

Docket Nos. 50-390
50-391

February 13, 1974

Tennessee Valley Authority
ATTN: Mr. James E. Watson
Manager of Power
818 Power Building
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37401

Gentlemen:

As a result of revised transient pressure data, you have found it necessary to reanalyze the Sequoyah containment vessels. Your report, "Stability Analysis of the Sequoyah Nuclear Plant Containment Vessel, Report No. 72-21," covers this subject. Your letter of January 25, 1974, refers to discussions and understandings between our staffs regarding schedules in this matter, and notes that a late unfavorable ruling by our staff would cause a delay of several months in your overall schedule.

In the meeting of October 19, 1973 in Bethesda, you solicited questions and comments on your presentation of the results of your analysis. The staff stated that it would not be appropriate to make an instantaneous evaluation or to provide specific comments solely on the basis of your presentation. You were advised that the analysis could be resolved most expeditiously if TVA would provide a detailed report at the earliest possible date independent of the FSAR, then scheduled for December 3, 1973. A single preliminary copy was received by us on December 4, 1973, and the formal submittal on December 27, 1973.

Verbal discussions on January 17, 1974, indicated that dates then projected for review might result in excessive delays. We then verbally agreed to complete our review so as to reply formally by March 29, 1974, and requested information as to the suitability of that date. No reply was made until your letter of January 25, 1974.

Telephone discussions on February 5 verified that your analyses were based on data representing augmented flow, whereas the staff will require non-augmented flow be considered. You stated you have compared non-augmented and augmented flow pressure transient data and found little difference, and that partial results from Westinghouse tests confirm these data.

LB

OFFICE >						
SURNAME >						
DATE >						

These comparisons and data should be submitted. You indicated you fully expect the final non-augmented flow values to be well within the 30 percent margin on the augmented flow data which is used in the Stability Analysis. Final data and verification of your analyses will be incorporated in the FSAR and in appropriate reports when available.

In the interest of assisting you in minimizing any further delays, we have again considered our workload and priorities to determine if review of your report can be further expedited. As a result, we have rescheduled our review of this report so that a verbal reply will be transmitted to you by March 1, 1974, and a formal written reply by March 8, 1974.

Sincerely,



Voss A. Moore, Assistant Director
for Light Water Reactors, Group 2
Directorate of Licensing

cc: Mr. Robert H. Marquis
629 New Sprinkle Building
Knoxville, Tennessee 37919

DISTRIBUTION

- AEC PDR _____
- Local PDR _____
- LWR 2-2 File _____
- V. A. Moore _____
- J. Hendrie _____
- A. Kenneke _____
- D. Eisenhut _____
- R. Klecker _____
- OGC _____
- RO (3) _____
- H. Silver _____
- RP Reading _____
- M. Service _____
- LWR 1 & 2 BC's _____
- R. Boyd _____
- J. Panzarella _____
- ACRS (16)
- L. Shao

OFFICE →	LWR 2-2	LWR 2-2	L:LWR 2	L:TR:E		
SURNAME →	HSilver:as	KKniel <i>KK</i>	VAMoore <i>R. Knier</i>	R. Maccary		
DATE →	2/12/74 <i>JS</i>	2/12/74	2/12/74	2/ /74		

These comparisons and data should be submitted. You indicated you fully expect the final non-augmented flow values to be well within the 30 percent margin on the augmented flow data which is used in the Stability Analysis. Final data and verification of your analyses will be incorporated in the FSAR and in appropriate reports when available.

In the interest of assisting you in minimizing any further delays, we have again considered our workload and priorities to determine if review of your report can be further expedited. As a result, we have rescheduled our review of this report so that a verbal reply will be transmitted to you by March 1, 1974, and a formal written reply by March 8, 1974.

Sincerely,

A. Giambusso, Deputy Director
for Reactor Projects
Directorate of Licensing

cc:

Mr. Robert H. Marquis
629 New Sprankle Building
Knoxville, Tennessee 37919

DISTRIBUTION:

- AEC PDR
- Local PDR
- Docket File
- LWR 2-2 File
- VAMoore
- JHendrie
- AKenneke
- DEisenhut
- RKlecker
- OGC
- RO (3)
- HSilver
- RP Reading
- MService
- LWR 1 & 2 BC'S
- RBoyd
- JPanzarella
- ACRS (16)
- LShao



OFFICE →	LWR 2-2	LWR 2-2	L: LWR 2	L: TR: E	L: DDRP
SURNAME →	HSilver:as	KKniel	VAMoore	ARMaccary	AGiambusso
DATE →	2/11/74	2/12/74	2/ /74	2/ /74	2/ /74

Docket Nos. 50-390
50-391

February 13, 1974

Tennessee Valley Authority
ATTN: Mr. James E. Watson
Manager of Power
818 Power Building
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37401

Gentlemen:

As a result of revised transient pressure data, you have found it necessary to reanalyze the Sequoyah containment vessels. Your report, "Stability Analysis of the Sequoyah Nuclear Plant Containment Vessel, Report No. 72-21," covers this subject. Your letter of January 25, 1974, refers to discussions and understandings between our staffs regarding schedules in this matter, and notes that a late unfavorable ruling by our staff would cause a delay of several months in your overall schedule.

In the meeting of October 19, 1973 in Bethesda, you solicited questions and comments on your presentation of the results of your analysis. The staff stated that it would not be appropriate to make an instantaneous evaluation or to provide specific comments solely on the basis of your presentation. You were advised that the analysis could be resolved most expeditiously if TVA would provide a detailed report at the earliest possible date independent of the FSAR, then scheduled for December 3, 1973. A single preliminary copy was received by us on December 4, 1973, and the formal submittal on December 27, 1973.

Verbal discussions on January 17, 1974, indicated that dates then projected for review might result in excessive delays. We then verbally agreed to complete our review so as to reply formally by March 29, 1974, and requested information as to the suitability of that date. No reply was made until your letter of January 25, 1974.

Telephone discussions on February 5 verified that your analyses were based on data representing augmented flow, whereas the staff will require non-augmented flow be considered. You stated you have compared non-augmented and augmented flow pressure transient data and found little difference, and that partial results from Westinghouse tests confirm these data.

These comparisons and data should be submitted. You indicated you fully expect the final non-augmented flow values to be well within the 30 percent margin on the augmented flow data which is used in the Stability Analysis. Final data and verification of your analyses will be incorporated in the FSAR and in appropriate reports when available.

In the interest of assisting you in minimizing any further delays, we have again considered our workload and priorities to determine if review of your report can be further expedited. As a result, we have rescheduled our review of this report so that a verbal reply will be transmitted to you by March 1, 1974, and a formal written reply by March 8, 1974.

Sincerely,



Voss A. Moore, Assistant Director
for Light Water Reactors, Group 2
Directorate of Licensing

cc: Mr. Robert H. Marquis
629 New Sprankle Building
Knoxville, Tennessee 37919

DISTRIBUTION

- AEC PDR
- Local PDR
- LWR 2-2 File
- V. A. Moore
- J. Hendrie
- A. Kenneke
- D. Eisenhut
- R. Klecker
- OGC
- RO (3)
- H. Silver
- RP Reading
- M. Service
- LWR 1 & 2 BC's
- R. Boyd
- J. Panzarella
- ACRS (16)
- L. Shao

OFFICE →	LWR 2-2	LWR 2-2	L:LWR 2	L:TR:E		
SURNAME →	HSilver:as	KKniel <i>KK</i>	VAMoore <i>R. Knick</i>	R. Maccary		
DATE →	2/12/74 <i>SP</i>	2/12/74	2/12/74	2/ 174		