

William J. Cahill, Jr.  
Vice President

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.  
4 Irving Place, New York, N Y 10003  
Telephone (212) 460-3819

May 28, 1979

Re: Indian Point Unit No. 2  
Docket No. 50-247

Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation  
ATTN: Mr. A. Schwencer, Chief  
Operating Reactors Branch No. 1  
Division of Operating Reactors  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D. C. 20555

Dear Mr. Schwencer:

By conference call on the evening of May 25, 1979, the U. S. NRC expressed concern that a similar problem might exist at Indian Point Unit No. 2 as had been discovered at Brunswick Units 1 and 2 of Carolina Power and Light Company (CP&L). Con Edison immediately contacted CP&L to ascertain the details of the problem at Brunswick. We were informed that the problem appeared to be underdesigned supports on a small sample of lines.

Con Edison immediately began reanalysis effort to verify the support adequacy for piping systems at Indian Point Unit No. 2. The following describes the analysis effort:

- a. Loading for support reanalysis was determined from examination of original design documents or dynamic reanalysis results if available.
- b. In all cases the seismic component was increased by a factor of 1.3.
- c. The support was reevaluated by calculating the ratio of total load to allowable based on stress analysis of support components.
- d. In all cases, the ratio was less than 1.0. The highest ratio calculated was 0.78.

The lines that were subjected to support reanalysis follow:

- a. Line 516 representative class I seismic line; 6 inch diameter auxiliary coolant system from the boric acid evaporators. Twenty-one (21) supports reanalyzed.

*Dupe*

~~7906040783~~

*Aool  
5/10*

- b. Lines dynamically reanalyzed for Unit No. 3 with the same configuration at Unit No. 2.
  - 1. Line 80 charging line to loop 21 hot leg. Four (4) supports reanalyzed.
  - 2. Line 96 charging line to loop 21 cold leg. Four (4) supports reanalyzed.
  - 3. Line 63 pressurizer surge line. No supports to reanalyze since the line is supported off of equipment and has a spring hanger.
- c. Lines dynamically reanalyzed for Unit No. 2 alone.
  - 1. Line 70 pressurizer relief line. Fifteen (15) supports reanalyzed.

In conclusion, 44 supports were reanalyzed by Con Edison. All were found to be acceptable with loads well within allowable. No evidence has been found at Indian Point Unit No. 2 of the pipe support problem at the Brunswick facility.

Should you or your staff have any further questions, we would be pleased to discuss them at your convenience.

Very truly yours,



William J. Cahill, Jr.  
Vice President

cc: Mr. Boyce H. Grier, Director  
Office of Inspection and Enforcement  
Region I  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
631 Park Avenue  
King of Prussia, PA 19406

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Office of Inspection and Enforcement  
Division of Reactor Operations Inspection  
Washington, D. C. 20555

Mr. T. Rebelowski, Resident Inspector  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
P. O. Box 38  
Buchanan, N. Y. 10511