



UNITED STATES
 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
 REGION II
 101 MARIETTA STREET, N.W.
 ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30323

Report Nos.: 50-390/85-03 and 50-391/85-04

Licensee: Tennessee Valley Authority
 500A Chestnut Street
 Chattanooga, TN 37401

Docket Nos.: 50-390 and 50-391

License Nos.: CPPR-91 and CPPR-92

Facility Name: Watts Bar 1 and 2

Inspection Conducted: January 14-17 and January 22-25, 1985

Inspectors: J. J. Blake
 S. J. Mas

2/15/85
 Date Signed

J. J. Blake
 J. A. Coley

2/15/85
 Date Signed

Approved by: J. J. Blake
 J. J. Blake, Section Chief
 Engineering Branch
 Division of Reactor Safety

2/15/85
 Date Signed

SUMMARY

Scope: This routine, announced inspection involved 83 inspector-hours on site and at TVA headquarters in Knoxville, Tennessee in the areas of seismic analysis for as-built safety-related piping systems, pipe support baseplate designs using concrete expansion anchor bolts, IE Bulletins 83-07 and 83-05, followup on licensee identified items, and followup on inspector identified items.

Results: No violation or deviations were identified.

REPORT DETAILS

1. Licensee Employees Contacted

- *R. O. Hernandez, Head Civil Engineer, Civil Engineering Branch (CEB)
- *D. L. Williams, Supervisor, Nuclear Licensing Section (NEB)
- #S. Johnson, Quality Manager, Office of Construction (OC)
- #T. Hayes, Supervisor, Nuclear Licensing Unit
- #J. D. Collins, Project Managers Office
- #P. Wilson, Nuclear Licensing Unit
- #C. Hutzler, Hanger Engineering Unit
- *#G. Owens, Nuclear Engineer, Office of Engineering (OE)
- #L. G. Hebert, Quality Assurance, OC
- *#M. A. Cones, Civil Engineer, CEB
- *S. R. Stout, Nuclear Licensing Section, NEB
- *P. L. Duncan, Quality Management Staff, OE
- *J. A. Ellis, Civil Engineer, CEB
- *D. H. Level, Civil Engineer, CEB
- N. Perry, Civil Engineer, CEB
- J. E. McCord, Mechanical Engineer
- W. Smathers, Supervisor, Hanger Design Group
- B. Majors, Quality Manager

Other licensee employees contacted included construction craftsmen, technicians, and office personnel.

*Attended exit interview at Headquarters on January 17, 1985

#Attended exit interview at Watts Bar site on January 25, 1985

2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on January 17 and January 25, 1985, with those persons indicated in paragraph 1 above. The licensee was informed of the inspection findings listed below, and acknowledged the findings with no dissenting comments.

Inspector Followup Item, 390/85-03-01 and 391/85-04-01, Deficient Training Documentation, paragraph 7.

The licensee did not identify as proprietary any of the materials provided to or reviewed by the inspector during this inspection.

3. Licensee Action on Previous Enforcement Matters

- a. (Closed) Violation 390/84-05-03, Failure to Follow Procedure Civil Design Standard DS-C1.7.1. The inspector has reviewed the licensee's response. TVA has committed to reviewing the remainder of Unit 1 pipe supports using the criteria initiated in the sampling program used in the IEB 79-02 review. The licensee issued a memo dated May 21, 1982, and a revision to the memo on March 16, 1984, stating that the methods

of plate analysis in Civil Design Standard DS-C1.7.1 R/O governs. DS-C1.7.1 has also been revised to clarify the limitation on rigid plate analysis. TVA has initiated a training course to assure that designers understand the baseplate analysis requirement of DS-C1.7.1.

- b. (Closed) Violation 390/84-05-04, Failure to follow procedures for pipe support and baseplate design calculations. The inspector reviewed the licensee's response. TVA has upgraded its engineering training program. All training sessions are now required to be documented to assure that all personnel are aware of the engineering procedures which affect their work.
- c. (Closed) Violation 390/84-15-01 and 391/84-12-01, Inadequate corrective action for improper weld attachment of shear lugs. The inspector reviewed the licensee's Standard Operating Procedure, SOP-QMO-01, "Determining Generic NCRs" R/O, dated December 31, 1984. This program provides the Quality Assurance Group the ability to review and determine generic and/or repetitive applicability of Nonconformance Reports (NCRs).
- d. (Closed) Violation 390/84-39-01, Failure to follow procedure for support inspection. The inspector reviewed the response of the licensee for corrective action taken. Their efforts to identify and prevent recurring deficiencies were shown by increased revision procedures and additional training on procedures. During a field inspection of the ten problems listed, the inspector checked to verify corrective action as required. All support documentation have been revised.
- e. (Closed) Unresolved Item (URI) 390/82-27-11, Pipe support calculation discrepancies. The inspector held discussions with responsible licensee representatives, reviewed supporting documentation and observed representative's samples of work to verify that the unresolved items identified in Inspection Report 50-390/82-27 have been resolved. The unresolved items were identified in paragraph 8 as C(1), C(2), C(3), and C(4) of Report No. 50-390/82-27.

Subparagraph 8c(1)

The inspector reviewed Civil Design Standard DS-C1.7.1, Rev. 3, dated November 16, 1984, Table 4. Note 1 states, "Allowable tensile loads are limited to 20 percent of the ultimate tensile capacity determined in qualification testing". This would give the self drilling expansion shell anchor (SSD) a Factor of Safety = 5. This meets the requirements set forth in IE Bulletin 79-02.

Subparagraph 8C(2)

The inspector reviewed the design calculation for support 03B-1AFW-R84(R2). This support was voided on February 26, 1983. TVA has committed to reviewing 100% of all hangers using the criteria of their sampling program and to satisfy the issues in IE Bulletin 79-02.

Subparagraph 8C(3)

The inspector reviewed the Baseplate Analysis Program 222 and was told by the licensee that the program was superseded by CASDBAP 222 on September 12, 1983. The new program allows no credit for friction between the plate and the concrete; the shear is to be taken all by the anchor bolts. The entire program of anchor bolts and baseplate design is being reviewed due to the licensee's commitment to check 100% of the supports to the criteria set forth in the 79-02 sampling program.

Subparagraph 8C(4)

The inspector reviewed support Drawing No. 37A206-8-1, Rev. 3, and 37A206-8-2A, Rev. 2, both of the 2" HPFP FCV and yard piping systems. The licensee requested comments on acceptability of bolting to the Limatorque actuator in a letter dated February 8, 1984. Limatorque Corporation responded in a letter dated February 14, 1984, stating that they cannot recommend the procedures requested by TVA for this particular actuator. TVA redesigned the supports 37A206-8-1, 37A206-8-1A, 37A206-8-2, and 37A206-8-2A to show the actuator being supported by a different method.

- f. (Closed) Unresolved Item (URI) 390/84-05-01, Factor of safety for concrete expansion anchor bolts IEB 79-02. The inspector reviewed TVA OIE Bulletin 79-02 Final Report-Revision 2. TVA has committed to reviewing the remainder of Unit 1 pipe supports using the criteria initiated in the sampling program used in the IEB 79-02 review.
- g. (Closed) Unresolved Item (URI) 390/84-34-01, IEB 79-02 Shear Force distribution to concrete expansion anchor bolts. The inspector reviewed TVA OIE Bulletin 79-02, Final Report Revision 2. TVA has committed to reviewing the remainder of Unit 1 pipe supports using the criteria initiated in the sampling program used in the IEB 79-02 review.
- h. (Closed) Unresolved Item (URI) 390/84-43-01, Verified design criteria for welds on UHI hanger to pipe. The inspector reviewed the licensee's memorandum dated July 19, 1984, in response to this item. In reviewing the various codes and addenda stated as the means of allowing the use of later codes, it was found that the concern of using fillet welded lugs on class 1 pipe was acceptable.

i. (Open) Unresolved Item (URI) 390/84-79-03 and 391/84-53-03, Skewed weld acceptance criteria. Initially an inspector noted that there was no weld size specified for a skewed weld connecting a 3"x3"x1/4 tube steel brace to a 4"x4"x1/4" tube steel support, on the applicable drawings for pipe support No. 555-7-40-13. The only weld size specified on the drawings for the above support was a 1/2" fillet weld connecting the base plate to the 4"x4"x1/2" tube steel. The licensee had stated that a note to a general pipe support drawing indicated that similar welds on the same support would be the same size. The inspector made the following observations:

- The weld in question is not a fillet weld and the weld with size specified is a fillet weld. Therefore, the two welds are not similar.
- The weld in question does not conform to G29C-0-C.1.1(R0) of 11/30/83, Sheet 21 of 21, R1 Figure 9.3 - Alternate Fillet Weld All Around Connection for Members Meeting at an Angle. It should be noted that the above document post-dated the inspection of the support in question.

The licensee indicated that they would look further into the matter and determining the following:

- The visual acceptance criteria at the time of the weld acceptance.
- Whether the (TVA) inspector of record, correctly accepted the weld in question.
- The acceptance criteria applicable at the time of this inspection.
- The acceptance of this weld and support at the time of this inspection.

The licensee's reply to this item stated that the support identified was documented on January 18, 1982. The acceptance criteria for inspection of weld joints on supports at that time were contained in WBNP-QCP-4.23 R2, Appendix 4, paragraph 7.1. This procedure then referenced CONST SPEC G-29C, Section P.S. 3.C.5.2 and WBNP-QCP-4.13 R4, Addendum 3. These referenced documents contained the physical acceptance criteria. Additionally, acceptance criteria for skewed welds were contained in OE response to NCR 2807R. The inspector reviewed the acceptance criteria as indicated above, observed the weld in question, and held discussions with personnel from the Hanger Engineering Unit and ENDES. The weld on this support should be considered a seal weld not a fillet weld and would have required design to re-evaluate each support with this weld configuration. There was evidence that design had performed such a review of drawings prior to 1982; however, the inspector was not able to affirm if the drawing for this support was included in the ENDES review. This item will be investigated further by the inspector in a subsequent inspection.

4. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items were not identified during this inspection.

5. Licensee Identified Items

- a. (Closed) Item 390/83-64 and 391/83-59, Air Flow Rates for Safety-Related Room Exhaust Fans Below Acceptance Criteria (10 CFR 50.55(e)). The final report was submitted on January 19, 1984, and supplemental final report on June 1, 1984. The reports have been reviewed and determined to be acceptable. The inspector held discussions with responsible licensee representatives, and reviewed supporting documentation to verify that the corrective actions identified in the report have been completed.
- b. (Closed) Item 390/84-06, Improper Design Loads for Base Plates and Anchor Bolts (10 CFR 50.55(e)). The final report was submitted on April 18, 1984, with a revised final report on October 10, 1984. The reports have been reviewed and determined to be acceptable. The inspector held discussions with responsible licensee representatives, and reviewed supporting documentation to verify that the corrective actions identified in the reports have been completed.
- c. (Closed) Item 390/84-43, Air Return Fan Seismic Support Deficiencies (10 CFR 50.55(e)). The final report was submitted on August 28, 1984. The report has been reviewed and determined to be acceptable. The inspector held discussions with responsible licensee representatives and reviewed supporting documentation and observed representative samples of work to verify that the corrective actions identified in the report have been completed.
- d. (Closed) Item 390/84-47, Destruction of EDS Support Design Calculations (10 CFR 50.55(e)). The final report was submitted on January 7, 1985. The report has been reviewed and determined to be acceptable. The inspector held discussions with responsible licensee representatives, and reviewed supporting documentation, to verify that the corrective action identified in the report has been completed. This item is now considered not to be a nonconforming condition adverse to the safe operation of the plant by the licensee.
- e. (Closed) Item 390/84-48, Supports may be Degraded by used Installation Tolerances (10 CFR 50.55(e)). The final report was submitted on January 7, 1985. The report has been reviewed and determined to be acceptable. The inspector held discussions with responsible licensee representatives, and reviewed supporting documentation to verify that the corrective action identified in the report has been completed. This item is now considered not to be a nonconforming condition adverse to the safe operation of the plant by the licensee.

No violations or deviations were identified.

6. IE Bulletin (IEB)

- a. (Closed) IEB No. 83-05, ASME Nuclear Code Pumps and Spare Parts Manufactured by the Hayward Tyler Pump Company Units 1 and 2. TVA letter of September 7, 1983, reports that the subject type pumps and spare parts are not used in safety-related components at the station.

The inspector has reviewed TVA's letter of September 7, 1983, and determined that the requested actions of the bulletin have been acceptably addressed. The inspector held discussions with responsible utility representatives, and reviewed supporting documentation to verify that the actions identified in the letter of response have been completed.

- b. (Closed) IEB No. 83-07, Apparently Fraudulent Products Sold by Ray Miller, Inc. TVA's letter of March 22, 1984, reported that the subject type materials are not used in components or systems at the station.

The inspector has reviewed TVA's letter of March 22, 1984, and determined that the requested actions of the bulletin have been acceptably addressed. The inspector held discussions with responsible utility representatives, and reviewed supporting documentation to verify that the actions identified in the letter of response have been completed.

7. Inspector Followup Item

In reviewing the Civil Engineering Branch (CEB) Training and Utilization Policy (TVA memo dated August 10, 1982) the inspector found that all supervisors had not completed the required documentation if they decided that the group did not require a formal training class. The branch policy will be revised to assure that all Engineering Procedure (EP) Revision training be documented to assure compliance of the CEB-EP Branch Policy. Pending more information to be furnished by the licensee for further review, this matter is identified as Inspector followup item (IFI) 390/85-03-01 and 391/85-04-01, Deficient Training Documentation .



UNITED STATES
 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
 REGION II
 101 MARIETTA STREET, N.W.
 ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30323

Report Nos.: 50-390/85-03 and 50-391/85-04

Licensee: Tennessee Valley Authority
 500A Chestnut Street
 Chattanooga, TN 37401

Docket Nos.: 50-390 and 50-391

License Nos.: CPPR-91 and CPPR-92

Facility Name: Watts Bar 1 and 2

Inspection Conducted: January 14-17 and January 22-25, 1985

Inspectors: J. J. Blake
 S. J. Aras
J. J. Blake
 J. L. Coley

2/15/85
 Date Signed
2/15/85
 Date Signed
2/15/85
 Date Signed

Approved by: J. J. Blake
 J. J. Blake, Section Chief
 Engineering Branch
 Division of Reactor Safety

SUMMARY

Scope: This routine, announced inspection involved 83 inspector-hours on site and at TVA headquarters in Knoxville, Tennessee in the areas of seismic analysis for as-built safety-related piping systems, pipe support baseplate designs using concrete expansion anchor bolts, IE Bulletins 83-07 and 83-05, followup on licensee identified items, and followup on inspector identified items.

Results: No violation or deviations were identified.

Dupe

REPORT DETAILS

1. Licensee Employees Contacted

- *R. O. Hernandez, Head Civil Engineer, Civil Engineering Branch (CEB)
- *D. L. Williams, Supervisor, Nuclear Licensing Section (NEB)
- #S. Johnson, Quality Manager, Office of Construction (OC)
- #T. Hayes, Supervisor, Nuclear Licensing Unit
- #J. D. Collins, Project Managers Office
- #P. Wilson, Nuclear Licensing Unit
- #C. Hutzler, Hanger Engineering Unit
- *#G. Owens, Nuclear Engineer, Office of Engineering (OE)
- #L. G. Hebert, Quality Assurance, OC
- *#M. A. Cones, Civil Engineer, CEB
- *S. R. Stout, Nuclear Licensing Section, NEB
- *P. L. Duncan, Quality Management Staff, OE
- *J. A. Ellis, Civil Engineer, CEB
- *D. H. Level, Civil Engineer, CEB
- N. Perry, Civil Engineer, CEB
- J. E. McCord, Mechanical Engineer
- W. Smathers, Supervisor, Hanger Design Group
- B. Majors, Quality Manager

Other licensee employees contacted included construction craftsmen, technicians, and office personnel.

*Attended exit interview at Headquarters on January 17, 1985

#Attended exit interview at Watts Bar site on January 25, 1985

2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on January 17 and January 25, 1985, with those persons indicated in paragraph 1 above. The licensee was informed of the inspection findings listed below, and acknowledged the findings with no dissenting comments.

Inspector Followup Item, 390/85-03-01 and 391/85-04-01, Deficient Training Documentation, paragraph 7.

The licensee did not identify as proprietary any of the materials provided to or reviewed by the inspector during this inspection.

3. Licensee Action on Previous Enforcement Matters

- a. (Closed) Violation 390/84-05-03, Failure to Follow Procedure Civil Design Standard DS-C1.7.1. The inspector has reviewed the licensee's response. TVA has committed to reviewing the remainder of Unit 1 pipe supports using the criteria initiated in the sampling program used in the IEB 79-02 review. The licensee issued a memo dated May 21, 1982, and a revision to the memo on March 16, 1984, stating that the methods

of plate analysis in Civil Design Standard DS-C1.7.1 R/O governs. DS-C1.7.1 has also been revised to clarify the limitation on rigid plate analysis. TVA has initiated a training course to assure that designers understand the baseplate analysis requirement of DS-C1.7.1.

- b. (Closed) Violation 390/84-05-04, Failure to follow procedures for pipe support and baseplate design calculations. The inspector reviewed the licensee's response. TVA has upgraded its engineering training program. All training sessions are now required to be documented to assure that all personnel are aware of the engineering procedures which affect their work.
- c. (Closed) Violation 390/84-15-01 and 391/84-12-01, Inadequate corrective action for improper weld attachment of shear lugs. The inspector reviewed the licensee's Standard Operating Procedure, SOP-QMO-01, "Determining Generic NCRs" R/O, dated December 31, 1984. This program provides the Quality Assurance Group the ability to review and determine generic and/or repetitive applicability of Nonconformance Reports (NCRs).
- d. (Closed) Violation 390/84-39-01, Failure to follow procedure for support inspection. The inspector reviewed the response of the licensee for corrective action taken. Their efforts to identify and prevent recurring deficiencies were shown by increased revision procedures and additional training on procedures. During a field inspection of the ten problems listed, the inspector checked to verify corrective action as required. All support documentation have been revised.
- e. (Closed) Unresolved Item (URI) 390/82-27-11, Pipe support calculation discrepancies. The inspector held discussions with responsible licensee representatives, reviewed supporting documentation and observed representative's samples of work to verify that the unresolved items identified in Inspection Report 50-390/82-27 have been resolved. The unresolved items were identified in paragraph 8 as C(1), C(2), C(3), and C(4) of Report No. 50-390/82-27.

Subparagraph 8c(1)

The inspector reviewed Civil Design Standard DS-C1.7.1, Rev. 3, dated November 16, 1984, Table 4. Note 1 states, "Allowable tensile loads are limited to 20 percent of the ultimate tensile capacity determined in qualification testing". This would give the self drilling expansion shell anchor (SSD) a Factor of Safety = 5. This meets the requirements set forth in IE Bulletin 79-02.

Subparagraph 8C(2)

The inspector reviewed the design calculation for support 03B-1AFW-RB4(R2). This support was voided on February 26, 1983. TVA has committed to reviewing 100% of all hangers using the criteria of their sampling program and to satisfy the issues in IE Bulletin 79-02.

Subparagraph 8C(3)

The inspector reviewed the Baseplate Analysis Program 222 and was told by the licensee that the program was superseded by CASDBAP 222 on September 12, 1983. The new program allows no credit for friction between the plate and the concrete; the shear is to be taken all by the anchor bolts. The entire program of anchor bolts and baseplate design is being reviewed due to the licensee's commitment to check 100% of the supports to the criteria set forth in the 79-02 sampling program.

Subparagraph 8C(4)

The inspector reviewed support Drawing No. 37A206-8-1, Rev. 3, and 37A206-8-2A, Rev. 2, both of the 2" HPFP FCV and yard piping systems. The licensee requested comments on acceptability of bolting to the Limitorque actuator in a letter dated February 8, 1984. Limitorque Corporation responded in a letter dated February 14, 1984, stating that they cannot recommend the procedures requested by TVA for this particular actuator. TVA redesigned the supports 37A206-8-1, 37A206-8-1A, 37A206-8-2, and 37A206-8-2A to show the actuator being supported by a different method.

- f. (Closed) Unresolved Item (URI) 390/84-05-01, Factor of safety for concrete expansion anchor bolts IEB 79-02. The inspector reviewed TVA OIE Bulletin 79-02 Final Report-Revision 2. TVA has committed to reviewing the remainder of Unit 1 pipe supports using the criteria initiated in the sampling program used in the IEB 79-02 review.
- g. (Closed) Unresolved Item (URI) 390/84-34-01, IEB 79-02 Shear Force distribution to concrete expansion anchor bolts. The inspector reviewed TVA OIE Bulletin 79-02, Final Report Revision 2. TVA has committed to reviewing the remainder of Unit 1 pipe supports using the criteria initiated in the sampling program used in the IEB 79-02 review.
- h. (Closed) Unresolved Item (URI) 390/84-43-01, Verified design criteria for welds on UHI hanger to pipe. The inspector reviewed the licensee's memorandum dated July 19, 1984, in response to this item. In reviewing the various codes and addenda stated as the means of allowing the use of later codes, it was found that the concern of using fillet welded lugs on class 1 pipe was acceptable.

1. (Open) Unresolved Item (URI) 390/84-79-03 and 391/84-53-03, Skewed weld acceptance criteria. Initially an inspector noted that there was no weld size specified for a skewed weld connecting a 3"x3"x1/1 tube steel brace to a 4"x4"x1/4" tube steel support, on the applicable drawings for pipe support No. 555-7-40-13. The only weld size specified on the drawings for the above support was a 1/2" fillet weld connecting the base plate to the 4"x4"x1/2" tube steel. The licensee had stated that a note to a general pipe support drawing indicated that similar welds on the same support would be the same size. The inspector made the following observations:

- The weld in question is not a fillet weld and the weld with size specified is a fillet weld. Therefore, the two welds are not similar.
- The weld in question does not conform to G29C-0-C.1.1(R0) of 11/30/83, Sheet 21 of 21, R1 Figure 9.3 - Alternate Fillet Weld All Around Connection for Members Meeting at an Angle. It should be noted that the above document post-dated the inspection of the support in question.

The licensee indicated that they would look further into the matter and determining the following:

- The visual acceptance criteria at the time of the weld acceptance.
- Whether the (TVA) inspector of record, correctly accepted the weld in question.
- The acceptance criteria applicable at the time of this inspection.
- The acceptance of this weld and support at the time of this inspection.

The licensee's reply to this item stated that the support identified was documented on January 18, 1982. The acceptance criteria for inspection of weld joints on supports at that time were contained in WBNP-QCP-4.23 R2, Appendix 4, paragraph 7.1. This procedure then referenced CONST SPEC G-29C, Section P.S. 3.C.5.2 and WBNP-QCP-4.13 R4, Addendum 3. These referenced documents contained the physical acceptance criteria. Additionally, acceptance criteria for skewed welds were contained in OE response to NCR 2807R. The inspector reviewed the acceptance criteria as indicated above, observed the weld in question, and held discussions with personnel from the Hanger Engineering Unit and ENDES. The weld on this support should be considered a seal weld not a fillet weld and would have required design to re-evaluate each support with this weld configuration. There was evidence that design had performed such a review of drawings prior to 1982; however, the inspector was not able to affirm if the drawing for this support was included in the ENDES review. This item will be investigated further by the inspector in a subsequent inspection.

4. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items were not identified during this inspection.

5. Licensee Identified Items

- a. (Closed) Item 390/83-64 and 391/83-59, Air Flow Rates for Safety-Related Room Exhaust Fans Below Acceptance Criteria (10 CFR 50.55(e)). The final report was submitted on January 19, 1984, and supplemental final report on June 1, 1984. The reports have been reviewed and determined to be acceptable. The inspector held discussions with responsible licensee representatives, and reviewed supporting documentation to verify that the corrective actions identified in the report have been completed.
- b. (Closed) Item 390/84-06, Improper Design Loads for Base Plates and Anchor Bolts (10 CFR 50.55(e)). The final report was submitted on April 18, 1984, with a revised final report on October 10, 1984. The reports have been reviewed and determined to be acceptable. The inspector held discussions with responsible licensee representatives, and reviewed supporting documentation to verify that the corrective actions identified in the reports have been completed.
- c. (Closed) Item 390/84-43, Air Return Fan Seismic Support Deficiencies (10 CFR 50.55(e)). The final report was submitted on August 28, 1984. The report has been reviewed and determined to be acceptable. The inspector held discussions with responsible licensee representatives and reviewed supporting documentation and observed representative samples of work to verify that the corrective actions identified in the report have been completed.
- d. (Closed) Item 390/84-47, Destruction of EDS Support Design Calculations (10 CFR 50.55(e)). The final report was submitted on January 7, 1985. The report has been reviewed and determined to be acceptable. The inspector held discussions with responsible licensee representatives, and reviewed supporting documentation, to verify that the corrective action identified in the report has been completed. This item is now considered not to be a nonconforming condition adverse to the safe operation of the plant by the licensee.
- e. (Closed) Item 390/84-48, Supports may be Degraded by used Installation Tolerances (10 CFR 50.55(e)). The final report was submitted on January 7, 1985. The report has been reviewed and determined to be acceptable. The inspector held discussions with responsible licensee representatives, and reviewed supporting documentation to verify that the corrective action identified in the report has been completed. This item is now considered not to be a nonconforming condition adverse to the safe operation of the plant by the licensee.

No violations or deviations were identified.

6. IE Bulletin (IEB)

- a. (Closed) IEB No. 83-05, ASME Nuclear Code Pumps and Spare Parts Manufactured by the Hayward Tyler Pump Company Units 1 and 2. TVA letter of September 7, 1983, reports that the subject type pumps and spare parts are not used in safety-related components at the station.

The inspector has reviewed TVA's letter of September 7, 1983, and determined that the requested actions of the bulletin have been acceptably addressed. The inspector held discussions with responsible utility representatives, and reviewed supporting documentation to verify that the actions identified in the letter of response have been completed.

- b. (Closed) IEB No. 83-07, Apparently Fraudulent Products Sold by Ray Miller, Inc. TVA's letter of March 22, 1984, reported that the subject type materials are not used in components or systems at the station.

The inspector has reviewed TVA's letter of March 22, 1984, and determined that the requested actions of the bulletin have been acceptably addressed. The inspector held discussions with responsible utility representatives, and reviewed supporting documentation to verify that the actions identified in the letter of response have been completed.

7. Inspector Followup Item

In reviewing the Civil Engineering Branch (CEB) Training and Utilization Policy (TVA memo dated August 10, 1982) the inspector found that all supervisors had not completed the required documentation if they decided that the group did not require a formal training class. The branch policy will be revised to assure that all Engineering Procedure (EP) Revision training be documented to assure compliance of the CEB-EP Branch Policy. Pending more information to be furnished by the licensee for further review, this matter is identified as Inspector followup item (IF:) 390/85-03-01 and 391/85-04-01, Deficient Training Documentation .