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

January 3, 1983

WBRD-50-390/82-77
WBRD-50-391/82-73

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

83 JAN 5 A9:30

Dear Mr. O'Reilly:

WATTS BAR NUCLEAR PLANT UNITS 1 AND 2 - FREQUENCY CRITERIA FOR PIPING SUPPORTS - WBRD-50-390/82-77, WBRD-50-391/82-73 - REVISED THIRD INTERIM REPORT

The subject deficiency was initially reported to NRC-OIE Inspector R. V. Crlenjak on July 13, 1982 in accordance with 10 CFR 50.55(e) as NCR WBN SWP 8234. Our first and second interim reports were submitted on August 12 and October 5, 1982. A third interim report was submitted on December 23, 1982. Enclosed is a revised third interim report. We expect to submit our next report on or about March 28, 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

IE 27

8301070351 830103
PDR ADOCK 05000390
S PDR

An Equal Opportunity Employer

ENCLOSURE

WATTS BAR NUCLEAR PLANT UNITS 1 AND 2
FREQUENCY CRITERIA FOR PIPING SUPPORTS
NCR WBN SWP 8234
WBRD-50-390/82-77, WBRD-50-391/82-73
REVISED THIRD INTERIM REPORT

Description of Deficiency

During an investigation into a dissimilarity of information (concerning frequency criteria for piping supports) regarding frequency criteria for supports between section 3.9.3.4.2(1c) of the Watts Bar Nuclear Plant (WBN) Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) and section 8.2.3, figure 8.2-1 of design criteria WB-DC-40-31.9 (i.e., as amended by DIM-WB-DC-40-31.9-3), the following discrepancies were identified:

1. Uncertainty as to which support types must meet a frequency criteria.

2. Use of a frequency of 20 Hertz in some situations, as specified in the design criteria, rather than 33 Hertz in the FSAR to represent the natural frequency of a fixed support.

3. The use of the total span of the pipe on each side of a support or one-half of that mass in determining the support's natural frequency.

Interim Progress

TVA has reviewed the discrepancy between the two documents in item No. 2 and has determined that the design criteria is correct. The FSAR will be revised to reflect the 20 Hertz rather than the 33 Hertz criteria.

The other items (Nos. 1 and 3) will be addressed in the next report.