

Duke Power Company
P.O. Box 1006
Charlotte, NC 28201-1006

Hal B. Tucker
Senior Vice President
Nuclear Generation
(704)382-4531



DUKE POWER

February 3, 1993

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Attn: Document Control Desk
Washington, D. C. 20555

Subject: McGuire Nuclear Station Units 1 & 2
Docket Nos. 50-369, 370
Catawba Nuclear Station Unit 1
Docket No. 50-413
Request For Additional Information - Methodology for Analysis
Of The Primary Coolant Loops For Steam Generator Replacement

Gentlemen:

Per your Request for Additional Information dated January 28, 1993, involving the proposed methodology for the analysis of the primary loops at McGuire Units 1 & 2 and Catawba Unit 1 for steam generator replacement, please find attached Duke Power's response. As indicated in the response, Duke Power has decided that only the time history method for the generation of floor response spectra will be used for engineering work involved with the steam generator replacement.

Should there be any questions concerning this response, please contact David V. Ethington at (704) 382-6633.

Very truly yours,

D. L. Rehn, General Manager
Nuclear Services

Attachment

090051

9302110308 930203
PDR ADOCK 05000369
P PDR

Printed on recycled paper

Ad
1/14

U. S. NRC
Page 2
February 3, 1993

xc (w/att):

S. D. Ebnetter
Regional Administrator, Region II

T. A. Reed, ONRR

R. E. Martin, ONRR

P. K. Van Doorn
Senior Resident Inspector (MNS)

W. T. Orders
Senior Resident Inspector (CNS)

Request for Additional Information
McGuire 1/2 and Catawba 1
Methodology for Analysis of Primary Coolant Loops for
Steam Generator Replacement (SGR)

Background Information

In the May 17, 1990 safety evaluation report (SER) of the direct generation methodology (DGM) used for generating floor response spectra (FRS) for the snubber reduction program at Catawba 1 and 2, the NRC staff approved, after extensive discussions with Duke Power Company (DPC), the use of a composite ground response spectrum (GRS) as input for generating the FRS utilizing an appropriate DGM. In the same SER the staff also approved the use of a computer program called EDASP for DGM. In response to a question raised by the staff during a teleconference on October 28, 1992, DPC stated that it will generate the new FRS using either the time history method or the DGM as permitted in Section 3.7 of the FSAR.

Specific Requests for Information

1) DPC should clarify if it intends to use, in the SGR project at Catawba 1, the same composite GRS and the DGM that were approved for the snubber reduction program at Catawba 1 and 2 in the May 17, 1990 SER cited above; if not, DPC should furnish the details of the GRS and analysis procedure it will use for generating the FRS for the SGR project at Catawba 1. In order to expedite the resolution of this issue, DPC is advised to review all of its submittals and the staff's review comments and additional information requests on its application for the snubber reduction program at Catawba 1 and 2, and provide detailed information on the two related issues, namely, the GRS and the analysis procedure used.

2) Similarly furnish the details of the GRS and the analysis procedure that will be used for the SGR project at McGuire 1 and 2.

Response

While DPC is licensed to use the DGM, as described in the May 17, 1990 SER, at Catawba 1 and 2, all FRS that have been generated to date were created using the time history method. McGuire 1 and 2 have no approved composite GRS and are not presently licensed to use DGM for FRS generation. All McGuire FRS have been generated using the time history method as well. To maintain consistency between the two plants and expedite licensing reviews for SGR, DPC has decided to continue to use the time history method for the generation of FRS for all engineering work involved with SGR.