Docket No. 50-313

Arkansas Power & Light Company
ATTN: Mr. J. B. Phillips
      Senior Vice President
      Production, Transmission,
      and Engineering
Sixth and Pine Streets
Pine Bluff, Arkansas 71601

Gentlemen:

RE: ARKANSAS NUCLEAR ONE - UNIT NO. 1

On October 17, 1975, we informed you of a potential safety question
which has been raised regarding the design of reactor pressure vessel
support systems. We requested that you review the design bases for
the reactor vessel support system for your facility to determine
whether the transient loads described in the enclosure to our letter
were appropriately taken into account in the design.

Your reply of November 21, 1975, indicated that the transient
differential pressures in the annular region between the reactor
vessel and the cavity shield wall and across the core barrel were
not considered in the support design.

In our letter of October 17, 1975, we indicated that on the basis
of your initial review, a reassessment of the vessel support design
might be required. We have now determined that such a reassessment
is required.

As you are probably aware, we have been discussing with the PWR
vendors and various architect/engineer firms the generic aspects
of this problem. Should you contemplate utilizing organizations
other than your PWR vendor for calculation of the sub-cooled
internal loads, we suggest you contact us for the benefit of a
brief review of our generic discussions to date. We will continue
these generic discussions with the vendors and architect/engineers,
but such discussions are not intended to pace your evaluation
of this concern nor to eliminate the possibility that we may have
additional questions regarding your evaluation after submittal.
While the emphasis given in this letter deals with the reactor vessel
cavity, for your information and guidance our generic review may
consider other areas in the nuclear steam supply system and further
evaluation may be required.

OFFICE ▶					
SURNAME ▶					
DATE ▶					

8004220 882   P

Form AEC-318 (Rev. 9-53) AECM 0240   ☆ U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1974-526-166

JUN 09 1976

Please inform us within 30 days after receipt of this letter of your schedule for providing us your evaluation of the adequacy of the pressure vessel supports when the sub-cooled loads are calculated and taken into account in a manner which you determine best represents these phenomena. Your evaluation should include the answers to the attached request for additional information.

This request for generic information was approved by GAO blanket clearance number B-180225 (R0072). This clearance expires July 31, 1977.

Sincerely,

Original Signed by:
Dennis L. Ziemann

Dennis L. Ziemann, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #2
Division of Operating Reactors

Enclosure:
Request for Additional
 Information

cc w/encl:
Horace Jewell, Esquire
House, Holms & Jewell
1550 Tower Building
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201

Mr. William Cavanaugh, III
Manager, Nuclear Services
Arkansas Power & Light Company
Post Office Box 551
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201

Arkansas Polytechnic College
Russellville, Arkansas 72801

DISTRIBUTION
NRC PDR
Local PDR
Docket
ORB #2 Reading
KRGoller
TJCarter
OELD – Davis
OI&E (3)
DLZiemann
WEConverse
RMDiggs (2)
DEisenhut
TBAbernathy
JBuchanan
ACRS (16)
VStello
DRoss
CTrammell
EReeves

OFFICE ►	DOR:ORB #2	DOR:ORB #1	DOR:ORB #2				
SURNAME ►	WEConverse:ah	CTrammell	DLZiemann				
DATE ►	6/ /76	6/9/76	6/9/76				

Form AEC-318 (Rev. 9-53) AECM 0240   ☆ U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1974-526-166

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Recent analyses have shown that reactor pressure vessel supports may be subjected to previously underestimated lateral loads under the conditions that result from the postulation of design basis ruptures of the reactor coolant piping at the reactor vessel nozzles. It is therefore necessary to reassess the capability of the reactor coolant system supports to assure that the calculated motion of the reactor vessel under the most severe design basis pipe rupture condition will be within the bounds necessary to assure a high probability that the reactor can be brought safely to a cold shutdown condition.

The following information should be included in your reassessment of the reactor vessel supports and reactor cavity structure.

1. Provide engineering drawings of the reactor support system sufficient to show the geometry of all principle elements and materials of construction.

2. Specify the detail design loads used in the original design analyses of the reactor supports giving magnitude, direction of application and the basis for each load. Also provide the calculated maximum stress in each principle element of the support system and the corresponding allowable stresses.

3. Provide the information requested in 2 above considering a postulated break at the design basis location that results in the most severe loading condition for the reactor pressure vessel supports. Include

a summary of the analytical methods employed and specifically
state the effects of asymmetric pressure differentials across the
core barrel in combination with all external loadings including
asymmetric cavity pressurization calculated to result from the
required postulate. This analysis should consider:

(a) limited displacement break areas where applicable

(b) consideration of fluid structure interaction

(c) use of actual time dependent forcing function

(d) reactor support stiffness.

4. If the results of the analyses required by 3 above indicates loads
leading to inelastic action in the reactor supports or displacements
exceeding previous design limits provide an evaluation of the
following:

(a) Inelastic behavior (including strain hardening) of the material
used in the reactor support design and the effect on the load
transmitted to the reactor coolant system and the backup
structures to which the reactor coolant system supports are
attached.

5. Address the adequacy of the reactor coolant system piping, control
rod drives, steam generator and pump supports, structures surrounding
the reactor coolant system, [core support structures, fuel assemblies,
other reactor internals ....] and ECCS piping for both the elastic
and/or inelastic analyses to assure that the reactor can be safely
brought to cold shutdown. For each item include the method of

analysis, the structural and hydraulic computer codes employed, drawings of the models employed and comparisons of the calculated to allowable stresses and strains or deflections with a basis for the allowable values.

The compartment multi-node pressure response analysis should include the following information:

6. The results of analyses of the differential pressures resulting from hot leg and cold leg (pump suction and discharge) reactor coolant system pipe ruptures within the reactor cavity and pipe penetrations.

7. Describe the nodalization sensitivity study performed to determine the minimum number of volume nodes required to conservatively predict the maximum pressure within the reactor cavity. The nodalization sensitivity study should include consideration of spatial pressure variation; e.g., pressure variations circumferentially, axially and radially within the reactor cavity.

8. Provide a schematic drawing showing the nodalization of the reactor cavity. Provide a tabulation of the nodal net free volumes and interconnecting flow path areas.

9. Provide sufficiently detailed plan and section drawings for several views showing the arrangement of the reactor cavity structure, reactor vessel, piping, and other major obstructions, and vent areas, to permit verification of the reactor cavity nodalization and vent locations.

10. Provide and justify the break type and area used in each analysis.

11. Provide and justify values of vent loss coefficients and/or friction factors used to calculate flow between nodal volumes. When a loss coefficient co. .sts of more than one component, identify each component, its value and the flow area at which the loss coefficient applies.

12. Discuss the manner in which movable obstructions to vent flow (such as insulation, ducting, plugs, and seals) were treated. Provide analytical justification for the removal of such items to obtain vent area. Provide justification that vent areas will not be partially or completely plugged by displaced objects.

13. Provide a table of blowdown mass flow rate and energy release rate as a function of time for the reactor cavity design basis accident.

14. Graphically show the pressure (psia) and differential pressure (psi) responses as functions of time for each node. Discuss the basis for establishing the differential pressures.

15. Provide the peak calculated differential pressure and time of peak pressure for each node, and the design differential pressure(s) for the reactor cavity. Discuss whether the design differential pressure is uniformly applied to the reactor cavity or whether it is spatially varied.

In order to review the methods employed to compute the asymmetrical pressure differences across the core support barrel during the subcooled portion of the blowdown analysis, the following information is requested:

16. A complete description of the hydraulic code(s) used including the

development of the equations being solved, the assumptions and simplifications used to solve the equations, the limitations resulting from these assumptions and simplifications and the numerical methods used to solve the final set of equations.

17. In support of the hydraulic code(s) used provide comparisons with the code(s) to applicable experimental tests, including the following:

> (a). CSE tests B-63 and B-75
>
> (b). LOFT test L1-2
>
> (c). Semiscale tests S-02-6 and S-02-8

The models developed should be based on the assumptions proposed for the analysis of a PWR.

18. Provide a detailed description of the model proposed for your plant and include a listing of the input data used and a time zero edit. Identify the assumptions used in developing the model, specifically the treatment of area, length and volume.

19. Typically the current generation of hydraulic subcooled blowdown analysis codes solve the one-dimensional conservation equations. However, they are used to model the multi-dimensional aspects of the reactor system (i.e. the downcomer annulus region). Provide justification for the use of the code(s) to model multi-dimensional regions, including the equivalent representation of the region as modelled by the code(s).