



Consumers
Power
Company

*Still potential: need to
input to computer if
really a 50.55(e)*

*Shapiro
Gardner
Landsman*

James W Cook
Vice President - Projects, Engineering
and Construction

General Offices: 1945 West Parnall Road, Jackson, MI 49201 • (517) 788-0453

December 30, 1982

82-16 #1

Mr J G Keppler, Regional Administrator
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region III
799 Roosevelt Road
Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

MIDLAND NUCLEAR COGENERATION PLANT -
DOCKET NOS 50-329 AND 50-330
POTENTIAL 50.55(e) REPORT CONCERNING
PROCURED ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT
FILE 0.4.9.72 SERIAL 19130

On December 3, 1982, W R Bird reported a potential 50.55(e) condition concerning delivered, safety-related electrical equipment not meeting project requirements to R Gardner of your Staff. The attachment provides a description of the problem and the overall corrective actions to resolve this issue. This letter is the first interim report on this subject.

The condition remains as a potential reportable condition in that it is indeterminate whether the specific nonconforming conditions found would have prevented the equipment/components from properly functioning during all design basis events. The types of electrical equipment in question are those panels and cabinets having extensive vendor wiring and which provide instrument, control, and power functions. Actions being initiated to support the overall corrective actions include:

1. Establishing a comprehensive review of the subject equipment purchases to support determining root causes as to how equipment was manufactured with deficiencies and delivered to the Midland site without detection of the deficiencies.
2. Development of a matrix of past corrective actions implemented to provide improvements in this area versus the timing of manufacture and delivery of nonconforming equipment.
3. Development of specific inspection planning to be utilized at the supplier facilities for source or receipt inspection of future orders.
4. Review the status of the overinspections performed on delivered subject equipment to assure that no items were missed.

ocl282-1489a131
8309070147 830831
PDR ADOCK 05000329
S PDR

JAN 5 1983

5. Dispositioning and necessary rework or replacement of items identified.

Either another interim or final report will be submitted on or before February 28, 1983.

James W. Cook

WRB/MJS/jm

Attachment: Management Corrective Action Report MCAR-1, Report No 66, Rev 2,
dated 12/30/82

CC: Document Control Desk, NRC
Washington, DC

R J Cook, NRC Resident Inspector
Midland Nuclear Plant

CBechhoefer, ASLB Panel
RSDecker, ASLB Panel
FPCowan, ASLB Panel
JHarbour, ASLB Panel
AS&L Appeal Panel
MMCherry, Esq
MSinclair
BStamiris
CRStephens, USNRC
WDPaton, Esq, USNRC
FJKelley, Esq, Attorney General
SHFreeman, Esq, Asst Attorney General
WHMarshall
CJMerritt, Esq, TNK&J
Great Lakes QA Managers

**QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAM
MANAGEMENT CORRECTIVE ACTION REPORT
MCAR-1**

REPORT NO.: 66-Revision 2

JOB NO.: 7220

Q NO.:

DATE: 12/30/82

I DESCRIPTION* (Including References):

Unacceptable workmanship conditions, such as insufficient solder, broken wire strands, damaged wire insulation, leads pulling from lugs, loose identification tags and markers, use of improper wire lugs, and improper crimping have been identified on electrical control panels and cabinets supplied by various suppliers. Approximately 30 discrepancy reports
(continued on page 2)

RECOMMENDED ACTION* (Optional):

The following recommended corrective actions are for vendor supplied electrical panels and cabinets.

A. Safety Evaluation of Identified Conditions

1. Based on cases of workmanship identified as not in compliance with MPQAD overinspection (plan 01-E-7B) predict the potential effects on component performance. (continued on page 2)

REFERRED TO: ☒ Engineering ☐ Construction ☒ QA Management ☒ Quality Control
☒ Procurement (Supplier Quality) ☒ MPQAD

NOTE: This condition was reported to the NRC by CPCo as potentially reportable on 12/3/82.

ISSUED BY: D. Reia 12/30/82
for Project QA Engineer Date

II REPORTABLE DEFICIENCY:☐ NO☐ YES

NOTIFIED CLIENT: see above

Ray B. for Putzers 12/30/82
Project Manager Date

III CAUSE:

CORRECTIVE ACTION TAKEN:

AUTHORIZED BY: _____
Date

AAPD DISTRIBUTION

MGR OF CONSTRUCTION
MGR OF ENGINEERING
MGR OF PROCUREMENT
MGR OF PROJ OPERATIONS
MGR OF QUALITY ASSURANCE
CONSTRUCTION MGR
ENGINEERING MGR
SUPPLIER QUALITY MGR
QE SUPERVISOR

PROJ DISTRIBUTION

CHIEF CONSTR QC ENGR
CLIENT
PFOCE
PROJECT CONSTR MGR
PROJECT ENGINEER
PROJECT MGR
PROJ PROCUREMENT MGR
SITE MGR

OTHER DISTRIBUTION

MGR OF QA - TPO
GPD - QA MGR
LAPD - QA MGR
SFPD - QA MGR

FORMAL REPORT TO CLIENT
(If Section II Applies)

Date

CORRECTIVE ACTION IMPLEMENTED

VERIFIED BY: _____
Project QA Engineer Date

*Describe in space provided and attach reference document.

Description (continued)

(e.g., nonconformance reports and quality action requests) have been written in the last two years on electrical equipment for similar conditions discovered during MPQAD overinspections using Consumers Power Company Project Inspection Plan 01-E-7B. Recent examples of these conditions have also been noted on items supplied by Terry Corp. (auxiliary feedwater pump turbine control panel), Vitro Laboratories (ESIS cabinet internal circuit board) and Transamerica Delaval (diesel engine control panel).

The above is evidence of a weakness in the electrical panel and cabinet suppliers for Midland to fully meet specified requirements in the areas identified. The source and receipt inspection activities have not been structured to be completely effective in identifying the vendor's discrepancies.

Recommended Actions

2. Evaluate the effects on plant safety due to the predicted effects from Item A.1 above.

B. Evaluation of Requirements and Vendor Programs

1. Review the material requisitions for definition of workmanship requirements or criteria using the discrepancy reports (nonconformance reports and quality action requests) from MPQAD overinspection plan 01-E-7B. This will be input to Item B.2.
2. Evaluate the vendors' programs (i.e., workmanship standards, inspection planning, etc.). Modify the programs as appropriate.
3. Evaluate the vendors' implementation of their program (i.e., methods used and results obtained) in the area of workmanship. Initiate corrective action as appropriate.

C. Evaluation of Bechtel Programs

1. Evaluate the source and receipt inspection programs with regard to vendor workmanship and modify the programs as appropriate.
2. Determine process corrective actions necessary for Bechtel to improve control of vendors' performance in the area of workmanship.

D. Interim Report

1. Provide interim report by February 15, 1983 to meet client commitment date of February 28, 1983.