

DUKE POWER COMPANY

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

HAL B. TUCKER  
VICE PRESIDENT  
NUCLEAR PRODUCTION

TELEPHONE  
(704) 373-4531

June 12, 1985

Dr. J. Nelson Grace, Regional Administrator  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Region II  
101 Marietta Street, NW, Suite 2900  
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

Subject: Oconee Nuclear Station  
IE Inspection Report  
50-269/85-04  
50-270/85-04  
50-287/85-04

Dear Sir:

By a letter dated April 15, 1985, Duke Power submitted a response to your letter dated March 15, 1985 which transmitted the subject Inspection Report. The attached response provided by this letter supercedes in its entirety the response provided by my April 15, 1985 letter.

Very truly yours,

*H. B. Tucker*

Hal B. Tucker

PFG:slb

Attachment

cc: Mr. J. C. Bryant  
NRC Resident Inspector  
Oconee Nuclear Station

90 : DIV 81 NUC 50  
90 JUN 18 AID : 06

8507110065 850612  
PDR ADOCK 05000269  
Q PDR

IE01

### Violation

10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion II requires that activities affecting quality shall be accomplished under suitably controlled conditions, including suitable environmental conditions for accomplishing the activity. Controlled procedures for the calibration of Fluke 8100A and 8600A digital Multimeters (IP/O/B/1602/02, January 16, 1985, and IP/O/B/1602/04, December 5, 1984, respectively) prescribe specific temperature and humidity test conditions.

Contrary to the above, neither temperature nor humidity was routinely checked or recorded for calibration of digital multimeters in the I&E shop.

This is a Severity Level IV violation (Supplement I).

### Response

#### 1) Admission or denial of the alleged violation:

This violation is admitted. Neither temperature nor humidity was routinely recorded for calibration of digital multimeters in the I&E shop. However, as noted in the Inspection Report Details, Duke personnel are confident that all calibrations were performed within the recommended environmental conditions, just the data was not documented.

#### 2) Reasons for the violation:

The procedures cited in the violation did not specifically require that specific environmental conditions be recorded during calibration activities for the noted multimeters. The procedures did note verbatim the manufacturer's recommendations that the instruments "should" be calibrated within specific temperature and humidity conditions. These instructions were interpreted as recommendations, not as requirements.

#### 3) Corrective steps which have been taken and the results achieved:

Signs have been posted in the calibration shop noting limiting environmental conditions for calibration of Fluke multimeters. The appropriate procedures were revised (effective February 19, 1985) to allow calibration only within the recommended environmental limits and to require documentation of temperature and humidity conditions on the procedure data sheets.

#### 4) Corrective steps which will be taken to avoid further violations:

No further corrective actions are necessary.

#### 5) Date when full compliance will be achieved:

All corrective actions were completed by February 19, 1985.