

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

CHATTANOOGA, TENNESSEE 37401

400 Chestnut Street Tower II

April 1, 1981

WBRD-50-390/81-07  
WBRD-50-391/81-06



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:

WATTS BAR NUCLEAR PLANT UNITS 1 AND 2 - UNCONSERVATIVE LOADS ON PIPE  
SUPPORT DESIGN MODIFICATIONS - WBRD-50-390/81-07, WBRD-50-391/81-06 -  
THIRD 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 WBN CEB 8013. This was followed by our interim reports dated January 19 and March 2, 1981. Enclosed is our third interim report. We expect to provide additional information by August 12, 1981. This nonconformance was also reported for Sequoyah Nuclear Plant as NCR SQN CEB 8039.

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, 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/11

ENCLOSURE

WATTS BAR NUCLEAR PLANT UNITS 1 AND 2  
UNCONSERVATIVE LOADS ON PIPE SUPPORT DESIGN MODIFICATIONS  
WBRD-50-390/81-07, WBRD-50-391/81-06  
10 CFR 50.55(e)  
THIRD 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 require that EDS tabulate these loads on the affected support drawings.

Corrective Action

TVA is in the process of comparing the load values shown on the individual pipe support drawings to the corresponding loading on the revised EDS load tables in order to determine if there are any discrepancies. Where discrepancies exist, the drawing will be reevaluated to determine if the supports are adequate as designed or if redesign is necessary.