

TERA



APR 27 1981

Marvin I. Lewis  
6504 Bradford Terrace  
Philadelphia, PA 19149

Dear Mr. Lewis:

Thank you for your latest letter of April 2, 1981. Responses to your five questions are given below:

Question 1 - Are you specifically going to investigate the vibration or shaking of uncured concrete due to the blasting at the nearby quarry? If indicated, will further investigation be started? For instance, if the blasting occurred during the curing of the Class I structures, will vibration be estimated? If indicated, will cores be cut out and compression tested? Will ACI rules be followed or some other concrete guide?

Answer - We plan to investigate possible effects of the vibration of uncured concrete resulting from blasting at the Pottstown Traprock Quarry. The nature of the follow-up to this investigation will depend upon what we learn. If blasting occurred during the curing of Class I structures, the peak velocity at that structure will be estimated.

Question 2 - You state that, "The staff is requesting the PECO to provide a record of blastings and concrete pours for Class I structures." Was this requested in writing? May I have a copy of the letter? If by phone, when? I know that the PECO was requested to "correlate the data (blasting and pours) so that more precise information will be available to assist in an analysis." Where was this particular correlation requested? Can I see it when available?

Answer - PECO was alerted to the need for the correlation during telephone calls on March 6, and March 20, 1981. A Formal Request for Additional Information on this subject is currently being processed. You may see it when it becomes available at the Local Public Document Room (EPDR), Library, Pottstown.

Question 3 - Is investigation of Class I structures sufficient in light of the many non-ESF structures that were involved in the mitigation of the TMI 2 scenario? Will a study be done on this question? When and where can I see it?

Answer - We decided to limit the investigation to Class I structures first. If it appears justified, then, it will be extended to other structures.

8105050 236

OFFICE				
SURNAME				
DATE				

Question 4 - Question D answer, "The extent to which this (Lewis Report incorporated into PRA) is adequately accomplished will be studied in the staff review of the final report." Aren't there any guidelines for the way that the staff will accomplish the staff review of the PRA? It seems to be a pure staff decision according to your answer. If there are guidelines, where can I get a copy of NUREG #?

Answer - PECO was requested (letter Eisenhut to Bauer, dated May 6, 1980), to utilize the WASH-1400 methodology in the PRA and to specifically recognize the criticisms of the Risk Assessment Review Group Report. These items provide the guidelines to PECO and the staff concerning the content of the PRA. In addition, we held a detailed meeting on the PRA on May 21, 1980 (summarized in memo D. Sells to A. Schwencer of May 23, 1980), and I sent another Request for Additional Information to PECO on January 26, 1981. PECO specifically addresses the Lewis Committee's comments in Section 1.3.2 of the PRA. We are in the process now of conducting an acceptance review of the PRA to determine whether it contains the required material. Any missing material will have to be supplied by PECO before the technical review. All of the documents referenced above as well as the PRA are available at the LPDR.

Question 5 - Answer to question E. "The exact extent of coverage (Class 9 accidents) will not be known until we receive the final report (PRA) from PECO." This sounds like PECO (Licensee) is in charge of specifying how extensive the Class 9 consideration will be in the PRA. Is this correct? If not, are there any guidelines for the PECO to use? May I see them? Where? Can I get a copy? NUREG #?

Answer - The Limehick PRA uses four generic accident classes for analysis. It is recommended that you study the whole document (available at LPDR). However, Table 3.3.1. enclosed, from the PRA summarizes the cases.

I trust you will find the above answers responsive to your questions.

DISTRIBUTION

Docket or Central File  
NRC PDR ASchwencer  
Local PDR Licensing Project Manager  
LB#2 Licensing Assistant  
DEisenhut OELD  
RPurple (I&E (3)  
RTedesco

Sincerely,

Original signed by  
Robert L. Tedesco

Robert L. Tedesco, Assistant Director  
for Licensing  
Division of Licensing

Enclosures:  
As stated

bcc: ACRS (16)  
TERA  
TISC  
TIC

OFFICE	LB#2	LB#2	OELD	A/DL
SURNAME	GDCalkins:sp	ASchwencer		RTedesco
DATE	4/5/81	4/1/81	4/1/81	4/9/81

Table 3.3.1  
 GENERIC ACCIDENT SEQUENCE CLASSES

Generic Accident Sequence Designator	Physical Basis for Classification	System Level Contributing Event Sequence
Class I (C1)	Relatively fast core melt; containment intact at core melt and at low pressure	Transients involving loss of inventory makeup, small LOCA events involving loss of inventory makeup
Class II (C2)	Relatively slow core melt due to lower decay heat power; containment failed prior to core melt	Transients or LOCAs involving loss of heat removal, inadvertent SRV opening accidents with inadequate heat removal capability
Class III (C3)	Relatively fast core melt; containment intact at core melt, but at high internal pressure	Transients involving loss of scram function and inability to provide coolant makeup, large LOCAs with insufficient coolant makeup transient with loss of heat removal and long term loss of inventory makeup
Class IV (C4)	Relatively fast core melt; containment fails prior to core melt due to over-pressure	Transients involving loss of scram function and loss of containment heat removal or all reactivity control, but which have coolant makeup capability

POOR ORIGINAL