

CONSUMERS POWER COMPANY
MIDLAND ENERGY CENTER

50-329
50-330

Transmittal No: CSC-7290

Date: February 6, 1984

To: Stone & Webster
P O Box 1963
Midland, MI 48640

Attached Is: ☐ Partial Response To
☒ Complete Response To
☐ For Your Information
☐ Other

PRINCIPAL STAFF			
✓	h	DE	
A/RA		DE	
A/RA		DE	
RC		DE	
PAO		SCS	orig+3
SGA		ML	
ENF		116	h

Description:

Tracked Information Item 049.

NIR Signature:

[Handwritten Signature]

cc: JGKerpler, NRC Region III w/a
JJHarrison, NRC Region III w/a
RJCook, NRC Site w/a
RAWells, MPQAD w/a
BHPeck, MEC w/a
NIREichel, MEC w/a
DDJohnson, MEC w/a

8402150228 840206
PDR ADOCK 05000329
S PDR

FEB 10 1984

1801 1/1

STONE & WEBSTER CONSTRUCTION IMPLEMENTATION OVERVIEW MIDLAND NUCLEAR PLANT J.O. NO. 14509		ITEM NUMBER 049	HOLD POINT NUMBER
		<input type="checkbox"/> TRACKED ACTION ITEM	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TRACKED INFORMATION ITEM	
		<input type="checkbox"/> TRACKED RECOMMENDATION ITEM	
		<input type="checkbox"/> UNTRACKED ITEM	
REFERENCE(S) N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> HOLD POINT NOTIFICATION	

CONDITION DETAILS

During a review of specification M-326, obtained from Station 1, CIO found discrepancies in the document control methods. Further investigation resulted in the following observations:

- 1) In some cases, uncontrolled specifications contained controlled copies of FCRs, FCNs and SCNs. All of these controlled attachments were stamped "controlled", but some had the "controlled" lined out in black.
- 2) Apparently there is no procedure which allows the "decontrol" of a controlled document by lining out the "controlled" stamp.

☐ YES (PAGE NO.'S) ☒ NO

(See Sheet 2 of 2)

DATE RESPONSE REQ'D.	INITIATOR/DATE	INITIATION APPROVED/DATE
2/3/84	<i>Neal A. Kettwell</i> 1/26/84	<i>J. E. K...</i> 1-26-84

RESPONSE

Response is as follows:

1. Evaluation

Specifications were maintained as an uncontrolled reference copy. However, since these were the only design documents which we received uncontrolled from Ann Arbor, changes were inadvertently stamped controlled upon receipt. With some of the attachments the mistake was realized and corrected (stamp lined out), with others the error was not caught.

Action to prevent recurrence

This copy of uncontrolled specifications have been eliminated and a set maintained in a controlled area will be used.

☐ YES (PAGE NO.'S) ☐ NO

EST. CORRECTIVE ACTION COMPLETION DATE	RESPONDENT	TITLE	DATE
3/5/84	<i>W. Brooks</i>	Administrative Services Supervisor	2/3/84

RESPONSE ACCEPTED	DATE	RESPONSE VERIFIED/CLOSED	DATE

- 3) According to Bechtel Ann Arbor personnel, documents sent from Ann Arbor to the site are noted to be either controlled or uncontrolled on the transmittal. CPCo DCC is unaware of this identification and assumed that all documents received from Ann Arbor are controlled.

Please provide CIO with plans for addressing and correcting these observations.

Response Cont.

2. Evaluation

See Number 1 above. This was not a situation where a controlled document was "decontrolled". It was a clerical error which was corrected.

Action to prevent recurrence

It would not be appropriate to proceduralize "decontrol" of controlled drawings since this could cause confusion and inaccuracy in maintenance of the document distribution list.

3. Evaluation

CPCo DCC personnel were inadequately trained in this situation, possibly due to the fact that the transmittal method which Ann Arbor uses differs from the method used on site.

Action to prevent recurrence

Distribution from Ann Arbor is being discontinued. All controlled distribution will be issued from Field Document Control Center.