

USNRC REGION
ATLANTA, GEORGIA

83 APR 18 P 1: 35



FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

April 8, 1983

L-83-222

Mr. James P. O'Reilly
Regional Administrator, Region II
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
101 Marietta Street, N.W., Suite 2900
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Dear Mr. O'Reilly:

RE: RII:TDG
St. Lucie Unit #2
Docket No. 50-389/83-13

Florida Power & Light Company has reviewed the subject Inspection Report which identified one violation.

Please find attached our response to this violation.

Very truly yours,

Robert E. Uhrig
Vice President
Advanced Systems and Technology

REU/RJS/cab

Attachment

8305270520 830502
PDR ADOCK 05000389
Q PDR

VIOLATION

10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion V, as implemented by FPL Topical Quality Assurance Report Number 5.0, requires that activities affecting quality shall be prescribed by documented instructions, procedures or drawings and shall be accomplished in accordance with these instructions, procedures or drawings.

Construction QC Procedure Number QI 10.20, R0 is the procedure used for inspecting the installation of electrical cables. This procedure requires the QC inspector to verify during and after the cable installation process that the cables are installed in accordance with the cable pull cards.

Contrary to the above, six safety-related instrument cables identified as 21656X-ASB, 21656Y-ASB, 20332F-SB, 20332G-SB, 20332H-SB, and 20332J-SB were not routed in accordance with the cable pull cards. In all cases additional plan points were included in the routing. These cable installations had been QC inspected and accepted.

This is a Severity Level IV Violation (Supplement II).

RESPONSE

- 1) Florida Power & Light agrees with the finding.
- 2) The reason for the violation was inattention to detail on the part of the Quality Control inspector. All identified cables are routed in tray L2424-SB. In the total span of L2424-SB there are many plot (plan) points, which are added at the discretion of the architect engineer. All identified cables are correctly terminated at the identified "to" and "from" points via the identified conduits. The location of the conduit as it joins the cable tray was at variance with the cable pull cards and it was this fact the QC inspector was remiss in identifying. As all six cables were pulled on the same day, it is considered an isolated case.
- 3) The QC inspector in question was given a verbal reprimand and a written reprimand was placed in and will remain in his personnel file for ninety days. Construction Office Engineering informed Ebasco Site Support Engineering of the variance between the installed cables and the cable pullcards. The as-installed conditions were approved and revised cable pullcards have been issued to reflect those conditions.
- 4) The violation and the need for strict compliance with site criteria was thoroughly discussed at the weekly electrical inspectors meeting. As strict compliance is continually stressed and this is considered an isolated incident, QC supervisors were instructed to continue their vigilance to prevent the recurrence of this type problem.
- 5) Full compliance was achieved April 5, 1983.