

DUKE POWER COMPANY

POWER BUILDING

422 SOUTH CHURCH STREET, CHARLOTTE, N. C. 28242

WILLIAM O. PARKER, JR.
VICE PRESIDENT
STEAM PRODUCTION

April 3, 1981

TELEPHONE: AREA 704
373-4083

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

Re: RII:JLJ
50-269/81-01
50-270/81-01
5C-287/81-01

Dear Mr. O'Reilly:


Per conversation with Mr. Joe Lenahan of your office on March 16, 1981, Duke Power Company is resubmitting its response to the subject inspection report to specifically address the five points requested by the NRC. This letter supercedes the letter submitted to your office on March 6, 1981 by Mr. A. C. Thies, Senior Vice President.

With regard to C. E. Murphy's letter dated February 9, 1981 which transmitted the subject inspection report, Duke Power considers that my letter concerning IE Bulletin 80-11 submitted to your office on February 2, 1981 provides the necessary response. However, please find attached a response to the violation which specifically addresses the five points requested by the NRC as well as a copy of my letter of February 2, 1981.

Duke Power Company does not consider the information contained therein to be proprietary.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the statements set forth herein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, executed on April 3, 1981.

Very truly yours,


William O. Parker, Jr.

JLJ:pw
Attachment

DUKE POWER COMPANY
OCONEE NUCLEAR STATION

Response to IE Inspection Report 50-269/81-01, -270/81-01, 287/81-01

Violation

10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion V, as implemented by Duke Power Company Topical Report Section 17.1.5, requires in part, "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.

Contrary to the above, the procedures developed to implement IE Bulletin 80-11 requirements were not appropriate in that the procedures were not adequate to assure that all masonry walls in the vicinity of safety-related equipment would be identified and re-evaluated for their conformance to design requirements.

This is a Severity Level V Violation (Supplement I.E.).

Response

A review of the events leading up to the initial surveillance revealed that nine areas in the plant were not surveyed because no masonry walls were found in an office search of drawings showing these areas. Subsequent review of these drawings showed the existence of five masonry walls which had not been surveyed.

An exhaustive search of the nine areas concerned was conducted by trained engineers during the period of January 13-16, 1981. No masonry walls other than the five which are shown on the as-built plant drawings were found. The five additional walls were surveyed in accordance with established procedures and will be included in the review of all masonry walls at Oconee Nuclear Station.

Section 11

DUKE POWER COMPANY
POWER BUILDING
422 SOUTH CHURCH STREET, CHARLOTTE, N. C. 28242

WILLIAM O. PARKER, JR.
VICE PRESIDENT
STEAM PRODUCTION

February 2, 1981

TELEPHONE AREA 713
373 44

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

Re: Oconee Nuclear Station
U. S. NRC IE Bulletin 80-11
Docket Nos. 50-269, -270, -287

Dear Mr. O'Reilly:

This letter supplements my letters of July, October 28, and November 4, 1980 which previously provided information in response to IE Bulletin 80-11.

During a site visit to Oconee Nuclear Station by Mr. Joe Lenihan of USNRC Atlanta office on 6-9 January 1981, it was determined that several masonry walls at the station had not been surveyed in the conduct of initial as-built surveillance required by the subject bulletin. Review of the events leading up to the initial surveillance revealed that nine areas in the plant were not surveyed because no masonry walls were found in an office search of drawings showing these areas. Subsequent review of these drawings showed the existence of five masonry walls which had not been surveyed.

An exhaustive search of the nine areas concerned was conducted by trained engineers during the period 13-16 January 1981. No masonry walls other than the five which are shown on the as-built plant drawings were found. The additional walls are:

<u>Drawing</u>	<u>Wall Identification*</u>	<u>Priority**</u>
O-12	T1-775.0-2526-HJ-1165	III
	T1-775.0-HJ-2526-1166	III
	T1-775.0-2526-HJ-1167	III
	T1-775.0-HJ-2526-1168	III
O-2018	A3-783.8-PQ-8889-1463	I

* Wall identification is as defined in Duke's 60-day response to the bulletin. (William O. Parker letter dated July 7, 1980)

** The priority system is defined in Duke's 60-day response to the bulletin. (William O. Parker letter dated July 7, 1980)

DUPE: 8+02200129

Mr. James P. O'Reilly

Page 2

February 2, 1981

The five additional walls were surveyed in accordance with established procedures and will be included in the review of all masonry walls at Oconee Nuclear Station.

Very truly yours,

William O. Parker, Jr.

William O. Parker, Jr.

RLG:pw

cc: Director
Division of Reactor Operations
Office of Inspection and Enforcement
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555