

30 MAY 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR: T. E. Murley, Regional Administrator
THROUGH R. W. Starostecki, Director, Division of Reactor Projects
S. J. Collins, Chief, Reactor Projects Branch No. 2
FROM: J. C. Linville, Chief, Reactor Projects Section 2C
SUBJECT: NINE MILE POINT UNIT 2 DOWNCOMER GRADING CHRONOLOGY

In response to your request, the last time you were at the site in April 1986, attached is a History of NRC Downcomer Review provided by the licensee with their request for exemption dated February 18, 1986, and a chronological list of points either not addressed in the licensee list or cast in a somewhat different light than by the licensee. The latter list also briefly describes those events which have occurred since the licensee submittal.

J. C. Linville, Chief
Reactor Projects Section 2C

Enclosures: As stated

cc:
S. Collins
R. Gramm
R. Starostecki
S. Ebnetter
J. Durr
J. Wiggins
K. Manoly

CL
RJ:DRP
Linville/rhl
5/27/86

SC
RJ:DRP
Collins
5/27/86

SE
RJ:DRP
Ebnetter
5/27/86

RS
RJ:DRP
Starostecki
5/27/86

J. C. Linville
5/27/86

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

155 LINVILLE 5/27/86 - 0001.0.0
05/28/86

9102060336 901011
PDR FDIA
PERSON 90-207 PDR

NINE MILE POINT UNIT 2 (NMP2)

DOWNCOMER BRACING CHRONOLOGY

- 11/78 NUREG D478 indicated that NMP2 will have horizontal downcomer bracing added for pool dynamic loads like most other Mark II containments. At the time the only plants with no plans for bracing or restraints were Zimmer and Bailly.
- Unknown At some point downcomer bracing attachment pads were installed on the suppression pool lines.
- 11/15/79 Niagara Mohawk indicated that the load definition will be provided in the Design Assessment Report (DAR) which will be submitted with the FSAR.
- 10/83 Niagara Mohawk provided response to NRR FSAR Question F480.55 which requested the "realistic" load application used in the analyses of the unbraced downcomer due to SRV submerged drag loads in Appendix 6A of the FSAR DAR section 6A.3.4.8.
- 12/83 Niagara Mohawk provided response to FSAR Question F480.49 which stated that application of only single-downcomer loads for unbraced downcomers was inappropriate. Rather, the multivalent lateral load should also be used in assessing the vent system since the downcomers are braced together by the diaphragm drywell floor.
- 2/85 NMP2 SER section 3.9.3.1 stated that anticipated stresses will not cause a fatigue failure in the SRV piping and downcomers, and thus steam bypass is not likely to occur from these loadings.
- SER section 6.2.1.7.3.(5) stated that the applicant stated single downcomer loads as found acceptable by the staff will be used for the lateral load evaluation, and multivalent lateral loads theory is considered in the analysis of the diaphragm floor. The staff will require detailed discussion on the latter issue and report its findings in an SER supplement.
- 2/18/86 Applicant submitted exemption request in response to NRR 1/31/86 letter indicating that the downcomer design meets the licensing criteria for the upset and emergency conditions but not for the faulted condition. Applicant requested relief until the end of the first cycle when they will either modify the design or justify it.
- 4/2/86 Applicant presented to NRR two possible modifications, but indicated they are still pursuing load reductions which they feel can be justified.

5/1/86 NRR issued draft SER proposing to permit operation in the existing condition until the end of the first cycle when the modification is made or justification for the existing design is provided. The justification for the exemption is the low probability of occurrence of the faulted conditions and the unnecessary delay in plant operation associated with requiring the modification prior to operation.