

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

CHATTANOOGA, TENNESSEE 37401

400 Chestnut Street Tower II

August 12, 1981 | 1981 AUG 17 01

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 -
FOURTH 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, March 2, and April 1, 1981. Enclosed is our fourth interim report. We expect to provide additional information by July 27, 1982. 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

IE27
3
111

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)
FOURTH 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.

Interim Progress

TVA has reviewed the subject deficiency and determined that the design review for unit 1 and unit 2 will be completed by June 30 and August 31, 1982.