

MAY 17 1979

Docket No.: 50-397

Mr. Neil O. Strand  
Washington Public Power Supply System  
300 George Washington Way  
P. O. Box 968  
Richland, Washington 99352

Dear Mr. Strand:

SUBJECT: FIRST ROUND QUESTIONS ON THE WNP-2 OL APPLICATION - AB

In our review of your application for an operating license for the WNP-2 facility, we have identified a need for additional information which we require to complete our review. The specific requests are contained in the enclosure to this letter and are the tenth set of our round one questions; additional requests related to other portions of the WNP-2 facility will be sent during this month. In order to maintain our present schedule, we need a completely adequate response to all questions in the enclosure by July 20, 1979. The attached set of round one questions represent the review effort of the Analysis Branch.

Please contact us if you require any discussion or clarification of the enclosed requests.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:  
C. Stahle

*for* Steven A. Varga, Chief  
Light Water Reactors Branch No. 4  
Division of Project Management

Enclosure:  
As stated

cc: See next page

Distribution  
Docket File  
LWR #4 Reading  
D. Lynch  
NRC PDR  
Local PDR  
R. Boyd  
D. Vassallo  
F. Williams  
S. Varga  
M. Service  
R. Mattson  
D. Ross  
J. Knight  
R. Tedesco  
R. DeYoung  
V. Moore

R. Vollmer  
M. Ernst  
R. Denise  
ELD  
IE (3)

bcc:  
J. Buchanan, NSIC  
T. Abernathy, TIC  
ACRS (16)

MA 4

60

7906270271 A

OFFICE	LWR#4: DPM	LWR#4: DPM				
SURNAME	DLynch/1k	SVarga				
DATE	5/12/79	5/17/79				

[illegible][illegible]

$\frac{d}{dt} \left( \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{x}} \right) = \frac{\partial L}{\partial x}$

5 2

• *Chlorophyll a* (Chl *a*)

The authors thank Dr. R. A. Huggins for his helpful comments.

This work was supported by National Science Foundation Grant IBN-8007967.

Received July 22, 1982

Accepted September 13, 1982

050207

Washington Public Power Supply System

cc:

Joseph B. Knotts, Jr., Esq.  
Debevoise & Liberman  
1200 Seventeenth Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

Richard Q. Quigley, Esq.  
Washington Public Power Supply System  
3000 George Washington Way  
P. O. Box 968  
Richland, Washington 99352

Nicholas Lewis, Chairman  
Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council  
820 East Fifth Avenue  
Olympia, Washington 98504

Mr. O. K. Earle  
Licensing Engineer  
P. O. Box 968  
Richland, Washington 99352



220.0     Analysis Branch

222.0     Systems Analysis Section

222.01     Describe in detail, how you evaluated the mass and energy  
(6.2.1)     release data during the complete blowdown phase (i.e., during  
             the first 100 seconds) for a postulated break in the recircu-  
             lation line and in the feedwater line. Describe all analytical  
             models which you used, including your assumptions. If any  
             hand calculations were performed, provide the detailed  
             calculations.

222.02     Provide a detailed description of your analytical model to  
             evaluate the mass and energy release rates for your analyses  
             of the short-term annulus pressurization and the evaluation of  
             the structural loads resulting from postulated pipe breaks for  
             the first five seconds following the accident. Indicate the  
             mass flux (LBM/sec-ft<sup>2</sup>), the enthalpy (BTU/LBM) and the flow  
             area (square feet) as a function of time for each side of the  
             break. Justify all your assumptions. Describe the break  
             geometry assumed throughout the transient. Discuss the over-  
             all conservatism of your analysis.

222.03     Describe in detail, how the long-term steaming rates were  
             developed for the time period following a postulated loss-of-  
             coolant accident (LOCA). If the steaming rates were developed  
             by hand calculations, provide the details of your method and  
             list your assumptions. Describe the break flow area as a  
             function of time. Discuss the overall conservatism of your  
             analysis.

222.04     Describe in detail, how you evaluated the mass and energy  
             release rates for a postulated steam line break. Describe the  
             reactor vessel liquid swelling model you assume to be applicable  
             during the transition from single-phase to two-phase flow at  
             the postulated break. Indicate all your assumptions and  
             discuss the conservatism of your method of analysis.

