

SSER

Task: Allegation A-230

Reference No.: 4-84-A-06/118

Characterization: The allegation is that an Ebasco review of Startup System (SUS) 52B, Reactor Coolant, disclosed many Mercury documents that were incomplete and red lines on drawings that did not match the as-built plant configuration. This allegation also claims that there are generic deficiencies in Mercury turnover packages.

Assessment of Allegation: The implied significance of this allegation is that missing or inadequate documentation and incorrect red line drawings could place the quality of installation in question.

The NRC staff investigated this allegation by reviewing four of the six safety-related Operation Control Reports (OCRs) associated with SUS52B and five other OCRs. Ebasco reviewed 100% of the OCRs prior to Mercury turnover of the packages and LP&L performed a 10% sample review. [The NRC staff has objective evidence that Ebasco reviewed these turnover packages, document findings, and closed out deficiencies.]

The issue involving problems with red lines was addressed by allegation A-187, where the NRC review did not detect any problems.

The NRC staff concludes that this allegation has neither safety significance nor generic implications.

[Potential Violations: None.]

Actions Required: None.

References

1. Operational Control Reports (OCR)

OCR-666, -1019, -1020, -1022, -1647, -1782, -1855, -1859, -1881

Document Name:
A-230

Requestor's ID:
PATTYN

Author's Name:

Document Comments:

WATERFORD OPEN ISSUE

Task: A-230

Ref. No.: 4-84-A-05 No. 118

Characterization: Individual ["C"] alleged that on September 27, 1982, the review of SUS 52B identified so many documents that were incomplete and red line drawings that did not match that the review was stopped.

Initial Assessment of Significance: Allegation claims generic deficiencies in turnover packages.

Source: ["Individual "C"]

Approach to Resolution:

1. Review turnover packages for system SUS 52B; also, see exhibit 16.
2. Review additional OCR packages for generic concern.
3. Work with *A-35.
4. Evaluate/for generic/safety implications.
5. Report/results of review/evaluation of this allegation.

Status:

Review Lead: J. Harrison

Support: OI

Estimate Resources: 1/2 man day

Estimated Completion:

CLOSURE:

Draft 3
5/16/84 (TSK2)

WATERFORD OPEN ISSUE

*Superseded
6-14-84
rl*

Task: A-230

Ref. No.: 4-84-A-06 No. 118

Characterization: Individual ["C"] alleged that on September 27, 1982, the review of SUS 52B identified so many documents that were incomplete and red line drawings that did not match that the review was stopped.

Initial Assessment of Significance: Allegation claims generic deficiencies in turnover packages.

Source: Individual "C"

Approach to Resolution:

- turnover P system; also, see exhibit*
1. Review ~~package~~ ^{turnover P system} for SUS 52B (Exhibit 16).
 2. Review additional OCR packages for generic concern.
 3. Work with *A-35.
 4. Evaluate/for generic/safety implications.
 5. Report/results of review/evaluation of this allegation.

Status:

Review Lead: J. Harrison

Support: OI

Estimate Resources: 1/2 man day

Estimated Completion:

CLOSURE:

WATERFORD OPEN ISSUE

Task: A-230

Ref. No.: 4-84-A-06 No. 118

Characterization: Individual ["C"] alleged that on September 27, 1982, the review of SUS 52B identified so many documents that were incomplete and red line drawings that did not match that the review was stopped.

Initial Assessment of Significance: Allegation claims generic deficiencies in turnover packages.

[Source: Individual "C"]

Approach to Resolution:

1. Review turnover packages for system SUS 52B; also, see exhibit 16.
2. Review additional OCR packages for generic concern.
3. Work with *A-35.
4. Evaluate/for generic/safety implications.
5. Report/results of review/evaluation of this allegation.

Status:

Review Lead: J. Harrison

Support: 01

Estimate Resources: 1/2 man day

Estimated Completion:

CLOSURE:



LOUISIANA
POWER & LIGHT

317 BARONNE STREET
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA

P.O. BOX 60340
70160

(504) 595-2204

October 15, 1984

J.M. CAIN
President and
Chief Executive Officer

W3B84-0496

Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
ATTN: Mr. Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director
Division of Licensing
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

SUBJECT: Waterford 3 SES
Partial Response to Items
from Waterford Review Team

REFERENCES: 1) Letter, D.G. Eisenhut to J.M. Cain,
"Waterford 3 Review," dated June 13, 1984
2) Letter W3B84-0495, J.M. Cain to D.G. Eisenhut,
"Revised Program Plan" dated October 10, 1984

Dear Mr. Eisenhut:

The purpose of this letter is to submit a supplement to the response to Issue 2, reflecting information developed since our August 10, 1984 submittal. The information contained in this supplement was informally provided to your staff. The logic in our original response to Issue 2 remains unchanged.

The supplement has been reviewed and verified by LP&L QA in accordance with procedure QASP 19-13. The designated subcommittee of the Waterford Safety Review Committee also has reviewed the adequacy of the supplement for resolving the issues raised. The subcommittee scope of responsibility does not include independent validation of the facts.

Sincerely,



J.M. Cain

JMC:DA:pbs

Attachments

8410170239 3pp

Mr. Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director
W3B84-0496
October 15, 1984

Page 2

cc: Mr. R.S. Leddick

Mr. D.E. Dobson

Mr. R.F. Burski

Mr. K.W. Cook

Mr. T.F. Gerrets

Mr. A.S. Lockhart

Mr. R.P. Barkhurst

Mr. L. Constable
USNRC - Waterford 3

Mr. J.T. Collins
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region IV
611 Ryan Plaza Suite 1000
Arlington, TX 76011

Mr. D. Crutchfield
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Mr. G. Knighton, Chief
Licensing Branch No. 3
Division of Licensing
Washington, D.C. 20555

Mr. M. Peranich
Waterford 3 Investigation and
Evaluation Inquiry Report Team
Leader
4340 E.W. Hwy. MS-EWS-358
Bethesda, MD 20114

Mr. D. Thatcher
Waterford 3 Instrumentation & Control
Leader
7920 Norfolk Ave. MS-216
Bethesda, MD 20114

Mr. L. Shao
Waterford 3 Civil/Structure Team
Leader
5650 Nicholson Ln.
Rockville, MD

Mr. J. Harrison
Waterford 3 QA Team Leader
Region III
700 Roosevelt Rd.
Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Mr. J.E. Gagliardo
Director of Waterford 3 Task
Force
Region IV
611 Ryan Plaza Suite 1000
Arlington, TX 76011

Mr. S. Levine
NUS Corporation
910 Clopper Road
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

Mr. R.L. Ferguson
UNC Nuclear Industries
P.O. Box 490
Richland, WA 99352

Mr. L.L. Humphreys
UNC Nuclear Industries
1200 Jadwin, Suite 425
Richland, WA 99352

Mr. G. Charnoff
Shaw, Pittman, Potts &
Trowbridge
1800 M. St. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. J. Hendrie
50 Bellport Lane
Bellport, NY 11713

Mr. R. Douglass
Baltimore Gas & Electric
8013 Ft. Smallwood Road
Baltimore, MD 21226

Mr. M.K. Yates, Project Manager
Ebasco Services, Inc.
Two World Trade Center, 80th
New York, NY 10048

Mr. R. Christesen, President
Ebasco Services, Inc.
Two World Trade Center
New York, NY 10048

SUPPLEMENT TO RESPONSE TO CONCERN NO. 2

SUBMITTED AUGUST 10, 1984

DISCUSSION:

In preparation for the reinspection of N1 instrument lines conducted in response to Issue No. 1 (Inspection Personnel Issues), an inconsistency was identified between the Instrument List and a Mercury isometric drawing. A review was therefore conducted consisting of a cross-check between the Instrument List and the Mercury isometric drawings for all N1 instrument lines, and a review of Design Change Notices (DCNs) posted against either the Instrument List or the Isometric Drawings pertaining to the classification of N1 instruments. As a result of the review, the following revisions and additions to the response to Concern No. 2 submitted on August 10, 1984 (W3B84-0467) have been identified.

- ° 10 additional N1 instruments installed prior to April 7, 1982 were identified (for a total of 202 instead of 192).
- ° Of the 10 additional N1 instruments identified, eight are cabinet mounted (for a total of 110 instead of 102) and two are locally mounted.
- ° The eight additional cabinet mounted N1 instruments identified underwent QAIRG review and full documentation is available.
- ° Four cabinet mounted and the two additional locally mounted N1 instruments identified were installed with ASME III/ANSI B31.1 class breaks, and will be reworked to ASME Code requirements.

There is no change to the previously stated Cause, Generic Implications and Safety Significance.

CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN/SCHEDULE:

The 12 N1 instrument installations noted in the original response plus the six additional N1 instrument (four cabinet mounted/two locally mounted) will be reworked to ASME Code requirements before fuel load.