

NOV 30 1982

Docket Nos.: 50-440  
and 50-441

MEMORANDUM FOR: B. J. Youngblood, Chief  
Licensing Branch No. 1  
Division of Licensing

FROM: John J. Stefano, Project Manager  
Licensing Branch No. 1  
Division of Licensing

SUBJECT: REPORT OF MEETING WITH THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC  
ILLUMINATING COMPANY (CEI) REGARDS SRV HYDRODYNAMIC  
LOAD TESTS - PERRY NUCLEAR POWER PLANT (UNITS 1  
and 2)

The meeting was held on Monday, November 22, 1982 in Bethesda, Maryland to discuss CEI's proposal for not performing the Perry SRV hydrodynamic loads discharge tests. The basis for the discussions was information provided in CEI letters dated October 15, 1982 and November 17, 1982, which documented CEI's position that the Kuosheng SRV test data confirms the conservative designs of the Mark III containment for SRV hydrodynamic loads; and thus that a plant-unique test of the Perry SRV discharge was not necessary. CEI requires a staff decision on its proposal by December 15, 1982 in order to maintain currently estimated Unit 1 fuel load by November 30, 1983.

Individuals who participated in the meeting follows:

<u>NRC</u>	<u>CEI</u>	<u>Gilbert Associates</u>	<u>NuTech</u>
D. Jeng, SEB	E. Buzzelli	C. Cheng	L. Conrad
L. Yang, SEB	P. Nevins	C. Vath	I. McInnes
N. Chokshi, SEB		F. Lakovski	
K. Skazukat, SEB			
D. Terao, MEB			
J. Stefano, LB#1			

Summary of Discussions and Conclusions

The information presented by CEI/Gilbert Associates (the AE) reflected a close similarity between the Kuosheng and Perry containment designs in the suppression pool region (both plants have a reinforced concrete steel-lined containment structure in the suppression pool region - above the suppression pool, Perry differs in that its containment is a free-standing steel structure). The presentation specifically addressed questions raised by the CSB, SEB and MEB staff review of information contained in the October 15, 1982 letter, and responded to

8212080115 821130  
PDR ADOCK 05000440  
PDR

OFF	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
SURNAME	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
DATE	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

by CEI in its letter dated November 17, 1982. CEI's response provided the results of a further analysis performed utilizing a pressure time history from the Kuosheng tests as the forcing function input to Perry structural models to predict the response of the Perry containment and internals structures to SRV loads from a discharge into the suppression pool. The response spectra concluded from this analysis was that the Perry models effectively predicted the accelerations measured by the Kuosheng test. During the Kuosheng test, exceedances in the high frequency range were identified which were found to be similar to those anticipated for Perry by CEI/Gilbert Associates. CEI/Gilbert Associates, with the assistance of NuTech, have developed a program to evaluate the exceedances. This program includes a re-analysis of the piping system with active valves and equipment located within containment where the exceedances were located. CEI maintains that, although high frequency exceedances exist at various points (nodes) in the Perry structure, Kuosheng measured responses of piping and equipment in similar areas were quite low. This finding, coupled with Perry design conservatisms, adequately demonstrate design margins in support of its no-test proposal; and that the criteria of NUREG-0763 will be met without performing the plant-unique SRV tests for Perry.

The SEB staff was unable to agree with CEI's no-test proposal at the meeting, and will require still further analytical results to support the comparative basis for the no-test proposal in order to make a decision. Accordingly, the SEB staff requested CEI to further analyze the Perry design using the SRV plus SRVCO loadings, and then compare design response spectra determined in the radial direction with the Kuosheng test data. A conference call was scheduled for November 24, 1982 between SEB, CEI and Gilbert Associates to discuss specifics and whether response spectra in the vertical direction would also be needed by SEB to concur with the no-test proposal.

On the basis of responses provided to their questions (CEI letter dated November 17, 1982), the CSB staff agrees with the no-test proposal provided that the containment forcing functions remain unchanged from that presented. As such, CSB did not participate in this meeting.

The MEB staff remains concerned about potential thermal gradient stresses in the SRV discharge pipe supports in the suppression pool region. This will require a further analysis by CEI as opposed to a test. Therefore, MEB agrees with the no-test proposal, and will advise the project managers of the specific analytical work needed for them to confirm the adequacy of the SRV pipe support design in the suppression pool region.

151

John J. Stefano, Project Manager  
 Licensing Branch No. 1  
 Division of Licensing

cc: See next page

OFFICE	DL:LB#1	DL:LB#1					
SURNAME	JStefano:cw	BJYoungblood					
DATE	11/24/82	11/24/82					

Mr. Dalwyn R. Davidson  
Vice President, Engineering  
The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company  
P. O. Box 5000  
Cleveland, Ohio 44101

cc: Jay Silberg, Esq.  
Shaw, Pittmar, Potts & Trowbridge  
1800 M Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20006

Donald H. Hauser, Esq.  
The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company  
P. O. Box 5000  
Cleveland, Ohio 44101

Resident Inspector's Office  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Parmlly at Center Road  
Perry, Ohio 44081

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Mr. James G. Keppler, Regional  
Administrator, Region III  
799 Roosevelt Road  
Glen Ellyn, Illinois 60137

Donald T. Ezzone, Esq.  
Assistant Prosecuting Attorney  
105 Main Street  
Lake County Administration Center  
Painesville, Ohio 44077

Daniel D. Wilt, Esq.  
P. O. Box 08159  
Cleveland, Ohio 44108

Ms. Sue Hiatt  
OCRE Interim Representative  
8275 Munson  
Mentor, Ohio 44060

Terry Lodge, Esq.  
915 Spitzer Building  
Toledo, Ohio 43604

John G. Cardinal, Esq.  
Prosecuting Attorney  
Ashtabula County Courthouse  
Jefferson, Ohio 44047

MEETING SUMMARY

NOV 30 1992

Document Control 50-440/50-441

NRC PDR  
L PDR  
PRC System  
NSIC

LB#1 Rdg.  
M. Rushbrook  
Project Manager J. Stefano  
Attorney, OELD  
W. Lovelace\*  
OPA\*  
T. Novak  
F. Schauer  
R. Bosnak  
H. Brammer  
W. Butler

NRC PARTICIPANTS

D. Jeng  
L. Yang  
N. Chokshi  
K. Skaukat  
D. Terao  
J. Stefano

J. Kudrick  
F. Eltawila

\*CASELOAD FORECAST PANEL VISITS