

VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23261

June 29, 1979

Mr. James P. O'Reilly, Director
Office of Inspection and Enforcement
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region II
101 Marietta Street, Suite 3100
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Serial No. 476
PO/FHT:baw
Docket No.: 50-280
50-281
License No.: DPR-32
DPR-37

Dear Mr. O'Reilly:

We have reviewed your letter of June 5, 1979, in reference to the inspection conducted at Surry Power Station Units 1 and 2 on May 9-11, 1979, and reported in IE Inspection Report Nos. 50-280/79-23 and 50-281/79-35. Our response to the specific deficiency is attached.

We have determined that no proprietary information is contained in the report. Accordingly, the Virginia Electric and Power Company has no objection to this inspection report being made a matter of public disclosure.

Very truly yours,

W. C. Stallings
C. M. Stallings
Vice President-Power Supply
and Production Operations

Attachment

cc: Mr. Albert Schwencer

CCP

7908150247

790386
OFFICIAL COPY

USNRC REGIONAL
ATLANTA, GEORGIA

79 JUL 3 A 8:16

RESPONSE TO DEFICIENCY
LISTED IN IE INSPECTION REPORT
NOS. 50-280/79-23 and 50-281/79-35

A. NRC COMMENT

As required by 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion V, "Activities affecting quality shall be prescribed by documented instructions, procedures, or drawings, of a type appropriate to the circumstances and shall be accomplished in accordance with these instructions, procedures or drawings". The accepted Quality Assurance Program, Section 17.2.5 states in part, "Section 5 in the Nuclear Power Station Quality Assurance Manual (NPSQAM) describes the sequence of actions and the requirements for developing, reviewing, approving and controlling procedures ...". NPSQAM, Section 5, paragraph 5 states in part: "Each nuclear power plant shall be operated and maintained in accordance with written procedures...".

1. Project Operating Procedure (POP) 2.8.5 requires that, as individual portions of the working copy of the Engineering Task Assignments (ETA) are signed off and completed they will be reproduced in hard copy form (master ETA copy).

Contrary to the above, the master copy (ETA 10061) was not being reproduced as required by POP 2.8.5 for a period of about two months prior to the inspection.

2. Project Operating Procedure 2.8.7 requires that revised drawings be controlled and distributed to controlled files.

Contrary to the above, nine out of ten drawings reviewed by Daniel QC ETA 40025, were not of the latest revision.

This is a deficiency.

RESPONSE

The deficiency is correct as stated.

1. Corrective steps taken and results achieved:

- a. The Master Copy of ETA 10061 was retrieved and re-processed in accordance with POP 2.8.5.
- b. The drawings found to be not of the latest revision were reissued and that set decontrolled.

2. Corrective Steps taken to avoid further non-compliance:

- a. All master copies of ETA's are now processed in accordance with POP 2.8.5.
- b. Controlled sets of drawings were reduced in number June 8, 1979. All controlled sets of drawings are now handled in accordance with POP 2.8.7.

3. The date when full compliance will be achieved:

Full compliance has been achieved.