JUN 2 5 1985

Distribution
Docket
NRC PDR
Local PDR
PRC System
NSIC
LB#2 Reading
Licensing Assistant-Hylton
SStern
JPartlow
BGrimes
EJordan
Dewey OELD
ACRS (16)
F. Eltawila, DSI (P-1002)
J. Kudrick, DSI (P-1000A)

Docket No. 50-458

Mr. William J. Cahill, Jr.
Senior Vice President
River Bend Nuclear Group
Gulf States Utilities Company
P.O. Box 2951
Beaumont, Texas 77704
ATTN: Mr. J. E. Booker

Dear Mr. Cahill:

Subject: Request for Additional Information - Mark III Issues

As a part of the NRC staff's review of your application for an operating license for River Bend Station, the staff has determined the need for additional information in the area of Mark III issues (Humphrey Concerns). The request for information is included in the enclosure as Question 1 through 5.

Please inform NRC Project Manager Stephen Stern or Ralph Caruso of your schedule for response and for clarification or further discussion on this topic.

Sincerely,

Walter Butler, Chief
Licensing Branch No. 2
Division of Licensing

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/enclosure:
See next page

OFFICE	LB#2/DL	LB#2/DL					
SURNAME	SStern:mk	WButler					
DATE	6/24/85	6/25/85					

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

JUN 2 5 1990

Docket No. 50-458

Mr. William J. Cahill, Jr.
Senior Vice President
River Bend Nuclear Group
Gulf States Utilities Company
P.O. Box 2951
Beaumont, Texas 77704
ATTN: Mr. J. E. Booker

Dear Mr. Cahill:

Subject: Request for Additional Information - Mark III Issues

As a part of the NRC staff's review of your application for an operating license for River Bend Station, the staff has determined the need for additional information in the area of Mark III issues (Humphrey Concerns). The request for information is included in the enclosure as Question 1 through 5.

Please inform NRC Project Manager Stephen Stern or Ralph Caruso of your schedule for response and for clarification or further discussion on this topic.

Sincerely,

Walter R. Butler

Walter Butler, Chief
Licensing Branch No. 2
Division of Licensing

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/enclosure:
See next page

cc: Troy B. Conner, Jr., Esq.
Conner and Wetterhahn
1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Mr. William J. Reed, Jr.
Director - Nuclear Licensing
Gulf States Utilities Company
Post Office Box 2951
Beaumont, Texas 77704

H. Anne Plettinger
3456 Villa Rose Dr.
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70806

Richard M. Troy, Jr., Esq.
Assistant Attorney General in Charge
State of Louisiana Department of Justice
234 Loyola Avenue
New Orleans, Louisiana, 70112

Dwight D. Chamberlain
Resident Inspector
Post Office Box 1051
St. Francisville, Louisiana 70775

Gretchen R. Rothschild
Louisianians for Safe Energy, Inc.
1659 Glenmore Avenue
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70775

James W. Pierce, Jr., Esq.
P. O. Box 23571
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70893

Mr. Robert D. Martin
U.S. NRC, Region IV
Parkway Central Plaza Building
611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Sutie 1000
Arlington, Texas 76011

Ms. Linda B. Watkins/Mr. Steven Irving
Attorney at Law
355 Napoleon Street
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70802

Mr. David Zaloudek
Nuclear Energy Division
Louisiana Department of
Environmental Quality
Post Office Box 14690
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70898

Mr. J. David McNeill, III
William G. Davis, Esq.
Department of Justice
Attorney General's Office
7434 Perkins Road
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70808

Enclosure

CONTAINMENT SYSTEMS BRANCH

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

RE: HUMPHREY CONCERNS FOR

RIVER BEND STATION

Docket No. 50-458

1. In the response to issue 1.3, it was stated that for structures that are submerged prior to pool rise, the bubble loads are bounded by the LOCA vent clearing loads as defined in GESSAR II. Since the only load mentioned, though not specified, in GESSAR II during the vent clearing is the LOCA water jet load, provide each element of the water jet load and the design value(s) used for River Bend.

2. In the response to issue 2.1, the proposed approach does not account for possible resonance between sleeve annulus CO frequency and sleeve acoustic frequency which might lead to pressure loads in excess of those developed via the scaling laws. If it can be demonstrated that resonant amplification does not occur, the proposed load specification would be acceptable; otherwise, provide the necessary information to account for resonant amplification effect.

3. Provide the following additional information regarding Humphrey Concern 2.2 and 2.3:

   a. The source of the MARK II data base used to develop the lateral load and the applicability of this data to RBS;

   b. The procedure used to scale this data;

c. Indicate if the load is applied dynamically or statically; and

d. Justify the elimination of a lateral load specification during the CO phase.

4. In your response to issues 3.1, 3.3 and 3.7, no mention was made regarding the lateral loads on any of the discharge lines. Provide your justification for eliminating these loads or specify the lateral load that is used in assessing the discharge line mentioned in your response to these issues.

5. The information provided in your response to issue 3.4 does not permit the staff to conclude that a conservative estimate of the potential loads has been obtained. Provide the assumptions used in your analysis.