

ORC

RI-90-A-0208

NOV 21 1990

Docket No. 50-336

Mr. Edward Mroczka
Senior Vice President
Nuclear Engineering and Operations
Northeast Nuclear Energy Company
P.O. Box 270
Hartford CT. 06141-0270

Dear Mr. Mroczka;

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission recently received a number of allegations concerning activities at Millstone 2. Details of these issues are enclosed for your review and followup. We request that the results of your review and disposition of these matters be submitted to Region I within 30 days of receipt of this correspondence. We request that your response contain no personal privacy, proprietary, or safeguards information so that it can be released to the public and placed in the NRC Public Document Room. If necessary, such information to be withheld shall be contained in a separate correspondence and the affidavit required by 10CFR 2.790 must accompany your response if proprietary or like information is included.

The response requested by this letter and the accompanying enclosures are not subject to the clearance procedures of the Office of Management and Budget as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, PL 96-511.

Your cooperation with us is appreciated. Please address any questions that you may have regarding these issues to Mr. Scott Stewart at (215) 337-5232, or Mr. Donald Haverkamp at (215) 337-5120.

Sincerely,
Original Signed By
John Stehly for
Edward C. Wenzinger, Chief
Reactor Projects Branch 4

Enclosure 1, Allegation RI-90-A-0208,
Enclosure 2, Allegation RI-90-A-0204.

cc w/encl:
W. Raymond, SRI

9212220057 920608
PDR FOIA
GUILD91-162 PDR

ORC

W/139

Official Record

R1-90-A-0208

bcc:
J. Stewart
M. Perkins

Concurrences:

Stewart

J. Stewart
11/26/90

Haverkamp

J. Haverkamp
11/26/90

Wenzinger

J. Wenzinger
11/27/90

Official Record

Issue: Maintenance (weld repairs) was performed on "MSRs" on Saturday, November 10. The welders objected to the exclusion of "Q.S.D." as it was their opinion that the repairs were governed by the ASME Code. The welders were directed to proceed. Later, QSD determined that ASME Section 8 was applicable. The maintenance supervisor ignored QSD and the repairs continued to completion without an NCR or QSD involvement.

1. What were the governing procedures for this work and were they properly prepared and implemented? Were code requirements required, included, and implemented? Was QSD consulted and were their comments answered? Were any procedures violated regarding this work item; Please explain.

Issue 1. The following problems exist with IC 2421C:

1. Step 5.5.6.1 calls for visually inspecting the connector assemblies on each cable for signs of degradation or damage. Problems have been identified with Z-1, #4, #7, and Z-2, #8. The cables were put together anyway. Please explain. Further, the step calls for visually inspecting the Grafoil gasket at the Litton-Veam connector, but no information is provided about these connectors or the grafoil gaskets. Are I&C technicians trained on these items? Does the procedure require upgrades to explain what the technician is looking for in this step? No figure is provided with the procedure to identify the connectors and it is impossible to read the etched numbers on the connectors. How are the connectors to be identified on the job?
2. The caution on page 14 is impossible to achieve as only about a 45 degree turn is possible. Is this technically satisfactory? Does this indicate procedural non-compliance during past performance? Has there been repeated connection damage in complying with this step?
3. Dust cover caps are shown in Figures in IC-2421C and IC-2419C. These caps are not being used. Are dust covers needed? Why are they not used if shown in the Figure?
4. Step 5.6.4 calls for the verification of the HJTC probes per IC-2419C. Why is this not done prior to the connection of the detector cables?
5. Are any generic problems with procedural non-compliance or laxity with regards to procedural adherence evidenced by these problems? Please explain.

Issue 2: Instrument Calibration Review ICR 90-113 was written on 11-2-90. Please provide the resolution documentation for the ICR.

Issue 3: Recently, an ICR was generated concerning out-of-specification test voltages found during the performance of SP-2404C. Please provide the resolution documentation for the ICR. Historically, the reference voltages have been out-of-specification:

3/9/90	AWO M2-90-02559
5/5/90	AWO M2-90-02736
5/5/90	AWO M2-90-05237
5/5/90	AWO M2-90-05480
8/30/90	Surveillance, SP-2401F and SP-2401B

Please discuss the operability of Channel "C" of the RPS with the historic out-of-specification test voltages. Note, Drawings 25203-39069 Sheet 40, and 25203-25193 Sheet 6, supposedly identify the reference test voltage applications.

Issue 4: A red tag was improperly hung by operations on the back of CO5/CO6. The tag was hung on TDE but should have been hung on TDD. SCO(*) knows the details. Please explain the tagout problem and actions taken to both correct the problem and to prevent recurrence.

(*) - identity may be obtained from the SRI.

Issue 5: A recent annunciator window change CO4(CRDR) was apparently not reviewed and completed properly as procedures SP-2401B, 2401F, 2401J had to be changed during the performance to accommodate the annunciator window changes. Please discuss the accuracy of the statement, and any actions that you have taken or may take to rectify any identified problems.

Issue 6: On 11/5/90, on completion of the CWP portion of SP-2401J, (the CRDR change was done as a non-intent change on this date), Channel C TO-7 was left bypassed by technicians after the surveillance was turned in and the technicians had to be called by the SS and the channel unbypassed by the SCO. Please discuss the procedural compliance aspects of this statement.

APPENDIX 4.0

SAMPLE RECORD OF ALLEGATION PANEL DECISIONS

SITE: MS-2

PANEL ATTENDEES:

ALLEGATION NO.: RI-90-A-208

Chairman - Wiggins

DATE: 11/21/90 (Mtg. 1 2 3 4 5)

Branch Chief - FC Wenzinger

PRIORITY: High Medium Low

Section Chief (AOC) - Stewart

SAFETY SIGNIFICANCE: Yes No Unknown

Others - H. Gray - DRS

CONCURRENCE TO CLOSEOUT: DD BC SC

L. Briggs - DRS (Act SC)

CONFIDENTIALITY GRANTED: Yes No
(See Allegation Receipt Report)

IS THERE A DOL FINDING: Yes No

IS CHILLING EFFECT LETTER WARRANTED: Yes No

HAS CHILLING EFFECT LETTER BEEN SENT: Yes No

HAS LICENSEE RESPONDED TO CHILLING EFFECT LETTER: Yes No

ACTION:

- 1) Annotate other Alleg file on H&T issue. Send Ack letter w/
DOL rights. No Confidentiality granted.
- 2) Turnover to licensee use "Governing Procedures & Codes"
request QA involvement info.
- 3) Routine closeout.
- 4) _____
- 5) _____

NOTES: _____

W/14/