



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

JUN 24 1985

Docket Nos.: 50-445
and 50-446

APPLICANT: Texas Utilities Generating Company (TUGCO)
FACILITY: Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station,
Units 1 and 2 (CPSES)
SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF MEETING BETWEEN NRC STAFF AND TUGCO TO DISCUSS
THE REANALYSIS OF ROCK-STRUCTURE INTERACTION FOR COMANCHE
PEAK

At the request of TUGCO, a meeting between the NRC staff and TUGCO was held on June 18, 1985 in Room P-422, Phillips Building, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland. The meeting was transcribed and the transcript is enclosed. The transcript contains a listing of the meeting attendance and the slides used by TUGCO during its presentation.

The applicant, TUGCO, had commissioned a reanalysis of the rock-structure interaction for Comanche Peak. The objective of the reanalysis was to assess the seismic margin in the in-structure floor response spectra considering improvements in the technology that have occurred since the response spectra given in the FSAR were developed. The meeting consisted of descriptions of the basic seismic design criteria, the site foundation conditions, the earlier analysis for developing the in-structure floor response spectra used heretofore, the major steps and methodology used in the reanalysis, and the results of the reanalysis on the response spectra for the auxiliary building, as an example.

The NRC staff raised questions concerning conformance of the reanalysis to the Standard Review Plan and to the designs used in other nuclear plants reviewed and accepted by the NRC. The staff also requested additional information on whether the reanalysis is an improvement in the analytical methodology, or is there data to demonstrate that the results more accurately reflect the response of a structure to earthquake excitation. The applicant's reanalysis had used a layered base model to depict the rock conditions at the site. The pros and cons of using a fixed base model verses a layered base model were discussed in considerable detail.

The staff cautioned the applicant that should TUGCO make an submittal, it should be very clear on how they intend to use the results of the reanalysis. If the results are to have only a limited application, then justification for restricting its application should be provided.

8507050060 850624
PDR ADOCK 05000445
T PDR

At the close of the meeting the applicant advised that they will evaluate whether a submittal requesting NRC acceptance of the reanalysis should or should not be made. If that decision is affirmative, they will further evaluate whether the submittal will be founded on the layered base model presented at the meeting or on a fixed base model.

S. B. Burwell, Project Manager
Licensing Branch No. 1
Division of Licensing

Enclosure: As stated

cc: See next page

LB#1/DL *SBBurwell*
SBBurwell/mac
06/24/85

LB#1/DL *BJYoungblood*
BJYoungblood
06/24/85

CP/TRT/DL *CTrammell*
CTrammell
06/24/85

CP/TRT/DL *VSNoonan*
VSNoonan
06/24/85