

COM-02-039-7
Revision 0
May 1983
27.0200.1201

QUAD CITIES NUCLEAR POWER STATION
UNIT 2
PLANT UNIQUE ANALYSIS REPORT
VOLUME 7
TORUS ATTACHED PIPING
AND SUPPRESSION CHAMBER
PENETRATION ANALYSES

Prepared for:
Commonwealth Edison Company

Prepared by:
NUTECH Engineers, Inc.
San Jose, California

Approved by:

P. Pandey

P. Pandey
Project Leader

G. S. Wallach

G. Wallach
Project Leader

J. A. Gavula

J. A. Gavula, P.E.
Project Engineer

H. L. Gustin

H. L. Gustin, P.E.
Project Engineer

Issued by:

T. J. Victorine

T. J. Victorine, P.E.
Project Manager

N. A. McClean

N. A. McClean, P.E.
Engineering Manager

Thomas W. Soo Hoo

T. W. Soo Hoo, P.E.
Engineering Manager

J. D. Muffett

J. D. Muffett, P.E.
Engineering Manager

Dr. L. C. Hsu

Dr. L. C. Hsu
Engineering Manager

R. H. Buchholz

R. H. Buchholz
Project Director

REVISION CONTROL SHEET

TITLE: Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station Unit 2, Plant Unique Analysis Report, Volume 7
 REPORT NUMBER: COM-02-039-7
 Revision 0

T. J. Victorine/Project Manager

TV
 INITIALS

A. G. Brnilovich/Project Manager

AGB
 INITIALS

A. K. Moonka/Project Manager

AKM
 INITIALS

 INITIALS

 INITIALS

 INITIALS

 INITIALS

EFFEC-TIVE PAGE(S)	REV	PRE-PARED	ACCURACY CHECK	CRITERIA CHECK	EFFEC-TIVE PAGE(S)	REV	PRE-PARED	ACCURACY CHECK	CRITERIA CHECK
7-ix through 7-xix 7-1.1 through 7-1.10	0 ↓ 0	TV ↓ TV	AGB ↓ AGB	AKM ↓ AKM		0 ↓ 0			

QEP-001.4-30

REVISION CONTROL SHEET

TITLE : Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station REPORT NUMBER: COM-02-039-7
 Unit 2, Plant Unique Analysis Revision 0
 Report, Volume 7

P. Pandey/Consultant I

PP
 INITIALS

N. Jafarey/Consultant I

NJ
 INITIALS

S. R. Farahani, P.E./Associate Engineer

SRF
 INITIALS

N. A. McClean, P.E./Engineering Manager

N. ME.
 INITIALS

 INITIALS

 INITIALS

 INITIALS

EFFECTIVE PAGE(S)	REV	PRE- PARED	ACCURACY CHECK	CRITERIA CHECK	EFFECTIVE PAGE(S)	REV	PRE- PARED	ACCURACY CHECK	CRITERIA CHECK
7-2.1 through 7-2.4	0	NJ	PP SRF	N. ME. PP	7-2.14 through 7-2.28	0	NJ	PP	N. ME.
7-2.5			PP	N. ME.	7-2.29			SRF	PP
7-2.6			SRF	PP	7-2.31			PP	N. ME.
7-2.7			SRF	PP	7-2.32			PP	N. ME.
7-2.8			PP	N. ME.	7-2.34			SRF	PP
7-2.9			PP	N. ME.	7-2.35				
7-2.10			PP		7-2.40				
7-2.11 through 7-2.13	0	NJ	SRF	PP		0	NJ	SRF	PP

QEP-001.4-00

REVISION CONTROL SHEET

TITLE: Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station
Unit 2, Plant Unique Analysis
Report, Volume 7

REPORT NUMBER: COM-02-039-7
Revision 0

EFFECTIVE PAGE(S)	REV	PRE- PARED	ACCURACY CHECK	CRITERIA CHECK	EFFECTIVE PAGE(S)	REV	PRE- PARED	ACCURACY CHECK	CRITERIA CHECK
7-2.41	0	NJ	PP	71.7MS.					
7-2.42			PP	71.7MS.					
7-2.43			SRF	PP					
7-2.44			PP	71.7MS.					
7-2.45			PP	71.7MS.					
7-2.46			SRF	PP					
7-2.47			SRF	PP					
7-2.48									
through			PP						
7-2.51				71.7MS.					
7-2.52			SRF	PP					
7-2.53									
through			PP						
7-2.77				71.7MS.					
7-2.78			SRF	PP					
7-2.79			PP	71.7MS.					
7-2.80			PP	71.7MS.					
7-2.81		NJ	SRF	PP					

QEP-001.4-00

REVISION CONTROL SHEET

TITLE: Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station
Unit 2, Plant Unique Analysis
Report, Volume 7

REPORT NUMBER: COM-02-039-7
Revision 0

J. A. Gavula, P.E./Engineer

JAG
INITIALS

J. E. Neurauter, P.E./Engineer

JEN
INITIALS

INITIALS

INITIALS

INITIALS

INITIALS

INITIALS

EFFECTIVE PAGE(S)	REV	PRE- PARED	ACCURACY CHECK	CRITERIA CHECK	EFFECTIVE PAGE(S)	REV	PRE- PARED	ACCURACY CHECK	CRITERIA CHECK
7-3.1	0	JAG	JEN	JEN	1-3.13	0	JAG	JEN	JEN
7-3.2					1-3.14				
7-3.3					1-3.15				
7-3.4					1-3.16				
7-3.5					1-3.17				
7-3.6					1-3.18				
7-3.7					1-3.19				
7-3.8					1-3.20				
7-3.9					1-3.21	0			
7-3.10									
7-3.11									
7-3.12	0								

CEP-001.4-00

REVISION CONTROL SHEET

TITLE: Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station
Unit 2, Plant Unique Analysis
Report, Volume 7

REPORT NUMBER: COM-02-039-7
Revision 0

T. W. Soo Hoo/Principal Engineer

TWSH
INITIALS

G. S. Wallach/Consultant I

GSW
INITIALS

E. V. Harlow/Consultant I

E.V.H.
INITIALS

INITIALS

INITIALS

EFFECTIVE PAGE (S)	REV	PRE- PARED	ACCURACY CHECK	CRITERIA CHECK	EFFECTIVE PAGE (S)	REV	PRE- PARED	ACCURACY CHECK	CRITERIA CHECK
7-4.1	0	GSW	E.V.H.	TWSH					
7-4.2									
7-4.3									
7-4.4									
7-4.5									
7-4.6									
7-4.7									
7-4.8									
7-4.9	0	GSW	E.V.H.	TWSH					

QEP-001.4-00

REVISION CONTROL SHEET

TITLE: Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station REPORT NUMBER: COM-02-039-7
Unit 2, Plant Unique Analysis Revision 0
Report, Volume 7

P. Pandey/Consultant I

RP
INITIALS

N. Jafarey/Consultant I

NJ
INITIALS

S. R. Farahani, P.E./Associate Engineer

SRF
INITIALS

N. A. McClean, P.E./Engineering Manager

N. MC
INITIALS

INITIALS

INITIALS

INITIALS

EFFECTIVE PAGE (S)	REV	PRE- PARED	ACCURACY CHECK	CRITERIA CHECK	EFFECTIVE PAGE (S)	REV	PRE- PARED	ACCURACY CHECK	CRITERIA CHECK
7-5.1 through 7-5.8	0 ↓	NJ	pp	N-MS.					

QEP-001.4-00

REVISION CONTROL SHEET

TITLE: Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station
Unit 2, Plant Unique Analysis
Report, Volume 7

COM-02-039-7
REPORT NUMBER: Revision 0

H. L. Gustin/Engineer

NLS
INITIALS

L. C. Hsu/Supervising Engineer

LCH
INITIALS

Y. S. Wu/Consultant I

YSW
INITIALS

A. Y. Kuo/Consultant I

AYK
INITIALS

T. S. Hsu/Associate Engineer

TSH
INITIALS

L. K. Chang/Specialist

L.K.C.
INITIALS

D. G. Lee/Consultant I

DGL
INITIALS

A. K. Rao/Consultant II

AKR
INITIALS

EFFEC- TIVE PAGE(S)	REV	PRE- PARED	ACCURACY CHECK	CRITERIA CHECK	EFFEC- TIVE PAGE(S)	REV	PRE- PARED	ACCURACY CHECK	CRITERIA CHECK
7-6.1 through 7-6.3 7-6.4 through 7-6.8 7-6.9 through 7-6.13 7-6.14 through 7-6.18	0	NLS	YSW ↓ LKC ↓ LKC TSH ↓ TSH AYK ↓ AYK	LCH ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ LCH	7-6.19 through 7-6.22 7-6.23 through 7-6.26	0	NLS	AKR ↓ DGL ↓ DGL	LCH ↓ ↓ ↓ LCH

QEP-001.4-00

REVISION CONTROL SHEET

TITLE: Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station REPORT NUMBER: COM-02-039-7
Unit 2, Plant Unique Analysis Revision 0
Report, Volume 7

P. Pandey/Consultant I

AP
INITIALS

N. Jafarey/Consultant I

NJ
INITIALS

S. R. Farahani, P.E./Associate Engineer

SRF
INITIALS

N. A. McClean, P.E./Engineering Manager

N. MC
INITIALS

INITIALS

EFFECTIVE PAGE (S)	REV	PRE- PARED	ACCURACY CHECK	CRITERIA CHECK	EFFECTIVE PAGE (S)	REV	PRE- PARED	ACCURACY CHECK	CRITERIA CHECK
7-7.1	0	ZJ	PP	7. ME.					
7-7.2	↓	ZJ	PP	7. ME.					

QEP-001.4-00

ABSTRACT

The primary containments for the Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station Units 1 and 2 were designed, erected, pressure-tested, and N-stamped in accordance with the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, Section III, 1965 Edition with addenda up to and including Winter 1965 for the Commonwealth Edison Company (CECo) by the Chicago Bridge and Iron Company. Since then, new requirements have been established. These requirements affect the design and operation of the primary containment system and are defined in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC) Safety Evaluation Report, NUREG-0661. This report provides assessment of containment design loads postulated to occur during a loss-of-coolant accident or a safety relief valve discharge event. In addition, it provides an assessment of the effects that the postulated events have on containment systems operation.

This plant unique analysis report (PUAR) documents the efforts undertaken to address and resolve each of the applicable NUREG-0661 requirements. It demonstrates that the design of the primary containment system is adequate and that original design safety margins have been restored, in accordance with NUREG-0661 acceptance criteria. The Quad Cities 1 and 2 PUAR is composed of the following seven volumes:

- o Volume 1 - GENERAL CRITERIA AND LOADS METHODOLOGY
- o Volume 2 - SUPPRESSION CHAMBER ANALYSIS
- o Volume 3 - VENT SYSTEM ANALYSIS
- o Volume 4 - INTERNAL STRUCTURES ANALYSIS
- o Volume 5 - SAFETY RELIEF VALVE DISCHARGE LINE
PIPING ANALYSIS
- o Volume 6 - TORUS ATTACHED PIPING AND SUPPRESSION
CHAMBER PENETRATION ANALYSES (QUAD
CITIES UNIT 1)

o Volume 7 - TORUS ATTACHED PIPING AND SUPPRESSION
CHAMBER PENETRATION ANALYSES (QUAD
CITIES UNIT 2)

This volume documents the evaluation of the torus attached piping and suppression chamber penetrations. Volume 1 through 4 and 6 and 7 have been prepared by NUTECH Engineers, Incorporated (NUTECH), acting as an agent to the Commonwealth Edison Company. Volume 5 has been prepared by Sargent and Lundy (also acting as an agent to Commonwealth Edison Company), who performed the safety relief valve discharge lines (SRVDL) piping analysis. Volume 5 describes the methods of analysis and procedures used in the SRVDL piping analysis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ABSTRACT	7-x
LIST OF ACRONYMS	7-xv
LIST OF TABLES	7-xvii
LIST OF FIGURES	7-xix
7-1.0 INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY	7-1.1
7-1.1 Scope of Analysis	7-1.4
7-1.2 Summary and Conclusions	7-1.9
7-2.0 LARGE BORE PIPING	7-2.1
7-2.1 Component Description	7-2.2
7-2.1.1 Torus External Piping	7-2.6
7-2.1.2 Torus Internal Piping	7-2.9
7-2.2 Loads and Load Combinations	7-2.14
7-2.2.1 Loads	7-2.15
7-2.2.2 Load Combinations	7-2.32
7-2.2.3 Combination of Dynamic Loads	7-2.41
7-2.3 Acceptance Criteria	7-2.42
7-2.4 Methods of Analysis	7-2.44
7-2.4.1 Piping Analytical Modeling	7-2.48
7-2.4.2 Methods of Analysis for SAR and Static Torus Displacement Loads	7-2.53
7-2.4.3 Methods of Analysis for Hydrodynamic Loads	7-2.57
7-2.4.4 Methods of Analysis for Torus Motions	7-2.64

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
7-2.4.5 Fatigue Evaluation	7-2.79
7-2.5 Analysis Results	7-2.80
7-3.0 SMALL BORE PIPING	7-3.1
7-3.1 Component Description	7-3.2
7-3.2 Loads and Load Combinations	7-3.8
7-3.2.1 Loads	7-3.9
7-3.2.2 Load Combinations	7-3.11
7-3.3 Acceptance Criteria	7-3.12
7-3.4 Methods of Analysis	7-3.13
7-3.4.1 Analysis for Major Loads	7-3.14
7-3.5 Analysis Results	7-3.20
7-4.0 PIPING SUPPORTS	7-4.1
7-4.1 Component Description	7-4.2
7-4.2 Loads and Load Combinations	7-4.4
7-4.3 Methods of Analysis and Acceptance Criteria	7-4.6
7-4.4 Analysis Results	7-4.9
7-5.0 EQUIPMENT AND VALVES	7-5.1
7-5.1 Component Description	7-5.2
7-5.2 Loads and Load Combinations	7-5.3
7-5.3 Methods of Analysis and Acceptance Criteria	7-5.4
7-5.3.1 Equipment	7-5.4
7-5.3.2 Valves	7-5.5

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Concluded)

	<u>Page</u>
7.5.3.3 Acceptance Criteria for Valves	7-5.6
7-5.4 Analysis Results	7-5.7
7-5.4.1 Equipment	7-5.7
7-5.4.2 Valves	7-5.8
7-6.0 SUPPRESSION CHAMBER PENETRATIONS	7-6.1
7-6.1 Component Description	7-6.2
7-6.2 Loads and Load Combinations	7-6.9
7-6.2.1 Loads	7-6.10
7-6.2.2 Load Combinations	7-6.12
7-6.3 Acceptance Criteria	7-6.14
7-6.4 Methods of Analysis	7-6.15
7-6.5 Analysis Results	7-6.20
7-7.0 LIST OF REFERENCES	7-7.1

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ACI	American Concrete Institute
ASME	American Society of Mechanical Engineers
CAD	Containment Atmosphere Dilution
CAM	Containment Atmosphere Monitoring
CECo	Commonwealth Edison Company
CO	Condensation Oscillation
DBA	Design Basis Accident
DBE	Design Basis Earthquake
DLF	Dynamic Load Factor
DOF	Degree of Freedom
DW	Dead Weight
ECCS	Emergency Core Cooling System
FSI	Fluid-Structure Interaction
HPCI	High Pressure Coolant Injection
IBA	Intermediate Break Accident
LDR	Load Definition Report
LOCA	Loss-of-Coolant Accident
MRSB	Multiple Response Spectrum Method
NEP	Non-Exceedance Probability
NOC	Normal Operating Conditions
NRC	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
OBE	Operating Basis Earthquake
OL	Operating Loads
PSO	Pool Swell

LIST OF ACRONYMS
(Concluded)

PUA	Plant Unique Analysis
PUAAG	Plant Unique Analysis Applications Guide
PUAR	Plant Unique Analysis Report
PULD	Plant Unique Load Definition
RCIC	Reactor Core Isolation Cooling
RHR	Residual Heat Removal
SAP	Structural Analysis Program
SAR	Safety Analysis Report
SBA	Small Break Accident
SBP	Small Bore Piping
SRSS	Square Root of the Sum of the Squares
SRV	Safety Relief Valve
SSE	Safe Shutdown Earthquake
TAP	Torus Attached Piping
VCL	Vent Clearing Loads

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
7-1.1-1	Identification of Large Bore Torus Attached Piping Systems and Associated Penetrations	7-1.7
7-2.2-1	Torus Attached Piping Loading Identification Cross-Reference	7-2.29
7-2.2-2	Maximum Seismic Relative Anchor Displacements	7-2.30
7-2.2-3	Large Bore Piping System Design Data	7-2.31
7-2.2-4	Event Combinations and Allowable Limits for Torus Attached Piping	7-2.35
7-2.2-5	Governing Load Combinations - Torus Attached Piping	7-2.37
7-2.2-6	Basis for Governing Load Combinations - Torus Attached Piping	7-2.39
7-2.3-1	Applicable ASME Code Equations and Allowable Stresses for Torus Attached Piping	7-2.43
7-2.4-1	Summary of Analysis Methods for Large Bore Torus Attached Piping	7-2.46
7-2.5-1	Analysis Results for Torus Attached Piping Stress	7-2.81
7-3.1-1	Small Bore Piping - System Design Data	7-3.4
7-3.5-1	Governing Small Bore Piping Stresses for Controlling Load Combinations	7-3.21
7-4.2-1	Load Combinations - Torus Attached Piping Supports	7-4.5
7-4.3-1	Pipe Support Allowables	7-4.8
7-6.1-1	Penetration Geometry and Reinforcement Schedule	7-6.4
7-6.2-1	Governing Penetration Load Combinations and Service Levels	7-6.13

LIST OF TABLES
(Concluded)

<u>Table</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
7-6.5-1	Penetration Evaluation Stress Summary for Penetration X-203	7-6.21
7-6.5-2	Penetration Evaluation Stress Summary for Penetration X-204	7-6.22
7-6.5-3	Penetration Evaluation Stress Summary for Penetration X-205	7-6.23
7-6.5-4	Penetration Evaluation Stress Summary for Penetration X-210	7-6.24
7-6.5-5	Penetration Evaluation Stress Summary for Penetration X-211	7-6.25
7-6.5-6	Penetration Evaluation Stress Summary for Penetration X-220.	7-6.26

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
7-1.1-1	Large Bore TAP Penetration Locations in Torus - Plan View	7-1.8
7-2.1-1	TAP System Isometric and Support Locations - RCIC Turbine Exhaust Line (X-212)	7-2.5
7-2.1-2	Typical TAP System Support Outside Torus Attached to Main Steel	7-2.7
7-2.1-3	Typical TAP System Support Outside Torus Attached to Concrete Wall or Slab	7-2.8
7-2.1-4	Typical Suction Strainer Penetration	7-2.11
7-2.1-5	Typical TAP System Support Inside Torus	7-2.12
7-2.1-6	Typical TAP System Support Inside Torus Attached to Ring Girder	7-2.13
7-2.4-1	TAP System Structural Model (Line X-212)	7-2.52
7-2.4-2	TAP System Coupled/Transfer Function Analysis Procedure	7-2.78
7-3.1-1	Typical Cantilevered Vent or Drain	7-3.5
7-3.1-2	Typical Flex Loop Installation	7-3.6
7-3.1-3	Typical Small Bore Piping Line	7-3.7
7-6.1-1	Typical Unreinforced Penetration	7-6.5
7-6.1-2	External View of Typical Penetration Reinforcement	7-6.6
7-6.1-3	Reinforcement Details for Typical Radial Penetrations	7-6.7
7-6.1-4	Reinforcement Details for Typical Non-Radial Penetrations	7-6.8
7-6.4-1	Suppression Chamber Reinforced Penetration - Typical Finite Element Model	7-6.19

In conjunction with Volume 1 of the plant unique analysis report, this volume (Volume 7) documents the efforts undertaken to address the requirements defined in NUREG-0661 (Reference 1) which affect the Quad Cities Unit 2 torus attached piping (TAP), including large and small bore piping and supports, piping equipment, and suppression chamber penetrations. The torus attached piping Plant Unique Analysis Report (PUAR) is organized as follows:

- o INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY
 - Scope of Analysis
 - Summary and Conclusions
- o LARGE BORE PIPING
 - Component Description
 - Loads and Load Combinations
 - Analysis Acceptance Criteria
 - Methods of Analysis
 - Analysis Results
- o SMALL BORE PIPING
 - Component Description
 - Loads and Load Combinations
 - Analysis Acceptance Criteria
 - Methods of Analysis
 - Analysis Results

- o PIPING SUPPORTS
 - Component Description
 - Loads and Load Combinations
 - Methods of Analysis and Acceptance Criteria
 - Analysis Results
- o EQUIPMENT AND VALVES
 - Component Description
 - Loads and Load Combinations
 - Methods of Analysis and Acceptance Criteria
 - Analysis Results
- o SUPPRESSION CHAMBER PENETRATIONS
 - Component Description
 - Loads and Load Combinations
 - Analysis Acceptance Criteria
 - Methods of Analysis
 - Analysis Results

The introduction contains an overview discussion of the scope of the TAP and suppression chamber penetration evaluations as well as a summary of the results and conclusions resulting from the evaluations presented in later sections. Each of the analysis sections contains a comprehensive discussion of the loads and load combinations to be addressed, a description of the piping components or penetrations affected by these loads and load combinations, the methodology used to

evaluate the effects of the loads and load combinations, and the evaluation results and acceptance limits to which the results are compared to ensure that the design is adequate.

7-1.1 Scope of Analysis

The general criteria presented in Volume 1 are used as the basis for the Quad Cities Unit 2 TAP and suppression chamber penetration evaluations described in this report. The investigation includes an evaluation of the large and small bore TAP, the related equipment (pumps, valves, turbines), and piping penetrations for the effects of loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA)-related and safety relief valve (SRV) discharge-related loads discussed in Volume 1 of this report, and defined by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC) Safety Evaluation Report NUREG-0661 (Reference 1) and the "Mark I Containment Program Load Definition Report" (LDR) (Reference 2). Table 7-1.1-1 lists the large bore TAP systems and the associated penetrations. Figure 7-1.1-1 shows the locations of the penetrations on the torus.

The LOCA and SRV discharge loads used in this evaluation are formulated using procedures and test results which include the effects of the plant unique geometry and operating parameters contained in the Plant Unique Load Definition (PULD) report (Reference 3). Other loads and methodology which have not been redefined by NUREG-0661, such as the evaluation for seismic loads,

are taken from the plant's Safety Analysis Report (SAR) (Reference 4).

The evaluation includes performing a structural analysis of the torus attached piping systems and suppression chamber penetrations for the effects of LOCA-related and SRV discharge-related loads to verify that the design of the torus attached piping and suppression chamber penetrations is adequate. Rigorous analytical techniques are used in this evaluation, utilizing detailed analytical models and refined methods for computing the dynamic response of the torus attached piping and penetrations, including consideration of the interaction effects of each piping system and the suppression chamber.

The results of the TAP structural analysis for each load are used to evaluate load combinations for the piping, piping supports, equipment, and penetrations in accordance with NUREG-0661 and the "Mark I Containment Program Structural Acceptance Criteria Plant Unique Analysis Applications Guide" (PUAAG) (Reference 5). The analysis results are compared with the acceptance limits specified by the PUAAG and the applicable sections of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Code for Class 2 piping and piping

supports, and for Class MC containment structures
(Reference 6).

Evaluation of the piping for fatigue effects stipulated
in Volume 1 has been addressed generically for all Mark
I plants by the Mark I Owners Group (Reference 7).

Table 7-1.1-1

IDENTIFICATION OF LARGE BORE TORUS ATTACHED
PIPING SYSTEMS AND ASSOCIATED PENETRATIONS

SYSTEM	PENETRATION NUMBER	DESIGNATION OF LINE ATTACHED TO PENETRATION
PRESSURE SUPPRESSION	X-203A	2-1603-18"
ECCS SUCTION HEADER	X-204A, B, C, D	2-1025-24"
VACUUM RELIEF	X-205	2-1601-20"
RHR TEST LINE AND SPRAY HEADER DISCHARGE FROM PUMPS 2A/2B	X-210A	2-1014A-14"
	X-211A	2-1017A-6"
RHR TEST LINE AND SPRAY HEADER DISCHARGE FROM PUMPS 2C/2D	X-210B	2-1014B-14"
	X-211B	2-1017B-14"
CORE SPRAY 2A DISCHARGE	CONNECTING TO X-210B	2-1406-8"
CORE SPRAY 2B DISCHARGE	CONNECTING TO X-210B	2-1409-8"
RCIC TURBINE EXHAUST	X-212	2-1313-8"
HPCI TURBINE EXHAUST	X-220	2-2306-24"
HPCI POT DRAIN	X-221	2-2309-2"
RCIC POT DRAIN	X-222	2-1334-2"
CORE SPRAY 2A SUCTION	CONNECTING TO ECCS SUCTION HEADER	2-1401-18"
CORE SPRAY 2B SUCTION	CONNECTING TO ECCS SUCTION HEADER	2-1402-18"
HPCI PUMP SUCTION	CONNECTING TO ECCS SUCTION HEADER	2-2302-16"
RCIC PUMP SUCTION	CONNECTING TO ECCS SUCTION HEADER	2-1318-6"
RHR 2A/2B PUMP SUCTION	CONNECTING TO ECCS SUCTION HEADER	2-1015A-24"
RHR 2C/2D PUMP SUCTION	CONNECTING TO ECCS SUCTION HEADER	2-1015B-24"




Figure 7-1.1-1
LARGE BORE TAP PENETRATION LOCATIONS
IN TORUS - PLAN VIEW

COM-02-039-7
 Revision 0

7-1.8

7-1.2 Summary and Conclusions

An evaluation of the Quad Cities Unit 2 large and small bore torus attached piping, piping supports, equipment and valves, and suppression chamber penetrations has been performed as described in Sections 7-2.1 through 7-6.1.

The loads considered in the evaluation are described in Sections 7-2.2, 7-3.2, 7-4.2, 7-5.2, and 7-6.2. They include original loads as documented in the SAR plus additional loadings which are postulated to occur during a small break accident (SBA), an intermediate break accident (IBA) or a design basis accident (DBA) LOCA-related events, and during SRV discharge events as defined in Volume 1.

Detailed structural models are developed and utilized in calculating the response of the piping systems and the suppression chamber penetration loads. A combination of static, dynamic, and equivalent static analyses are performed and the results appropriately combined in accordance with NUREG-0661 for evaluation. For selected piping system components, the dynamic load responses have been combined using the square root of the sum of the squares (SRSS) technique. Results of the analyses

are compared to the NUREG-0661 criteria as discussed in Volume 1. Resultant loadings on the piping equipment are compared to specified allowables.

The evaluation results show that the piping, piping supports, equipment, and suppression chamber penetrations meet the requirements of both NUREG-0661 and the manufacturers.

An evaluation of each of the NUREG-0661 requirements which affect the design adequacy of the Quad Cities Unit 2 large bore torus attached piping (TAP) is presented in the following sections. The general criteria used in this evaluation are contained in Volume 1.

The component parts of the TAP systems which are analyzed are described in Section 7-2.1. The loads and load combinations for which the piping systems are evaluated are described and presented in Section 7-2.2. The acceptance limits to which the analysis results are compared are discussed and presented in Section 7-2.3. The analysis methodology used to evaluate the effects of the loads and load combinations on the piping systems, including evaluation of fatigue effects, is discussed in Section 7-2.4. The analysis results are presented in Section 7-2.5.

7-2.1 Component Description

The large bore TAP for Quad Cities Unit 2 consists of 4" and larger nominal diameter piping, which penetrates or is directly attached to the suppression chamber. This section gives a general description of the large bore TAP systems and their associated components.

Large bore TAP lines range in size from 4" to 24" nominal diameter and have varying schedules. Most of the piping consists of ASTM A106, Grade B carbon steel material. Table 7-1.1-1 lists the Quad Cities Unit 2 large bore TAP systems along with their associated penetrations. Figure 7-1.1-1 shows the locations of penetrations on the torus.

Large bore TAP may be grouped into two general categories: torus external piping and torus internal piping. An example of a system with only torus external piping is the pressure suppression system line. Typical systems having both torus external and internal piping are the high pressure coolant injection (HPCI) turbine exhaust line, the reactor core isolation cooling (RCIC) turbine exhaust line, and the residual heat removal (RHR) test line. Figure 7-2.1-1 shows an isometric view of a typical TAP system for Quad Cities Unit 2.

In addition to the large bore systems described above, selected small diameter piping systems are included in this section since they have been analyzed using the same methods applied to the large bore piping. These systems are the torus internal portions of the RCIC/HPCI pot drain lines.

The large bore piping suppression chamber penetrations evaluated for Quad Cities Unit 1 are numbered and located as shown in Figure 7-1.1-1. The principal components of the penetrations are the nozzles, the insert plates, and the "spider" reinforcements. The nozzle extends from the outer circumferential pipe weld through the insert plate to the inner circumferential pipe weld or flange. The insert plate and "spider" provide local reinforcement of the suppression chamber shell near the penetration.

Each penetration modification is designed to allow the penetrations to sustain TAP reaction loads produced by suppression chamber motions due to normal loads and hydrodynamic loads, while keeping component stress intensities below the specified allowable values. Sufficient similarities exist in the penetrations' diameters, geometries, locations on the suppression

chamber, reinforcements, and loadings to allow some grouping for analysis.



TAP SYSTEM ISOMETRIC AND SUPPORT LOCATIONS -
RCIC TURBINE EXHAUST LINE (X-212)

7-2.1.1 Torus External Piping

The torus external piping initiates at the ECCS suction header or at the penetration nozzles which are connected to the torus shell through insert plates, and terminates at anchor supports or equipment within the reactor auxiliary building. From the torus, the lines typically extend up to the building slab at an elevation of 595'-0"; however, some lines extend up to slabs at elevations of 623'-0" and 647'-6".

The external piping is supported by hangers, rigid restraints, guides, and snubbers attached to building slabs or walls, or to main structural steel in the building. Figures 7-2.1-2 and 7-2.1-3 illustrate typical pipe supports outside the torus. Other components on these lines are valves and standard pipe fittings. Valve types are gate valves, swing check valves, and nozzle type relief valves.

Smaller lines branching off the large bore TAP are discussed in Section 7-3.0. Piping supports are described in Section 7-4.0. Equipment such as valves, pumps, and turbines are described in Section 7-5.0. The suppression chamber penetrations are described in Section 7-6.0.




Figure 7-2.1-2
TYPICAL TAP SYSTEM SUPPORT OUTSIDE TORUS
ATTACHED TO MAIN STEEL

COM-02-039-7
Revision 0

7-2.7




Figure 7-2.1-3

TYPICAL TAP SYSTEM SUPPORT OUTSIDE TORUS
ATTACHED TO CONCRETE WALL OR SLAB

COM-02-039-7
 Revision 0

7-2.8

7-2.1.2 Torus Internal Piping

Piping internal to the torus may be categorized into three basic configurations:

- a) Short penetration nozzles projecting inside the torus. Typical examples of this type of configuration are the vacuum relief, pressure suppression, and the emergency core cooling system (ECCS). The ECCS nozzles have a strainer connected to their inner nozzle flange. Figure 7-2.1-4 shows a typical penetration and strainer, which is reinforced for Mark I loads.
- b) A short segment of piping inside the torus. In some cases, these short segments are supported by a plate strut assembly attached to the torus shell or to the ring girders (Figure 7-2.1-5).
- c) A long length of pipe running through more than a single torus bay and supported at the ring girders (Figure 7-2.1-6).

Supports for the torus internal piping are discussed in Section 7-4.0

Loads and load combinations which are applied to the large bore TAP described above are presented in the following sections.




Figure 7-2.1-4

TYPICAL SUCTION STRAINER PENETRATION

COM-02-039-7
Revision 0

7-2.11




Figure 7-2.1-5

TYPICAL TAP SYSTEM SUPPORT INSIDE TORUS

COM-02-039-7
Revision 0

7-2.12




Figure 7-2.1-6
TYPICAL TAP SYSTEM SUPPORT
INSIDE TORUS ATTACHED TO RING GIRDER

7-2.2 Loads and Load Combinations

The loads for which the Quad Cities Unit 2 TAP is designed are defined in NUREG-0661 on a generic basis for all Mark I plants. The methodology used to develop plant unique TAP loads for each load defined in NUREG-0661 is discussed in Volume 1. The results of applying the methodology to develop specific values for each of the controlling loads which act on the piping are discussed and presented in Section 7-2.2.1.

Using the event combinations and event sequencing defined in NUREG-0661 and discussed in Volume 1, the governing load combinations which affect the torus attached piping are formulated. The load combinations are discussed and presented in Section 7-2.2.2.

7-2.2.1 Loads

The loads acting on the TAP are categorized as follows:

1. Dead Weight Loads
2. Seismic Loads
3. Pressure and Temperature Loads
4. Operating Loads
5. Static Torus Displacement Loads
6. Safety Relief Valve Discharge Loads
7. Vent Clearing Loads
8. Pool Swell Loads
9. Condensation Oscillation Loads
10. Chugging Loads
11. Torus Motion Loads

Loads in Categories 1 through 4 are considered in the piping design as documented in the SAR (Reference 4). The SAR loads considered in the piping evaluations are those normal loads which are combined directly with Mark I loadings (LOCA and SRV discharge) as well as SAR loads considered for evaluation of system design and test conditions. Loads in Category 5 are displacements resulting from torus internal pressure or water dead weight during both normal and accident conditions. Loads in Category 6 result from SRV discharge events.

Loads in Categories 7 through 10 result from postulated LOCA events. Loads in Category 11 consist of torus inertial and displacement responses due to hydrodynamic loads acting on the torus.

Not all of the loads defined in NUREG-0661 and the SAR need be examined, since some are enveloped by others or have a negligible effect on the torus attached piping. Only those loads which cause the maximum piping response and lead to controlling stresses are examined and discussed. The loads are referred to as governing loads in the following sections.

The magnitudes and characteristics of the governing loads in each category, obtained using the methodology discussed in Volume 1, are identified and presented in the following paragraphs. The corresponding section of Volume 1 where the loads are discussed is provided in Table 7-2.2-1. The loading information presented in this section is the same as that presented in Volume 1, with additional specific information relevant to the evaluation of the TAP systems.

1. Dead Weight (DW) Loads

These loads are defined as the uniformly distributed weight of the pipe and insulation, and

the concentrated weight of piping supports, hardware attached to piping, valves, and flanges. Also included is the weight of the contents of the torus attached piping.

2. Seismic Loads

a. OBE Inertia (OBE_I) Loads: These loads are defined as the horizontal and vertical accelerations acting on the TAP during an operating basis earthquake (OBE). The loading is taken from the design basis for the piping as documented in the safety analysis report. Horizontal building response spectra at two different elevations which represent piping attachment points are utilized for the N-S and E-W direction OBE_I inputs.

b. OBE Displacement (OBE_D) Loads: These loads are defined as the maximum horizontal and vertical relative seismic displacements at the piping attachment points during an operating basis earthquake. The loading is taken from the design basis for the piping, as documented in the safety analysis

report. Table 7-2.2-2 provides the OBE relative displacements in the N-S, E-W, and vertical directions.

- c. SSE Inertia (SSE_I) Loads: These loads are defined as the horizontal and vertical accelerations acting on the piping during a safe shutdown earthquake (SSE). The loading is taken from the design basis for the piping, as documented in the safety analysis report. Horizontal building the response spectra curves for the N-S and E-W, and vertical directions SSE_I inputs are twice the corresponding OBE_I inputs.
- d. SSE Displacement (SSE_D) Loads: These loads are defined as the maximum horizontal and vertical relative seismic displacements at the piping attachment points during a safety shutdown earthquake. The SSE_D displacements are twice the corresponding OBE_D displacements. Table 7-2.2-2 provides the SSE relative displacements in the N-S, E-W, and vertical directions.

3. Pressure and Temperature Loads

- a. Pressure (P_O , P) Loads: These loads are defined as the maximum operating internal pressure (P_O) and design condition pressure (P), in the torus attached piping. Table 7-2.2-3 lists values of P_O and P used in the analysis.
- b. Temperature (TE , TE_1) Loads: These loads are defined as the thermal expansion (TE) of the piping associated with temperature changes occurring during normal operating conditions, and the thermal expansion (TE_1) of the piping associated with temperature changes occurring during accident conditions. Table 7-2.2-3 lists pipe temperatures for TE and TE_1 used in the analysis.

Effects of thermal anchor movements at the torus penetrations, torus supports, and external anchors (e.g., pumps, turbines, and drywell penetrations) are also included in the analysis. The piping thermal anchor movement loadings are categorized and designated as follows:

1. THAM - Piping thermal anchor movement during normal operating conditions (NOC), and
2. THAM₁ - Piping thermal anchor movement during accident conditions.

4. Operating (OL) Loads

These loads are defined as line operating thrust loads due to discharge of piping contents inside the torus. The loads are applicable to the HPCI turbine exhaust, the RCIC turbine exhaust, and the RHR test lines.

5. Static Torus Displacement Loads

These loads are defined as the torus displacement loads due to dead weight of the torus, weight of water in the torus, and normal operating and accident condition pressures.

- a. TD - These are the torus displacements due to normal operating pressure, dead weight of the torus, and the weight of water in the torus.

- b. TD_1 - These are the torus displacements due to torus internal pressure during SBA conditions, dead weight of the torus, and the weight of water in the torus.
- c. TD_2 - These are the torus displacements due to torus internal pressure during IBA conditions, dead weight of the torus, and the weight of water in the torus.
- d. TD_3 - These are the torus displacements due to torus internal pressure during DBA conditions, dead weight of the torus, and the weight of water in the torus.

6. Safety Relief Valve Discharge (QAB) Loads

These loads are defined as the transient pressures which act on the submerged portion of the TAP and supports in the torus during a SRV discharge. The SRV discharge loads consist of the following:

a. Water Jet Impingement Loads: During the water clearing phase of a SRV discharge event, the submerged TAP and supports are subjected to transient drag pressure loads. The procedure used to develop the transient forces and spatial distribution of these loads is discussed in Volume 1.

b. Air Bubble Drag Loads: During the air clearing phase of a SRV discharge event, transient drag pressure loads are postulated to act on the submerged TAP and supports. The procedure used to develop the transient forces and spatial distribution of these loads is discussed in Volume 1.

Loads are developed for several possible patterns of air bubbles for both single and multiple T-quencher discharge cases. The results are evaluated to determine the controlling loads.

7. Vent Clearing (VCL and VCLO) Loads

These loads are defined as the transient pressure loads acting on the submerged portion of TAP and

supports during the water and air clearing phase of a DBA event. They are defined for two conditions: those with a differential pressure (ΔP) between the drywell and wetwell (VCL) and without the differential pressure (VCLO).

a. LOCA Water Jet Impingement Loads: During the water clearing phase of a DBA event, the submerged portion of the TAP and supports are subjected to transient impact and drag pressure loads. The procedure used to develop these transient drag forces is discussed in Volume 1.

b. LOCA Air Bubble Drag Loads: During the air clearing phase of a DBA event, the submerged portions of the TAP and supports are subjected to transient drag pressure loads. The procedure used to develop these transient drag forces is discussed in Volume 1.

8. Pool Swell (PS and PSO) Loads

These loads are defined as the transient pressure loads which act on the torus internal piping and supports. They are defined for two cases: those

with a differential pressure between the drywell and wetwell (PS) and those without the differential pressure (PSO).

- a. Impact and Drag Loads: During the initial portion of a DBA event, the TAP and supports within the torus are subjected to transient pressures. The procedure used to develop these pressure transients is discussed in Volume 1.
- b. Froth Impingement Loads: During the LOCA pool swell event, the TAP and supports within the torus are subjected to transient pressures. The procedure used to develop these pressure transients is discussed in Volume 1.
- c. Pool Fallback Loads: During the later phase of pool swell, the TAP and supports within the torus are subjected to transient pressures. The procedure used to develop these pressure transients is discussed in Volume 1.

9. Condensation Oscillation (CO) Loads

During the CO phase of a DBA event, the submerged portion of the TAP and supports within the torus are subjected to harmonic velocity and acceleration drag pressures. The procedure used to develop the harmonic drag loads is discussed in Volume 1. Included are acceleration drag loads due to torus fluid-structure interaction (FSI).

10. Chugging Loads

- a. Pre-Chug (PCHUG) Loads: These loads are defined as single harmonic velocity and acceleration drag loads, including acceleration drag loads due to torus FSI effects, acting on the submerged portion of the TAP and supports during the pre-chug phase of a SBA, IBA, or DBA event. The procedure used to develop the pre-chug loads on these components is discussed in Volume 1.
- b. Post-Chug (CHUG) Loads: These loads are defined as harmonic velocity and acceleration drag loads, including acceleration drag loads due to torus FSI effects, acting on the

submerged portion of TAP and supports during the post-chug phase of a SBA, IBA, or DBA event. The procedure used to develop the post-chug loads on these components is discussed in Volume 1.

11. Torus Motion Loads

These loads are defined as the inertia and displacement effects at the TAP attachment points on the suppression chamber due to loads acting on the suppression chamber shell.

a. SRV Torus Motion Loads:

1. QAB_I - These are the inertia effects of torus motions due to SRV T-quencher discharge loads.
2. QAB_D - These are the displacement effects of torus motions due to SRV T-quencher discharge loads.

b. Pool Swell Torus Motion Loads:

1. PS_I and PSO_I - These are the inertia effects of torus motions due to pool swell loads for operating ΔP and zero ΔP , respectively
2. PS_D and PSO_D - These are the displacement effects of torus motions due to pool swell loads for operating ΔP and zero ΔP , respectively.

c. Condensation Oscillation Torus Motion Loads:

1. CO_I - These are the inertia effects of torus motions due to CO loads.
2. CO_D - These are the displacement effects of torus motions due to CO loads.

d. Pre-Chug Torus Motion Loads:

1. $PCHUG_I$ - These are the inertia effects of torus motions due to pre-chug loads.
2. $PCHUG_D$ - These are the displacement effects of torus motions due to pre-chug loads.

e. Post-Chug Torus Motion Loads:

1. $CHUG_I$ - These are the inertia effects of torus motions due to post-chug loads.
2. $CHUG_D$ - These are the displacement effects of torus motions due to post-chug loads.

Table 7-2.2-1

TORUS ATTACHED PIPING LOADING
IDENTIFICATION CROSS-REFERENCE

LOAD DESIGNATION		VOLUME 1 REFERENCE NUMBER
LOAD CATEGORY	LOAD CASE NUMBER	
DEAD WEIGHT	1	1-3.1
SEISMIC	2	1-3.1
PRESSURE AND TEMPERATURE	3	1-3.1, 1-4.1.1
OPERATING	4	1-3.1
STATIC TORUS DISPLACEMENT	5	1-3.1, 1-4.1.1
SRV DISCHARGE	6	1-4.2.2, 1-4.2.4
VENT CLEARING	7	1-4.1.5, 1-4.1.6
POOL SWELL	8	1-4.1.4.2, 1-4.1.4.3, 1-4.1.4.4
CONDENSATION OSCILLATION	9	1-4.1.7.3
CHUGGING	10	1-4.1.8.3
TORUS MOTION	11	1-4.1, 1-4.2

Table 7-2.2-2

MAXIMUM SEISMIC RELATIVE ANCHOR DISPLACEMENTS

LOCATION	ELEVATION	OBE DISPLACEMENT (in phase) RELATIVE TO BASE	
		N - S (inches)	E - W (inches)
REACTOR BUILDING	552'-0"	FIXED	FIXED
	571'-6"	0.02	0.02
	595'-0"	0.02	0.02
	623'-0"	0.05	0.05
	647'-6"	0.07	0.07
	666'-6"	0.07	0.10
	690'-6"	0.07	0.10
	711'-9"	0.14	0.89
	736'-9"	0.41	0.98
TURBINE BUILDING	615'-6"	0.02	0.02
	626'-6"	0.05	0.05
	639'-0"	0.05	0.07

Table 7-2.2-3

LARGE BORE PIPING SYSTEM DESIGN DATA

SYSTEM	NORMAL OPERATING TEMPERATURE (°F)	MAXIMUM OPERATING CONDITIONS		DESIGN CONDITIONS		CONTENTS
		PRESSURE (psig) (P ₀)	TEMPERATURE (°F)	PRESSURE (psig) (P)	TEMPERATURE (°F)	
PRESSURE SUPPRESSION	90	35	165	55	285	AIR
ECCS SUCTION HEADER	90	35	165	55	285	WATER
VACUUM RELIEF	90	35	165	55	285	AIR
RHR TEST LINE AND SPRAY HEADER DISCHARGE FROM PUMP 2A/2B AND 2C/2D	90	180	280	415	400	WATER
RCIC TURBINE EXHAUST	280	35	280	150	360	SATURATED STEAM
HPCI TURBINE EXHAUST	240	50	295	150	300	SATURATED STEAM
HPCI POT DRAIN	145	60	145	60	285	WATER
RCIC POT DRAIN	160	35	160	150	200	WATER
RHR PUMP 2A/2B AND 2C/2D SUCTION	90	35	165	55	285	WATER
CORE SPRAY 2A/2B PUMP SUCTION	90	35	165	55	285	WATER
HPCI PUMP SUCTION	90	35	165	55	285	WATER
RCIC PUMP SUCTION	90	35	165	55	285	WATER

7-2.2.2 Load Combinations

The loads for which the TAP systems are evaluated are presented in Section 7-2.2.1. The NUREG-0661 criteria for grouping the loads into load combinations are discussed in Volume 1.

Table 7-2.2-4 shows that the load combinations specified in NUREG-0661 for each event can be expanded into many more load combinations than those shown. However, not all load combinations for each event need be examined, since many have the same allowable stresses and are enveloped by others which contain the same or additional loads. Many of the load combinations listed in Table 7-2.2-4 are actually pairs of load combinations with all of the same loads except for seismic loads. The first load combination in the pair contains OBE loads, while the second contains SSE loads.

The governing load combinations for torus attached piping are presented in Table 7-2.2-5. Table 7-2.2-6 presents the basis for establishing the governing loading combinations.

Stress allowables corresponding to the following Service Levels are used for evaluation of the torus attached piping:

- A - Design conditions,
- B - NOC including SRV discharge,
- C - NOC including SRV discharge, plus seismic loads or SBA conditions including SRV discharge, and
- D - SBA, IBA, and DBA conditions including SRV discharge plus seismic loads.

Also included in the list of governing load combinations are four combinations which do not result from the 27 event combinations listed in Table 7-2.2-4. These are: Load Combination A-1, which relates to the design pressure plus dead weight condition; Load Combinations A-2 and B-1, which include the combination of normal and seismic loads; and Load Combination T-1, which relates to the hydrostatic test condition. Evaluation of Load Combination T-1 is a requirement of the ASME Code (Reference 6). Load Combinations A-1, A-2, and B-1 are consistent with the requirements as specified in the SAR (Reference 4).

The normal SAR loads included in the loading combinations are assumed to occur simultaneously with the

NUREG-0661 loads for the LOCA event sequence defined in the LDR (Reference 2).

The appropriate ASME Code equations for the torus attached piping are also provided in the governing load combination table.

Each of the listed governing load combinations for the torus attached piping as provided in Table 7-2.2-5 has been considered in the analysis methods described in Section 7-2.4.

Table 7-2.2-4

EVENT COMBINATIONS AND ALLOWABLE LIMITS
FOR TORUS ATTACHED PIPING

EVENT COMBINATIONS			SRV	SRV + EQ		SBA		SBA + EQ		SBA+SRV		SBA + SRV + EQ		DBA		DBA + EQ		DBA+SRV		DBA + SRV + EQ										
						IBA	CO, CH	CO, CH	CO, CH	CO, CH	PS (1)	CO, CH	PS	CO, CH	PS	CO, CH														
TYPE OF EARTHQUAKE				0	S		0	S	0	S		0	S	0	S		0	S	0	S	0	S								
COMBINATION NUMBER			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	
L/CADS	NORMAL (2)	N	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
	EARTHQUAKE	EQ		X	X			X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	
	SRV DISCHARGE	SRV	X	X	X							X	X	X	X	X	X						X	X	X	X	X	X		
	THERMAL	T _A	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
	PIPE PRESSURE	P _A	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
	LOCA POOL SWELL	P _{PS}																X		X	X			X		X	X			
	LOCA CONDENSATION OSCILLATION	P _{CO}					X			X	X		X			X	X		X			X			X			X		
	LOCA CHUGGING	P _{CH}					X			X	X		X			X	X		X			X	X			X		X	X	
STRUCTURAL ELEMENT			ROW																											
ESSENTIAL PIPING SYSTEMS	WITH IBA/DBA	10	B	B (3)	B (3)	B (4)	B (4)	B (4)	B (4)	B (4)	B (4)	B (4)	B (4)	B (4)	B (4)	B (4)	B (4)	B (4)	B (4)	B (4)	B (4)	B (4)	B (4)	B (4)	B (4)	B (4)	B (4)	B (4)		
	WITH SBA	11				B (3)	B (3)	B (4)	B (4)	B (4)	B (4)	B (3)	B (3)	B (4)	B (4)	B (4)	B (4)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
NONESSENTIAL PIPING SYSTEMS	WITH IBA/DBA	12	B	C (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)		
	WITH SBA	13				C (5)	C (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	D (5)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		

NOTES TO TABLE 7-2.2-4

- (1) REFERENCE 1 STATES "WHERE A DRYWELL-TO-WETWELL PRESSURE DIFFERENTIAL IS NORMALLY UTILIZED AS A LOAD MITIGATOR, AN ADDITIONAL EVALUATION SHALL BE PERFORMED WITHOUT SRV LOADINGS BUT ASSUMING THE LOSS OF THE PRESSURE DIFFERENTIAL." SERVICE LEVEL D LIMITS SHALL APPLY FOR ALL STRUCTURAL ELEMENTS OF THE PIPING SYSTEM FOR THIS EVALUATION. THE ANALYSIS NEED ONLY BE ACCOMPLISHED TO THE EXTENT THAT INTEGRITY OF THE FIRST PRESSURE BOUNDARY ISOLATION VALVE IS DEMONSTRATED."
- (2) REFERENCE 1 STATES "NORMAL LOADS (N) CONSIST OF DEAD LOADS (D)."
- (3) REFERENCE 1 STATES "AS AN ALTERNATIVE, THE $1.2 S_H$ LIMIT IN EQUATION 9 OF NC-3652.2 MAY BE REPLACED BY $1.8 S_H$, PROVIDED THAT ALL OTHER LIMITS ARE SATISFIED. FATIGUE REQUIREMENTS ARE APPLICABLE TO ALL COLUMNS, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF 16, 18, 19, 22, 24 AND 25."
- (4) REFERENCE 1 STATES "FOOTNOTE 3 APPLIES EXCEPT THAT INSTEAD OF USING $1.8 S_H$ IN EQUATION 9 OF NC-3652.2, $2.4 S_H$ IS USED."
- (5) REFERENCE 1 STATES "EQUATION 10 OF NC WILL BE SATISFIED, EXCEPT THAT FATIGUE REQUIREMENTS ARE NOT APPLICABLE TO COLUMNS 16, 18, 19, 22, 24 AND 25 SINCE POOL SWELL LOADINGS OCCUR ONLY ONCE. IN ADDITION, IF OPERABILITY OF AN ACTIVE COMPONENT IS REQUIRED TO ENSURE CONTAINMENT INTEGRITY, OPERABILITY OF THAT COMPONENT MUST BE DEMONSTRATED."

Table 7-2.2-5

COVEPNING LOAD COMBINATIONS - TORUS ATTACHED PIPING

NUREG-0661 LOAD COMBINATION NUMBER	LOAD COMBINATIONS (1,5,6)	ASME (2) CODE EQUATION
A-1	$P + DW + OL$	8
A-2	$TE + THAM + TD + OBE_D$	10 (3)
A-3	$TE + THAM + TD + QAB_D + SSE_D$	10 (3)
A-4	$TE_1 + THAM_1 + TD_1 \text{ or } TD_2 \text{ or } TD_3 + PCHUG_D + QAB_D + SSE_D$	10 (3)
A-5	$TE_1 + THAM_1 + TD_1 \text{ or } TD_2 \text{ or } TD_3 + CHUG_D + QAB_D + SSE_D$	10 (3)
A-6 (7)	$TE_1 + THAM_1 + TD_3 + PSO_D$	10 (3)
A-7	$TE_1 + THAM_1 + TD_3 + PS_D + QAB_D + SSE_D$	10 (3)
A-8 (4)	$TE_1 + THAM_1 + TD_3 + CO_D + OBE_D$	10 (3)
B-1	$P_O + DW + OBE_I + OL$	9
B-2	$P_O + DW + QAB + QAB_I + OL$	9
C-1	$P_O + DW + QAB + QAB_I + SSE_I + OL$	9
C-2	$P_O + DW + PCHUG + PCHUG_I + QAB + QAB_I + OL$	9
C-3	$P_O + DW + CHUG + CHUG_I + QAB + QAB_I + OL$	9
D-1 (8)	$P_O + DW + PCHUG + PCHUG_I + QAB + QAB_I + SSE_I + OL$	9
D-2 (8)	$P_O + DW + CHUG + CHUG_I + QAB + QAB_I + SSE_I + OL$	9
D-3 (7)	$P_O + DW + PSO + PSO_I + VCLO + OL$	9
D-4 (8)	$P_O + DW + PS + PS_I + VCL + QAB + QAB_I + SSE_I + OL$	9
D-5 (4)	$P_O + DW + CO + CO_I + OBE_I + OL$	9
T-1 (9)	$1.25P + DW$	8

NOTES TO TABLE 7-2.2-5

- (1) SEE SECTION 7-2.2.1 FOR DEFINITION OF INDIVIDUAL LOADS.
- (2) EQUATIONS ARE DEFINED IN SUBSECTION NC-3650 OF THE ASME CODE (REFERENCE 6).
- (3) AS AN ALTERNATE, MEET EQUATION 11 OF THE ASME CODE (REFERENCE 6).
- (4) FOR THE DBA CONDITION, SRV DISCHARGE LOADS NEED NOT BE COMBINED WITH CO AND CHUGGING LOADS.
- (5) SEE SECTION 7-2.2.3 FOR COMBINATION OF DYNAMIC LOADS.
- (6) ONLY GOVERNING LOAD COMBINATIONS FROM TABLE 7-2.2-4 ARE CONSIDERED HERE.
- (7) ONLY PIPING OUT TO THE FIRST ISOLATION VALVE NEEDS TO BE EVALUATED.
- (8) THE LARGER OF LOCA AND SSE COMBINED BY THE SRSS METHOD OR LOCA AND OBE COMBINED BY THE ABSOLUTE SUM METHOD IS USED.
- (9) HYDROSTATIC TEST CONDITION. DW FOR ALL LINES SHALL BE WITH LINES FULL OF WATER AT 70°F.

Table 7-2.2-6

BASIS FOR GOVERNING LOAD COMBINATIONS -
TORUS ATTACHED PIPING

EVENT COMBINATION NUMBER (1)	GOVERNING LOAD COMBINATIONS (2)	DISCUSSION	EVENT COMBINATION GOVERNING BASIS
1	B-2,	SECONDARY STRESS BOUNDED BY EVENT COMBINATION NUMBER 3.	(3b)
2	C-1	SECONDARY STRESS BOUNDED BY EVENT COMBINATION NUMBER 3.	(3a)
3	C-1, A-3	N/A	N/A
4,5	N/A	IBA BOUNDED BY EVENT COMBINA- TION NUMBER 15 AND SBA BOUNDED BY EVENT COMBINATION NUMBER 11.	(3b)
6,8,12	N/A	BOUNDED BY EVENT COMBINATION NUMBER 14.	(3b)
7,9,13	N/A	BOUNDED BY EVENT COMBINATION NUMBER 15.	(3b)
10	N/A	IBA BOUNDED BY EVENT COMBINA- TION NUMBER 15 AND SBA BOUNDED BY EVENT COMBINATION NUMBER 11.	(3b)
11	C-2, C-3 A-4, A-5	FOR SBA ONLY. IBA BOUNDED BY EVENT COMBINATION NUMBER 15.	(3b)
15	D-1, D-2 A-4, A-5	N/A	N/A
14	D-1, D-2	SECONDARY STRESS BOUNDED BY EVENT COMBINATION NUMBER 15	(3a)
16,18,22	N/A	BOUNDED BY EVENT COMBINATION NUMBER 24.	(3b)
19	N/A	BOUNDED BY EVENT COMBINATION NUMBER 25.	(3b)
17,20,23	N/A	BOUNDED BY EVENT COMBINATION NUMBER 26.	(3b)
21	N/A	BOUNDED BY EVENT COMBINATION NUMBER 27.	(3b)
24	D-3, D-4	SECONDARY STRESS BOUNDED BY EVENT COMBINATION NUMBER 25.	(3a)
25	D-3, A-6 D-4, A-7	N/A	N/A
26	D-5, A-8	FOR CO ONLY, DBA CHUGGING BOUNDED BY EVENT COMBINATION NUMBER 14. SECONDARY STRESS BOUNDED BY EVENT COMBINATION NUMBER 27.	(3b)
27	A-4, A-5	DBA CHUGGING BOUNDED BY EVENT COMBINATION NUMBER 15. EVALUATE FOR SECONDARY STRESS ONLY.	(3b)

NOTES TO TABLE 7-2.2-6

- (1) EVENT COMBINATION NUMBERS REFER TO THE NUMBERS USED IN TABLE 7-2.2-4.
- (2) GOVERNING LOAD COMBINATIONS ARE LISTED IN TABLE 7-2.2-5.
- (3) EVENT COMBINATION GOVERNING BASIS:
 - a. THE GOVERNING EVENT COMBINATION CONTAINS SSE LOADS WHICH BOUND OBE LOADS.
 - b. THE GOVERNING EVENT COMBINATION CONTAINS MORE LOADS WHILE THE ALLOWABLE LIMITS ARE THE SAME.

7-2.2.3 Combination of Dynamic Loads

The methods used in the analyses for combining dynamic loads are based on NUREG-0484, "Methodology for Combining Dynamic Responses" (Reference 8). As described in NUREG-0484, when the time-phase relationship between the responses caused by two or more sources of dynamic loading is undefined or random, the peak responses from the individual loads are combined by absolute sum (except for combined SSE and LOCA loads). The peak responses which result from SSE and LOCA loads are combined using the SRSS technique.

As an alternate, when the absolute sum method of combining dynamic loads produces excessively conservative results, the dynamic loads are combined using the SRSS method, as permitted by Reference 9.

7-2.3 Acceptance Criteria

The acceptance criteria defined in NUREG-0661 upon which the Quad Cities Unit 2 TAP analysis is based are discussed in Volume 1. In general, the acceptance criteria follow the rules contained in the ASME Code, Section III, Division 1 up to and including the 1977 Summer Addenda for Class 2 piping (Reference 6). The corresponding service level limits and allowable stresses are also consistent with the requirements of the ASME Code and NUREG-0661. The torus attached piping is analyzed in accordance with the requirements for Class 2 piping systems contained in Subsection NC of the Code. Table 7-2.3-1 lists the applicable ASME Code equations and stress limits for each of the governing piping load combinations.

Table 7-2.3-1

APPLICABLE ASME CODE EQUATIONS AND
ALLOWABLE STRESSES FOR TORUS ATTACHED PIPING

STRESS TYPE	ASME CODE EQUATION NUMBER	SERVICE LEVEL (3)	STRESS LIMIT	ALLOWABLE VALUE (ksi) (4)	GOVERNING LOAD COMBINATION NUMBER (1)
PRIMARY	8	A	$1.0 S_h$	15.0/18.6	A-1, T-1
PRIMARY	9	B	$1.2 S_h$	18.0/22.32	B-1, B-2
PRIMARY	9	B	$1.8 S_h$	27.0/33.48	C-1 THROUGH C-3
PRIMARY	9	B	$2.4 S_h$	36.0/44.64	D-1 THROUGH D-5
SECONDARY	10	B	$1.0 S_a$	22.5/27.9	A-2 THROUGH A-8
PRIMARY AND SECONDARY	11	B	$S_h + S_a$	37.5/46.5	(2)

- (1) GOVERNING LOAD COMBINATION NUMBERS ARE LISTED IN TABLE 7-2.2-5.
- (2) SEE ASME CODE, SECTION III, SUBSECTION NC, PARAGRAPH NC-3652.3 (REFERENCE 6) FOR COMBINATION OF LOADS.
- (3) INCREASED ALLOWABLES AS DEFINED IN NUREG-0661 (REFERENCE 1) HAVE BEEN UTILIZED FOR PIPING SYSTEMS WHICH HAVE BEEN CLASSIFIED AS NON-ESSENTIAL.
- (4) CARBON STEEL/STAINLESS STEEL.

7-2.4 Methods of Analysis

This section describes the methods of analysis used to evaluate the large bore piping systems attached to the torus both internally and externally, for the effects of the governing loads as described in Section 7-2.2. As described in Section 7-2.1, selected small diameter torus internal piping systems have also been evaluated using the analytical methods described in this section. Table 7-2.4-1 summarizes the specific analytical techniques used in analyzing the piping systems for each loading.

The methodology used to develop the structural models of the TAP systems is presented in Section 7-2.4.1. The methodology used to obtain results for the governing load combinations and to evaluate the analysis results for comparison with the acceptance limits is discussed in Sections 7-2.4.2, 7-2.4.3, and 7-2.4.4. The approach used to address fatigue effects is presented in Section 7-2.4.5.

A standard, commercially available piping analysis computer code, PISTAR, is used in performing the piping system analyses. The computer code is based on the well known SAP computer program, and has been verified

using ASME benchmark problems. The PISTAR program performs static, modal extraction, response spectrum, and dynamic time-history analyses of piping systems. It also performs the ASME Code, Section III piping evaluation.

Table 7-2.4-1

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS METHODS FOR
LARGE BORE TORUS ATTACHED PIPING

LOAD	LOAD CASE NUMBER	ANALYSIS METHOD
DW	1	STATIC
OBE _I	2a	RESPONSE SPECTRUM
OBE _D	2b	STATIC
SSE _I	2c	RESPONSE SPECTRUM
SSE _D	2d	STATIC
P _O	3a	(1)
P	3a	(1)
TE	3b	STATIC
TE ₁	3b	STATIC
THAM	3b	STATIC
THAM ₁	3b	STATIC
OL	4	STATIC
TD	5a	STATIC
TD ₁	5b	STATIC
TD ₂	5c	STATIC
TD ₃	5d	STATIC
QAB	6a,b	EQUIVALENT STATIC
VCL, VCLO	7a,b	EQUIVALENT STATIC
PS, PSO	8a,b,c	EQUIVALENT STATIC
CO	9	DYNAMIC ⁽³⁾
PCHUG	10a	DYNAMIC ⁽³⁾
CHUG	10b	DYNAMIC ⁽³⁾
QAB _I	11a ₁	COUPLED DYNAMIC/MRSM ⁽²⁾
QAB _D	11a ₂	STATIC ⁽⁴⁾
PS _I , PSO _I	11b ₁	COUPLED DYNAMIC/MRSM ⁽²⁾
PSO _D	11b ₂	STATIC ⁽⁴⁾
CO _I	11c ₁	COUPLED DYNAMIC/MRSM ⁽²⁾
CO _D	11c ₂	STATIC ⁽⁴⁾
PCHUG _I	11d ₁	COUPLED DYNAMIC/MRSM ⁽²⁾
PCHUG _D	11d ₂	STATIC ⁽⁴⁾
CHUG _I	11e ₁	COUPLED DYNAMIC/MRSM ⁽²⁾
CHUG _D	11e ₂	STATIC ⁽⁴⁾

NOTES TO TABLE 7-2.4-1

- (1) THE EFFECTS OF INTERNAL PRESSURE ARE EVALUATED UTILIZING THE TECHNIQUES DESCRIBED IN SUBPARAGRAPH NC-3650 OF THE ASME CODE, SECTION III (REFERENCE 6).
- (2) THE COUPLED DYNAMIC ANALYSIS METHOD FOR TORUS MOTION LOADS AS DESCRIBED IN SECTION 7-2.4-4 HAS BEEN UTILIZED FOR ALL PIPING SYSTEMS LISTED IN TABLE 7-1.1-1 EXCEPT LINES X-223A, X-223B, X-224A, X-224B, X-225, AND X-226. FOR THESE LINES, THE MULTIPLE RESPONSE SPECTRUM METHOD (MRSM) IS USED.
- (3) A DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE ANALYSIS METHODS USED FOR THIS LOADING IS PRESENTED IN SECTION
- (4) DISPLACEMENT LOADS ARE APPLIED SEPARATELY WHEN INERTIA LOADS ARE ANALYZED BY MRSM. FOR THE COUPLED DYNAMIC METHOD, BOTH THE INERTIA AND DISPLACEMENT LOADS ARE INCLUDED IN THE ANALYSIS.

COM-02-039-7
Revision 0

7-2.47

7-2.4.1 Piping Analytical Modeling

The structural models used in the analysis of the large bore TAP fall into the following two categories: piping models which represent systems with only torus external piping, and piping models which include both torus internal and torus external piping. Figure 7-2.4-1 shows a representative torus internal and external piping model.

The piping systems are modeled as multi-degree of freedom (DOF), finite element systems consisting of straight and curved beam elements using a lumped mass formulation. Sufficient detail is used to accurately represent the dynamic behavior of the piping systems for the applied loads. Flexibility and stress intensification factors based on the ASME Code, Section III, Class 2 piping requirements are also included in the model formulations.

Torus external piping supports included in the models consist of snubbers, struts, spring hangers, and their backup structures. Where required, an element is included to model the offset connection between the supporting member and the centerline of the pipe.

Snubbers are modeled as active in seismic and other dynamic load cases, while struts and spring hangers are active in all load cases. Spring hangers are modeled with appropriate preloads. The effects of the mass of supports and connecting hardware attached to the piping are included in the piping models when the effective support mass attached to the piping exceeds 5% of the mass of both adjacent pipe spans.

Stiffness values at a piping support location are established considering the combined effects of the standard component hardware (e.g., snubber or strut) and its backup supporting structure.

For piping models that have torus internal piping, the entire piping system including the internal supports connected to the torus, is included in the model. The hydrodynamic mass acting on submerged portions of the piping is also included in the model, using the methods described in Volume 1.

Boundary conditions for the piping models at the torus consist of the torus penetration and attachment points for the torus internal piping supports. The local stiffness of the torus is included at these locations in the form of six DOF linear springs. These local

stiffnesses are not included when performing the coupled torus motion analyses of the piping systems since they are inherently included in this methodology.

Model boundary conditions at the torus external termination points consist of anchors at support or equipment (pump, turbine) locations. Large stiffness values are specified in the models at these locations. In some cases, piping models used to evaluate the effects of NUREG-0661 loads are truncated at locations where stress levels due to those loadings have attenuated to less than 10% of the appropriate ASME Code allowables. At these truncation points, the mass and stiffness of the excluded portions of the piping system are simulated.

The mass and flexibility properties of in-line valves and their operators are included in the piping structural models. The valve and operator mass is lumped at their respective center of gravity.

Branch lines are included in the piping models unless they meet uncoupling criteria based on the relative moments of inertia of the branch line and main line. These criteria ensure that omission of the branch line

will not influence the behavior of the main line. The evaluation of the uncoupled branch lines has been considered in Section 7-3.0.




Figure 7-2.4-1

TAP SYSTEM STRUCTURAL MODEL (LINE X-212)

7-2.4.2 Methods of Analysis for SAR and Static Torus Displacement Loads

The following loads, which are described in Section 7-2.2, represent the SAR loads for which all TAP systems are analyzed. In addition, analyses are performed for static torus displacement loads due to normal and accident conditions.

1. Dead Weight Loads
2. Seismic Loads
3. Pressure and Temperature Loads
4. Operating Loads
5. Static Torus Displacement Loads

The methods used to analyze the piping systems for the above loads are described as follows:

1. Dead Weight (DW) Loads

A static analysis is performed for the uniformly distributed and concentrated weight loads, including insulation and pipe contents, applied to the TAP systems.

2. Seismic Loads

- a. OBE Inertia (OBE_I) Loads: A dynamic analysis is performed independently for the N-S and E-W directions using the uniform response spectra method. A constant vertical seismic acceleration is included in both cases. Response spectra generated for 1/2% of critical damping are used in accordance with the safety analysis report. All modes up to 33 hertz are considered in calculating the peak response of the piping system.
- b. OBE Displacement (OBE_D) Loads: A static analysis is performed independently for the N-S and E-W direction only since the vertical displacements are negligible. The relative anchor displacements at the torus penetration and reactor auxiliary building slabs are conservatively considered to be out of phase.
- c. SSE Inertia (SSE_I) Loads: Consistent with the definition of the loading in Section 2.2.1, the OBE_I results are doubled to obtain the SSE_I results.

- d. SSE Displacement (SSE_D) Loads: Consistent with the definition of the loading in Section 2.2.1, OBE_D results are doubled to obtain SSE_D results.

The methodology used to combine modal responses and spatial components in the seismic analysis is in accordance with the SAR (Reference 4). The individual modal responses are combined by the SRSS method. The seismic analysis is performed independently for each of the two horizontal directions, N-S and E-W, and for the vertical direction. The N-S and the E-W responses are separately combined with the vertical response by absolute sum method and the larger result is used.

3. Pressure and Temperature Loads

- a. Pressure Loads: The effects of maximum operating pressure (P_O) and design pressure (P) are evaluated utilizing the techniques described in Subsection NC-3650 of the ASME Code, Section III (Reference 6). Table 6-2.2-3 lists the values of P_O and P used in the analysis.

b. Temperature Loads: A static thermal expansion analysis is performed for the piping temperature cases TE and TE₁, as described in Table 7-2.2-3. A static analysis is performed for anchor movement, as described in Section 7-2.2, at the torus supports and penetrations.

4. Operating (OL) Loads

Line operating loads are applied statically using piping end segment thrust loads to the TAP systems, as described in Section 7-2.2.1.

5. Static Torus Displacement Loads

The static displacements of the torus at the appropriate TAP penetration location due to torus movement induced by normal (TD) and accident (TD₁, TD₂, TD₃) condition pressures and enclosed water weight are applied to each piping system as an applied displacement load case.

7-2.4.3 Methods of Analysis for Hydrodynamic Loads

Portions of TAP systems internal to the torus are subjected to hydrodynamic impact and drag loads as a result of the SRV discharge and LOCA events discussed in Section 7-2.2.1. The methods used to analyze the piping for these loads are described as follows:

6. Safety Relief Valve Discharge (QAL) Loads

- a. **Water Jet Impingement Loads:** Water jet pressure loadings are evaluated by multiplying the pressures by the appropriate submerged piping projected areas to convert them into nodal piping forces. An equivalent static analysis is then performed by multiplying the forces by a value of 2.0, which is the maximum DLF for the rectangular pulse jet pressure loading. The final analysis results are multiplied by a scale factor of 1.5. This value is used to account for the effects of multimode response.

- b. Air Bubble Drag Loads: An equivalent static analysis of the piping systems is performed to evaluate the acceleration drag and standard drag forces imparted to the submerged portions of piping. The applied equivalent static loads represent the peak dynamic loads from the loading transient multiplied by the peak dynamic load factor (DLF) of the structure within the load frequency range (1 to 50 hertz). The final analysis results are multiplied by a scale factor of 1.5, as described in Load Case 6a. This value is used to account for the effects of multimode response.

7. Vent Clearing (VCL and VCLO) Loads

- a. LOCA Water Jet Impingement Loads: An equivalent static analysis method is used to apply the LOCA jet loads to submerged portions of the piping models. For a given jet loading time-history, the peak DLF of the structure within the load frequency range (1 to 50 hertz) is determined. The equivalent static load applied to each segment of piping is equal to the product of the peak jet load

section force and the appropriate dynamic load factor. The final analysis results are multiplied by a scale factor of 1.5, as described in Load Case 6a.

- b. LOCA Air Bubble Drag Loads: An equivalent static analysis is performed to evaluate the acceleration drag and standard drag forces imparted to the submerged portions of the piping. For a given loading time-history, the peak DLF of the structure within the load frequency range (1 to 50 hertz) is determined. A scale factor of 1.5 is applied to the analysis results, as described in Load Case 6a.

8. Pool Swell (PS and PSO) Loads

The method of equivalent static loads is used in analyzing the piping system for the effects of pool swell loads. Since pool swell loads are time-limited pulses with regular shapes, their DLF's are constants and are well defined. The applied equivalent static piping section forces are equal to the peak section forces multiplied by their corresponding dynamic load factors. These

section forces are converted into nodal forces for application to the piping models.

- a. Impact and Drag Loads: Horizontal torus internal piping above the elevation of the downcomers is subjected to pool swell impact and drag loads. The impact and drag pressure transients are distributed uniformly over the affected piping surface. The load is applied in the upward direction most critical to the piping within the specified load directional range. The impact plus drag loading transient consists of a sharp triangular impulse followed by a rectangular drag loading. The combined DLF value for this transient is 1.7. In some cases where the impact load component does not exist, a DLF of 2.0 is utilized to account for the drag load component.
- b. Froth Impingement Loads: The pool swell froth loading time-history is a rectangular pulse which has a maximum DLF value of 2.0. Froth impingement loads are applied to piping located within the suppression chamber, as defined in Volume 1.

c. Pool Fallback Loads: Following the pool swell transient, the pool water falls back to its original level, creating drag loads on piping inside the torus. The fallback loading is a triangular pulse and is applied statically to the piping using a DLF value of 1.25.

The final pool swell loading analysis results for each of the above loads are multiplied by a scale factor of 1.5, as described in Load Case 6a.

9. Condensation Oscillation Loads

As discussed in Section 2.2.1, the CO drag force is composed of both velocity and acceleration drag components. The drag forces are determined based on the summation of 50 harmonic loading functions. A detailed description of the harmonic loading functions as well as the procedures used in applying the loads are discussed in Volume 1.

Once the amplitudes of the drag forces for a given piping system have been determined, they are converted to the PISTAR coordinate system and applied as PISTAR nodal forces.

Given the harmonic nodal force time-histories for acceleration and standard drag as well as the results of a PISTAR mode-frequency analysis for each piping system, a steady-state response calculation is carried out using the modal superposition method. The FSI effect is also considered in the analysis. The FSI effect is superimposed on results from the PISTAR mode frequency analysis.

10. Chugging Loads

- a. Pre-Chug (PCHUG) Loads: As described in Section 7-2.2.1, the pre-chug load definition is a single harmonic velocity and acceleration drag loading. The defined loading amplitude is ± 2 psi, and the loading frequency is in the 6.9 to 9.5 hertz range. The specific frequency chosen for performing the piping analysis is the frequency that is most critical for the particular piping system being evaluated. Details of the loading definition are described in Volume 1. The pre-chug loading is applied to the piping models as a nodal force, and a dynamic response analysis is carried out to obtain

maximum system response. Torus FSI effects are also included in the analysis.

- b. Post-Chug (CHUG) Loads: The post-chug loading definition is similar to that for CO in that it is defined as a 50 harmonic forcing function. The piping analysis procedures for post-chug loads are therefore the same as for the CO loads described above.

7-2.4.4 Methods of Analysis for Torus Motions

11. Torus Motion Loads

Torus motion loads, as discussed in Section 7-2.2.1, are considered for the analysis of all torus attached piping systems. This section describes the methods of analysis for the following torus motion load cases:

- a. SRV Torus Motion (QAB_I , QAB_D)
- b. Pool Swell Torus Motion (PS_I , PSO_I , PS_D , PSO_D)
- c. Condensation Oscillation Torus Motion (CO_I , CO_D)
- d. Pre-Chug Torus Motion ($PCHUG_I$, $PCHUG_D$)
- e. Post-Chug Torus Motion ($CHUG_I$, $CHUG_D$)

The coupling analysis method and/or multiple response spectrum method (MRSN) are utilized to obtain piping response for the five torus motion load cases. The methods of analysis for each torus motion event are described in the following paragraphs.

Coupling Analysis

The conventional method for performing dynamic analyses of structures and supported equipment such as piping systems is to perform independent uncoupled dynamic analyses of the containment and of the supported piping. A detailed model of the structure is first developed. This model often accounts for the mass of the supported piping but not its dynamic characteristics. A dynamic analysis of the uncoupled containment is performed, and the response time-history at the attachment point of the supported piping is obtained. This response time-history or the corresponding spectra is then used to calculate the response of an uncoupled dynamic model of the piping. This conventional method of analysis is termed an uncoupled analysis because the dynamic models of the containment and the piping are never directly coupled or combined.

Conventional uncoupled analyses tend to over-estimate the response of the supported piping. The response at the piping attachment point obtained from the uncoupled containment analysis will include the contribution of all uncoupled

containment modes excited by the input time-history. The spectra from this time-history will show amplified spectral peaks at each of the significant uncoupled containment modes. If the uncoupled piping model has natural modes near these spectral peaks, then the uncoupled containment response will engender an amplified response of the piping system. However, when the uncoupled containment and piping natural modes are nearly the same, the piping system will in reality inhibit the response of the containment at that frequency, and the torus response will be less than that obtained from an uncoupled analysis. This effect is particularly significant for the SRV, pre-chug, and CO torus motion analyses, since the LDR requires "tuning" the loading frequencies to the critical piping response frequencies.

This overestimation of piping response may be corrected by performing a coupled analysis, in which a single dynamic model including both the torus and piping is used. In this way, the coupling effects between the torus and piping are automatically included. However, a coupled analysis of this type is not practical for the majority of the TAP systems. For these systems, a

computer program has been developed which is used to incorporate the coupling effects into the results of the uncoupled torus and piping analyses. This program has been formulated in the time domain. For loads such as pool swell, where the torus load definition is defined in the time domain, the coupling program may be applied directly. For LOCA-related loads such as CO and chugging, which are defined in the frequency domain, the coupling program is not directly applicable, since it is formulated in the time domain. The coupling program is also impractical for performing analyses for SRV loads due to the wide range of forcing frequencies involved and to the number of separate load cases that must be considered in addressing the LDR "tuning" requirement.

Transfer Function Approach

In order to facilitate application of the coupling methods for the CO, chugging, and SRV loads, a transfer function approach, based on a white noise time-history analysis, is utilized in conjunction with the coupling program. This method provides for determination of the critical coupled response

frequencies of the piping systems, which are in turn used in selecting the appropriate frequencies of the applied loadings.

The transfer functions relate piping system response to torus shell forcing functions, and are calculated in the time domain by applying to the mathematical model of the torus a white noise time-history with a spatial distribution equivalent to that specified for the particular hydrodynamic load under consideration. The resulting uncoupled torus shell motions are then used in conjunction with piping and torus modal characteristics to obtain the coupled piping responses in the time domain. These time domain piping responses, together with the white noise time-history that is employed for the torus forcing function, are then transformed into the frequency domain using standard fast-fourier transform methods. The transfer function of the piping system is then obtained by dividing the coupled white noise response by the white noise input in the frequency domain. The critical piping response frequencies are then obtained by examining the relative magnitudes of the transfer function peaks.

Knowing the critical piping response frequencies, appropriate frequencies from the range of CO, chugging, and SRV load frequencies can be selected to determine the forcing functions to be applied to the torus. The forcing function time-histories are then transformed into the frequency domain and multiplied by the transfer function to obtain piping system responses in the frequency domain which, in turn, are transformed back into the time domain to conclude the process. For CO and post-chug loads, it is also necessary to sum the responses from each of the 50 harmonics that must be considered.

The flow chart provided in Figure 7-2.4-2 shows the basic steps involved in performing the coupled/transfer function TAP analysis.

The specific coupling analysis procedure used for each category of torus motions loads is described as follows:

a. SRV Torus Motion

1. Using the mathematical model of the TAP systems described in Section 7-2.4.1, the uncoupled piping dynamic characteristics (mode shapes and frequencies) are determined using the PISTAR piping analysis program. All modes up to 60 hertz have been considered in the analysis.
2. Similarly, using the finite element model of a 1/32 segment of the suppression chamber as described in Volume 2, the torus dynamic characteristics (mode shapes and frequencies) are determined. The STARDYNE computer program is used for this analysis.
3. The time-history response of the suppression chamber at the torus-pipe intersection due to a band limited white noise time-history is determined. The STARDYNE computer program is used for this analysis.

4. Using information derived in Steps 1 through 3 above, the coupled response of the piping system for each mode due to the white noise input is determined using the coupling computer program.
5. Using the modal superposition technique, the modal responses of the piping system obtained from Step 4 are used in calculating the response of the piping system due to the white noise input. The static response of the piping at high frequencies is accounted for by use of a pseudomode computer program.
6. Transformation of the white noise response time-history from Step 5 and the input white noise time-history to the frequency domain is then performed using the fast-fourier transform method.
7. The transfer function for each component of the piping system is calculated by dividing the white noise response by the white noise input in the frequency domain.

8. Critical piping frequencies within the prescribed SRV load frequency range are selected at the transfer function peaks.
9. The torus safety relief valve bubble loading is generated by "tuning" the SRV bubble pressure frequency to the piping critical frequencies obtained in Step 8 above.
10. The "tuned" torus shell load time-histories are transformed into the frequency domain using the fast-fourier transform method.
11. Piping response in the frequency domain for each piping component is computed by multiplying the transfer function (determined in Step 7) times the torus shell load in the frequency domain obtained in Step 10. In this step, the response is scaled down based on results from the SRV alternate analysis method, described in Volume 1, which calibrates the results of the coupled fluid-torus analysis to in-plane SRV test data.

12. Final piping time-history responses are derived from piping response in the frequency domain (Step 11) by using the inverse fast-fourier transform method.

13. The peak of the time-history response is selected for the piping stress evaluation.

b. Pool Swell Torus Motion

1. Uncoupled torus and TAP system mode shapes and frequencies, as described above, are again utilized.

2. The actual time-history response of the suppression chamber is determined at the torus-pipe intersection due to the pool swell pressure time-history load.

3. The coupled response of the piping system for each mode due to the pool swell load input is determined using the coupling computer program.

4. Using the modal superposition technique, the modal response of the piping system is obtained and is used in calculating the final response time-history.

5. The peak of the time-history response is selected for the piping stress evaluation.

c. Condensation Oscillation and Chugging Torus Motions

1. Transfer functions relating piping responses to CO, pre-chug, and post-chug torus internal pressures are obtained in a manner similar to Steps 1 through 7, described above for SRV torus motion.

2. Calculations are then performed to obtain piping responses in the frequency domain utilizing the fast-fourier technique and applying amplitudes of pressure versus frequency for the CO and post-chug load cases. The pressure amplitudes and frequencies utilized for CO and post-chug loads are defined in Volume 1. The pre-chug load is defined as a single harmonic with an

amplitude of ± 2 psi in the frequency range of 6.9 to 9.5 hertz. The selection of the critical piping frequency in this range is based on the transfer function peak which occurs most frequently.

3. For CO and post-chug, the frequency domain harmonic response is conservatively determined for each of the 50 defined harmonic forcing frequencies as the product of the pressure amplitude and the peak of the transfer function in each frequency band.
4. The final time domain response for the CO load case is taken as 1.15 times the direct sum of 50 harmonic responses which are randomly phased by introduction of a set of 50 random phase angles. Cumulative distribution functions of analytical and test data form the basis for this random phasing. A 50% non-exceedance probability (NEP) with 90% confidence is achieved as a result of this method.
5. For the post-chug case, the final time domain response is obtained as the absolute sum of

the 50 harmonic responses. The phase angles are set to zero in this case.

6. The peak magnitude of the time domain response for CO, pre-chug, and post-chug load cases is selected for the piping stress evaluation.

Multiple Response Spectrum Method (MRSM) Analysis

An alternate method of analysis was utilized to analyze for torus motions on selected piping systems in lieu of the coupling method described above. The alternate method is termed the multiple response spectrum method (MRSM), and is performed using the PISTAR computer program. The MRSM method of analysis calculates the dynamic responses of the piping system due to a single support motion input. This method is used to analyze piping systems attached to the ECCS suction header. The ECCS suction header is analyzed using coupling analysis procedures outlined in this section. Then the response spectra in the three orthogonal translational directions are generated at a location where piping systems are attached to the ECCS header.

The inertial component of the torus input motion is analyzed using these response spectrum curves. The displacement components of the torus input motion are analyzed by applying static end displacement loads to the piping at the attachment point.




Figure 7-2.4-2

TAP SYSTEM COUPLED/TRANSFER FUNCTION ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

7-2.4.5 Fatigue Evaluation

Section 4.3.3.2 of NUREG-0661 requires that a fatigue evaluation of the SRV and TAP torus attached piping be performed for all loading conditions except pool swell.

The Mark I Owners Group prepared and submitted a generic fatigue evaluation report (Reference 7) to the NRC in late 1982. The report addressed fatigue on a generic basis using actual piping analysis results from essentially all Mark I plants. The resulting cumulative usage factors are below 0.5, demonstrating that further plant unique fatigue evaluations are not warranted. Therefore, the Quad Cities Unit 2 TAP is qualified based on this generic evaluation.

7-2.5 Analysis Results

The analytical results for the large bore TAP evaluation are summarized in this section.

The maximum piping stresses resulting from governing load combinations for highly stressed locations on each large bore TAP line and for small diameter torus internal lines, are presented in Table 7-2.5-1. The maximum stresses for each service level are listed along with the associated Code equations and allowable stress values.

Fatigue evaluations for the TAP lines have been performed generically as described in Section 6-2.4.5. The Quad Cities Unit 2 TAP is qualified for fatigue effects based on this generic evaluation.

In summary, the results show that the design of the large bore TAP systems are adequate for the loads, load combinations, and acceptance criteria limits specified in NUREG-0661 (Reference 1) and the PUAAG (Reference 5).

Table 7-2.5-1

ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR TORUS ATTACHED PIPING STRESS

SERVICE LEVEL	A	B	C	D	SECONDARY
ASME CODE EQUATION	8	9	9	9	10
ALLOWABLE STRESS (ksi)	15.00 17.50 ⁽¹⁾	18.00 21.00 ⁽¹⁾	27.00 31.50 ⁽¹⁾	36.00 42.00 ⁽¹⁾	22.50/37.50 ⁽²⁾ 26.25 ⁽¹⁾ /43.75 ⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾
SYSTEM DESCRIPTION	MAXIMUM STRESS (ksi)				
PRESSURE SUPPRESSION	2.23	2.55	3.94	10.25	19.95
ECCS SUCTION HEADER	7.18	17.53	29.64	39.68	8.59
VACUUM RELIEF	6.72	14.33	24.97	24.97	25.48 ⁽²⁾
RHR TEST LINE AND SPRAY HEADER DISCHARGE FROM PUMP 2A/2B	8.74	17.10	26.47	35.90	19.56
RHR TEST LINE AND SPRAY HEADER DISCHARGE FROM PUMP 2C/2D	4.17	11.37	21.68	32.91	37.21 ⁽²⁾
RCIC TURBINE EXHAUST	1.30	17.90	26.10	35.20	7.56
HPCI TURBINE EXHAUST	7.30	13.75	17.62	20.00	20.31
HPCI POT DRAIN	1.11	12.87	15.02	17.69	4.07
RCIC POT DRAIN	1.11	12.87	15.02	17.69	4.07
RHR 2A/2B PUMP SUCTION	4.18	15.24	26.83	29.06	12.60
RHR 2C/2D PUMP SUCTION	4.41	15.78	24.13	24.41	13.81
CORE SPRAY 2A/2B PUMP SUCTION	6.68	16.43	26.24	30.44	37.38 ⁽²⁾
HPCI PUMP SUCTION	6.36	16.48	25.68	32.10	11.65
RCIC PUMP SUCTION	2.85	15.39	20.89	21.66	13.69

(1) FOR ECCS SUCTION HEADER.

(2) EQUATION 11 IS USED IN PLACE OF EQUATION 10.

7-3.0 SMALL BORE PIPING

An evaluation of each of the NUREG-0661 (Reference 1) requirements which affect the design adequacy of the Quad Cities Unit 2 small bore piping (SBP) is presented in the following sections. The general criteria used in this evaluation are contained in Volume 1 of this PUAR.

The components of the SBP which are examined are described in Section 7-3.1. The loads and load combinations for which the SBP are evaluated are described and presented in Section 7-3.2. The acceptance limits to which the analysis results are compared are discussed and presented in Section 7-3.3. The analysis methodologies used to evaluate the effects of the loads and load combinations on the SBP are discussed in Section 7-3.4. The analysis results and the corresponding design margins are presented in Section 7-3.5.

7-3.1 Component Description

The SBP lines for the Quad Cities Unit 2 plant unique analysis (QUA) falls into the following five categories.

1. Small bore piping lines which meet the 10% exclusion criteria
2. Cantilevered lines
3. Small bore piping with flex loops
4. Other torus external small bore lines
5. Torus internal small bore lines

Of the 99 small bore lines, 62 initiate from large bore piping lines that meet the 10% exclusion criteria; therefore, they are not evaluated. There are 14 lines cantilevered from the torus or large bore TAP which are evaluated. Table 7-3.1-1 provides typical SBP systems design data. Figure 7-3.1-1 shows two typical cantilever lines.

Several small bore lines are attached directly to the torus or large bore torus attached piping (TAP). Evaluation of these systems included a flex loop installed to reduce the effects of torus motion on the piping systems. Downstream of the flex loop is an anchor separating the remaining SBP from the effects of



Mark I loads. Figure 7-3.1-2 shows a typical flex loop installation.

Several small bore lines range in size from 1/2" to 2" Schedule 80, and 2-1/2" to 4" Schedule 40 pipe supported by rigid struts, rods, guides, and spring supports. These lines are either attached to the torus or other large bore lines connected to the torus, and serve a multitude of functions such as nitrogen purges, RHR pump bypasses, and HPCI minimum flow returns. Figure 7-3.1-3 provides an example of these lines.

Table 7-3.1-1

SMALL BORE PIPING - SYSTEM DESIGN DATA⁽¹⁾

SYSTEM TYPE	DESIGN PRESSURE (psi)	DESIGN TEMPERATURE (°F)	NORMAL PRESSURE (psi)	NORMAL TEMPERATURE (°F)
CANTILEVERS	415	400	180	165
PIPING	415	400	180	165
FLEX LOOPS	170	300	155	280



⊕ ANCHOR

Figure 7-3.1-1
TYPICAL CANTILEVERED VENT OR DRAIN




Figure 7-3.1-2
TYPICAL FLEX LOOP INSTALLATION




Figure 7-3.1-3
TYPICAL SMALL BORE PIPING LINE

COM-02-039-7
 Revision 0

7-3.7

7-3.2 Loads and Load Combinations

The loads for which the Quad Cities Unit 2 SBP is designed are defined in NUREG-0661 on a generic basis for all Mark I plants. The methodology used to develop plant unique loads for each load defined in NUREG-0661 is discussed in Volume 1. The results of applying the methodology to develop specific values for each of the controlling loads which act on the SBP are discussed and presented in Section 7-3.2.1.

Using the event combinations and event sequencing defined in NUREG-0661 and discussed in Volume 1, the governing load combinations which affect the SBP are formulated. The load combinations are discussed and presented in Section 7-3.2.2.

7-3.2.1 Loads

The loads acting on the SBP are categorized as follows:

1. Dead Weight Loads
2. Seismic Loads
3. Pressure and Temperature Loads
4. Safety Relief Valve Discharge Loads
5. Pool Swell Loads
6. Condensation Oscillation Loads
7. Chugging Loads

Loads in Categories 1 and 3 are defined in Categories 1 and 3 in Section 7-2.2.1. Table 7-3.1-1 provides further definition of Category 3 loads for typical SBP systems. Category 2 loads are defined in Section 7-3.4.1. Loads in Categories 4 through 7 are defined in Category 11 in Section 7-2.2.1.

Small bore piping attached to the torus experiences LOCA-induced and SRV discharge-induced loadings directly from the torus response to these loads. Small bore piping attached to large bore TAP lines experiences these loads indirectly, from the response of the large bore piping to the input response of the torus.

Not all of the loads defined in NUREG-0661 need be evaluated, since some are enveloped by others or have a negligible effect on the piping. Only those loads which maximize the piping response and lead to controlling stresses are examined and discussed. These loads are referred to as governing loads in subsequent discussions.

7-3.2.2 Load Combinations

The loads for which the SBP are evaluated are presented in Section 7-3.2.1. The NUREG-0661 criteria for grouping these loads into load combinations are discussed in Volume 1.

Load combinations specified for the SBP are the same as those specified for the large bore TAP in Table 7-2.2-5. Several of the load combinations presented in these tables do not result in controlling stresses in the SBP, and are not evaluated. Load combinations which contain hydrotest loadings are not evaluated since these loadings have a negligible effect on the small bore piping.

The governing load combinations for the SBP as described above have been considered in the analytical methods described in Section 7-3.4.

7-3.3 Acceptance Criteria

The acceptance criteria defined in NUREG-0661 on which the Quad Cities Unit 2 SBP analysis is based are discussed in Volume 1. The acceptance criteria follow the rules contained in the ASME Code, Section III, Division 1, 1977 Summer Addenda for Class 2 piping (Reference 6). The corresponding service level limits and allowable stresses are also consistent with the requirements of the PUAAG and the ASME Code (References 5 and 6, respectively).

The SBP systems are evaluated in accordance with the requirements for piping systems contained in Subsection NC of the ASME Code.

7-3.4 Methods of Analysis

The governing load combinations for which the Quad Cities Unit 2 SBP are evaluated are presented in Section 7-3.2.2. The methodology used to evaluate the SBP for the effects of these loads is discussed in Section 7-3.4.1.

7-3.4.1 Analysis for Major Loads

The SBP systems are evaluated for the effects of the loads discussed in Section 7-3.2.1 using several different methods, depending on the type of system configuration. A description of methods used for each type of configuration follows.

- a. Cantilevered Drains and Vents: Section 7-3.1 provides a description of the system, which is shown in Figure 7-3.1-1. A beam model of the system is used to calculate the natural frequency using standard beam formulations of the system. A dynamic load factor is calculated based upon the calculated system natural frequency and the predominant loading frequency. An equivalent static analysis is performed using loads and load combinations defined in Sections 7-3.2.1 and 7-3.2.2.
- b. SBP Lines with Flex Loops: Flex loops, shown in Figure 7-3.1-2, are designed for locations of large input displacements. The loops have resonant frequencies outside the critical frequency range of the input motion. An anchor isolates the remainder of the piping system from

the Mark I loads. Since the flex loop orientation is critical in determining stresses within the loop, a method for analyzing stress in the loop for a given location is necessary. To do this, the coefficient method was developed. Stresses are determined in the loop when a reference load is applied to each direction of the six DOF's at the penetration, or loaded point. For the static case, the reference load is defined as a unit displacement or unit rotation, depending on the nature of the loading. For the dynamic loading, the reference load is defined by the motion whose response spectrum envelops other response spectra obtained at other locations on the suppression chamber in terms of frequency content.

- c. Instrument Lines and Other Piping Systems: Section 7-3.1 provides a description of the systems shown in Figures 7-3.1-2 and 7-3.1-3. A beam model is generated and a frequency analysis is performed in which all modes of vibration in the range of 0 to 60 hertz are extracted. Selected lines underwent in situ testing to determine the dynamic characteristics of the SBP systems. The hammer impact method is used for excitation during the dynamic test. Modal

parameters, i.e., resonant frequencies and modal damping, are extracted using the multi-degree of freedom curve fit algorithm. A dynamic load factor is calculated based on the resulting first natural frequency. An equivalent static analysis is performed using a finite element model.

The specific treatment of each load in each load category identified in Section 7-3.2.1 is discussed in the following paragraphs.

1. Dead Weight (DW) Loads

A static analysis is performed for a unit vertical acceleration applied to the weight of steel and the weight of water contained inside the small bore piping.

2. Seismic Loads

- a. OBE Inertia (OBE_I) Loads: A static analysis is performed for a 1.0g maximum horizontal and 0.185g maximum vertical acceleration applied to the combined weight of steel and water in the analytical model.

- b. OBE Displacement (OBE_D) Loads: A static analysis is performed for the horizontal and vertical OBE displacements as defined in the safety analysis report.
- c. SSE Inertia (SSE_I) Loads: A static analysis is performed for a 2.0g maximum horizontal and 0.370g maximum vertical acceleration applied to the combined weight of steel and water in the analytical model.
- d. SSE Displacement (SSE_D) Loads: A static analysis is performed for the horizontal and vertical SSE displacements as defined in the safety analysis report.

3. Pressure and Temperature Loads

- a. Pressure (P_O , P) Loads: The effects of these loads on the SBP are evaluated by using the ASME Code piping equations.
- b. Temperature (TE , TE_1) Loads: A static analysis is performed for the TE and TE_1 temperature cases, with the load applied uniformly to the small bore piping. The temperatures

applied to the SBP are equal to the maximum pipe temperature.

An additional static analysis is performed for the effects of thermal anchor movements at the attachment of the SBP to the suppression chamber for normal operating and accident conditions.

4. Safety Relief Valve Discharge (QAB) Loads

A multiple response spectra analysis is performed for the loads defined in Section 7-2.2.1.

5. Pool Swell (PSO) Loads

A multiple response spectra analysis is performed for the pool swell pressure transients defined in Section 7-2.2.1.

6. Condensation Oscillation Loads

A multiple response spectra analysis is performed for the loads defined in Section 7-2.2.1.

7. Chugging Loads

- a. Pre-Chug (PCHUG) Loads: Post-chug loads bound pre-chug loads. Accordingly, the analysis results for post-chug are used in load combinations which include pre-chug loads.
- b. Post-Chug (CHUG) Loads: An equivalent static analysis is performed for the loads defined in Section 7-2.2.1.

The methodology described in the preceding paragraphs results in conservative values for the SBP stresses for the controlling loads defined in NUREG-0661. Therefore, use of the analysis results obtained by applying this methodology leads to conservative estimates of design margins for the small bore piping.

7-3.5 Analysis Results

The component descriptions, loads and load combinations, acceptance criteria, and analysis methods used in the evaluation of the Quad Cities Unit 2 SBP are presented and discussed in the preceding sections. The results from the evaluation of the SBP are presented in the following paragraphs.

Table 7-3.5-1 shows maximum stresses for a typical SBP evaluation resulting from ASME Code piping equations for the controlling load combinations.

In summary, the results show that the SBP is adequate for the loads, load combinations, and acceptance criteria specified in NUREG-0661 (Reference 1) and the PUAAG (Reference 5).

Table 7-3.5-1

GOVERNING SMALL BORE PIPING STRESSES FOR
CONTROLLING LOAD COMBINATIONS⁽¹⁾

SYSTEM TYPE	LEVEL A	LEVEL B	LEVEL C	LEVEL D
	ALLOWABLE STRESS (psi)			
	MAXIMUM STRESS (psi)			
CANTILEVERS				
PIPING				
FLEX LOOPS				

(1) DATA TO BE SUPPLIED LATER.

An evaluation of the NUREG-0661 (Reference 1) requirements related to the design adequacy of the Quad Cities Unit 2 piping supports is presented in the following sections. The general criteria used in this evaluation are contained in Volume 1 of this PUAR.

The piping supports are described in Section 7-4.1. The loads and load combinations for the piping supports are described in Section 7-4.2. The acceptance limits to compare analysis results and the analysis methodologies to evaluate the effects of the loads and load combinations on the piping supports are discussed in Section 7-4.3. The analysis results are presented in Section 7-4.4.

7-4.1 Component Description

External TAP lines are supported by U-bolts, rod and spring hangers, rigid struts, guides, anchors, and snubbers attached to building walls or slabs using structural steel frames and baseplates or directly to the main structural steel in the building. Figures 7-2.1-2 and 7-2.1-3 show typical TAP supports outside the suppression chamber. Torus internal piping is generally supported by rigid structural steel supports attached directly to the torus shell or ring girders, as shown in Figure 7-2.1-5.

An example of a TAP support outside the suppression chamber consists of a pipe clamp attached to a rigid strut, which is welded to a steel baseplate anchored to the building structure with wedge-type anchor bolts. These components are designed and qualified by the manufacturers for specific load magnitudes. For the addition of piping supports and the modification to existing piping supports, the standard component pipe support hardware and respective manufacturers include: rigid struts, clamps, and springs - Elcen Metal Products Co. and NPS Industries, Inc.; mechanical snubbers and clamps - Bergen-Paterson Pipe Support Corp.; anchor bolts - ITT Phillips Drill Division,

Hilti, Inc. and Drillco Devices Limited. Rigid struts are usually constructed of A106, Grade B pipe of various diameters and schedules. Typically, pipe clamps are fabricated from ASTM A36 steel plates which are connected with A307 carbon steel bolts. Base plates are cut from ASTM A36 carbon steel of various thicknesses. Anchor bolts are wedge-type or undercut type and of various diameters and lengths. Integral attachments (lugs, trunnions, and pads) welded to the pipe pressure boundary are used where necessary to provide shear resistance between the pipe clamp and piping or to anchor the piping system.

Torus attached piping supports connected to the torus shell or ring girders inside the suppression chamber are generally made from ASTM A516, Grade 70 carbon steel plate and ASTM A516 pipe.

7-4.2 Loads and Load Combinations

The loads for which the Quad Cities Unit 2 TAP supports are designed are defined in NUREG-0661 on a generic basis for all Mark I plants. The methodology used to develop plant unique TAP loads for each load defined in NUREG-0661 is discussed in Volume 1.

The loads acting on the piping supports outside the suppression chamber are transmitted via the response of the piping to loads defined in Sections 7-2.2.1 and 7-3.2.1. Piping supports inside the suppression chamber experience these same loads, with the addition of hydrodynamic impact and drag loads as defined in Section 7-2.2.1 for large bore torus attached piping.

Using the event combinations and event sequencing defined in NUREG-0661 and discussed in Volume 1, the governing load combinations which affect the piping supports are formulated. Table 7-4.2-1 presents the governing load combinations. For external piping supports, loads resulting from dynamic events have been combined using the SRSS method in accordance with References 9 and 10.

Table 7-4.2-1

LOAD COMBINATIONS - TORUS ATTACHED PIPING SUPPORTS

LOAD COMBINATION NUMBER	LOAD CONDITIONS (1,2,3,6,7)
S-1	DW + OL + OBE _I
S-2	DW + OL + QAB + QAB _I
S-3	DW ⁽⁵⁾
S-4	DW + OL + QAB + QAB _I + SSE _I
S-5	DW + OL + QAB + QAB _I + PCHUG + PCHUG _I
S-6	DW + OL + QAB + QAB _I + CHUG + CHUG _I
S-7	DW + OL + QAB + QAB _I + SSE _I + PCHUG + PCHUG _I
S-8	DW + OL + QAB + QAB _I + SSE _I + CHUG + CHUG _I
S-9	DW + OL + OBE _I + CO + CO _I
S-10	DW + OL + QAB + QAB _I + SSE _I + PS + PS _I + VCL
S-11	DW + OL + PSO + PSO _I + VCLO
S-12	DW + OL + OBE _I + TE + THAM + TD + OBE _D
S-13	DW + OL + QAB + QAB _I + TE + THAM + TD + QAB _D
S-14	DW + OL + QAB + QAB _I + PCHUG + PCHUG _I + TE ₁ + THAM ₁ + TD ₃ ⁽⁴⁾ + QAB _D + PCHUG _D
S-15	DW + OL + QAB + QAB _I + CHUG + CHUG _I + TE ₁ + THAM ₁ + TD ₃ ⁽⁴⁾ + QAB _D + CHUG _D
S-16	DW + OL + QAB + QAB _I + SSE _I + PCHUG + PCHUG _I + TE ₁ + THAM ₁ + TD ₃ ⁽⁴⁾ + QAB _D + SSE _D + PCHUG _D
S-17	DW + OL + QAB + QAB _I + SSE _I + CHUG + CHUG _I + TE ₁ + THAM ₁ + TD ₃ ⁽⁴⁾ + QAB _D + SSE _D + CHUG _D
S-18	DW + OL + OBE _I + CO + CO _I + TE ₁ + THAM ₁ + TD ₃ ⁽⁴⁾ + OBE _D + CO _D
S-19	DW + OL + QAB + QAB _I + SSE _I + PS + PS _I + VCL + TE ₁ + THAM ₁ + TD ₃ ⁽⁴⁾ + QAB _D + SSE _D + PS _D
S-20	DW + OL + PSO + PSO _I + VCLO + TE ₁ + THAM ₁ + TD ₃ ⁽⁴⁾ + PSO _D
S-21	DW + OL + QAB + QAB _I + SSE _I + TE + THAM + TD + QAB _D + SSE _D

- (1) SEE SECTION 7-2.2.1 FOR DEFINITION OF INDIVIDUAL LOADS.
- (2) USE THE LARGER OF LOCA AND SSE COMBINED BY THE SRSS METHOD OR LOCA AND OBE COMBINED ABSOLUTELY.
- (3) THE MOST SEVERE COMBINATION OF STATIC LOADS MUST BE CONSIDERED.
- (4) USE THE TD₁, TD₂, OR TD₃ CASE; WHICHEVER IS MOST SEVERE.
- (5) APPLICABLE TO NON-WATER LINES ONLY (HYDROTEST LOAD).
- (6) DYNAMIC LOAD COMBINED BY SRSS (REFERENCE 8) FOR SELECTED SUPPORTS.
- (7) USE THE MAXIMUM OF OBE_I OR SSE_I.

7-4.3 Methods of Analysis and Acceptance Criteria

Pipe supports are evaluated using standard linear elastic structural analysis methods, hand calculations, or standard structural analysis computer programs. The resultant component forces and/or stresses are compared to their respective allowable values.

Standard component allowables for Levels B, C, and D service limits are supplied by the manufacturer. Allowables for structural members, base plates and welds are defined in the ASME Code, Section III, Subsection NF, up to and including the 1977 Summer Addenda and in NUREG-0661. The application of these allowables is as described in Table 7-4.3-1.

Anchor bolt allowables are based on manufacturer's test data in accordance with IEB-79-02 requirements and the American Concrete Institute (ACI) Standard ACI-349-80 (References 11 and 13). Base plate flexibility and shear-tension interaction are considered in the anchor bolt evaluation.

Integral attachments are evaluated by adding the local stresses in the pipe from each support load combination to the corresponding pipe stress load combination

listed in Table 7-2.2-5. Allowable stresses are given in Table 7-2.3-1. Local stresses are generally calculated using methods described in Welding Research Council Bulletin WRC-107 and in ASME Code Case N-318 (Reference 12 and 14).

Table 7-4.3-1

PIPE SUPPORT ALLOWABLES

LOAD ⁽³⁾ COMBINATION	SERVICE LIMITS STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS	SERVICE LIMITS STANDARD COMPONENTS
S-1 S-2 S-3	B	B
S-4 S-5 S-6	C	C
S-7 S-8 S-9 S-10 S-11	D	D
S-12 S-13 S-14 S-15 S-16 S-17 S-18 S-19 S-20 S-21	$3 \times B^{(1,2)}$	D

- (1) LIMITS APPLY TO THE RANGE OF STRESS. COMPRESSIVE STRESS NOT TO EXCEED 2/3 OF THE CRITICAL BUCKLING STRESS.
- (2) PEAK VALUE OF THE RANGE OF STRESS APPLIES TO ANCHOR BOLTS.
- (3) SEE TABLE 7-4.2-1 FOR DEFINITION OF THESE LOAD COMBINATIONS.

7-4.4 Analysis Results

New pipe supports and modifications to existing pipe supports were designed and analyzed to satisfy the acceptance criteria of Section 7-4.3. As a result, the design of the TAP supports for Quad Cities Unit 2 is adequate for the loads, load combinations, and acceptance criteria limits specified in NUREG-0661 (Reference 1) and substantiates the piping analysis results.

An evaluation of each of the NUREG-0661 (Reference 1) requirements which affect the design adequacy of the Quad Cities Unit 2 equipment and valves is presented in the following sections. The general criteria used in this evaluation are contained in Volume 1 of this PUAR.

The components of the equipment and valves which are examined are described in Section 7-5.1. The loads and load combinations for which the equipment and valves are evaluated are described and presented in Section 6-5.2. The acceptance limits to which the analysis results are compared and the analysis methodologies used to evaluate the effects of the loads and load combinations on the equipment and valves are discussed in Section 7-5.3. The analysis results and the corresponding design margins are presented in Section 7-5.4.

7-5.1 Component Description

The torus attached piping (TAP) systems include equipment and valves. Eight TAP systems required analysis up to connections to pumps and a turbine. All valves included in the piping analytical models as described in Section 7-2.4.1 are considered in this evaluation. The principal valve manufacturers are Crane (gate, globe, and check valves) and Pratt (butterfly valves). Valve operator types include Bettis air operators and Limitorque motor operators.

7-5.2 Loads and Load Combinations

The loads acting on the valves, valve operators, and equipment nozzles are caused by the response of the piping systems to the loads defined in Sections 7-2.2.1 and 7-3.2.1. These components of the TAP systems are evaluated for those loading conditions resulting from hydrodynamic responses of the torus due to LOCA and SRV discharge events, as generically defined in NUREG-0661.

Equipment nozzle connections are modeled as anchors, as described in Section 7-2.4.1. Stress at equipment nozzles and valve body/yoke junction are computed using the governing load combinations listed in Table 7-2.2-5.

7-5.3 Methods of Analysis and Acceptance Criteria

7-5.3.1 Equipment

The equipment described in Section 7-5.1 is qualified by meeting the requirements of one of the following criteria.

The pipe stress due to loads defined in NUREG-0661 for load combinations described in Table 7-2.2-5 at the equipment nozzle meets:

- (1) The 10% rule of Section C.2.b of the PUAAG (Reference 5), or
- (2) The pipe stress at the equipment nozzle obtained from the original design (Reference 4).

7-5.3.2 Valves

Check valves and manual valves are modeled in the piping analysis as piping elements, with increased stiffnesses and masses to represent the properties of the valve body. Lumped mass models are included in the piping analysis to represent valves with actuators, with the valve mass lumped at the center of gravity. For these valves, the stiffness and mass of the valve body and stem are considered, along with the eccentricity of the valve operator. Stresses are computed at the weakest sections of the yoke for each dynamic loading given in Table 7-2.2-5.

7-5.3.3 Acceptance Criteria for Valves

The stresses in the valve body and the actuator components will not exceed yield stress.

The results of the analysis of valves in TAP systems are presented in Section 7-5.4.2.

7-5.4 Analysis Results

7-5.4.1 Equipment

All equipment nozzle stresses meets the acceptance criteria described in Section 6-5.3.1.

7-5.4.2 Valves

All active valves in TAP systems are evaluated for the loads and load combinations listed in Table 7-2.2-5.

For Quad Cities Unit 2, all active valves meet the acceptance criteria described in Section 7-5.3.3 as the valve body and actuator component stresses are below yield stress.

An evaluation of the NUREG-0661 requirements which affect the design adequacy of the Quad Cities Unit 2 torus attached piping (TAP) penetrations is presented in the following sections. The general criteria used in this evaluation are contained in Volume 1 of this report.

The components which are analyzed are described in Section 7-6.1. The loads and load combinations for which the penetrations are evaluated are described and presented in Section 7-6.2. The acceptance limits to which the analysis results are compared are discussed and presented in Section 7-6.3. The analysis methodology used to evaluate the effects of the loads and load combinations on the penetrations, including consideration of fatigue effects, is discussed in Section 7-6.4. The analysis results are presented in Section 7-6.5.

7-6.1 Component Description

The large bore piping suppression chamber penetrations evaluated in this section are numbered and located as shown in Figure 7-1.1-1. The principal components of the penetrations are the nozzles and the insert plates, as shown in Figure 7-6.1-1. The nozzle extends from the outer circumferential pipe weld through the insert plate to the inner circumferential pipe weld or flange. The insert plate provides local reinforcement of the suppression chamber shell near the penetration. Additional reinforcing is provided for many penetrations, as shown in Table 7-6.1-1 and Figures 7-6.1-2 through 7-6.1-4.

Radial penetrations are aligned radially with the suppression chamber segment and are symmetrical about their centerline, as shown in Figure 7-6.1-3. Slightly non-radial penetrations are aligned parallel to the horizontal or vertical centerline of the suppression chamber segment and are slightly offset. Non-radial penetrations are aligned parallel to the suppression chamber vertical centerline, producing an oblique orientation with respect to the torus shell, as shown in Figure 7-6.1-4.

Typical penetration reinforcement modifications are shown in Figures 7-6.1-2 through 7-6.1-4. The modifications include pipe sections which are installed as sleeves to reinforce the penetration nozzles. Support arms extend radially from the pipe sleeves to pad plates attached to the suppression chamber shell.

Each penetration modification is designed to allow the penetrations to sustain TAP reaction loads produced by suppression chamber motions due to normal loads and hydrodynamic loads, while keeping component stress intensities below the allowable values specified in Reference 6.

Table 7-6.1-1

PENETRATION AND GEOMETRY REINFORCEMENT SCHEDULE

PENETRATION NUMBER	PENETRATION DIAMETER (INCHES)	EXTERNAL REINFORCEMENT	REFERENCE FIGURE
		SUPPORT ARMS	
X-203A	18	NO	7-6.1-1
X-204A, B, C, D	20	YES	7-6.1-3
X-205	20	NO	7-6.1-1
X-210A, B	14	YES	7-6.1-4
X-211A, B	6.625	YES	7-6.1-4
X-212	8.625	YES	7-6.1-4
X-220	24	NO	7-6.1-1
X-221	2.375	NO	7-6.1-1
X-222	2.375	NO	7-6.1-1




Figure 7-6.1-1
TYPICAL UNREINFORCED PENETRATION





Figure 7-6.1-2

EXTERNAL VIEW OF TYPICAL PENETRATION REINFORCEMENT

COM-02-039-7
Revision 0

7-6.6



SECTION A-A

Figure 7-6.1-3
REINFORCEMENT DETAILS FOR
TYPICAL RADIAL PENETRATIONS




Figure 7-6.1-4
REINFORCEMENT DETAILS FOR
TYPICAL NON-RADIAL PENETRATIONS

COM-02-039-7
Revision 0

7-6.8

7-6.2 Loads and Load Combinations

The loads for which the Quad Cities 2 suppression chamber penetrations are evaluated are defined in NUREG-0661 on a generic basis for all Mark I plants. The methodology used to develop plant unique torus attached piping reaction loads for each penetration is discussed in Section 7-2.0. The results of applying the controlling reaction loads which act on the penetrations are discussed in Section 7-6.2.1.

Using the event combinations and event sequencing defined in NUREG-0661 and discussed in Volume 1, the governing load combinations which affect the penetrations are formulated. The load combinations are discussed and presented in Section 7-6.2.2.

7-6.2.1 Loads

The loads acting on the suppression chamber penetrations are categorized as follows:

1. Dead Weight Loads
2. Seismic Loads
3. Pressure and Temperature Loads
4. Operating Loads
5. Static Torus Displacement Loads
6. Safety Relief Valve Discharge Loads
7. Vent Clearing Loads
8. Pool Swell Loads
9. Condensation Oscillation Loads
10. Chugging Loads
11. Torus Motion Loads

Loads in the above categories include those acting on torus attached piping discussed in Section 7-2.2.1 and those acting on the torus shell discussed in Volume 2. Loads acting directly on torus attached piping systems result in reaction loads on the penetrations. Loads acting directly on the torus shell result in suppression chamber motions. The suppression chamber motions excite the attached piping systems and produce reaction loads on the penetrations. In addition, loads acting

directly on the torus shell produce initial stresses in the shell and insert plate, which are included in the evaluation as discussed in Section 7-6.4.

The reaction loads used in the suppression chamber penetration evaluation for each load category are taken from the TAP system evaluation presented in Sections 7-2.4 and 7-2.5. The components of these reaction loads at the penetrations consist of the maximum forces and moments acting on the penetration nozzle both inside and outside the suppression chamber. The reaction loads include the coupling effects of the TAP system and the suppression chamber as discussed in Section 7-2.4.

Maximum torus operating temperature and pressure values are used in the analysis of the penetrations. These values are taken from Reference 3 and envelop the maximum operating pressures and temperatures.

7-6.2.2 Load Combinations

The loads for which the suppression chamber penetrations are evaluated are presented in Section 7-6.2.1. The general NUREG-0661 criteria for grouping the loads into load combinations are discussed in Volume 1. Not all load combinations for each event need to be examined, since many are enveloped by others which contain the same or additional loads. Table 7-6.2-1 shows the governing load combinations used in evaluating the suppression chamber penetrations.

Table 7-6.2-1

GOVERNING PENETRATION LOAD COMBINATIONS AND SERVICE LEVELS

LOAD COMBINATION NUMBER	LOAD COMBINATIONS ⁽¹⁾	SERVICE LEVEL
CHUG-14E	$ DW + TE_1 + THAM_1 + TD^{(3)} + OL + (QAB + CHUG + QAB_I + OBE ^{(4)} + CHUG_I)$ or $2(QAB + CHUG + QAB_I + OBE ^{(4)} + CHUG_I)$, WHICHEVER IS HIGHER	B
CHUG-14M	$ DW + TE_1 + THAM_1 + TD^{(3)} + OL + QAB + QAB_I + OBE ^{(4)} + CHUG + CHUG_I $	B
CHUG-27M	$ DW + TE_1 + THAM_1 + TD^{(3)} + OL + QAB + SSE ^{(5)} + QAB_I + CHUG + CHUG_I $	C
PS-15M	$ DW + TE_1 + THAM_1 + TD^{(3)} + OL + QAB + SSE ^{(5)} + QAB_I + PS + PS_I $	C
PS-18M ⁽²⁾	$ DW + TE_1 + THAM_1 + TD^{(3)} + OL + OBE ^{(4)} + PS + PS_I $	B
CO-27M	$ DW + TE_1 + THAM_1 + TD^{(3)} + OL + SSE ^{(5)} + CO + CO_I $	C

- (1) SEE SECTION 6-2.2.1 FOR DEFINITION OF SYMBOLS USED IN LOAD COMBINATION.
- (2) PRIMARY PLUS SECONDARY STRESS INTENSITY RANGE AND FATIGUE EVALUATION ARE NOT REQUIRED, SINCE CHUG-14E GOVERNS.
- (3) TD IS THE MAXIMUM OF TD_1 , TD_2 , AND TD_3 .
- (4) OBE IS DEFINED AS $OBE_I + OBE_D$.
- (5) SSE IS DEFINED AS $SSE_I + SSE_D$.

7-6.3 Acceptance Criteria

The acceptance criteria defined in NUREG-0661 are the basis for the Quad Cities Unit 2 suppression chamber penetrations analysis. These criteria are discussed in Volume 1. In general, the acceptance criteria follow the rules contained in the ASME Code Section III, Division 1, 1977 Edition up to and including the 1977 Summer Addenda (Reference 6). The corresponding service level limits and allowable stresses are also consistent with the requirements of the ASME Code and NUREG-0661.

The suppression chamber penetrations and reinforcing modifications are evaluated in accordance with the requirements for Class MC components contained in the ASME Code. The jurisdictional boundaries for the penetration MC components are defined at the inner and outer piping/nozzle circumferential welds nearest to the suppression chamber.

7-6.4 Methods of Analysis

The methodology used to evaluate the penetrations for the loading conditions described in Section 7-6.2.1 is discussed in the following paragraphs.

All of the large bore suppression chamber penetrations listed in Table 7-6.1-1 have been evaluated using finite element models.

Based on similarities in geometric configurations of selected penetrations discussed in Section 7-6.1, six analytical models are used to represent a total of twelve penetrations. The mechanical and thermal loads for each group of penetrations are enveloped and applied to the associated analytical model. The allowable stresses for the representative penetrations are determined at the maximum temperature, as discussed in Section 7-6.2.

The finite element models of the penetrations consist of the external and internal nozzles, the insert plate, a portion of the suppression chamber shell, and for the reinforced penetrations, the support arms, the pad plates, and the nozzle sleeves. Thin plate finite elements are used to model each component explicitly.

Figure 7-6.4-1 shows a typical penetration analytical model.

The entire length of each nozzle is modeled between the inner and outer piping/nozzle circumferential welds nearest to the suppression chamber shell.

The portion of the suppression chamber shell included in the models is chosen to minimize the impact of boundary effects on the region of stress evaluation. Translational restraints are imposed at the boundary nodes on the suppression chamber shell section of the models. Where pad plates are attached to the suppression chamber, shell element thicknesses are taken as the effective thickness of the suppression chamber shell and the pad plate.

The maximum absolute value of each force and moment component for each reaction load case is conservatively applied to the analytical models in a manner which maximizes penetration stresses. Local thermal effects at each penetration are also evaluated.

The stresses in the suppression chamber shell and insert plate due to piping reactions are added to the stresses in the suppression chamber shell due to loads

acting directly on the suppression chamber. These stresses are taken from the suppression chamber analysis results discussed in Volume 2. The stress intensities of the dynamic loads are combined using direct summation in accordance with Reference 8. The maximum stress intensities for each penetration component are calculated and compared to stress allowables.

The small bore piping penetrations are evaluated in a manner similar to the above described procedure. For these penetrations, however, a computer code based on closed-form solutions for nozzle-type attachments to cylindrical vessels is used. The mechanical and thermal loads from the piping analysis are applied to the nozzles. The maximum stress intensities for each penetration component are then calculated and compared to the allowable stresses.

Fatigue effects for the penetration with the highest stress levels and maximum loading cycles are evaluated.

The number of stress cycles and load cycles for each loading case is established using the suppression chamber analysis results presented in Reference 10. the alternating stress intensity for each loading is

then calculated. Fatigue strength reduction factors of 2.0 for major component stresses and 4.0 for component weld stresses are conservatively used. The governing cumulative fatigue usage factor is determined by calculating fatigue usage for the controlling event combination.




Figure 7-6.4-1
SUPPRESSION CHAMBER REINFORCED PENETRATION -
TYPICAL FINITE ELEMENT MODEL

7-6.5 Analysis Results

The geometry, loads and load combinations, acceptance criteria, and analysis methods used in the evaluation of the Quad Cities Unit 2 suppression chamber penetrations are presented and discussed in the previous sections. The results from the evaluation of the penetrations are presented in Tables 7-6.5-1 through 7-6.5-6.

These tables show the maximum calculated stresses and the associated design margins for the major penetration components for the governing load combinations.

The unreinforced SBP penetrations were also evaluated and found to be within the specified allowable limits.

The cumulative fatigue usage factors for the controlling component and weld are within the acceptable fatigue usage factor of 1.0.

Table 7-6.5-1

PENETRATION EVALUATION STRESS SUMMARY
FOR PENETRATION X-203

CONTAINMENT/ COMPONENT	LOAD CASE					
	CHUG-14E		CHUG-14M		PS-15M	
	STRESS INTENSITY					
	MAXIMUM (ksi)	LIMIT (ksi)	MAXIMUM (ksi)	LIMIT (ksi)	MAXIMUM (ksi)	LIMIT (ksi)
TORUS	48.60	69.50	21.00	28.95	23.80	53.80
INSERT PLATE	32.60	69.50	18.08	28.95	20.01	53.80
PAD	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
STIFFENER	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NOZZLE	23.30	54.90	5.71	22.65	7.03	42.45

Table 7-6.5-2

PENETRATION EVALUATION STRESS SUMMARY
FOR PENETRATION X-204

CONTAINMENT/ COMPONENT	LOAD CASE					
	CHUG-14E		CHUG-14M		PS-15M	
	STRESS INTENSITY					
	MAXIMUM (ksi)	LIMIT (ksi)	MAXIMUM (ksi)	LIMIT (ksi)	MAXIMUM (ksi)	LIMIT (ksi)
TORUS	43.90	69.50	16.90	28.95	21.70	53.80
INSERT PLATE	42.20	69.50	18.00	28.95	25.60	53.80
PAD	45.10	69.50	15.50	23.95	19.20	53.80
STIFFENER	24.90	69.50	17.70	28.95	30.90	53.80
NOZZLE	50.30	69.50	12.20	28.95	23.00	53.80

Table 7-6.5-3

PENETRATION EVALUATION STRESS SUMMARY
FOR PENETRATION X-205

CONTAINMENT/ COMPONENT	LOAD CASE					
	CHUG-14E		CHUG-14M		PS-15M	
	STRESS INTENSITY					
	MAXIMUM (ksi)	LIMIT (ksi)	MAXIMUM (ksi)	LIMIT (ksi)	MAXIMUM (ksi)	LIMIT (ksi)
TORUS	33.67	69.50	16.36	28.95	27.90	53.80
INSERT PLATE	27.21	69.50	15.61	28.95	27.93	53.80
PAD	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
STIFFENER	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NOZZLE	17.79	54.90	4.81	22.65	6.69	42.45

Table 7-6.5-4

PENETRATION EVALUATION STRESS SUMMARY
FOR PENETRATION X-210

CONTAINMENT/ COMPONENT	LOAD CASE					
	CHUG-14E		CHUG-14M		PS-15M	
	STRESS INTENSITY					
	MAXIMUM (ksi)	LIMIT (ksi)	MAXIMUM (ksi)	LIMIT (ksi)	MAXIMUM (ksi)	LIMIT (ksi)
TORUS	37.60	69.50	17.80	28.95	19.50	53.80
INSERT PLATE	36.76	69.50	25.56	28.95	28.58	53.80
PAD	41.25	69.50	14.39	28.95	15.94	53.80
STIFFENER	17.52	69.50	9.23	28.95	12.02	53.80
NOZZLE	28.47	54.90	13.06	22.65	16.92	42.45

Table 7-6.5-5

PENETRATION EVALUATION STRESS SUMMARY
FOR PENETRATION X-211

CONTAINMENT/ COMPONENT	LOAD CASE					
	CHUG-14E		CHUG-14M		PS-15M	
	STRESS INTENSITY					
	MAXIMUM (ksi)	LIMIT (ksi)	MAXIMUM (ksi)	LIMIT (ksi)	MAXIMUM (ksi)	LIMIT (ksi)
TORUS	26.40	69.50	13.20	28.95	14.50	53.80
INSERT PLATE	26.80	69.50	12.70	28.95	18.20	53.80
PAD	22.50	69.50	15.10	28.95	14.00	53.80
STIFFENER	8.30	69.50	6.10	28.95	9.00	53.80
NOZZLE	20.40	54.90	10.10	22.65	15.20	42.45

Table 7-6.5-6

PENETRATION EVALUATION STRESS SUMMARY
FOR PENETRATION X-220

CONTAINMENT/ COMPONENT	LOAD CASE					
	CHUG-14E		CHUG-14M		PS-15M	
	STRESS INTENSITY					
	MAXIMUM (ksi)	LIMIT (ksi)	MAXIMUM (ksi)	LIMIT (ksi)	MAXIMUM (ksi)	LIMIT (ksi)
TORUS	33.58	69.50	18.08	28.95	20.18	53.80
INSERT PLATE	19.58	69.50	17.08	28.95	18.08	53.80
PAD	17.30	69.50	2.50	28.95	4.20	53.80
STIFFENER	4.30	69.50	3.30	28.95	5.70	53.80
NOZZLE	23.60	54.90	14.30	22.65	22.40	42.45

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. "Mark I Containment Long-Term Program," Safety Evaluation Report, USNRC, NUREG-0661, July 1980; Supplement 1, August 1982.
2. "Mark I Containment Program Load Definition Report," General Electric Company, NEDO-21888, Revision 2, November 1981; Addenda, Sheet 1, April 1982.
3. "Mark I Containment Program Plant Unique Load Definition," Quad Cities Station, Units 1 and 2, General Electric Company, NEDO-24567, Revision 2, April 1982.
4. "Safety Analysis Report (SAR)," Quad Cities Station, Units 1 and 2, Commonwealth Edison Company, Section 3.9, July 20, 1982.
5. "Mark I Containment Program Structural Acceptance Criteria Plant Unique Analysis Applications Guide," Task Number 3.1.3, Mark I Owners Group, General Electric Company, NEDO-24583-1, October 1979.
6. ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, Section III, Division 1, 1977 Edition with Addenda up to and including Summer 1977.
7. "Mark I Containment Program Augmented Class 2/3 Fatigue Evaluation Method and Results for Typical Torus Attached and SRV Piping Systems," MPR Associates, Inc., MPR-751, November 1982.
8. "Methodology for Combining Dynamic Responses," USNRC, NUREG-0484, Revision 1, May 1980.
9. Letter from D. B. Vassallo (NRC) to H. C. Pfefferlen (GE), "Acceptability of SRSS Method for Combining Dynamic Responses in Mark I Piping Systems," dated March 10, 1983.
10. "Combining Modal Responses and Spatial Components in Seismic Response Analysis," USNRC, Regulatory Guide 1.92, Revision 1, February 1976.
11. "Pipe Support Base Plate Designs Using Concrete Expansion Anchor Bolts," NRC Office of Inspection and Enforcement, IEB-79-02, Revision 2, November 8, 1979.

12. Wichman, K. R., Hopper, A. G., and Mershon, J. L., "Local Stresses in Spherical and Cylindrical Shells due to External Loadings," Welding Research Council Bulletin 107, March 1979.
13. "Code Requirements for Nuclear Safety - Related Concrete Structures," American Concrete Institute, ACI 349-80, 1980.
14. "Procedures Evaluation of the Design of Rectangular Cross Section Attachments on Class 2 or 3 Piping," ASME Code Case N-318, Section III, Division 1, July 13, 1981.