DOCKET 50-269

SEP 21 1972

NOTE TO FILES

TELECON WITH BABCOCK & WILCOX (JMALLAY AND DSTEINKE) AND LICENSING (PELTIER, HOU AND BRAMMER) - BAW-10008, PART 2 REVISION 1
SEPTEMBER 19, 1972

The conference call was set up to discuss areas in which the subject topical report was felt by MEB to be deficient with regard to the Oconee application. The areas listed below were discussed and B&W will call back with answers to the questions raised.

1. Why was a 3 ft^2 leak rate used for a 36" pipe break?

2. Is the response spectra assumed for the vessel mounting conservative for the Oconee application?

3. Does the response model for the fuel element which ignores nonlinear effects in the first stage of analysis but includes them in the second stage conservative?

4. Is the assumption of one degree of freedom (one spring-one mass) for the fuel element conservative in view of the nonlinear multi-mass-multi-spring arrangement?

I. A. Peltier, Project Manager
Pressurized Water Reactors Branch No. 4
Directorate of Licensing

cc: R. C. DeYoung
A. Schwencer
D. Lange
S. Hou
H. Brammer
I. Peltier

8001090 651

A