mitigated by 25%. An Order for \$130,000 was issued on January 16, 1985 and the licensee paid the civil penalties on January 31, 1985.

Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company, Hartford, Connecticut (Haddam Neck Plant) EA 84-115, Supplement I

An Order Modifying License and Notice of Violation and Proposed Imposition of Civil Penalty in the amount of \$80,000 was issued on December 13, 1984 based on the failure of the reactor refueling cavity seal and the resultant draining of the reactor coolant water in the cavity to the containment floor. An Order was issued to ensure improvements in the design change modification program. The licensee responded and paid the civil penalty on January 28, 1985 1981 (1985) and 1985 of 1985 and 1985 of 1985 and 1985 of 1

Kansas Gas did Electric Company, Wischita, Kansas Company, Wischita, Kansas Company, Wischita, Kansas Company, Wischita, Kansas Company, Children Company, C

notice of Violation and Proposed Imposition of Civil Penalty in the amount of \$75,000 was issued on November 21, 1984 based on a significant breakdown in the licensee's program for the inspection and correction of defective safety-related structural steel welds.

The licensee responded on December 21 and 31, 1984, and included payment of the civil penalty in the latter response.

Nebraska Publica Power District, Columbus, Nebraska of po "(Cooper Nuclear Station)" EA 84-132, Supplement I

A Notice of Violation and Proposed Imposition of Civil Penalty in the amount of \$25,000 was issued on February 13, 1985 based on violations associated with inadequacies in the performance of surveillance tests of the unit batteries. The licensee responded and paid the civil penalty on March 14, 1985.

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company, Allentown, Pennsylvania (Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 2) EA 84-109, Supplement I

A Notice of Violation and Proposed Imposition of Civil Penalty in the amount of \$50,000 was issued on December 18, 1984 based on an event that involved a complete loss of all low-pressure emergency core cooling systems for approximately 43 minutes. The licensee responded and paid the civil penalty on January 17, 1985.

Tennessee Valley Authority, Chattanooga, Tennessee (Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 1, 2, and 3) EA 84-108, Supplement I

A Notice of Violation and Proposed Imposition of Civil Penalties in the amount of \$100,000 was issued on January 28, 1985 based on three violations which related to a core spray overpressurization event and other violations which collectively represent inadequate implementation of the licensee's quality assurance program. The licensee responded and paid the civil penalty on February 27, 1985.

he mostry the city i paratry for noe of the safoquards visitions was

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION IV

611 RYAN PLAZA DRIVE. SUITE 1000 ARLINGTON, TEXAS 75011

Docket: STN 50-482/84-22

EA 84-107 cht go beileacht en menore au Minne er

ed live notisiters (inter the NOV 2 1 284

Kansas Gas and Electric Company

ATTN: Glenn L. Koester Vice President - Nuclear P.O. Box 208

w managet appearance to company and a careful that and a sit is complete the graph of

Wichita, Kansas 567201 and the second of the

Gentlemen:

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF VIOLATION AND PROPOSED IMPOSITION OF CIVIL PENALTY

This refers to the inspection conducted by Mr. R. G. Taylor and other Region IV personnel during the period June 11 through September 28, 1984 of activities authorized by NRC Construction Permit CPPR-147 for the Wolf Creek Generating Station. The results of the inspection were discussed with Mr. F. J. Duddy and other members of your staff at the conclusion of the inspection and during an Enforcement Conference held on October 29, 1984 at the NRC Region IV office in Arlington, lexas with you and other members of the Kansas Gas and Electric staff and myself and other members of the Region IV staff.

Two violations were identified during this inspection. They are described in the enclosed Notice of Violation and Proposed Imposition of Civil Penalty. Violation I represents a significant breakdown in your program for the inspection and correction of defective safety-related structural steel welds. To emphasize the need for Kansas Gas and Electric Company management to ensure an effective quality assurance program has been implemented that both identifies and corrects construction deficiencies, I have been authorized, after consultation with the Deputy Director, Office of Inspection and Enforcement, to issue the enclosed Notice of Violation and Proposed Imposition of Civil Penalty in the amount of Seventy-five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000) for this violation. : The violation has been categorized as a Severity Level III violation in accordance with the NRC Enforcement Policy, 10 CFR Part 2, Appendix C, 49 FR 8583 (March 8, 1984). The base civil penalty for a Severity Level III violation is \$50,000. However, since you failed to take adequate corrective actions for the problems identified by Corrective Action Requests CAR No. 1-W-0029 (initiated on March 22, 1983) and CAR No. 1-W-0031 (issued August 16, 1983), the base civil penalty is being escalated by 50%. Violation II has been categorized as a Severity Level IV violation for which no civil penalty is proposed.

You are required to respond to the enclosed Notice of Violation and Proposed Imposition of Civil Penalty. In preparing your response you should follow the instructions specified in the Notice. Your reply to this letter and the results of future inspections will be considered in determining whether further enforcement action is warranted.

CERTIFIED MAIL RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.790, of the NRC's "Rules of Practice," Part 2, Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, a copy of this letter and the enclosures will be placed in the NRC's Publica Document Room.

The responses directed by this letter and the enclosed Notice are not subject to the clearance procedure of the Office of Management and Budget as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, PL 96-511. The company of the control of the co

The search of Arms and the South Committee of the supposed for the financial transfer.

ender and the company of the company

Original Signed Ey and Paul S. Checker for the feature of

the second of the part was the company of the second

The companies of the control of the

Robert D. Martin, Regional Administrator o is r**Region**HIV or some of a byte medicial end of

The second of th

Enclosure:

Notice of Violation and Proposed Imposition of Civil Penalty

CC: May Menclosure in the second of the seco

ATTN: gra Gene Rep. Rathbun, a Manager was such a war is a province as a second member and

of Licensing

P.O. Box 208

Wichita, Kansas-a 67201 soul of employer of Ex E of mester to the outsets of the second of the secon

Forrest Rhodes, Plant Superintendent Wolfineekt Generating Stations January 3 to 1960 1966 1978 40 1981 40 1981 P.O. Box 309 Burlington, Kansas 66839

NOTICE OF VIOLATION AND PROPOSED IMPOSITION OF CIVIL PENALTY

Kansas Gas and Electric Company Wolf Creek Generating Station

TABLE () SIRL LINE TO BE THE

Docket: 50-482/84-22

deficiency of stately

Permit: CPPR-147

THE PARTY OF THE P

EA 84-107

As a result of an NRC inspection conducted during the period of June 11, 1984, through September 28, 1984, two violations were identified one of which represents a significant breakdown in the licensee's program for the inspection and correction of defective safety-related structural steel welds. To emphasize the need for Kansas Gas and Electric Company management to ensure an effective quality inspection program has been implemented that both identifies and corrects construction deficiencies, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission proposes to impose a civil penalty in the amount of Seventy-five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000) for this violation.

In accordance with the NRC Enforcement Policy, 10 CFR Part 2, Appendix C, as revised, 49 FR 8583 (March 8, 1984), and pursuant to Section 234 of the Atomic Energy Action 1954, as amended (#Act"), 42 U.S.C. 2282, PL 96-295 and 10 CFR 2.205, the particular violations and the associated civil penalty is set forth sin Section I below:

I. <u>Civil Penalty Violation</u>

Criterion X of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix B, requires that a program for inspection of activities affecting quality be established and executed by or for the organization performing the activity to verify conformance with the documented instructions, procedures, and drawings for accomplishing ATT the activity.

Criterion XVI of Appendix B further requires that measures be established to assure that nonconformances are promptly identified and corrected.

Criterion XVII requires that sufficient records be maintained to furnish evidence of activities affecting quality.

Daniel International Corporation (DIC) Construction Procedure No. QCP-VII-200 describes the requirements for performance and inspection of safety-related structural steel welds with respect to committed conformance to the American Welding Society (AWS) D1.1.-75. Appendix I in Revision 4 of this procedure invokes a prohibition with respect to lack of fusion, overlap, slag, arc strikes, and weld splatter. Paragraph 6.5.1 of AWS D1.1-75 requires inspector verification that the size and length of welds conform to the drawing requirements and that no specified welds are omitted.

Contrary to the above, the inspection program for safety-related structural steel welds was not adequately executed to assure conformance to the requirements of Construction Procedure QCP-VII-200 Revision 4 and the AWS D1.1-75 Code nor were adequate records kept to document the quality of the welds. Furthermore, once deficient welds were identified, no actions were taken to correct the deficiencies. This inadequate inspection program and the failure to take corrective actions is evidenced by the following:

Priorite ::

- A random reinspection of 241 structural steel safety-related welds. which were made in accordance with Revision 4 of QCP-VII-200; was performed by DIC and documented in Corrective Action Report (CAR) No. 1-W-0029 dated March 22, 1983. Sixty-two percent of the inspected welds were found by the DIC inspectors to not conform to the requirements of Revision 4 of QCP-VII-200. The reported defects that resulted in rejection by the DIC inspectors included arc strikes, slag, lack of fusion, overlap, and weld splatter.
- 2. Another reinspection of a sample of structural members with the lowest design safety margins was initiated on September 14:1984. The results of the licensee reinspection activities (verified by NRC inspectors) as of September 28, 1984, were as follows:
 - A missing weld was found at the same location in each of six pressurizer support connections. In addition, five of 14 fillet welds in one pressurizer support connection were undersized by 1/8-inch to 1/4-inch with respect to the drawing-required size of 5/8-inch, and two of these welds were also under the required length; i.e. 3 3-inch and by the 5-inch lengths, respectively, versus a drawing-required length of 8 inches. The weld dimensions of the remaining five pressurizer support connections were not included in the NRC verification activity of the merce of coseta follow
- Reinspection of nine structural steel connections in the ∠b: auxiliary building identified two missing welds in one ာက်မှာ connection ေ In addition ့ weld size and alength discrepancies were identified in each of the nine connections: Of the total of 106 welds in the connections, eight were found to be undersized by 1/16=inch to 3/16=inch with respect to drawing-required width. Two of the undersized welds were also under the required length; i.e., 2-1/4-inch and 2-1/2-inch lengths, respectively, versus a drawing required length of 3 inches An additional in inches welds were also under the drawing-required dength-of-3 inches-by-1/2-45ch-to-1-inch. Examination of 54 weld returns in the nine connections found 26 to be undersized by 1/16-inch to 3/16-inch with respect to drawing required widths. One of the undersized weld returns was ு ்விக்கியாம்சு? the required length; ்பு சி. "2 inches versus a drawingrequired size of 3 inches. In addition, 36 weld returns exceeded the drawing-required maximum length of 5/8-inch by 1 5/8 inches to 3.5/8 inches. Ancadditional eight weld returns exceeded the drawing-required maximum length of 3/4-inch by 1/2-inch to 2 1/8 inches.
 - The absence of required Miscellaneous Structural Steel Weld Records (MSSWRs) for documenting welding and inspection of safety-related structural steel welded connections was identified by KG&E in CAR No. 1-C-0031. As a result of this identification, it has been established that approximately 16 percent of MSSWRs could not be located, which precludes positive verification of control of welding and performance

こくらりじょう デスティン

of required inspections. Approximately 80 percent of the MSSWRs applicable to the activities described in paragraph 2 above could not be located. Records were not available to indicate that an initial inspection was performed of either the pressurizer support connections or the auxiliary building structural connection which was identified to be missing two welds.

MSSWRs were located for certain welds in four structural connections which indicated acceptable welds. However, reinspection of these four connections showed one undersized weld in one connection and undersized and overlength weld returns in the four connections.

This is a Severity Level III Violation: (Supplement II.C)

To make a fina fit and (see and 15 but) to be the control of the

Criterion Voof 10 CFR 50 Appendix Barrequires that activities affecting quality shall be accomplished in accordance with appropriate instructions, procedures, and drawings, and that these instructions, procedures, and drawings appropriate quantitative acceptance criteria.

Bechtel Drawing E-1R8900, Revision 1, "Raceway Notes, Symbols and Details" states in paragraph 3.36.4 that:

"Mininum separation between different Class 1E conduit systems and minimum separation between Class 1E conduit systems and non 1E conduit systems shall be 1". Separation shall be measured between the outside edges of the conduit.

ີ່ອີດ ຄົກ bount sees ເກັດໂຮ້ ເປັດປ່ຽວອ່າກ່ຽວ ພາໄດ້ໄດ້ ເຄື່ອຈາງປີ Bechtel Drawing E-01013(q); Revision 11, requires the following:

- Paragraph 5:8:1:6:- "Within the control boards and other panels associated with protection systems, circuits and instruments of different separation groups shall be independent and physically separated horizontally and vertically by a distance of 6 inches".
- 2. Paragraph 5.8.3.3 "Non-safety related circuits shall be separated from Class 1E circuits by the same distances applicable to Class 1E circuits of different groups".

Contrary to the above the following activities affecting quality were not accomplished in accordance with appropriate drawings:

- 2: Albere were five areas, in the control panels and cabinets where seems are electrical cable separation was less than six inches.

This is a Severity Level IV Violation (Supplement II).

Notice of Violation

Pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR 2.201, Kansas Gas and Electric Company is hereby required to submit to the Deputy Director, Office of Inspection and Enforcement, USNRC, Washington, D.C. 2055, with a copy to this office, within 30 days of the date of this Notice, a written statement or explanation in reply, including for each alleged violation: (1) admission or denial of the alleged violation; (2) the reasons for the violation, if admitted; (3) the corrective steps that will be taken and the results achieved; (4) the corrective steps that will be taken to avoid further violations; and (5) the date when full compliance will be achieved. Consideration may be given to extending the response time for good cause shown. Under the authority of Section 182 of the Act, 42 U.S.C. 2232, this response shall be submitted under oath or affirmation.

Within the same time as provided for the response required above under 10 CFR 2.201, Kansas Gas and Electric Company may pay the civil penalty in the amount of \$75,000 or may protest imposition of the civil penalty inwhole or in part by a written answer and should Kansas Gas and Electric Company : fail to answer within the time specified, the Deputy Director, Office of Inspection and Enforcement, will issue an order imposing the civil penalty in the amount proposed above. Should Kansas Gas and Electric Company elect to file an answer in accordance with 10 CFR-2.205 protesting the civil penalty; such answer may: (1) deny the violations listed in the Notice in whole or in part; (2) demonstrate extenuating circumstances; (3) show error in this Notice; or (4) show other reasons why the penalty should not be imposed. In addition to protesting the civil penalty in whole or in partureuch answer may request ... fremission or mitigation of the penalty. In requesting mitigation of \pm the proposed penalty, the five factors contained in section V.B of 10 CFR Part 2, should be addressed. Any written answer in accordance with 10, CFR 2.205 should be set forth separately from the statement or explanation in reply pursuant to 10, CFR 2, 201, but may incorporate by specific reference (e.g., ociting page and). paragraph numbers) to avoid repetition. The attention of Kansas Gas and page Electric, Company is directed to the other, provisions of 10, CFR, 2::205 regarding the procedure for imposing a civil-penalty will be seened at the street armage.

Upon failure to pay any civil penalty due which has been subsequently determined in accordance with the applicable provisions of 10 CFR 2.205, this matter may be referred to the Attorney General, and the penalty, unless compromised, remitted, or mitigated, may be collected by civil action pursuant to Section 234c of the Act, 42 U.S.C. 2282.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Robert D. Martin Regional Administrator

Dated at Arlington, Texas this 2 May of November 1984

Dar Lh

. cartoG.M