



Tennessee Valley Authority, Post Office Box 2000, Soddy-Daisy, Tennessee 37379

March 22, 1994

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
ATTN: Document Control Desk
Washington, D.C. 20555

Gentlemen:

In the Matter of) Docket Nos. 50-327
Tennessee Valley Authority) 50-328

SEQUOYAH NUCLEAR PLANT (SQN) - REVISED RESPONSE TO SQN'S INDIVIDUAL PLANT EXAMINATION (IPE) REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RESPONSE (TAC NOS. M74468 AND M74469)

Reference: TVA letter to NRC dated February 25, 1994, "Sequoyah Nuclear Plant (SQN) - Response to Request for Additional Information Related to the SQN Units 1 and 2 Individual Plant Examination (IPE) Submittal (TAC Nos. M74468 and M74469)"

The purpose of this letter is to provide a revised response to General Question 3, Insight 3, which is contained within the above reference. As discussed with D. E. LaBarge on March 8, 1994, a revised response is needed to Insight 3 because the "area" coolers described in the response do not receive a start signal upon pump start as stated in the response. This discrepancy was identified by the NRC Senior Resident Inspector and was the result of ambiguous information contained within the associated logic drawings and design criteria. This information is being corrected. The electrical schematic drawings correctly reflect the cooler start criteria. Note that "room" coolers do receive a start signal upon pump start.

9403780310 940322
PDR ADDCK 05000327
P PDR

AD11

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Page 2

March 22, 1994

The revised response to Insight 3 is as shown in the enclosure. We regret any inconvenience this may have caused. Please direct questions concerning this issue to J. D. Smith at (615) 843-6672.

Sincerely,



Ken Powers
Site Vice President
Sequoyah Nuclear Plant

Enclosure

cc (Enclosure):

Mr. D. E. LaBarge, Project Manager
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
One White Flint, North
11555 Rockville Pike
Rockville, Maryland 20852-2739

NRC Resident Inspector
Sequoyah Nuclear Plant
2600 Igou Ferry Road
Soddy-Daisy, Tennessee 37379-3624

Regional Administrator
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region II
101 Marietta Street, NW, Suite 2900
Atlanta, Georgia 30323-2711

NRC Review Question General 3:

Section 6.4 discusses insights and recommendations that you view as potential enhancements. Please discuss the status of these insights and recommendations, vis-a-vis, actual implementation at Sequoyah. If relevant, provide a schedule for the evaluation and/or implementation of these issues.

Response:

Insight 3. Area ventilation is provided to the motor-driven AFW pumps and the CCS pumps from multiple systems. Current room heatup analyses suggest that, without successful area ventilation, temperatures would exceed the motor-driven pump temperature limits within 24 hours. Perform an evaluation of the CCS/AFW area cooling requirements.

Status 3. The AFW and CCS pumps areas are cooled and ventilated for normal plant operation by non-safety related equipment. When these ESF pumps are needed for accident conditions, the associated safety-related pump area coolers will operate upon receipt of an ABI signal or high space temperature. The safety-related coolers are redundant and seismically qualified.

The likelihood of all the safety related and non-safety related cooling and ventilation being inoperable during operation of the AFW and CCS pumps for accident conditions is remote. The non-safety related ventilation and cooling equipment normally runs all the time and even has equipment redundancy to provide for some additional reliability. Discussion with plant personnel have indicated that the availability of the non-safety-related ventilation and cooling equipment over the past years has been acceptable.

A transient analysis of the cooling requirements in these pump areas can determine what the heat up rate and temperature would be for various equipment and plant alignment scenarios. The results could be used in the event of loss of safety-related and/or non-safety related ventilation and cooling equipment. While the results of a temperature analysis may provide some benefit, the cost and resource commitment to perform the analysis would be substantial and is not justified.