

SSER

Task: Allegation A-13, A-14, A-15, A-16, A-17

Reference No.: 4-83-A-74-1, -2, -3, -4, -5

Characterization: It is alleged that seismic supports for cable trays had documentation deficiencies identified by Ebasco Quality Assurance Installation Review Group (QAIRG) which were not being addressed.

Assessment of Allegation: The implied significance of the five separate allegations in this area is that lack of corrective action on identified deficiencies could cause the quality of installation to be questionable.

These five allegations involved specific problems with documentation of cable tray supports. The NRC staff evaluated each of the allegations for adequacy of documentation; and the staff inspected each installed support.

LP&L had responded to each of the allegations in two submittals to the NRC Senior Resident Inspector (SRI). Their responses explained why they did not consider some of the allegations to be a problem, or if problems were evident, what corrective actions they were taking. The NRC staff reviewed LP&L's responses and considered them to be adequate.

In assessing these allegations, the NRC staff verified that the documentation for each support matched each installed support inspected by the staff. The following is an itemized explanation of each allegation:

Allegation A-13 involved defaced documents and inaccurate references to design documentation. The allegation was brought to the attention of the NRC staff on October 7, 1983; however, on September 15, 1983, Ebasco NCR W3-6938 had been issued to document these concerns. Ebasco had reinspected the supports on October 12, 1983, and had closed the NCR on October 28, 1983. The NRC staff reviewed the documentation and inspected the supports, and determined that this nonconformance had been properly resolved.

Allegation A-14 was related to a support which contained three 3/8" concrete anchors instead of only two as indicated on the inspection documentation. LP&L agreed that a question existed, and they reinspected the hanger. Their reinspection revealed no deficiencies (Daily Surveillance Report W3-NY-12 TK-7, February 28, 1984). The NRC staff reviewed the reinspection records, performed a field inspection of the support, and determined that this problem had been properly corrected.

Allegation A-15 involved a question of whether a support had been deleted, replaced, or remained, due to "confusing" information on inspection documentation. The NRC staff reviewed the subject documentation, performed field inspections, and determined that the support had been deleted and was replaced by a new support. The new support was inspected by the NRC staff and was found acceptable.

Allegation A-16 involved a missing concrete anchor inspection form in the documentation package for support 32J13. Ebasco had issued NCR W3-7310 on October 19, 1983, to document this deficiency. The NRC staff reviewed the closure of this NCR and found that it had been properly dispositioned and closed. X

Allegation A-17 involved a question as to whether support 22E40 still existed in the field, due to a "confusing" hanger identification number in the documentation package (22E40/C100), and involved a concrete anchor inspection report which referenced this support, although the support contained no concrete anchors. The NRC staff review of this allegation revealed the following:

- o The "C100" in the hanger identification number was the batch number of the paint used to coat the support. The staff determined that no conflict in hanger identification existed.
- o The anchor inspection report in question (303-87-87) had been revised on October 10, 1983, to indicate that the correct support identification number was 24E40, not 22E40. This correction of the report was considered appropriate. In addition, support 24E40 had since been deleted; therefore inspection report 303-87-87 no longer pertained to any existing installation and was removed from the records vault. The NRC staff considered this action to be appropriate. X

The NRC staff determined that Ebasco QAIRG adequately addressed and corrected seismic support documentation deficiencies. These allegations had neither safety significance nor generic implications.

Potential Violations: None. 4

Actions Required: None.

References

1. Letter from L. L. Bass (LP&L) to L. Constable (NRC-SRI) dated February 15, 1984.
2. Letter from L. L. Bass (LP&L) to L. Constable (NRC-SRI) dated March 2, 1984.
3. NCR W3-6938
4. LP&L Surveillance Report W3-NY-12 TK-7 dated February 28, 1984.
5. NCR W3-7310

~~11-13, 14, 15, 16, 17~~

Statement Prepared By:

Date Thatcher

                      
Date

William Marini

                      
Date

Reviewed By:

Team Leader

                      
Date

Reviewed By:

Site Team Leader(s)

                      
Date

Approved By:

Task Management

                      
Date