

REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

MAY

ACCESSION NBR: 8312190053 DOC. DATE: 83/12/07 NOTARIZED: NO DOCKET #
 FACIL: 50-397 WPPSS Nuclear Project, Unit 2, Washington Public Powe 05000397
 AUTH. NAME AUTHOR AFFILIATION
 SORENSEN, G.C. Washington Public Power Supply System
 RECIP. NAME RECIPIENT AFFILIATION
 SCHWENCER, A. Licensing Branch 2

SUBJECT: Submits written responses to questions discussed at 831128 meeting re final design assessment rept. Table on potential finding rept for RHR piping & supports encl.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: B001S COPIES RECEIVED: LTR 1 ENCL 1 SIZE: 7
 TITLE: Licensing Submittal: PSAR/FSAR Amdts & Related Correspondence

NOTES:

	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES LTTR ENCL	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES LTTR ENCL
	NRR/DL/ADL	1 0	NRR LB2 BC	1 0
	NRR LB2 LA	1 0	AULUCK, R. 01	1 1
INTERNAL:	ELD/HDS2	1 0	IE FILE	1 1
	IE/DEPER/EPB 36	3 3	IE/DEPER/IRB 35	1 1
	IE/DEQA/QAB 21	1 1	NRR/DE/AEAB	1 0
	NRR/DE/CEB 11	1 1	NRR/DE/EHEB	1 1
	NRR/DE/eqB 13	2 2	NRR/DE/GB 28	2 2
	NRR/DE/MEB 18	1 1	NRR/DE/MTEB 17	1 1
	NRR/DE/SAB 24	1 1	NRR/DE/SGEB 25	1 1
	NRR/DHFS/HFEB40	1 1	NRR/DHFS/LQB 32	1 1
	NRR/DHFS/PSRB	1 1	NRR/DL/SSPB	1 0
	NRR/DSI/AEB 26	1 1	NRR/DSI/ASB	1 1
	NRR/DSI/CPB 10	1 1	NRR/DSI/CSB 09	1 1
	NRR/DSI/ICSB 16	1 1	NRR/DSI/METB 12	1 1
	NRR/DSI/PSB 19	1 1	NRR/DSI/RAB 22	1 1
	NRR/DSI/RSB 23	1 1	<u>REG FILE</u> 04	1 1
	RGNS	3 3	RM/DDAMI/MIB	1 0
EXTERNAL:	ACRS 41	6 6	BNL (AMDTS ONLY)	1 1
	DMB/DSS (AMDTS)	1 1	FEMA-REP DIV 39	1 1
	LPDR 03	1 1	NRC PDR 02	1 1
	NSIC 05	1 1	NTIS	1 1

1. The purpose of this document is to provide a comprehensive overview of the current status of the project. It is intended for the use of management and other stakeholders who are involved in the project. The information contained herein is confidential and should be handled accordingly.

2. The project has been initiated in accordance with the approved business plan. The initial phase of the project has been completed, and the results have been reviewed. The project is currently in the planning stage, and the next steps are being determined.

3. The project is being managed in accordance with the project management plan. The project manager is responsible for ensuring that the project is completed on time, within budget, and to the satisfaction of the stakeholders. The project manager will provide regular updates on the progress of the project.

Item No.	Description	Quantity	Unit Price	Total Price
1	Item 1	10	1.00	10.00
2	Item 2	5	2.00	10.00
3	Item 3	15	0.50	7.50
4	Item 4	20	0.25	5.00
5	Item 5	30	0.15	4.50
6	Item 6	40	0.10	4.00
7	Item 7	50	0.08	4.00
8	Item 8	60	0.07	4.20
9	Item 9	70	0.06	4.20
10	Item 10	80	0.05	4.00
11	Item 11	90	0.04	3.60
12	Item 12	100	0.03	3.00
13	Item 13	110	0.02	2.20
14	Item 14	120	0.01	1.20
15	Item 15	130	0.01	1.30
16	Item 16	140	0.01	1.40
17	Item 17	150	0.01	1.50
18	Item 18	160	0.01	1.60
19	Item 19	170	0.01	1.70
20	Item 20	180	0.01	1.80
21	Item 21	190	0.01	1.90
22	Item 22	200	0.01	2.00
23	Item 23	210	0.01	2.10
24	Item 24	220	0.01	2.20
25	Item 25	230	0.01	2.30
26	Item 26	240	0.01	2.40
27	Item 27	250	0.01	2.50
28	Item 28	260	0.01	2.60
29	Item 29	270	0.01	2.70
30	Item 30	280	0.01	2.80
31	Item 31	290	0.01	2.90
32	Item 32	300	0.01	3.00
33	Item 33	310	0.01	3.10
34	Item 34	320	0.01	3.20
35	Item 35	330	0.01	3.30
36	Item 36	340	0.01	3.40
37	Item 37	350	0.01	3.50
38	Item 38	360	0.01	3.60
39	Item 39	370	0.01	3.70
40	Item 40	380	0.01	3.80
41	Item 41	390	0.01	3.90
42	Item 42	400	0.01	4.00
43	Item 43	410	0.01	4.10
44	Item 44	420	0.01	4.20
45	Item 45	430	0.01	4.30
46	Item 46	440	0.01	4.40
47	Item 47	450	0.01	4.50
48	Item 48	460	0.01	4.60
49	Item 49	470	0.01	4.70
50	Item 50	480	0.01	4.80
51	Item 51	490	0.01	4.90
52	Item 52	500	0.01	5.00
53	Item 53	510	0.01	5.10
54	Item 54	520	0.01	5.20
55	Item 55	530	0.01	5.30
56	Item 56	540	0.01	5.40
57	Item 57	550	0.01	5.50
58	Item 58	560	0.01	5.60
59	Item 59	570	0.01	5.70
60	Item 60	580	0.01	5.80
61	Item 61	590	0.01	5.90
62	Item 62	600	0.01	6.00
63	Item 63	610	0.01	6.10
64	Item 64	620	0.01	6.20
65	Item 65	630	0.01	6.30
66	Item 66	640	0.01	6.40
67	Item 67	650	0.01	6.50
68	Item 68	660	0.01	6.60
69	Item 69	670	0.01	6.70
70	Item 70	680	0.01	6.80
71	Item 71	690	0.01	6.90
72	Item 72	700	0.01	7.00
73	Item 73	710	0.01	7.10
74	Item 74	720	0.01	7.20
75	Item 75	730	0.01	7.30
76	Item 76	740	0.01	7.40
77	Item 77	750	0.01	7.50
78	Item 78	760	0.01	7.60
79	Item 79	770	0.01	7.70
80	Item 80	780	0.01	7.80
81	Item 81	790	0.01	7.90
82	Item 82	800	0.01	8.00
83	Item 83	810	0.01	8.10
84	Item 84	820	0.01	8.20
85	Item 85	830	0.01	8.30
86	Item 86	840	0.01	8.40
87	Item 87	850	0.01	8.50
88	Item 88	860	0.01	8.60
89	Item 89	870	0.01	8.70
90	Item 90	880	0.01	8.80
91	Item 91	890	0.01	8.90
92	Item 92	900	0.01	9.00
93	Item 93	910	0.01	9.10
94	Item 94	920	0.01	9.20
95	Item 95	930	0.01	9.30
96	Item 96	940	0.01	9.40
97	Item 97	950	0.01	9.50
98	Item 98	960	0.01	9.60
99	Item 99	970	0.01	9.70
100	Item 100	980	0.01	9.80
101	Item 101	990	0.01	9.90
102	Item 102	1000	0.01	10.00

Washington Public Power Supply System

P.O. Box 968 3000 George Washington Way Richland, Washington 99352 (509) 372-5000

December 7, 1983
G02-83-1125

8312190053 831207
PDR ADOCK 05000397
A PDR

Docket No. 50-397

Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Attention: Mr. A. Schwencer, Chief
Licensing Branch No. 2
Division of Licensing
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Dear Mr. Schwencer:

Subject: NUCLEAR PROJECT NO. 2
WNP-2 DESIGN REVERIFICATION PROGRAM
RESPONSE TO STAFF QUESTIONS

Reference: Letter from G. C. Sorensen to H. R. Denton, dated
September 27, 1983, subject, "WNP-2 Design Reverifi-
cation Program"

A meeting between the NRC staff and Supply System personnel was held on Tuesday, November 28, 1983, to discuss the Final Design Assessment Report prepared for WNP-2 (reference). During the meeting, D. Jang and R. Li of the NRC staff, presented several questions which were addressed by the Supply System. As requested by R. Auluck, the written responses to these questions are provided for your information.


Structural Branch Questions

Question 1

What is the basis used in the selection of structural members which were examined to determine if loads applied to these members were adequately considered in the design process? Also provide a detailed discussion to justify that the audit results from the limited selected samples are sufficiently representative of the entire plant to be used in judging the overall adequacy of WNP-2 Category I structural design.

Response

Technical Audit Associates' Finding No. 5 recommended that the Supply System make a spot check of a selected heavily loaded wall to determine



Bool
0/1



3-10-1941
10:15

10:15

if the original structural design is still adequate in view of the additional loads from piping supports and restraints that may have been added. They recommended, based on their plant walkdown, that review of the main steam tunnel north wall would be an appropriate example. After completing the review of the main steam tunnel wall, the Supply System concluded that the design adequately included impact from whipping pipes, but this sample was not representative from a hung load standpoint. A field walkdown was then conducted to identify a wall in the reactor building that would represent a worst case for evaluation. A wall at elevation 471 ft., which supports a large number of pipe supports and cable trays, was then selected and evaluated.

The two walls evaluated would not represent a statistically valid review sample. The primary purpose for performing this review was to determine if the AE design methodology and processes were adequate. However, field walkdown was utilized to identify worst case walls for review. The review concluded that the design of these walls, utilizing the AE methodology and process, is adequate.

Question 2

It was determined that for the main steam tunnel north wall, the use of a cracked versus uncracked wall section for the computation of dynamic deflection did not affect the final acceptability of the structure. Describe the procedures and assumptions adopted for both the cracked and uncracked section analyses, also provide the design margins with respect to the code allowables obtained from the analyses.

Response

The procedures and assumptions used to determine the ductility ratio are described in FSAR Section 3.6.1.6.3.2 with the maximum allowable values provided in Table 3.6-1. Using the procedure described in the FSAR, the calculated ductility ratio, μ , was 6.6. The allowable value per FSAR Table 3.6-1 is 10.

Question 3

Referring to Section 3.5.4.1 of Reference 2, (WNP-2 Final Assessment Report), the imposed pipe whip restraint design loads are comprised of equivalent static loads due to high energy pipe break, jet impingement loads, and missile impact loads due to the postulated break. Provide a discussion as to how these loads are considered in the design of adjacent structures. If the method used to assess the combined effects of these loads is different from that given in the SRP Section 3.8.4, provide a discussion of the basis for deviating from the SRP load combination procedures.



Response

Imposed pipe whip restraint design loads were included as stated in FSAR Section 3.8.4 and Tables 3.8-15 and 3.8-16. This method corresponds to that provided in SRP 3.8.4. Reference 2 (WNP-2 Final Assessment Report) Section 3.5.6.1 describes the reviews performed for the two walls reviewed. This review included consideration for the equivalent static, jet impingement and missile impact loads.

Mechanical Engineering Branch Questions

Question 1

Provide a summary of the results of the RHR System Piping and Support Review discussing the Potential Finding Reports and the status of their resolution.

Response

The RHR Addendum to the Final Assessment Report will be issued by December 31, 1983. This report will discuss the results of the RHR piping and support reviews. A summary of the results, potential finding reports (PFRs) and their status follows.

Six PFRs, all classified as observations, were issued. Three were design related and three construction related. The generic and specific deficiencies identified during the review of the HPCS piping and support calculations did not exist in the RHR calculations. All areas of design and construction reviewed are acceptable. A summary of the issued PFRs is provided on the attached table. Since all of the PFRs were classified as observations, specific corrective action plans were not required to track implementation of resolutions. The status of each resolution is provided for information.

Question 2

Clarify the description and provide the status of the corrective action plan described for PFR-PB-3.

Response

This finding is described on Page 3.5-14 of our Final Assessment Report and relates to the use of an incorrect higher than allowable shear stress for structural attachment fillet welds in determining pipe movement following a postulated break. The analysis concluded that the



[The text in this section is extremely faint and illegible due to low contrast and noise. It appears to be a large block of text, possibly a list or a series of paragraphs, but the individual characters and words cannot be discerned.]

specific pipe would have limited movement following the postulated break where, in fact, use of correct allowable shear stress would result in less limited movement. Upon review of the related calculations, as committed to in the corrective action plan, only two cases were affected by this error. These cases are: one postulated break in HPCS piping and one postulated break in LPCS piping. The postulated HPCS break was examined in the design reverification activities. In all other postulated break analysis, no credit was taken for limited pipe movement. For the two specific cases, a preliminary re-analysis shows that pipe movement following postulated break is, in fact, limited due to other features and that there is no additional equipment impacted. The preliminary re-analysis is expected to be finalized by December 16, 1983.


Question 3

Describe the actions that have occurred relative to PFR-RHR-25 since your Final Assessment Report was issued.

Response

As discussed on Page 3.3-27 of our Final Assessment Report, this finding relates to a failure by the AE to update all aspects of the RHR heat exchanger lower support anchor bolt calculations as a result of revised loading conditions transmitted by project letter, GEBR-2-81-189. The only revised loading condition not evaluated was that of a vertical load in the upward direction that would put the anchor bolt in tension. Neither the anchor bolt washer plate nor the concrete beam which supports the heat exchanger were reassessed for this load change. The conclusions presented in our report were that vertical loads in the upward direction do not actually exist because neither containment hydrodynamic loads nor seismic loads were significant. On a preliminary basis, the equipment supplier, General Electric, concurred with this conclusion. Upon further evaluation, as part of Project's evaluation of the information transfer process, it became apparent that significant loads in the vertical upward direction were possible depending on the loads that the piping system applied to the heat exchanger nozzles and depending on the flexibility of the heat exchanger nozzles. In order to avoid potential last minute construction impact, the Supply System has taken the following contingency action. The anchor bolt washer was modified to be at least as strong in the vertical upward direction as the supporting concrete beam. This strengthening will accommodate an approximate increase of a factor of 5 over the original upward design load.

General Electric has performed a coupled analysis of the piping and heat exchanger to determine the actual loads to the structure. The preliminary results indicate that the maximum up load is within the modified washer plate design and the maximum support structure design.



General

Question

Does the transmittal of design information between General Electric and Burns and Roe, Incorporated via project letters (see PFR-RHR-25) comply with the requirements of the GE Quality Assurance Program?

Response

General Electric has confirmed that transmittal of New Load Interface Requirements to the Supply System and Burns and Roe via project letters is within the provisions set forth in their quality assurance program.

If you have any questions concerning the above information, please contact me on (509) 372-5238.

Very truly yours,



G. C. Sorensen, Manager
Regulatory Programs

GCS:DLW:ch

Attachment: Table 1, RHR Piping and Supports -
Potential Finding Reports

cc: Mr. R. Auluck - NRC
Mr. W. S. Chin - BPA
Mr. A. D. Toth - NRC Resident Inspector



2024

11
12
13
14
15

Table 1

RHR Piping and Supports - Potential Finding Reports

<u>Description</u>	<u>Status</u>
<p><u>PFR-RHR-32</u> was issued to document an error in the calculation of the maximum vertical load on RHR-436. Analysis showed that the support design was conservative and adequate for the increased load.</p>	<p>The subject hanger has been redesigned based on the as-built stress calculation. The revised hanger calculation corrected the error and no new deficiencies were identified.</p>
<p><u>PFR-RHR-36</u> reported that seismic accelerations on valves RHR-V-14B and RHR-V-104 were not calculated utilizing the correct valve stem orientation. These two valves are oriented such that their operators lie in the horizontal plane, as opposed to the vertical plane, like the other valves in this system. The accelerations were calculated and reported to the Supply System Equipment Qualification Group as if the operators were in the vertical plane.</p>	<p>This anomaly is understood by the Supply System EQ group. B&R tabulates the accelerations in the Global 'X', 'Y', 'Z' system and the EQ group transforms the accelerations into the correct local orientation for use in seismic qualifications. Qualification is performed in accordance with procedure TDP 3.32 and the data sheet for transformation of coordinate systems.</p>
<p><u>PFR-RHR-40</u> was issued as a result of checking the section properties used for determination of shear and bending stresses in an M4X13 beam for RHR-902N. The analyst had mistakenly used section moduli from a W4X13 beam. Correction of the error will cause member stresses to increase slightly. (Less than 2000 psi).</p>	<p>BRI has corrected the calculation error. This type of error was not noted in any other hanger calculations reviewed and therefore was not considered to have generic implications.</p>
<p><u>PFR-RHR-37</u> was issued to document a potential interference between small bore pipe RHR-2289-1 and pipe support RHR-2289-11. This PFR was noted during the as-built walkdown of the piping.</p>	<p>Analysis shows that for this small bore line, the thermal movement will eliminate any interference. Project Engineering was notified of the potential generic consideration. The generic consideration will be addressed when conducting Power Ascension Test 8.2.17, Piping Systems Expansion and Vibration Tests. These tests will be performed to meet the requirements of ASME Section XI, Winter 1978 Addendum and NRC letter GI2-81-62. High energy small bore piping with a safety significance is included in the inspections.</p>

17
1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
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

17

1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
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

1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
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

1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
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

Table 1
Page 2 of 2
RHR Piping and Supports - Potential Finding Reports

PFR-RHR-38 was issued to document an error in an overall dimension shown on the as-built drawing for hanger RHR-915N.

Project Engineering was requested to correct the error on the as-built drawing. This error has been corrected.

PFR-RHR-39 was issued to document an incorrect deletion of material from the as-built drawing for hanger RHR-184.

Project Engineering was requested to correct the as-built drawing error. This error has been corrected.



10 (1/2)