

MEMORANDUM TO: John A. Grobe, Director March 12, 2001
Division of Reactor Safety, Region III

FROM: Suzanne C. Black, Deputy Director */RA/*
Division of Licensing Project Management, NRR

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE - RESOLUTION OF PIPE
SUPPORT DESIGN ISSUES AT LASALLE COUNTY STATION -
SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE, TIA 2000-03 (TAC NOS. MB1255 AND
MB1256)

By memorandum dated May 9, 2000, Region III requested Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR) technical assistance regarding pipe support design assumptions at LaSalle County Station. In response, NRR issued a memorandum dated December 29, 2000, addressing the issues by stating that we did not identify significant programmatic deficiencies in the methodology used by Sargent and Lundy (S&L) for LaSalle and that concerns about the adequacy of pipe support anchorages at other facilities designed by S&L did not present any significant safety issues that would require agency action. However, we did not specifically address the details of your questions. Attached is our supplemental response addressing those questions.

Docket Nos. 50-373 and 50-374

Attachment: As stated

cc w/encl: J. Wiggins, RI
B. Mallett, RII
A. Howell, RIV

CONTACT: J. Hopkins, NRR/DLPM
(301) 415-3027

MEMORANDUM TO: John A. Grobe, Director March 12, 2001
 Division of Reactor Safety, Region III

FROM: Suzanne C. Black, Deputy Director */RA/*
 Division of Licensing Project Management, NRR

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE - RESOLUTION OF PIPE
 SUPPORT DESIGN ISSUES AT LASALLE COUNTY STATION -
 SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE, TIA 2000-03 (TAC NOS. MB1255 AND
 MB1256)

By memorandum dated May 9, 2000, Region III requested Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR) technical assistance regarding pipe support design assumptions at LaSalle County Station. In response, NRR issued a memorandum dated December 29, 2000, addressing the issues by stating that we did not identify significant programmatic deficiencies in the methodology used by Sargent and Lundy (S&L) for LaSalle and that concerns about the adequacy of pipe support anchorages at other facilities designed by S&L did not present any significant safety issues that would require agency action. However, we did not specifically address the details of your questions. Attached is our supplemental response addressing those questions.

Docket Nos. 50-373 and 50-374

Attachment: As stated

cc w/encl: J. Wiggins, RI
 B. Mallett, RII
 A. Howell, RIV

CONTACT: J. Hopkins, NRR/DLPM
 (301) 415-3027

Distribution:

PUBLIC	PD3-2 r/f
AMendiola	BBurgess, RIII
JHopkins	EDuncan, RIII
EAdensam (EGA1)	CRosenberg
RPulsifer	JZwolinski/SBlack

*See previous concurrences

OFFICE	PM:LPD3-2	LA:LPD3-2	SC:LPD3-2	EMEB	LPD3	DD:DLPM
NAME	JHopkins*	CRosenberg	AMendiola	KManoly*	SBajwa	SBlack
DATE	03/ 7 /01	03/8/01	03/8/01	03/ 2 /01	03/8/01	03/9/01

ACCESSION NO.: ML010720295

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

SUPPLEMENTAL EVALUATION BY THE
OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO SARGENT & LUNDY PIPE SUPPORT
DESIGN ISSUE AT LASALLE STATION

Question 1: Is it appropriate to use a secant modulus based on the behavior of the anchor bolt at ultimate capacity for design or analysis?

Response: While the NRR staff does not recommend this usage, we evaluate designs for overall acceptability. The Standard Review Plan (SRP, NUREG-0800) does not include the level of detail involved in your question; however, the SRP does indicate that it is NRR's policy to review alternative licensee approaches.

Question 2: What is the impact of using a secant modulus, based on anchor bolt behavior near its ultimate capacity, on the anticipated magnitude of anchor bolt force at operational load?

Response: This is a calculational approximation in the non-conservative direction, the impact of which can only be determined on a case-by-case basis by reviewing the entire design approach and application.

Question 3: Has the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission approved such a design approach, either directly or indirectly, based on the information being presented in the licensee's IE Bulletin 79-02 submittal dated July 5, 1979?

Response: With regard to using fixed-end versus pin-ended connections in design, that is the designer's determination to make. With regard to secant modulus usage, it was acceptable for evaluating baseplates in response to IE Bulletin 79-02. For the connections issue, we are not aware of a previous NRR review of that secant modulus usage.

Attachment