MAY 20 1974

Docket No. 50-460

A. Schwencer, Chief, Light Water Reactors Branch 2-3, L

MEETING WITH WASHINGTON PUBLIC POWER SUPPLY SYSTEM (WPPSS) TO DISCUSS APPLICANT'S DESIGN CRITERIA FOR HIGH ENERGY FLUID LINES

Time and Date: 9:00 a.m., Friday
May 24, 1974

Location: Room P-110
Bethesda, MD

Purpose of Meeting: To discuss staff concerns about applicant's high energy fluid line design criteria.

Participants: AEC - T. Cox, J. Knight, A. Miller

WPPSS - A. Hosler

UE&C - A. Friedman, J. Schmieder, W. Moritz, G. Rigamonti, J. Dainora

B&W - K. Suhrke

Original Signed by

Thomas H. Cox, Project Manager
Light Water Reactors Branch 2-3
Directorate of Licensing

Attachment:
Proposed Meeting Agenda

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket Files	RP ADs	DKartalia
AEC PDR	RP BCs	RO (3)
LPDR	JHendrie	RS (3)
LWR 2-3 Reading	AKenneke	EGoulbourne
L Reading	TR ADs	Receptionist
EGCase	TR BCs	RKlecker
AGiambusso	SVarga	JKnight
RSBoyd x7886	TCox	AMiller
DEisenhut	RLoose	ACRS (16)

LB

OFFICE ▶	LWR 2-3				
SURNAME ▶	THCox:cjb				
DATE ▶	5/17/74				

Form AEC-318 (Rev. 9-53) AECM 0240 GPO C43 16 81465-1 820-284

Proposed Meeting Agenda

WNP-1 - Postulated Pipe Breaks

3.0 Design of Structures, Components, Equipment and Systems

3.6 Protection Against Dynamic Effects Associated with the Postulated Rupture of Piping

1. The design criteria presented in PSAR 3.6 do not specifically conform to criteria acceptable to the staff in a number of details. It is required that the applicant either modify the criteria appropriately or provide technical justification for the apparent differences. The principle areas of difference are the following:

(a) Criteria for postulating break locations and orientations in high energy fluid lines inside containment.

(b) Procedures for determining load capacity of pipe following a postulated break and the load which can be transmitted to an anchor point.

(c) Assumption of operating condition prior to a postulated break in design of restraints.

(d) Criteria for postulating break locations in high energy lines outside containment but within an enclosing structure or compartment as compared with such criteria for lines routed alongside, above, or below such structures and compartments.

(e) The avoidance of design features, especially at points of pipe fixity, that would require welding directly to the outer surface of the piping.

2. In PSAR 3.6.6.1, in the discussion of stress criteria for piping which passes through the primary containment penetration, clarify the meaning of the term, "the outermost isolation valve."

3. In PSAR 3.6.1, in stating the assumption of a LOCA on the reactor side of the valve in cases I and IV of Figure 3.6-1, indicate whether the valve referred to is the second valve, not shown in the figure.

4. In PSAR 3.6.2.1 there is a discussion of piping which passes through primary containment penetrations. Provide the additional criteria required for such sections of pipe in order to justify the no-break postulate or refer to other parts of the PSAR where such criteria are provided. Modify the answer in Amendment 4 to Question 3.40 to incorporate the criteria for this feature of the design.

5. PSAR 3.6 states that the design philosophy for pipe breaks outside containment is described in Section 3.6.6. Indicate specifically all the portions of PSAR Section 3.6 which are applicable to this subject for piping systems outsiue containment, and not only those concerned with postulated break locations.

6. In PSAR 3.12/1.46, the statement that the WNP-1 design utilizes ANS 20.1 in the protection against pipe whip inside containment is not acceptable without specific technical justification as noted above in item 1. It is required that the applicant either modify the criteria employed or provide said justification for the differences with Regulatory Guide 1.46.