

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

CHATTANOOGA, TENNESSEE 37401

5B Lookout Place

DEC 03 1990

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

Gentlemen:

In the Matter of the Application of)
Tennessee Valley Authority) Docket Nos. 50-390
50-391

WATTS BAR NUCLEAR PLANT (WBN) UNITS 1 AND 2 - CLARIFICATIONS/CORRECTIONS TO NRC
INSPECTION REPORT NOS. 50-390, 50-391/90-20

NRC Inspection Report Nos. 50-390, 50-391/90-20 documented reviews of WBN
civil and electrical issues, employee concerns, fire prevention and
protection, preoperational testing, and previously defined inspection items.
These reviews were conducted between July 21 and August 17, 1990.

TVA civil engineering has completed a review of the detailed discussions of
civil items, as described on pages 2 through 8 of Inspection Report 90-20.
The enclosure provides several clarifications/corrections which are believed
necessary to clarify these critical discussions.

If there are any questions, please telephone P. L. Pace at (615) 365-1824.

Very truly yours,

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY



E. G. Wallace, Manager
Nuclear Licensing and
Regulatory Affairs

Enclosure
cc: See page 2

9612070141

TEOL
11

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

DEC 03 1990

cc (Enclosure):

Ms. S. C. Black, Deputy Director
Project Directorate II-4
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
One White Flint, North
11555 Rockville Pike
Rockville, Maryland 20852

NRC Resident Inspector
Watts Bar Nuclear Plant
P.O. Box 700
Spring City, Tennessee 37381

Mr. P. S. Tam, Senior Project Manager
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
One White Flint, North
11555 Rockville Pike
Rockville, Maryland 20852

Mr. B. A. Wilson, Project Chief
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region II
101 Marietta Street, NW, Suite 2900
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

ENCLOSURE

TVA CLARIFICATIONS OF CIVIL ISSUES DISCUSSION
INSPECTION REPORT 390, 391/90-20

TVA offers the following comments/clarifications to the discussion of civil issues recorded on pages 2 through 8 of NRC Inspection Report 50-390, 391/90-20.

1. Page 2, Section b, HAAUP - The quantities noted for small bore piping are approximations and should be so indicated. "For small bore piping, the program includes verifying the acceptance of [approximately] 520 stress calculations and [approximately] 6200 pipe supports." The totals quoted have not been finalized and may vary from the numbers referenced.
2. Page 2, Section b, HAAUP - The statement "the licensee has indicated that the evaluation of small bore piping and supports will be qualified by bounding calculations" is incorrect. Small bore piping stress analysis will not utilize bounding calculations, only small bore support evaluations will.
3. Page 2, Section b, HAAUP - In reference to the statement that "The design input documents are complete and the licensees stress qualification is in progress," piping stress analysis is in progress for large bore and has not yet started for small bore.
4. Page 3, Section b, HAAUP - TVA would like to clarify that the statement "additionally, the licensee plans to verify the adequacy of 4400 typical support designs for field routed tubing" is not to be numerically added to the previous sentence's "the HAAUP includes the verification of the qualification of approximately . . . 4400 supports." It is preferred that this statement read, "additionally, the licensee plans to verify the adequacy of typical support designs for field routed tubing. . . ."
5. Page 3, Section b, HAAUP - TVA wishes to add that "Category I(L) piping is covered under the integrated interactions program (page 8)." This revision is proposed as reference to Category I(L) appears to have been omitted from this inspection report.
6. Page 3, Section b, HAAUP - It should be clarified that "the use of bounding calculations for small bore pipe support [variance] evaluation is under review." The report omitted the term variance.
7. Page 3, Section c, Equipment Seismic Qualification - It should be clarified that the licensee anticipates completing the modifications for the ASCO solenoid valves in January 1991.
8. Page 4, Section d, Conduit and Supports - "The licensee plans to walkthrough the remaining 80 percent of the conduit runs and [assess configurations for] the 8 critical attributes discussed above." The report indicated that inspections would be performed. This is not correct.

ENCLOSURE

TVA CLARIFICATIONS OF CIVIL ISSUES DISCUSSION
INSPECTION REPORT 390, 391/90-20

9. Page 5, Section e, Cable Trays and Supports - "The licensee is proposing to sample inspect 58 of 3000 supports . . ." and ". . . the licensee is proposing a critical case evaluation of 1700 supports (20 percent). . . ." TVA wishes to update these statements to read "the licensee has sample inspected 58 of 3000 supports . . ." and ". . . the licensee has performed a critical case evaluation which envelops 1700 supports (20 percent). . . ."
10. Page 5, Section e, Cable Trays and Supports - The NRC references NCIG-01 as the basis for sample inspecting 58 of 3000 supports. This reference is correctly identified as NCIG-02.
11. Page 6, Section g, DBVP CAP - In reference to the statement "they will obtain walkdown data and actual loading for 20 selected sets of platforms," it should be clarified that TVA "will obtain walkdown data and actual loading for 20 platforms." This more correctly reflects TVA's action and is consistent with the report's subsequent discussion of this issue in the following sentences.
12. Page 7, Section h, Miscellaneous Issues with Steel Structures - The quantities noted for pipe whip restraints and embedded plates are approximations. "The work scope includes [approximately] 115 pipe whip restraints and [approximately] 136 embedded plates." Similarly, "the work scope includes [approximately] 131 piping, electrical, and HVAC penetrations. [Approximately] three hundred and thirty pad plates require assessment."