

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

CHATTANOOGA, TENNESSEE 37401

400 Chestnut Street Tower II

August 27, 1982

USNRC REGION II
ATLANTA, GEORGIA
82 AUG 30 4 9: 19

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:

SEQUOYAH NUCLEAR PLANT UNITS 1 AND 2 - SPENT FUEL POOL GATES - NCR
SQN NEB 8012 - SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION TO THE FOURTH REVISED FINAL REPORT

The subject deficiency was initially reported to NRC-OIE Inspector
J. D. Wilcox on May 1, 1980 in accordance with 10 CFR 50.55(e). Reports
were submitted on May 29, June 18, July 2, September 8, and October 15,
1980 and May 18, 1982. Enclosed is supplemental information pertaining
to this deficiency.

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, DC 20555

 OFFICIAL COPY

IE 27

8209020212 820827
PDR ADOCK 05000327
S PDR

ENCLOSURE
SEQUOYAH NUCLEAR PLANT
SPENT FUEL POOL GATES
NCR SQN NEB 8012
10 CFR 50.55(e)
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

The Sequoyah gate designs for the transfer canal and the cask loading area were reanalyzed under new design criteria. The gates were found to be inadequate. At the present time, there is no spent fuel stored in the spent fuel pit. Therefore, if a seismic event occurred, failure of these gates would not create a safety problem. The gates will be modified before placing any spent fuel in the spent fuel pit.

The transfer canal and the cask loading area gates at Sequoyah were designed with paired restraints attached to the pool wall at the top and at the bottom of the gates. Intermediate restraints will be added for both gates at Sequoyah to meet seismic requirements.

The previous SQN reports addressed the gates for WBN and BLN. Those gates were also reanalyzed under the new design criteria and were found to be inadequate. Separate 10CFR50.55(e) reports are being prepared on those plants.