

7

DUKE POWER COMPANY

P.O. BOX 33189  
CHARLOTTE, N.C. 28242

HAL B. TUCKER  
VICE PRESIDENT  
NUCLEAR PRODUCTION

July 29, 1983

TELEPHONE  
(704) 373-4531

AUG 4 11:00

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

Re: RII:JWY  
50-413/83-04  
50-414/83-04

Dear Mr. O'Reilly:

Please find attached a final response to Violation No. 413-414/83-04-01 as identified in the above referenced inspection report. Duke Power Company does not consider any information contained in this inspection report to be proprietary.

Very truly yours,

*H.B. Tucker*

Hal B. Tucker

RWO/php

Attachment

cc: NRC Resident Inspector  
Catawba Nuclear Station

Mr. Robert Guild, Esq.  
Attorney-at-Law  
P. O. Box 12097  
Charleston, South Carolina 29412

Palmetto Alliance  
2135½ Devine Street  
Columbia, South Carolina 29205

8308230263 830815  
PDR ADOCK 05000413  
Q PDR

DUKE POWER COMPANY  
CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION

Violation:

As a result of the inspection conducted on March 15-18, 1983, and in accordance with the NRC Enforcement Policy, 47 FR 9987 (March 9, 1982), the following violation was identified.

10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion V as implemented by Duke Power Company (DPC) Topical Report "Duke 1-A", Section 17, Paragraph 17.1.5, requires in part that activities affecting quality be accomplished in accordance with instructions, procedures, or drawings. Drawing Nos. CN-1491-NV104-R and 1-R-NV-1385 give the location and location tolerances for Hanger No. 1-R-NV-1385.

Contrary to the above, activities affecting quality were not being accomplished with documented drawings in that QA accepted Hanger No. 1-R-NV-1385 was found at a location outside the one required by the appropriate drawings.

Modification to our interim response of May 11, 1983, beginning with Item three (3) is as follows:

(3) The discrepancy with hanger No. 1-R-NV-1385 was recorded on Nonconforming Item Report No. 16516 and forwarded to Design Engineering for evaluation. The present location was found acceptable.

The QA inspectors were re-instructed in the recognition and application of special location tolerances.

A sample of 80 hangers with special location tolerances were selected and evaluated for proper location. An additional three hangers (Hanger Nos. 1-R-NS-1055, 1-R-NS-1219, and 1-R-NI-1264) were found to have locations outside of the erection tolerances given in the appropriate drawings. These discrepancies were reported on Nonconforming Item Report No. 16638 and forwarded to Design for evaluation. The present locations were found acceptable.

Due to the sample size and results received from the evaluation, it was concluded that further evaluation was necessary. Since the drawings for Unit 1 are essentially complete, a list was developed of Unit 1 hangers with special location tolerances (approximately 3500) and an additional sample of 200 hangers was selected. Upon evaluation for proper location, an additional six hangers (Hanger No. 1-R-NV-2097, 1-R-NV-2098, 1-R-NV-2077, 1-R-NV-2075, 1-R-NV-2099, and 1-R-NS-1242) were found to have locations outside of the tolerance allowed on the drawings. These discrepancies were reported on Nonconforming Item Report Number 16774 and forwarded to Design for evaluation. The present locations were found to be acceptable.

An evaluation of all Unit 2 isometric drawings issued for Construction for hangers with special location tolerances on the hanger detail drawing was made and all isometric drawings contained a reference to the special location tolerances. This practice will continue, therefore eliminating any confusion for Unit 2 supports.

The craft have been re-instructed in recognition and application of special location tolerances.

It is concluded that this situation has not resulted in any significant problem with hangers being constructed in a manner that would prevent them from performing their required functions. This is substantiated by finding only nine errors in a sample of 280 supports, and none of the errors affected the ability of supports to perform their functions.

(4) No further corrective steps are required.

It is concluded that this situation has not resulted in any significant problem with hangers being constructed in a manner that would prevent them from performing their required functions. This is substantiated by finding only nine errors in a sample of 280 supports, and none of the errors affected the ability of supports to perform their functions.

(4) No further corrective steps are required.