

July 24, 1984

Docket No. 50-333

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File
NRC PDR
Local PDR
ORB#2 Reading
DEisenhut
OELD
SNorris
HAbelson
BSiegel
ELJordan
JNGrace
ACRS (10)
Gray File
HShaw

Mr. J. P. Bayne
Executive Vice President,
Nuclear Generation
Power Authority of the State
of New York
123 Main Street
White Plains, New York 10601

Dear Mr. Bayne:

SUBJECT: MARK I CONTAINMENT LONG TERM PROGRAM - PLANT
UNIQUE ANALYSIS REPORT STRUCTURAL EVALUATION

Re: James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant

The NRC staff and its consultant, the Franklin Research Center (FRC), are reviewing the structural aspects of your plant unique analysis report. As a result of our review to date and our meeting of June 12, 1984, we have prepared the enclosed request for additional information.

It is requested that you provide a response within 30 days of receipt of this letter. If you determine there is a need to meet with or to have a conference call with the staff and FRC to discuss this request prior to responding, please contact the NRC project manager. In addition, if you cannot meet this response date, please notify your project manager within seven days of receipt of this letter.

This request for information was approved by the Office of Management and Budget under clearance number 3150-0091 which expires October 31, 1985.

Sincerely,

Original signed by/

Domenic B. Vassallo, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #2
Division of Licensing

Enclosure:
As stated

cc w/enclosure:
See next page

DL:ORB#2
SNorris:ajs
07/24/84

DL:ORB#2
HAbelson
07/24/84

DL:LB#2
BSiegel
07/24/84

DL:ORB#2
DVassallo
07/24/84

Mr. J. P. Bayne
Power Authority of the State of New York
James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant

cc:

Mr. Charles M. Pratt
Assistant General Counsel
Power Authority of the State
of New York
10 Columbus Circle
New York, New York 10019

U. S. Environmental Protection
Agency
Region II Office
Regional Radiation Representative
26 Federal Plaza
New York, New York 10007

Mr. Corbin A. McNeill, Jr.
Resident Manager
James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear
Power Plant
Post Office Box 41
Lycoming, New York 13093

Mr. J. A. Gray, Jr.
Director - Nuclear Licensing - BWR
Power Authority of the State
of New York
123 Main Street
White Plains, New York 10601

Mr. Robert P. Jones, Supervisor
Town of Scriba
R. D. #4
Oswego, New York 13126

Mr. Leroy W. Sinclair
Power Authority of the State
of New York
10 Columbus Circle
New York, New York 10019

Mr. Jay Dunkleberger
Division of Policy Analysis
and Planning
New York State Energy Office
Agency Building 2
Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12223

Resident Inspector's Office
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Post Office Box 136
Lycoming, New York 13093

Mr. A. Klausman
Vice President - Quality Assurance
Power Authority of the State
of New York
10 Columbus Circle
New York, New York 10019

Mr. George Wilverding, Chairman
Safety Review Committee
Power Authority of the State
of New York
123 Main Street
White Plains, New York 10601

Mr. M. C. Cosgrove
Quality Assurance Superintendent
James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear
Power Plant
Post Office Box 41
Lycoming, New York 13093

Thomas A. Murley
Regional Administrator
Region I Office
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
631 Park Avenue
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406

Request for Information
James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant
SRV and Torus Attached Piping Systems

1. In Section 2.4.2 of the PUA report, TR-5321-2 [2], four conditions are listed that would be evaluated in case the conservative condition for SRV pipe stress could not be met. Provide the reason for considering the first of these cases and verify the value and derivation of the allowable stress associated with this case.
2. With respect to Section 3.3.5 of the PUA report, TR-5321-2 [2], indicate whether the 10% rule of Section 6.2d [1] was used to exempt any branch piping from analysis. If so, provide calculations demonstrating conformance to this rule. Also, indicate why, in the analysis of flexible branch piping, a displacement equal to the total torus attached piping motion at the connection point was used for the FitzPatrick plant, whereas Teledyne Engineering Services used twice the torus attached piping motion for other plants.
3. With respect to Section 3.4.1 of the PUA report, TR-5321-2 [2], indicate whether seismic loads were considered in load cases 25 and 15 (Table 1).
4. With respect to Tables 3-1 and 3-2 of the PUA report, TR-5321-2 [2], indicate whether the lines in each of the following sets are identical and explain why only one result appears for each set:

X-202A and X-202F, X-202B and X-202G, X-210A and X-211A, X-210B and X-211B, X-213A and X-213B, and X-206A, B, C, and D.
5. With respect to Section 3.4.6 of the PUA report, TR-5321-2 [2], provide the analytical results of the fatigue evaluation of torus shell penetrations.

REFERENCES

1. NEDO-24583-1
"Mark I Containment Program Structural Acceptance Criteria Plant-Unique Analysis Application Guide"
General Electric Company, San Jose, CA
October 1979
2. James A. FitzPatrick
Plant-Unique Analysis Report of the Torus Attached Piping, Mark I Containment Program
New York Power Authority
May 1984, TR-5321-2