TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

CHATTANOOGA, TENNESSEE 37401
400 Chestnut Street Tower II

February 23, 1983

83 FEB 25 AM 9:33
USNRC REGION II
ATLANTA, GEORGIA

WBRD-50-390/82-67
WBRD-50-391/82-64

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region II
Attn: Mr. James P. O'Reilly, Regional Administrator
101 Marietta Street, Suite 3100
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Dear Mr. O'Reilly:

WATTS BAR NUCLEAR PLANT UNITS 1 AND 2 - ATTACHMENT OF CONDUIT AND PIPING SUPPORTS TO CABLE TRAY SUPPORTS - WBRD-50-390/82-67, WBRD-50-391/82-64 - THIRD INTERIM REPORT

The subject deficiency was initially reported to NRC-OIE Inspector R. V. Crlenjak on June 7, 1982 in accordance with 10 CFR 50.55(e) as NCR WBN SWP 8224. Interim reports were submitted on July 8, and November 29, 1982. Enclosed is our third interim report. We expect to submit our next report on or about April 1, 1983.

If you have any questions, please get in touch with R. H. Shell at FTS 858-2688.

Very truly yours,

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

L. M. Mills, Manager
Nuclear Licensing

Enclosure
cc: Mr. Richard C. DeYoung, Director (Enclosure)
Office of Inspection and Enforcement
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

OFFICIAL COPY

1827

8303010198 830223
PDR ADOCK 05000390
S PDR

ENCLOSURE

WATTS BAR NUCLEAR PLANT UNITS 1 AND 2
ATTACHMENT OF CONDUIT AND PIPING SUPPORTS TO CABLE TRAY SUPPORTS
NCR WBN SWP 8224
WBRD-50-390/82-67, WBRD-50-391/82-64
10 CFR 50.55(e)
THIRD INTERIM REPORT

Description of Deficiency

TVA has approved construction variances to various typical pipe and conduit support drawings that permit attachment of conduit and piping supports to cable tray supports. In addition, site personnel have attached certain conduit and piping to cable tray supports using notes on the typical support drawings. These attachments were for relatively small loads. When evaluating these attachments, TVA evaluated the cable tray supports for structural integrity only and not for seismic movement.

It was later determined that the cable tray supports were not designed to rigid requirements and that some of the supports, especially the cantilevered type, could have significant movement during a seismic event.

The apparent cause was that the designers were not aware of the significant movement of the cable tray supports and evaluated them for structural adequacy only.

Interim Progress

TVA's sampling program required 59 attachments to be evaluated (with no failures) in order to have a 95-percent confidence level that less than 5 percent of the attachments are overstressed. We have completed our preliminary evaluation of the sample and have found that all the sampled attachments are within the allowable values. We are in the process of finalizing our evaluation and expect to provide final information in the next report.