

W. Scholten

Frederick W. Schneider
Vice President
Production

Public Service Electric and Gas Company 80 Park Place Newark, N.J. 07101 201/430-7373

November 4, 1980

Mr. Boyce H. Grier, Director
Office of Inspection and Enforcement
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region 1
631 Park Avenue
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406

Dear Mr. Grier:

NRC IE BULLETIN NO. 80-11
MASONRY WALL DESIGN
SALEM GENERATING STATION
UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2
DOCKET NOS. 50-272 AND 50-311

We wish to amend our initial (60 day) response to Bulletin 80-11, submitted July 2, 1980, and request an extension for submission of the final report and evaluation.

It was brought to our attention that our 60 day response was, in part, incorrect when we stated in Item 1 that none of the masonry walls are used to support seismic category 1 piping. We have determined that a misunderstanding of instructions caused this problem. Subsequently, a second walk-through of Unit 1 was performed. A walk-through of Unit 2 was also performed at this time.

These walk-throughs revealed that there are seven (7) 2" control air lines mounted on a masonry partition wall in the Auxiliary Building on Elev. 100'-0" separating Unit 1 from Unit 2. This wall is approximately 20' high by 30' long.

There are two (2) safety related pipe supports on the Unit 1 side of this wall and five (5) on the Unit 2 side of the wall. The support numbers are as follows; CTAA-1123, and CTAA-1120 on the Unit 1 side, and 2A-CTAA-1033, 2A-CTAG-1034, 2A-CTAS-1009, 2A-CTAG-1006, 2A-CTAA-1005 on the Unit 2 side.

dup 8011260013

Mr. Boyce H. Grier, Dir.

-2-

November 4, 1980

Because of the small size of the lines (2") supported on the wall, the reactions on the wall are quite small and we still conclude that the walls have an adequate factor of safety, and no safety related system or equipment is in jeopardy.

We have retained the services of a consultant, Computech of Berkeley, Calif., to analyze our masonry walls and to prepare the re-evaluation report required by Section 2 of the Bulletin. Computech concurs with our opinion that the corridor wall on Elev. 100'0 is not jeopardized by the seven (7) air pipe supports on it. The wall will now be reanalyzed, taking into account the effects of all pipe support loads. Until this is completed, the consultant cannot submit his final report and evaluation to us for review and approval.

Additionally, we have determined that a discrepancy exists between the wall design drawings and a detail specification. A field investigation is currently being conducted to resolve the discrepancy.

For these reasons we request an extension for submission of our final report until December 3, 1980.

Sincerely,



CC Director, Office of Inspection & Enforcement
Division of Reactor Operations Inspection
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555