

TERA



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

JUNE 20 1979

Docket No. 50-344

LICENSEE: Portland General Electric Company (PGE)

FACILITY: Trojan Nuclear Plant

TRIP REPORT - VISIT TO TROJAN NUCLEAR PLANT AND BECHTEL SAN FRANCISCO
JUNE 13-15, 1979

On June 13 and 14, 1979, representatives of the NRC staff visited Trojan Nuclear Plant for an on-site review of the proposed seismic modifications to the Control Building. Persons participating in this portion of the trip are identified in Attachment 1.

The purpose of the site visit was to provide the opportunity for a detailed walk-down of the facility in relation to the proposed building design changes. Specifically observed were:

1. Both sides of the control building west wall (column line R) between el. 45' and 117'.
2. The control building east wall (column line N) between el. 65' and el. 93'.
3. All non-structural walls in the control/fuel/auxiliary building complex.
4. Shear walls 6 and 8 enclosing the monitor tank.
5. The diesel-generator rooms.
6. The proposed location of the new diesel generator combustion air intake in the turbine building north wall.

At the conclusion of the visit the following items were discussed:

1. More detailed information is needed concerning essential systems located below grade and the potential for damage to them due to handling of the steel plates.
2. The effects and control of dust, noise, and vibration created by drilling holes through the control building walls should be considered. The impact on fire barrier integrity should also be addressed. PGE is considering

486 307

7907300 024

drilling a test hole to determine these effects.

3. PGE stated that no changes to the security plan are needed. All construction personnel will either be badged (and scrutinized to the same degree as PGE employees) or escorted in accordance with the security plan.
4. PGE plans to leave the diesel-generator day tank vent line in place while installing the steel plates.
5. PGE estimates that it will take one shift to install each plate (8 plates), including the heavy top plate. (The top plate weighs 47,000 pounds.)
6. PGE stated that it may be desirable to install protective covers over selected cable trays to protect cables from an accidental drop of washers, nuts, tools, etc.
7. NRC stated that the load sharing on each chain fall should be addressed.
8. PGE plans to use Yale NH series chain falls, each rated at 15 tons. Four chain falls will be used for each plate - fully redundant.

On June 15, 1979, the NRC staff met with representatives of Bechtel Power Corporation at their headquarters in San Francisco. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss in detail the 50 NRC questions transmitted to PGE by letter of May 18, 1979. See Attachment 2 for those attending. See Attachment 3 for the questions, which served as the meeting agenda.

Bechtel identified two changes to the Trojan Control Building design report, which will be described in Revision 2 to PGE-1020:

1. The existing 7' x 7' equipment hatch in the control building east wall will be reduced to a 4' x 4' opening instead of being eliminated.
2. Due to a refinement in a recent STARDYNE run, the east wall will be thickened and increased in height to el. 93'.

PGE will submit Revision 2 to PGE-1020 describing these changes in about one week. NRC questions will be answered starting about the first week in July - perhaps in several letters.

JUNE 20 1979

The staff expressed an additional concern (not contained in the 50 questions) regarding the effect, if any, of cracking in concrete block on anchor bolt (base plate) integrity. The staff also raised questions as to the seismic restraint of the steel plates during various phases of construction. PGE stated that it has not yet been decided whether or not these plates will be used as concrete forms.

Charles M. Trammell, Project Manager
Operating Reactors Branch #1
Division of Operating Reactors

Attachments:

1. List of Participants - site visit
2. List of Participants - Bechtel
3. Request for Additional Information (50 questions)

cc: w/attachments
See next page

488 309

Docket Files
 NRC PDR
 Local PDR
 ORBI Reading
 NRR Reading
 H. Denton
 E. Case
 V. Stello
 D. Eisenhut
 B. Grimes
 R. Volimer
 A. Schwencer
 D. Ziemann
 P. Check
 G. Lainas
 D. Davis
 B. Grimes
 T. Ippolito
 R. Reid
 V. Noonan
 G. Knighton
 D. Brinkman
 Project Manager
 OELD
 OI&E (3)
 C. Parrish
 ACRS (16)
 NRC Participants
 J. Buchanan
 TERA
 Licensee
 Short Service List

William Kinsey, Esquire
 1002 N.E. Holladay
 Portland, Oregon 97232

Columbia Environmental Council
 203 First Street
 St. Helens, Oregon 97051

Ronald W. Johnson, Esquire
 Corporate Attorney
 Portland General Electric Company
 121 S.W. Salmon Street
 Portland, Oregon 97204

Marshall E. Miller, Esquire, Chairman
 Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
 U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, D. C. 20555

Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel (5)
 U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, D. C. 20555

Docketing and Service Section (4)
 Office of the Secretary
 U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, D. C. 20555

Alan S. Rosenthal, Esquire
 Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board
 U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, D. C. 20555

Dr. John H. Buck
 Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board
 U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, D. C. 20555

Dr. W. Reed Johnson
 Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board
 U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, D. C. 20555

Mr. H. H. Phillips
 Portland General Electric Company
 121 S.W. Salmon Street
 Portland, Oregon 97204

Warren Hastings, Esquire
 Counsel for Portland General
 Electric Company
 121 S.W. Salmon Street
 Portland, Oregon 97204

Mr. J. L. Frewing, Manager
 Generation Licensing and Analysis
 Portland General Electric Company
 121 S.W. Salmon Street
 Portland, Oregon 97204

Columbia County Courthouse
 Law Library, Circuit Court Room
 St. Helens, Oregon 97501

Director, Oregon Department of Energy
 Labor and Industries Building, Room 111
 Salem, Oregon 97310

Dr. Hugh D. Paxton
 1220 41st Street
 Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544

Michael Malmrose
 U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Trojan Nuclear Plant
 P. O. Box 0
 Rainier, Oregon 97048

Dr. Kenneth A. McCollom, Dean
 Division of Engineering,
 Architecture and Technology
 Oklahoma State University
 Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

Mr. John A. Kullberg
 Route One
 Box 2500
 Sauvie Island, Oregon 97231

Ms. Nina Bell
 728 S.E. 26th Street
 Portland, Oregon 97214

Mr. Stephen M. Willingham
 555 N. Tomahawk Drive
 Portland, Oregon 97217

Mr. Eugene Rosolie
 Coalition for Safe Power
 215 S.E. 9th Avenue
 Portland, Oregon 97214

Richard M. Sandvik, Esquire
 Frank W. Ostrander, Jr.
 Counsel for Oregon Dept. of
 Energy
 500 Pacific Building
 520 S.W. Yamhill
 Portland, Oregon 97204

Maurice Axelrad, Esquire
 Lowenstein, Newman, Reis,
 Axelrad and Toll
 Suite 1214
 1025 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
 Washington, D. C. 20036

Mr. David B. McCoy
 348 Hussey Lane
 Grants Pass, Oregon 97526

Ms. C. Gail Parson
 800 S.W. Green #6
 Portland, Oregon 97526

TROJAN SITE VISIT

JUNE 13-14, 1979

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

NRC

J. E. Knight
J. Gray
F. Clemenson
C. Trammell
K. Herring

PGE

G. Lanthrum
R. Johnson
M. Hoffman
J. Aldersebaes
S. Christiansen
A. Starmer
T. Bushnell
D. Mitchem
G. Zimmerman

Coalition for Safe Power

E. Rosolie

Bechtel Power Corporation

W. Edwards
J. Webber
K. Paulson
J. O'Leary

State of Oregon

H. Laursen, consultant to Dept. of Energy
F. Ostrander, Dept. of Justice

JUNE 15, 1979 CONFERENCE
WITH N.R.C.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Bruce Churchill	Shaw-Pittman-Potts-Trowbridge
Boris Bessler	Wiss-Jenney-Elstner
Maurice Axelrad	Lowenstein-Newman-Ries-Axelrad & Toll
Harold Laursen	Oregon Dept. of Energy
Joseph Gray	NRC
Ken Herring	NRC
Charles Trammel	NRC
Joe Mattore	NRC
Ron Johnson	PGE
Don Broehl	PGE
Ted Bushnell	PGE
Gary Lantham	PGE
Ken Buchert	Bechtel
Dick Anderson	Bechtel
Jack O'Leary	Bechtel
Bill White	Bechtel
Karl Gross	Bechtel
Larry Damon	Bechtel
Enrique Goldenberg	Bechtel
Steve Kadysiewski	Bechtel
Vel Shunmugavel	Bechtel
Bimal Sarkar	Bechtel
Fred Meyer	Bechtel

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
TROJAN NUCLEAR PLANT
PROPOSED CONTROL BUILDING DESIGN MODIFICATIONS
ENGINEERING BRANCH
DIVISION OF OPERATING REACTORS

1. The footnote on page 1-7 which defines "safety related" implies that there may be a difference between this and the original definition of the term. Provide a list of any equipment, components, and piping which were originally designated as "safety related" but are no longer being considered as such and corresponding justifications for no longer considering them as "safety related."
2. Verify that closely spaced modes resulting from the modal analysis of the building complex are being considered in accordance with the criteria delineated in BC-TOP-4A. Additionally, describe what the beam elements in the STARDYNE finite element mesh represent.
3. Provide clear, detailed sketches and descriptions of the connection interfaces of the additional walls to the existing structure. Additionally, describe the methods by which the effects of concrete creep and shrinkage (causing tension in the walls and/or a reduction in assumed dead weight) have been factored into the design of these additional walls. Describe and justify in detail the design and the procedures for the connections of the new walls to the existing structure.
4. Verify that the applicable requirements of ACI 318-77 for the modifications are the same as those of ACI 349-76 as supplemented by Regulatory Guide 1.142. Identify any differences and justify the acceptability of the ACI 318-77 requirements in lieu of those contained in ACI 349-76 and Regulatory Guide 1.142.
5. Provide the basis for your determination in Section 3.2.3 of PGE-1020 that the allowance for future addition of equipment will have an insignificant effect on the seismic analysis.
6. For the "Criteria for Bolts", provide the following:
 - a) A clear description of the bolt assembly and hardware arrangement.
 - b) The basis for the formula to calculate the allowable shear force for the bolt including the contact area between the wall and the steel, the stress distribution at the wall/steel interface and the maximum compressive stress induced in the wall at this interface along with justification for the value.
 - c) The basis for the assumed loss factor.
 - d) The effect of the condition of the in-situ wall on the assumed shear capacity.

7. For the "Criteria for Studs", provide the basis for the design value being one-half the values given in Table 15 of the Nelson Division of TRW, Inc. publication, "Design Data 10 -- Embedment Properties of Headed Studs." Include a discussion of what is indicated in this table (e.g. maximum or minimum ultimate), and the statistical variation in the testing which established these values, if appropriate.
8. Verify that all resistances and stiffnesses based upon dead load considerations considers the dead load to be reduced by the vertical earthquake component.
9. Provide a discussion of the type and the extent of the nondestructive examinations which will be performed on the plate welds, along with detailed justifications.
10. Describe the decoupling criteria for equipment, components, piping, etc. whose mass was lumped into that of the structural system and verify that it is met everywhere.
11. Provide the shear capacities of the column connections vs. the required shear resistance under the combined loadings to support your claim in Section 3.4.2.2 that the derived flexural capacities of the Trojan walls are conservative in that the building walls will not slide. Additionally, for all walls discuss the causes of (e.g. shrinkage) and the effects of the observed separation between the bottom of the steel beams and the concrete along the west wall of the Control Building and limitations on the rotational restraint of the in-situ wall on the appropriateness of using the double curvature specimen test results. Significant separation of the concrete away from the beams or tension induced in the walls where there is no separation could impact the consideration of the "box effect" or confinement as suggested by PGE thereby reducing the shear capacity assumed for the wall. Quantify the extent of and effects of this unbonded condition for all walls. Also, in addition to considering the concrete strength of 5000 psi, discuss the effects of the interfaces with 3000 psi design strength concrete.
12. Justify the ductility limit of 4 for the outer rebar in the flexural calculations. Also, considering displacement compatibility for the entire structure using the stiffnesses indicated by the test results, what are the strains predicted in the outer rebar? Justify their acceptability in light of your assumptions. Additionally, for the flexural analysis equations justify the use of a compression zone length of 10% of the total effective length, and supply the maximum values of E_c and justify the use of a linear stress-strain relationship for the concrete in compression.
13. Discuss in detail how the effects of creep and shrinkage (e.g. weight reductions, tension fields, etc.) have been factored into your consideration of the walls shear strengths and stiffnesses.

14. Discuss in detail why the dead load acting for the SSE is greater than that acting for the OBE, thereby resulting in greater shear capacities for the SSE than considered for the OBE.
15. Provide the basis for the 30% amplification factor assumed in the vertical direction.
16. Provide the basis for your calculation from the block and the beam to column connection capacities. Include a discussion of the strain compatibility of the two, and the basis for the 100 psi allowable vertical shear on the block at corners which seems to include a 1/3 increase in UBC allowable stresses which would not be appropriate nor in line with current practice.
17. Discuss in detail the effects on the in-plane wall shear capacity of any tension induced in the walls by the gross overturning moments and the "plate bending" of the walls generated by the earthquake component perpendicular to these walls.
18. In Table 3.3-1 the sum of the effective weights in the N-S direction does not add up to your indicated total. Please clarify.
19. Provide the basis for your claim that, in lieu of the test program results, there are no UBC requirements addressing the type of walls in the Trojan complex since Sec. 2417 of UBC-1963 specifies that for combinations of units, materials, or mortars, the maximum stress shall not exceed that permitted for the weakest of these. Also, provide the basis for your statement that the UBC did not envision the use of a model such as STARDYNE, therefore, higher allowables are appropriate. UBC Section 2417 merely states that forces be determined from the principles of continuity and relative rigidity, which is what STARDYNE does.
20. Provide the upper limits for the relative displacement of the Turbine and Control Buildings, considering the test results, in the areas where the existing shake space is being reduced by the addition of the steel plate and verify that there is adequate clearance everywhere.
21. In Section 4.2.3 you discuss the removal of part of the concrete beam along the R line between columns 41 and 46. What was the original structural function of this beam? Verify that removal of part of the beam does not compromise its structural integrity or its structural functions. Specifically, what impact will this have on the masonry blocks supported above the beams?
22. Provide a summary of the load combinations and the maximum forces which will be developed for the bolts and the shear studs and locally in the existing elements. Indicate where the Nelson shear studs will be used. Also, discuss the shear transfer mechanism between the steel plate and existing walls in detail.

23. Describe and justify the design criteria for the rail stop being added in the Turbine Building.
24. Explain why the finite element representation of the new wall along column line does not duplicate the wall as depicted in Figures 3.1-2 and 3.2-1.
25. In Section 4.2.3, reference is made to the tensioning of bolts after concrete has attained "adequate strength." Define "adequate strength" and describe how it will be determined.
26. Verify that the static and dynamic effects of the rigging and the steel plate on the Turbine Building above elevation 93 feet have been considered.
27. What strength concrete was used to model the new walls in the STARDYNE analysis of the modified complex? In Section 3.2.5 a concrete strength of $f' = 5000$ psi at 90 days is specified for the new walls. Will the qualification of the modified complex be affected while this strength is being developed after concrete placement considering both in plane and out of plane wall loadings? Provide the basis for your response.
28. Describe the procedures used to remove the rock during relocation of the railroad spur (e.g. blasting) and verify that there will be no impact on plant safety resulting from the removal of the rock.
29. Describe in detail the modifications necessary to ensure the seismic qualification of the complex as a result of the strengthening or stiffening of the structure and the sequence in which they will be performed.
30. Provide your evaluations of the effects of the proximity or configuration of hole patterns, including the effects of any cracking which is present in the walls.
31. Summarize the details of your evaluations which determined that placement of the reinforcing steel, the forms and the concrete will not significantly degrade the seismic capability of the complex. Include a definition of significant.
32. Summarize the loads and load combinations and corresponding acceptance criteria for which the diesel generator air intake will be designed. Include a discussion of how the effects of the Turbine Building, a non-Category I structure, have been considered.
33. Provide the basis for your determination that removal of the face masonry block and a portion of the concrete core at column lines 41 and 46 on column line N' will not significantly effect the shear capacity of these walls.

34. Provide the capacity assumed for the dowels used to perform the wall modifications and the basis for this assumed capacity.
35. Provide the basis for your determination that the connection of the guide columns between the Control and Turbine Buildings will not significantly effect the behavior of either structure during a seismic event.
36. Provide the basis for your determination that removal of portions of the Turbine Building will not effect the analysis referred to in Section 2 nor significantly affects its seismic capability.
37. Provide the correlation, wall for wall between the test specimens and the actual walls, and justification for the applicability of the test specimen results to the actual wall including a discussion of the similarities of such items as reinforcing steel ratio and continuity, encasement, material strengths, joint preparation (especially where drypack was used), etc. With regard to the drypack, refer to the article by Kahn and Hanson entitled, "Infilled Walls for Earthquake Strengthening" in the February 1979 ASCE Journal of the Structural Division. This article describes a "brittle" failure of a test specimen with a drypack joint. Discuss the implications of this with respect to the walls in the Trojan complex with the drypack joints and the applicability of the test results from specimens without drypack joints.
38. Discuss the behavior of the test walls vs. those of the actual walls considering the large differences in the H/T and L/T ratios. Provide the basis for your response.
39. Define "representative" as used in defining the struts used in specimen E1, F2 and H2. Include a discussion of the similarity between the way in which the struts were anchored into the bulkheads, thus encasing the wall vs. the way the walls are encased in the frame formed by the columns and beams in the actual structure. Expand this to include a similar discussion for specimens L1 and L2. Also, discuss the similarities between the horizontal steel anchorage at the edge of the test specimens vs. that of the actual walls interrupted by openings, and those which intersect cross walls (e.g. the wall intersection at the intersection of column lines R and 55.)
40. Provide the relationships between stiffness and load degradation vs. the number of stress cycles at the stress levels to which the walls are loaded to substantiate that the structure will withstand several OBE's followed by an SSE. Indicate the number of full stress reversal cycles considered for each event and the number of OBE's considered for evaluation purposes, and the basis for each choice.
41. Discuss in detail the error band associated with each of the test results (e.g., stiffnesses, strengths, degradation, etc.). Explain and justify how these were factored into your evaluation of the complex.

42. Discuss the bases for your statements regarding the strength differences between L1 and L2 in more detail. Include further discussion of the effects of the shear studs in L1 since they were only at the base as indicated in Figure A3-2. For all specimens, indicate the reinforcement anchorage details in the upper and lower beams.
43. Describe in detail how the constant bending moment applied to the test specimens via the auxiliary loading system in conjunction with the main loading system compares to that which would exist due to end restraint in the actual Trojan walls, to justify the applicability to the test specimens results directly to the actual walls.
44. Provide the relative displacement profiles between the complex and other structures, along with the allowable, at the computed OBE stress levels in the walls and the factored OBE stress levels in the walls considering the test data results.
45. Considering the strength of the column connections for the actual walls, demonstrate that they are capable of resisting the axial forces indicated by those results for the columns in specimens L1 and L2. Justify any exceedences of the beam/column connection capacity.
46. Provide the secant modulus derived for each of the test specimens vs. stress level; a comparison of the experimental initial elastic modulus for the test specimens ... that calculated using the formula in Section 2.2.1.3.2 of Appendix G; the error bands, and their deviation, for the curves representing stiffness reduction as a function of stress level; and the stresses in each of the walls resulting from incorporation of the stiffness reduction factors in the STARDYNE model along with the associated stiffness reduction factors assumed in the analysis. Since the stiffness reduction factors are not linear with stress level discuss the effect of transverse gross overturning moments and transverse inertial wall loadings, plus the effects of creep and shrinkage on the stiffness in a given direction. Discuss the effects of the embedded steel framing and how it was incorporated into your analyses. Also, indicate why the results of the specimens with struts were not incorporated into your stiffness considerations.
47. Provide the detailed bases for each of the variations assumed in Table B-2 in the calculations of the peak broadening percentage.
48. Provide the SSE and the OBE floor response spectra for all elevations in the complex.
49. Compare the slopes of the sides of the peaks in floor response spectra for the complex frequency shift vs. stress (therefore, ground acceleration) level as derived from the test data results to verify that the floor response spectra are conservative for all earthquake levels for both the OBE and the SSE spectra. Justify any non-conservative deviations.

50. Verify that the original FSAR pipe break criteria are not impacted by the new analyses.

5

488 320