TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY
CHATTANOOGA, TENNESSEE 37401
400 Chestnut Street Tower II

USNRC REGION II ATLANTA, GA
JAN 23 P 1:30

January 19, 1981

SQRD-50-328/81-08
WBRD-50-390/81-07
WBRD-50-391/81-06

RECEIVED
MAR 02 1981
U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Mr. James P. O'Reilly, Director
Office of Inspection and Enforcement
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region II - Suite 3100
101 Marietta Street
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Dear Mr. O'Reilly:

SEQUOYAH NUCLEAR PLANT UNIT 2 AND WATTS BAR NUCLEAR PLANT UNITS 1 AND 2 - UNCONSERVATIVE LOADS ON PIPE SUPPORT DESIGN MODIFICATIONS - SQRD-50-328/81-08, WBRD-50-390/81-07, WBRD-50-391/81-06 - FIRST INTERIM REPORT

The subject deficiency was initially reported to NRC-OIE Inspector R. W. Wright on December 17, 1980, in accordance with 10 CFR 50.55(e) as NCR's SQN CEB 8039 and WBN CEB 8013. Enclosed in our first interim report. We expect to provide additional information by March 2, 1981.

If you have any questions, please get in touch with D. L. Lambert at FTS 857-2581.

Very truly yours,

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

L. M. Mills

L. M. Mills, Manager
Nuclear Regulation and Safety

Enclosure
cc: Mr. Victor Stello, Director (Enclosure)
Office of Inspection and Enforcement
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

B019
S 1/1

8103040754

S



OFFICIAL COPY

ENCLOSURE
SEQUOYAH NUCLEAR PLANT UNIT 2
WATTS BAR NUCLEAR PLANT UNITS 1 AND 2
UNCONSERVATIVE LOADS ON PIPE SUPPORT DESIGN MODIFICATIONS
SQRD-50-328/81-08, WBRD-50-390/81-07, WBRD-50-391/81-06
FIRST INTERIM REPORT

## Description of Deficiency

Piping system analyses and support design for class 1, 2, and 3 systems inside containment were contracted out to EDS Nuclear, Incorporated. EDS tabulated design loads for the pipe supports on support drawings. EDS had design and revision responsibility for all piping reanalysis results which could have an impact on existing support designs. Load increases that resulted from piping reanalyses but did not require design modifications were not revised on the support drawings. Design control responsibility for all support drawings was subsequently turned over to TVA, and subsequent design modifications by TVA were based on the design loads tabulated on the drawings. Therefore, some design modifications by TVA may be based on unconservative loads. At the time of EDS's contract, TVA did not recognize that these load increases could have an adverse impact on subsequent support designs and therefore did not required that EDS tabulate these loads on the affected support drawings.

## Corrective Action

TVA is reviewing design loads on support drawings to determine the impact on existing support designs. Further information will be supplied to the NRC by March 2, 1981.