PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY 2301 MARKET STREET P.O. BOX 8699 PHILADELPHIA, PA. 19101 (215) 841-4502

JOHN S. KEMPER VICE-PRESIDENT ENGINEERING AND RESEARCH AUG 08 1984

Docket Nos.: 50-352

50-353

Mr. A. Schwencer, Chief Licensing Branch No. 2 Division of Licensing U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D. C. 20555

SUBJECT: Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2

Structural Steel Survivability Evaluation

Additional Clarification Information

Reference: Telecon between NRC Staff and PECO

on August 8, 1984

File: GOVT 1-1 (NRC)

Attachment: Responses to Additional Questions

Concerning the Structural Steel

Survivability Evaluation

Dear Mr. Schwencer:

Pursuant to the Referenced telecon, the attachment provides our responses to additional questions raised by your Chemical Engineering Branch in concert with their Fire Protection consultant.

We hope that this information will support the final resolution of the SER open item no. 14.

Should any additional information be required, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

GJR/m1b/08088402

Copy to: See Attached Service List

8408200262 840808 PDR ADDCK 05000352

Judge Lawrence Brenner Judge Richard F. Cole Troy B. Conner, Jr., Esq. Ann P. Hodgdon, Esq. Mr. Frank R. Romano Mr. Robert L. Anthony Charles W. Elliot, Esq. Zori G. Ferkin, Esq. Mr. Thomas Gerusky Director, Penna. Emergency Management Agency Angus R. Love, Esq. David Wersan, Esq. Robert J. Sugarman, Esq. Spence W. Perry, Esq. Jay M. Gutierrez, Esq. Atomic Safety & Licensing Appeal Board Atomic Safety & Licensing Board Panel Docket & Service Section Martha W. Bush, Esq.

Mr. James Wiggins

Ms. Phyllis Zitzer

Judge Peter A. Morris

Mr. Timothy R. S. Campbell

(w/enclosure)

(w/enclosure) (w/enclosure) (w/enclosure) (w/enclosure) (w/enclosure) (w/enclosure)

(w/enclosure)

(w/enclosure) (w/enclosure) (w/enclosure) (w/enclosure) (w/enclosure) (w/enclosure) Columns - The latest revision (rev. 3) to the methodology describes the exposure criteria and acceptance criteria for columns. The "exposed columns" in the methodology included all steel columns not imbedded in the walls.

Columns were exposed to plume temperatures of 1500°F either from cable tray local effects, pool fires, or transient combustibles. The exposure durations were (1) the duration of cable exposure, (2) the duration of pool fires, or (3) 30 minute transient fire exposure. The longest of these exposures were used where multiple exposures were possible. For Limerick areas containing columns, all in-situ exposures exceeded the 30 minute transient exposure. The calculations contained in the appendix to the steel analysis contains the time-temperature history calculated for each column. The results are summarized in the table below.

The failures were as follows:

Calc #	Column	Corrective Action
18,19,20,23	W14X730 W14X87 W14X119	Automatic Sprinklers Not required structurally Coated Column - 3 hr. protection

Summary of Column Response to Localized Fire Exposure

Calc #		zed Fire & Duration	Column Sizes	Column T(s)
1	0il 0il	85 minutes 44 minutes	W14X730 W14X730	893°F 590°F
2	0il 0il	85 minutes 44 minutes	W14X730 W14X730	893°F 590°F
4	011	180 minutes	W14X730	>1000°F
12	Cables	35 minutes	W14X730	494°F
13	Cables	35 minutes	W14X550 W14X342	584°F 775°F
15	Cables	65 minutes	W14X730	757°F
16	Cables	32 minutes	W14X730 W14X550 W14X287	463°F 548°F 810°F
18	Cables	35 minutes	W14X730 W14X87	494°F 1402°F
19	Cables	47 minutes	W14X730 W14X665 W14X550 W14X370 W14X342 W14X119 W14X87	610°F 642°F 714°F 989°F 926°F 1385°F 1460°F
20	Cables	40 minutes	W14X730 W14X665 W14X87	544°F 574°F 1434°F
23	Cables	35 minutes	W14X87	1402°F
25	Cables	35 minutes	W14X398 W14X287	709°F 857°F

2. Cables in oil hazard rooms - For calculating No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8, minor amounts of cables are present in these rooms but were not included in the duration of these ventilation controlled fires. The table below shows the additional duration for the addition of cables.

Calculation No.	In-situ Oil (gal)	Transient Oil (gal)	Cables Insulation (1b)	Duration Oil Only (min)	Oil & Cable (min)
1 Case 1 Case 2 2 Case 1 Case 2 3 4 5 7	72 72 72 72 80 155 24 24 24	72 72 72 72 80 155 24 24 24	78 78 84 84 137 27 19 17	85 44 85 44 125 180 37 37	88 46 88 46 132 180 38 38 38

The areas addressed in Calc #3 and 4 are protected with automatic sprinklers. The other calculations were redone using both the large quantity of transient oil and the in-situ cables. The addition of cable in no case increased the area temperature greater than 15°F.

BUILDING: UNIT 1 REACTOR

ELEVATION AND AREA DESCRIPTION: 177' RHR

CASE DESCRIPTION: ONE 3'X7' DOOR

CEILING/WALL CEILING/ WALL AG HO AW D

(ft) (ft2) (ft) (ft2) (kU)

3.0 CONCRETE 21.0 7.0 7848 4504

FIRE DURATION	CAC TEMPERATURE
(min)	GAS TEMPERATURE
	(deg.F)
5	/ A"X
10	643
15	658
20	672
25	686
30	698
35	711
40	724
45	736
50	748
55	760
	772
60	784
65	795
70	907
75	818
80	830
85	841
90	
	852

BUILDING: UNIT 1 REACTOR ELEVATION AND AREA DESCRIPTION: 177' RMR

CASE DESCRIPTION: TWO 3'X7' DOORS

CEILING/WALL CEILING/ WALL THICKNESS

MATERIAL

Ao Ho

AW

(11)

(ft2) (ft) (ft2) (kU)

CONCRETE

42.0 7.0

7948 9000

FIRE IS VENTILATION CONTROLLED

FIRE DURATION	GAS TEMPERATURE
(min)	(deg.F)
2	
4	834
6	849
8	862
10	876
12	890
14	903
16	917
18	930
20	944
22	958
24	971
26	985
28	998
30	1012
32	1025
34	1039
36	1052
38	1066
40	1079
42	1092
44	1105
46	1118
40	1131

Calculation No. 1 ATTACHMENT 2

CASE NUMBER: 2 BUILDING: UNIT 1 REACTOR

ELEVATION AND AREA DESCRIPTION: 177' RHR

CASE DESCRIPTION: W 24 x 68

EFFECTS OF LOCAL HEATING ON STRUCTURAL STEEL

THE PERSON NAMED IN

FIRE TEMPERATURE (deg. F): 1131
WEIGHT OF STEEL MEMBER (lbs./ft): 68
SURFACE OF STEEL MEMBER HEATED (sq.ft./ft): 6.06

TIME	STEEL TEMPERATURE
(min)	(deg.F)
5.00	442
10.00	685
15.00	842
20.00	944
25.00	1010
30.00	1052
35.00	1080
40.00	1098
45.00	1110
50.00	1112
55.00	1122
60.00	
65.00	1125
	1127

BUILDING: UNIT 1 REACTOR

ELEVATION AND AREA DESCRIPTION: 177' RHR ROOM 103

CASE DESCRIPTION: ONE 3'X7' DOOR

CEILING/WALL THICKNESS	CEILING/ WALL MATERIAL	Ao	Но	Aw	ü
	**************************************	(ft2) ******** 21.0	****	(ft2) ***********	*****

4504

FIRE DURATION (min)	GAS TEMPERATURE (deg.F)
5	4.0 m
10	605
15	618
20	630
25	641
30	652
	663
35	673
40	693
45	
50	693
55	703
60	713
65	723
70	732
	7.12
25	751
80	
85	761
90	770
	779

BUILDING: UNIT 1 REACTOR

ELEVATION AND AREA DESCRIPTION: 177' RHR

CASE DESCRIPTION: TWO 3'X7' DUORS

CEILING/WALL THICKNESS	CEILING/ WALL MATERIAL	Ao	Но	AW	Q
(ft) ************************************	**************************************	(ft2) ******** 42.0	***	(ft2) ******* 9068	*XXXXXXXX

FIRE DURATION (min)	GAS TEMPERATURE (deg.F)
22	788
4	801
6	
8	812
10	824
12	835
14	846
16	857
18	869
20	879
55	890
24	901
26	912
29	923
30	934
32	945
34	955
36	966
38	977
40	988
42	998
44	1009
46	1020
	1030

BUILDING: UNIT 1 REACTOR

ELEVATION AND AREA DESCRIPTION: 177' CURE SPRAY RM 110 CASE DESCRIPTION: ONE DOOR

CEILING/WALL CEILING/ WALL AO HO
THICKNESS MATERIAL

ĤΨ

(ft2) (ft) (ft2) (ku)

Many Line State Bull And Many State Bull Sta

17.5 5.8 2749

FIRE IS VENTILATION CONTROLLED

FIRE DURATION	CAG TEMPERATURE
(min)	GAS TEMPERATURE
	(deg.F)
2	860
6	876
8	891
10	907
12	922
14	937
16	952
18	968
20	983
22	998
24	1014
26	1029
28	1044
30	1060
35	1075
34	1090
36	1105
33	1120
	1135

Calculation No. 5 ATTACHMENT 1

CASE NUMBER: 1
BUILDING: UNIT 1 REACTOR
ELEVATION AND AREA DESCRIPTION: 177' C.S. RM110
CASE DESCRIPTION: W27x84

EFFECTS OF LOCAL HEATING ON STRUCTURAL STEEL

FIRE TEMPERATURE (deg. F): 1135
WEIGHT OF STEEL MEMBER (lbs./ft): 84
SURFACE OF STEEL MEMBER HEATED (sq.ft./ft): 6.78

TIME	STEEL TEMPERATURE
(Min)	(deg.f)
5.00	408
10.00	640
15.00	798
20.00	905
25.00	978
30.00	1028
35.00	1052
40.00	1096
45,00	1101
50.00	1112
55.00	1119
60.00	1124
65.00	1120

BUILDING: UNIT 1 REACTOR ELEVATION AND AREA DESCRIPTION: 177' CORE SRRAY RM 113

CASE DESCRIPTION: ONE DOOR

CEILING/WALL CETLING/ WALL THICKNESS

60 Ho

MW

()

MATERIAL

(ft2) (ft)

CONCRETE

17.5 5.8

2976

FIRE DURATION	
(Min)	GAS TEMPERATURE (deg.F)
2	
4	834
6	849
8	862
10	876
12	890
14	903
16	917
18	931
20	944
22	258
	971
24	985
26	999
28	1012
30	1026
32	
34	1039
36	1052
38	1066
	1079

BUILDING: UNIT 1 REACTOR

ELEVATION AND AREA DESCRIPTION: 177' CORE SPRAY RM 114

CASE DESCRIPTION: ONE DOOR

CEILING/WALL CEILING/ WALL THICKNESS MATERIAL

Ao Ho

Aw G

(ft)

(ft2) (ft) (ft2) (kW)

17.5 5.8 2784 3417

FIRE IS VENTILATION CONTROLLED

FIRE DURATION	CAG TOWN
(min)	GAS TEMPERATURE (deg.F)
2	
4	856
6	872
8	887
10	902
12	917
14	932
16	947
18	962
20	977
22	992
24	1007
26	1022
28	1037
30	1052
32	1067
34	1082
36	1096
38	1111
	1126

ATTACHMENT 1

BUILDING: UNIT 1 REACTOR

ELEVATION AND AREA DESCRIPTION: 177' C.S. RM114

CASE DESCRIPTION: W27x145

EFFECTS OF LOCAL HEATING ON STRUCTURAL STEEL

FIRE TEMPERATURE (deg. F): 1126 WEIGHT OF STEEL MEMBER (16./ft): 145 SURFACE OF STEEL MEMBER HEATED (Eq.ft./ft): 7.87

TIME	CAT PRINT. WINDOWS
(min)	STEEL TEMPERATURE
	(deq.F)
5.00	200
10.00	295
	473
15.00	613
20.00	723
25.00	
30.00	809
35.00	877
	731
40.00	
45.00	972
50.00	1005
	1031
55.00	1052
60.00	
65 00	1057
	1080

3. Stratification - The use of a maximum constant fire size from time zero throughout the fire, and the omission of radiative and convective heat losses through openings make the estimates of area temperature conservatively high. These conservatisms for the area temperature, combined with the evaluation of plume effects adequately address the problem of stratification.

At the request of NRC, the heat balance area temperature method was applied to the UL conducted 20 foot separation test for comparison purposes. This comparison is shown in the tables below and indicate that the heat balance area temperature is conservative enough to compensate for the problem of potential stratification.

UL Test Comparison

#1	Test Description 5 gal heptane and E/PVC	Q	Heat Balance T	Measured Room Average	Peak Temp. Hot Layer Average
	PE/PVC cables, Exp. peak at 5 min duration 15 min	1160 kW heptane 1750 kW cables	1284°F	784°F	1212°F
#2	5 gal heptane and XLPE cables, exp peak at 6 min duration 14 min	1160 kW heptane 1234 kW cables	1036°F	659°F	1027°F
#3	10 gal heptane Experimental peak at 20 min Duration 25 min	1160 kW	696°F	524°F	710°F

4. Enclosure Feedback Effects - In those cases where enclosures are small, all cables are burning simultaneously, and adequate ventilation is supplied (so the fire is fuel controlled), the question regards whether the "open burning" mass loss rates from EPRI/FMRC intermediate scale test are conservative enough to account for potential enclosure feedback effects. Also, if mass loss rates increase with a corresponding decrease in fire duration, how significant would the change in enclosure temperature be?

Tests conducted at Sandia Laboratories on cable trays containing cross-linked polyethylene cable insulation showed that mass loss rate was a function of the inverse square of the diagonal distance from the ceiling-wall corner. The tests also showed that these effects drop off rapidly within the first five feet of this distance. Beyond that distance, the mass loss rate was rather flat. Based on these Sandia tests and the Limerick cable configuration below deep beams, it is not anticipated that the enclosure feedback effect would have a significant impact on the conservatism built into the methodology.

Sample calculations were run for calculation #9 and #31 picked as arbitrary examples of all cable burning to assess the effect of increased mass loss rate. For Calc 9 mass loss rates were increased by 7, 25, and 50%. These increases resulted in increases in calculated temperatures of 19°F, 63°F, and 118°F, respectively. For calculation 31 mass loss rates were increased by 17, 40, and 55%. These increases resulted in increases in calculated temperatures of 61°F, 139°F, and 157°F, respectively. Since in both cases 50% increase in mass loss rate only increased the resultant calculated temperature by approximately 15%, enclosure feedback effects would not have a significant effect on the conservatism built into the methodology.

--- WIZZANDAWAYA

BUILDING: UNIT 1 REACTOR

ELEVATION AND AREA DESCRIPTION: 177' SUMP ROOM

CASE DESCRIPTION: ALL CABLES BURNING

- 1 - Car . Name Last at ...

1820

2595

CEILING/WALL	CENTANG				***********
THICKNESS	CEILING/ WALL MATERIAL	Ao	Ho	AW	u
2.5	**************************************	(ft2) (******* 17.5	(ft) ****** 5.8	(ft2) *********** 2595	(kb) ********

	The state of the s
FIRE DURATION (min)	GAS TEMPERATURE (deg.F)
2	681
3	686
4	691
5	695
6	699
7	703
8	707
9	711
10	714
11	718
12	721
13	725
14	729
	732

BUILDING: UNIT 1 REACTOR

ELEVATION AND AREA DESCRIPTION: 177' SUMP ROOM

CASE DESCRIPTION: ALL CABLES BURNING

CEILING/WALL CEILING/ WALL THICKNESS

MATERIAL

Ao Ho

GW

(3)

(ft)

(ft2) (ft) (ft2) (kW)

CONCRETE

17.5 5.8 2595

2125

FIRE DURATION (min)	GAS TEMPERATURE
1	724
2	730
4	736
5	741
6	745
7	750
8	754
9	759
10	763
11	768
12	772
	776

BUILDING: UNIT 1 REACTOR

ELEVATION AND AREA DESCRIPTION: 177' SUMP ROOM

CASE DESCRIPTION: ALL CABLES BURNING

CEILING/WALL CEILING/ WALL As Ho AH Q

(ft2) (ft) (ft2) (kb)

CONCRETE 17.5 5.8 2595 2550

FIRE DURATION	GAS TEMPERATURE
(min)	(deg.F)
1	778
2	785
3	791
	797
5	803
6 7	809
	814
8	820
	825
10	8.31

. BUILDING: CONTROL STRUCTURE

ELEVATION AND AREA DESCRIPTION: 180 TANK AREA 163 CASE DESCRIPTION: ALL CABLES BURNING

(11)	CEILING/ WALL MATERIAL	Ao	Ho	Au	q
3.0	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	(ft2) ******* 21.0	(ft) ******* 7.0	(ft2) ********* 2772	(kW) ******** 3380

FIRE DURATION (min)	GAS TEMPERATURE
5 1 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6	
10	877
15	914
20	951
25	988
30	1026
	1063

BUILDING: CONTROL STRUCTURE

ELEVATION AND AREA DESCRIPTION: 150' TANK AFEA 163

CASE DESCRIPTION: ALL CABLES BURNING

CEILING/WALL CEILING/ WALL AO HO
THICKNESS MATERIAL

Aw 0

(f+2) (f+) (f+2) (kW)

CONCRETE

21.0 7.0

2772 4060

FIRE IS FUEL CONTROLLED

FIRE DURATION GAS TEMPERATURE (Min) (deg.F) 13 945 10 993 15 1042 230 1092 25 1141

BUILDING: CONTROL STRUCTURE

ELEVATION AND AREA DESCRIPTION: 180' TANK AREA 163

CASE DESCRIPTION: ALL CABLES BURNING

CEILING/WALL CEILING/ WALL AO HO THICKNESS MATERIAL

15

20

AW

(ft)

(ft2) (ft) (ft2) (kW)

1101

1159

CONCRETE 21.0 7.0 2772 4504

FIRE DURATION (min)	GAS TEMPERATURE (deg.F)
5	
10	986
1 60	1043

5. EPR/Hypalon Cable Test Data - Questions were raised regarding the temperature at which pyrolysis occurs for the EPR/Hypalon Cables. Data reported in EPRI-NP 1767 indicated one cable sample started to pyrolyze at 297°C. Others were reported at 488°C. To clarify these data, Dr. A Tewarson of FMRC, who conducted the tests, was contacted by telephone. Dr. Tewarson indicated that one sample did start to "give off gases" at around 300°C (570°F) but not in sufficient quality or quantity to support piloted ignition. Dr. Tewarson said a range of 450-500°C is where piloted ignition could occur. He further indicated that even with very high radiant heat flux, 70kW/m², they could not create autoignition in the EPR/Hypalon cables.

Relating these test data to the potential for secondary fires in areas where spreading cables fires were quantified, of the 7 areas evaluated for fuel controlled spreading cables fires, only 3 exceeded 800°F (426°C). The other four areas resulted in temperatures calculated between 395°F and 650°F. For the 3 areas exceeding 800°F, two are provided with automatic sprinkler protection and the third was shown to have a self-supporting floor slab not requiring the beams for support.

Based on the test data for EPR/Hypalon and the specific results for Limerick, the potential for secondary fires need not be further evaluated.

one of the RHR heat exchanger and pump rooms were performed using two doors open as the ventilation flow path. The selection of two doors open is conservative for these cases and would be conservative for any fire area location containing safe shutdown equipment. The RHR rooms have two watertight doors at elevation 177' and two steamtight doors at elevation 201'. All four doors are electrically supervised and monitored at the plant security panel. Whenever a door in a fire barrier is inoperable plant technical specifications require a fire watch. Considering that these doors have multiple design and operational functions including not only fire but security and plant safety (flood and steam line break) the likelihood of even one door being open for longer than the time it takes for personnel access is remote.

GJR/bls/07318404

Program to assure that changes to plant fire protection features are controlled. The Limerick Fire Protection Evaluation Report will be maintained as a working document for the life of the plant. Engineering and Research Department Procedures will require that all project engineers evaluate the effect of every proposed modification on fire protection features and safe shutdown separation. All modifications are accompanied by a safety evaluation. The Project Engineer will include in the safety evaluation a conclusion addressing the effects of the modification on fire protection features. The conclusion will be based on review of a fire protection checklist which includes an evaluation of possible increased combustible loadings, relocation of safe shutdown equipment, and the effect of the modification on existing fire protection features, including sprinklers and fire detectors.

A certain margin of safety has already been accounted for in our combustible loading and fire temperature calculations by doubling the quantity of fixed lubricant or fuel oil and adding 10% to the cable quantity.