

Yellow

APR 27 1984

Tennessee Valley Authority
ATTN: Mr. H. G. Parris
Manager of Power and Engineering
500A Chestnut Street Tower II
Chattanooga, TN 37401

Gentlemen:

SUBJECT: REPORT NOS. 50-327/84-01 AND 50-328/84-01

Thank you for your response of March 15, 1984, to our Notice of Violation issued on February 14, 1984, concerning activities conducted under NRC License Nos. DPR-77 and DPR-79.

We have reviewed your response to Violation A and found that it meets the requirements of 10 CFR 2.201. We will examine the implementation of your corrective actions during future inspections.

We have reviewed your response to Violation B and have concluded, for the reasons presented in the enclosure to this letter, that the violation occurred as stated in the Notice of Violation. Therefore, in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 2.201, please resubmit your response to the Notice within 30 days of the date of this letter.

Should you have any questions concerning this letter, we would be happy to meet with you and discuss the matter further.

Sincerely,

/s/

James P. O'Reilly
Regional Administrator

Enclosure:
Staff Evaluation of Licensee
Response

cc w/encl:
J. A. Coffey, Director of Nuclear Power
C. C. Mason, Plant Superintendent
R. W. Olson, Project Manager
J. W. Anderson, Manager
Office of Quality Assurance
H. N. Culver, Chief, Nuclear Safety
Review Staff
D. L. Williams, Jr., Supervisor,
Licensing Section
J. E. Wills, Project Engineer

bcc w/encl: (See page 2)

8407180269 840705
PDR ADOCK 05000327
Q PDR

APR 27 1984

bcc w/encl:
NRC Resident Inspector
Document Control Desk
State of Tennessee

RII
LEF
LEFoster:bhg
4/18/84

RII
CMU
CMUpright
4/18/84

RII
AR
ARHerdt
4/18/84

RII
JA
JAOlshinski
4/20/84

RII
JP
JPuckett
4/20/84

RII
CS
CASullivan
4/20/84

RII
RCL
RCLewis
4/26/84

ENCLOSURE 1

STAFF EVALUATION OF LICENSEE RESPONSE DATED
MARCH 15, 1984

You make the following statements in your denial:

"ANSI N45.2.2-1972, Section 6.3.2, "Arrangement of Items," specifies that items stacked for storage shall be arranged so that the racks, cribbing, or crates are bearing the full weight without distortion of the items. This requirement is to prevent permanent distortion of the items contained in the storage container. Although the crate was marked as containing a control rod drive mechanism (CRDM), the crate actually contained only gaskets. In a recent telecon, Westinghouse stated that had the crate in fact contained a CRDM and had the CRDM been subjected to the same deflections as the crate (1 3/4" inch over 10 ft.), no adverse effects to the CRDM or its intended function would have occurred. Additionally, there is no evidence to indicate that the deflection of the crate would have resulted in an equal deflection of any items in the crate. The deflection of the crate containing gaskets may have resulted in minor deflection of the gaskets but not in a way that permanent distortion of any gasket would occur."

Our contention is that your QA program (TVA-TR75-1, Revision 5) does not take exception to ANSI N45.2.2-1972, Section 6.3.7. The fact that the material in boxes marked CRDM contained gaskets appears fortuitous. If the boxes contained CRDMs as marked and Westinghouse states the deflection (1 3/4" inch over 10 ft.) would cause no adverse effects is also fortuitous. However, the requirement is that items stacked for storage shall (this shall denotes a requirement) be arranged so that the racks, cribbing, or crates are bearing the full weight without distortion of the items. The fact that you are not adhering to this requirement was the basis for the violation. The distorted crates were an example of inadequate stacking of items and inadequate training of storeroom personnel.

In summary, since no additional information was provided to assure compliance with the regulatory requirements, we consider the lack of adequate support to be a violation of regulatory requirements.