



# Omaha Public Power District

1623 HARNEY ■ OMAHA, NEBRASKA 68102 ■ TELEPHONE 536-4000 AREA CODE 402

August 6, 1982

Mr. F. B. Litton  
Generic Issues Branch  
Division of Safety Technology  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Subject: NRC Summary of June 23, 1982 Meeting on  
Pressurized Thermal Shock

Dear Mr. Litton:

The NRC written summary of the June 23, 1982 meeting between the CE Owners Group and the staff on the pressurized thermal shock issue (dated July 8, 1982) contains a statement which could result in confusion if left in its present form. The statement of concern is in the fourth sentence of the third paragraph and reads as follows:

"CEOG gave credit to warm prestressing, small crack size, negligible clad effect and heat transfer coefficient of 300 Btu/hr/ft<sup>2</sup>/F<sup>0</sup>."

This statement does not accurately reflect the CEOG presentation concerning the evaluations of the Ginna and Rancho Seco overcooling events. The following statements are suggested as an alternate to the above sentence:

"The CEOG noted that warm prestressing would have been effective in preventing crack initiation for the actual Ginna and Rancho Seco transients, but reported the RT<sub>NDT</sub> where K<sub>I</sub> equals K<sub>IC</sub> for comparison purposes. A range of through clad initial crack sizes from very shallow depth to one quarter thickness deep were evaluated in the analyses. Cladding was treated accurately in terms of thermal conductivity in determining temperature gradients in the vessel wall. The CEOG analysis considers zero residual stress in the cladding at normal operating temperature. The heat transfer coefficient at the clad-water surface was 300 Btu/hr/ft<sup>2</sup>/F<sup>0</sup>."

Please amend the NRC summary with the above clarification so as to minimize the potential for confusion in this area.

Sincerely,

Kenneth J. Morris  
Vice Chairman  
CE Owners Group

8208130301 820806  
PDR GTECI GRVA-49  
PDR

KJM:jmm

YGol