.58	0.637	1.358
	23	181.08	0.558	1.369
	26	155.83	0.523	1.292
	34	130.58	0.545	1.080
	37	109.67	0.537	0.793
Interior Structure	19-22	140.00	0.762	1.195
	24	127.00	0.709	0.982
	27-30	114.00	0.657	0.773
	32	110.00	0.645	0.726
	38	102.00	0.608	0.601
Base Slab	47-58	88.58	0.556	0.483

\* See Figure 3.7-5 of FSAR




TABLE 3. MAXIMUM DISPLACEMENTS,  
CONTAINMENT STRUCTURE

Structure	Nodal Point*	Elevation ft	Maximum Displacements in inches	
			PARKFIELD-5	DDE Analysis
Exterior Structure	2	301.64	0.734	1.063
	8	274.37	0.657	0.967
	10	258.27	0.618	0.911
	14	231.00	0.522	0.807
	17	205.58	0.425	0.695
	23	181.08	0.348	0.587
	26	155.83	0.263	0.459
	34	130.58	0.185	0.327
	37	109.67	0.121	0.212
Interior Structure	19-22	140.00	0.124	0.139
	24	127.00	0.109	0.114
	27-30	114.00	0.095	0.090
	32	110.00	0.091	0.084
	38	102.00	0.080	0.068
Base Slab	47-58	88.58	0.063	0.050

\* See Figure 3.7-5 of FSAR



Small, illegible markings or artifacts in the top right corner.

Faint, illegible text or markings located in the lower-left quadrant of the page.

TABLE 4. MAXIMUM TOTAL SHEARS,  
CONTAINMENT STRUCTURE

Structure	Associated Nodal Points*	Elevation ft	Maximum Shears-kipsx10 <sup>3</sup>	
			PARKFIELD-5	DDE Analysis
Exterior Structure	2	301.64	0.19	0.66
	8	274.37	6.04	9.38
	10	258.27	9.01	13.91
	14	231.00	12.97	19.55
	17	205.58	16.92	25.02
	23	181.08	19.74	29.98
	26	155.83	22.28	36.66
	34	130.58	24.24	44.18
	37	109.67	26.67	49.42
	57	88.58	27.49	51.39
Interior Structure	19&22	140.00	8.94	13.23
	27&30	114.00	13.07	16.87
	49&54	88.58	25.71	30.96
Total Base Shear	49,54&57	88.58	37.64	59.99

\* See Figure 3.7-5 of FSAR





TABLE 5. MAXIMUM TOTAL OVERTURNING MOMENTS,  
CONTAINMENT STRUCTURE

Structure	Associated Nodal Points*	Elevation ft	Maximum Overturning Moment - kip-ftx10 <sup>6</sup>	
			PARKFIELD-5	DDE Analysis
Exterior Structure	2	301.64	0.00	0.00
	8	274.37	0.11	0.18
	10	258.27	0.27	0.41
	14	231.00	0.63	0.97
	17	205.58	1.10	1.67
	23	181.08	1.68	2.50
	26	155.83	2.08	3.08
	34	130.58	2.79	4.07
	37	109.67	3.18	4.58
	57	88.58	3.76	5.48
Interior Structure	19&22	140.00	0.05	0.10
	27&30	114.00	0.19	0.33
	49&54	88.58	0.81	1.24
Total O.T.M. at Base	49,54&57	88.58	3.85	5.62

\* See Figure 3.7-5 of FSAR



**TABLE 6. MAXIMUM ABSOLUTE ACCELERATIONS,  
AUXILIARY BUILDING**

Mass Point*	Elevation (ft)	Maximum Absolute Accelerations					
		N-S Direction				E-W Direction	
		Horizontal Acceleration (g)		Rotational Acceleration (rad/sec <sup>2</sup> )		Horizontal Acceleration (g)	
		1†	2†	1	2	1	2
6	188.00	0.80	1.38	0.010	0.018	0.77	1.10
1	163.00	1.09	1.96	0.074	0.180	1.17	2.40
2	140.00	0.85	1.16	0.063	0.158	0.89	1.60
3	115.00	0.70	0.84	0.045	0.108	0.72	1.08
4	100.00	0.61	0.62	0.034	0.084	0.61	0.74
5	85.00	0.56	0.54	0.018	0.044	0.55	0.54


\*See Figure 3.7-13 of FSAR

**TABLE 7. MAXIMUM RELATIVE DISPLACEMENTS**

Mass Point*	Elevation (ft)	Maximum Relative Displacements					
		N-S Direction				E-W Direction	
		Translation (in.)		Rotation (radians x 10 <sup>-5</sup> )		Translation (in.)	
		1	2	1	2	1	2
6	188.00	1.524	2.688	1.551	1.814	1.866	2.756
1	163.00	0.137	0.224	2.105	4.934	0.154	0.276
2	140.00	0.089	0.122	1.835	4.426	0.101	0.172
3	115.00	0.057	0.076	1.282	3.096	0.065	0.104
4	100.00	0.035	0.044	0.977	2.364	0.039	0.060
5	85.00	0.020	0.028	0.464	1.120	0.019	0.028

\*See Figure 3.7-13 of FSAR

†Column 1 gives responses to Parkfield-5  
Column 2 gives responses to DDE



**TABLE 8. MAXIMUM STORY SHEARS,  
AUXILIARY BUILDING**

Member*	Maximum Story Shears (kips x 10 <sup>3</sup> )			
	N-S Direction		E-W Direction	
	1†	2†	1	2
5	2.08	3.50	2.00	2.78
1	10.65	20.72	13.90	27.06
2	64.05	90.70	61.04	115.18
3	110.37	142.84	111.05	184.82
4	69.62	98.84	62.13	96.56

\*See Figure 3.7-13 of FSAR

**TABLE 9. MAXIMUM OVERTURNING MOMENTS**

Member*	Maximum O.T. Moments (kip-ft x 10 <sup>6</sup> )			
	N-S Direction		E-W Direction	
	1	2	1	2
5	0.100	0.168	0.094	0.134
1	0.250	0.486	0.327	0.636
2 (top)	0.237	0.472	0.276	0.646
2 (bottom)	1.818	2.740	1.802	3.526
3	3.444	4.882	3.447	6.298
4	4.488	6.366	4.355	7.746

\*See Figure 3.7-13 of FSAR

†Column 1 gives responses to Parkfield-5  
Column 2 gives responses to DDE



TABLE 10. MAXIMUM TORSIONAL MOMENTS DUE TO EARTH-  
QUAKE IN N-S DIRECTION, AUXILIARY BUILDING

Member*	Maximum Torsional Moments (kip-ft x 10 <sup>5</sup> )	
	1†	2†
5	0.088	0.172
1	0.804	1.738
2	34.033	81.782
3	52.494	126.034
4	40.333	97.888

\*See Figure 3.7-13 of FSAR


†Column 1 gives responses to Parkfield-5  
Column 2 gives responses to DDE



Small, faint marks or artifacts in the top right corner.





ACCELERATION



P A R K F I E L D N O R M 0 . 5 0 G  
ACCELERATION TIME HISTORY


FIGURE 1






PARKFIELD NORM 0.50G  
ACCELERATION TIME HISTORY


FIGURE 1





C A S T A I C N O R M 0 . 5 0 G  
\_ ACCELERATION TIME HISTORY

FIGURE 2



JOHN A. BLUME AND ASSOCIATES





FIGURE 3





JOHN A. BLUME AND ASSOCIATES / RESEARCH DIVISION

PARKFIELD NORM 0.5 G DAMP 0.050  
GROUND MOTION FROM FEMODEL DECON





FIGURE 4



JOHN A. BLUME AND ASSOCIATES / RESEARCH DIVISION

C O N T A I N M E N T

N P 1 4

DDE 0.005

PARKFIELD 0.030





FIGURE 5



JOHN A. BLUME AND ASSOCIATES / RESEARCH DIVISION

C O N T A I N M E N T N P 1 9  
DDE 0.005 PARKFIELD 0.030





FIGURE 6



JOHN A. BLUME AND ASSOCIATES / RESEARCH DIVISION

C O N T A I N M E N T N P 3 2  
DDE 0.005 PARKFIELD 0.030





FIGURE 7





JOHN A. BLUME AND ASSOCIATES / RESEARCH DIVISION

C O N T A I N M E N T . N P 3 4  
DDE 0.005 PARKFIELD 0.030





FIGURE 8



JOHN A. BLUME AND ASSOCIATES / RESEARCH DIVISION

C O N T A I N M E N T    N P 4 7  
DDE. 0.005    PARKFIELD    0.030




FIGURE 9



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

JOHN A. BLUME AND ASSOCIATES / RESEARCH DIVISION

C O N T A I N M E N T . N P 1 9  
DDE 0.010 PARKFIELD 0.040





FIGURE 10



JOHN A. BLUME AND ASSOCIATES / RESEARCH DIVISION

C O N T A I N M E N T . N P 4 7  
DDE 0.010 PARKFIELD 0.040




FIGURE 11

