

(PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE ALL REQUIRED INFORMATION)

EVENT DESCRIPTION AND PROBABLE CONSEQUENCES (10)

CAUSE DESCRIPTION AND CORRECTIVE ACTIONS (27)

PHONE: 716/546-2700, ext. 291-206

Attachment to LER 79-012/01T-0
Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation
R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 1
Docket No. 50-244

During the annual refueling maintenance shutdown, inservice inspection was conducted on pipe support anchor bolts. Six such installations inside containment were observed not built in accordance with drawings. Data on these supports was reported to the Engineering Department on March 26, 1979. The evaluation of the data on four of the supports (RH-21, RH-22, RH-32, RH-33) resulted in the conclusion that they required correction to assure the capability to perform their intended function. The evaluation of the other two supports (CH-9 and CH-10) showed that the existing installations are adequate to assure performance of their intended functions.

On March 27 the Engineering Department was requested to determine additional supports for inspection to assure that the discrepancies found on RH-21, 22, 32 and 33 were limited to them. Over 500 pipe support drawings were then reviewed. The results of this review showed that there were no other Seismic Category I supports of similar design. Consequently, six additional supports outside containment of various designs containing anchor bolts were selected at random for inspection. These supports were located on several safety related systems in various locations throughout the plant. The evaluation of the inspection results (NCR's G-79-38 through G-79-43) for these supports shows that all the existing installations are adequate to assure performance of their intended functions.

It was concluded that the discrepancies found on RH-21, 22, 32 and 33 were unique to those supports. It is believed that they were caused by the field conditions relative to the specific location of these supports. Correction of these supports was judged to be the most prudent and conservative approach based on the nature of the discrepancies and the intended function of the supports. The drawing discrepancies found on the remaining supports, both inside and outside containment, were judged to be of minimal consequence, and in all cases it was determined that the supports met their intended design function.

Further action in this area is planned in response to IE Bulletin 79-02, Pipe Support Base Plate Designs using Concrete Expansion Anchor Bolts.

