

NATHAN M. NEWMARK  
CONSULTING ENGINEERING SERVICES

1114 CIVIL ENGINEERING BUILDING  
URBANA, ILLINOIS 61801

31 May 1968

Dr. Peter A. Morris, Director  
Division of Reactor Licensing  
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20545

Re: Contract No. AT(49-5)-2667  
Dresden Nuclear Power Station Units 2 and 3  
AEC Dockets No. 50-237 and 50-249  
Operating License Review

Dear Dr. Morris:

On Friday, May 24, 1968, Dr. W. J. Hall, Dr. W. H. Walker and I had an opportunity to inspect Dresden Units 2 and 3 in their present stage of construction at Morris, Illinois. As a result of this review we should like to request some additional information and clarification regarding several points as noted below.

1. In examining the suction header which is attached to the torus, it appears that the point of attachment of the header in the Dresden 2 and 3 Plants is at a significantly higher elevation than that which was observed in earlier plants. Details are requested with regard to the elevation of attachment of the suction header with respect to the torus, and the location of the suction header attachments to the torus, particularly with respect to internal structures in the torus, ring stiffeners, etc. The detail of the T-section in the suction header and reinforcement employed at the attachment point to the torus also should be provided.

2. At the present time it appears that a leak in the torus will flood the lower portions of the reactor buildings and conceivably could render inoperable some of the motor-pump systems that are required for core cooling.

654.1 ✓  
1980

We were unable to learn what steps, if any, are being taken to provide protection for these motor-pump units; additional information is requested on this point.

We were advised that there is an alternate source of water (river water) which could be used for flooding the drywell in an emergency. The procedure for doing this is not clear to us; for, if the torus had sprung a leak, it would seem to us that flooding of the drywell would indeed involve extensive flooding of the reactor building chambers as well. Clarification on this point is requested.

3. In order to gain a better understanding of the seismic analysis of the piping, equipment, dry well, reactor vessel, torus, and suction header, we should like to be supplied with the analysis reports prepared by the seismic consultants. We should also like a description of the procedure by which the piping design is carried out including a description of the handling of the various stages of analysis, the manner in which the location of snubbers is decided, and how valves are handled in the analysis.

4. It was not clear from our inspection, nor from the plans in our possession, how lateral support is provided for the main header inside of the torus. Reference here is to the header from which the downcomers originate and which are connected to the draft tubes leading into the drywell.

5. The applicant is requested to present a detailed description, with sketches as required, describing the materials, dimensions, and procedures employed in filling the space between the reactor drywell and the concrete shield surrounding the drywell.

Respectfully submitted,

*N. M. Newmark*

N. M. Newmark

bjw

cc: W. J. Hall  
W. H. Walker

654.2

