Detroit Edison

Edward Hines Assistant Vice President Quality Assurance

3331 W Big Beaver Road Troy Michigan 48084 (313) 649-7123

January 7, 1980

EF2-47,353

Mr. James G. Keppler
Regional Director
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region III
799 Roosevelt Road
Glen Ellyn, Illinois 60137

50-341

Dear Mr. Keppler:

Subject: Detroit Edison Response to USNRC IE Bulletin 79-02, Revision 2

A description of the measures by Edison to achieve full compliance with the requirements of the subject belief is provided by the attached memorandum, EF2-47,598 and the previous letters referenced therein. During a future visit by your inspectors, our Project Engineering group will be prepared to discuss the construction and design surveys planned to assure compliance with bulletin items 5 and 6.

If you require further input for this bulletin, please advise us.

Very truly yours,

Edward Hines

EH/TGB/1m

Enclosure

cc: Mr. John G. Davis
Acting Director
Office of Inspection and Enforcement
Division of Reactor Inspection Programs
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington D.C. 20555

1793 200

JAN ~ 1980

JAN 9 1980

8001240 5 25



ENRICO FERMI UNIT 2 PROJECT ENGINEERING

January 4, 1980 EF2 - 47,598

TO:

R. W. Barr

Project Quality Assurance Director

FROM:

W. F. Colbert WIC/WIS 1-4-79
Project Engineer

REFERENCES: 1) USNRC IE Bulletin 79-02, Revision 2

2) EF2 - 45,399 dated July 6, 1979 3) EF2 - 50,578 dated October 8, 1979

SUBJECT:

Response to Bulletin 79-02, Revision 2

Engineering believes that Items 1 thru 4 of the subject IE Bulletin have already been completely addressed via References 2) and 3); therefore, this memorandum is intended to provide the supplemental information required to address Items 5 and 6. Those items, and our responses to the requests for information therein, are discussed below:

Request No. 5

Determine the extent that expansion anchor bolts were used in concrete block (masonary) walls to attach piping supports in seismic Category I systems...

Response No. 5

Project policy generally prohibits the support of any permanent plant features, except minor items such as lighting conduits, from concrete block or plank walls. This policy was not formalized in a procedure or specification during the period of time that shell anchors were in use. This policy was formalized when the project switched to wedge anchors and now no anchors are allowed in any block or plank walls.

1793 201

R. W. Barr January 4, 1980 EF2 - 47,598 Page 2

The safety related pipe supports that have been installed with shell anchors must still be inspected per the bulletin for embeddment, size, etc. A: item will be added to the check list to verify that none of these anchors are installed in block or plank.

If, during the course of the survey, it is determined that safety-related pipe supports have been supported off concrete block or plank walls, the following course of action will be implemented.

a) The pipe support will be moved, or redesigned, so that it derives its main support from the reinforced concrete or steel structure

or . . .

b) Appropriate supplemental design and lyses will be conducted to insure that the pipe support, its anchorages, and the concrete block or plank wall maintain their required structural integrity during a postulated site seismic event.

Request No. 6

Determine the extent that pipe supports with expansion anchor bolts used structural steel shapes instead of base plates.

Response No. 6

In general, safety-related pipe support designs which rely on direct bolting of structural members to the reinforced concrete structure are not utilized, since the relatively narrow flanges of these shapes forces the designer to derate the capacity of the anchors extensively in order to account for shear-cone interaction.

In order to effectively address the concerns expressed in IE Bulletin 79-02, Revision 2, a design survey will be conducted to determine if any safety-related pipe support designs have been released which rely on direct bolting of structural steel shapes to the building structure. If any such designs are identified, the below stated course of action will be implemented.

R. W. Barr January 4, 1980 EF2 - 47,598 Page 3

a) Appropriate analysis will be performed to satisfy the concerns of the subject bulletin

or . . .

b) The attachment will be modified by stiffening or adding a base plate to satisfy the concerns of the bulletin.

This will be done in the same manner as the analysis required by the original bulletin.

We believe that the above information, together with references 2) and 3) provides a complete response to IE Bulletin 79-02, Revision 2. If you require our further input, please advise.

WFC/JHC:jl Written by J. H. Casiglia

cc: C. R. Bacon

L. Bertani

T. H. Dickson

K. J. Dempsey

W. M. Everett

W. J. Fahrner

S. H. Noetzel

M. G. Sigetich

J. Spiers

W. M. Street

R. A. Vance

H. A. Walker

Document Control