

ACCELERATED DISTRIBUTION DEMONSTRATION SYSTEM

REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR: 8812150198 DOC. DATE: 88/12/07 NOTARIZED: NO DOCKET #
 FACIL: 50-269 Oconee Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Duke Power Co. 05000269
 50-270 Oconee Nuclear Station, Unit 2, Duke Power Co. 05000270
 50-287 Oconee Nuclear Station, Unit 3, Duke Power Co. 05000287

AUTH. NAME AUTHOR AFFILIATION
 GIBSON, A.F. Region 2, Ofc of the Director
 RECIP. NAME RECIPIENT AFFILIATION
 TUCKER, H.B. Duke Power Co.

SUBJECT: Requests resubmittal of response to violations noted in Insp
 Repts 50-269/88-13, 50-270/88-13 & 50-287/88-13.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: IE01D COPIES RECEIVED: LTR 1 ENCL 1 SIZE: 4
 TITLE: General (50 Dkt)-Insp Rept/Notice of Violation Response

NOTES:

	RECIPIENT		COPIES		RECIPIENT		COPIES	
	ID CODE/NAME		LTR	ENCL	ID CODE/NAME	LTR	ENCL	
	PD2-3 PD		1	1	PASTIS, H	1	1	
INTERNAL:	ACRS		2	2	AEOD	1	1	
	DEDRO		1	1	NRR MORISSEAU, D	1	1	
	NRR/DLPQ/PEB 11		1	1	NRR/DLPQ/QAB 10	1	1	
	NRR/DOEA DIR 11		1	1	NRR/DREP/EPB 10	1	1	
	NRR/DREP/RPB 10		2	2	NRR/DRIS DIR 9A	1	1	
	NRR/PMAS/ILRB12		1	1	NUDOCS-ABSTRACT	1	1	
	OE LIEBERMAN, J		1	1	OGC/HDS2	1	1	
	REG FILE 02		1	1	RGN2 FILE 01	1	1	
EXTERNAL:	LPDR		1	1	NRC PDR	1	1	
	NSIC		1	1	RESL MARTIN, D	1	1	

NOTE TO ALL "RIDS" RECIPIENTS:

PLEASE HELP US TO REDUCE WASTE! CONTACT THE DOCUMENT CONTROL DESK,
 ROOM P1-37 (EXT. 20079) TO ELIMINATE YOUR NAME FROM DISTRIBUTION
 LISTS FOR DOCUMENTS YOU DON'T NEED!

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTR 24 ENCL 24

R
I
D
S
/
A
D
S

R
I
D
S
/
A
D
S

Official

December 7, 1988

Docket Nos. 50-269, 50-270, 50-287
License Nos. DPR-38, DPR-47, DPR-55

Duke Power Company
ATTN: Mr. H. B. Tucker, Vice President
Nuclear Production Department
422 South Church Street
Charlotte, NC 28242

Gentlemen:

SUBJECT: INSPECTION REPORT NOS. 50-269/88-13, 50-270/88-13, AND 50-287/88-13

Your response of September 2, 1988, to our Notice of Violation issued on August 3, 1988, concerning activities conducted at your Oconee facility partially denied Violations C and E. Our letter dated September 16, 1988, stated that we were evaluating your response.

We have examined your response to Violation E.2 and have concluded, for reasons presented in the enclosure to this letter, that the violation occurred as stated in the Notice of Violations. Therefore, in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 2.201, and within 30 days of the date of this letter, please resubmit your response to the Notice.

We have examined your response to Violation C and have concluded, based on the additional information provided, that this issue has been clarified for valves LPSW-772, LPSW-773, and LPSW-774, and our records will be modified accordingly.

We have examined your response to Violation C regarding valve HP-98 and found that it meets the requirements of 10 CFR 2.201. We will examine the implementation of your corrective actions during future inspections.

We have examined your response to Violations A, B, D, and E.1 and found that it meets the requirements of 10 CFR 2.201. We will examine the implementation of your corrective actions during future inspections.

With regard to our observations concerning control room demeanor we agree that this is a very important subject. Because we consider it so important we felt it was appropriate to raise the issue with you even though it represented an isolated incident which did not directly effect the operator at the controls.

8812150198 881207
PIR ADOCK 05000269
Q PDC

JEOL

Should you have any questions concerning this letter, we would be happy to meet with you and discuss the matter further.

Sincerely,

(Original signed by E. W. Merschhoff for)

Albert F. Gibson, Director
Division of Reactor Safety

Enclosure:
Staff Evaluation of Licensee Response

cc w/encl:
✓ M. S. Tuckman, Station Manager
State of South Carolina

bcc w/encl:
✓ NRC Resident Inspector
DRS Technical Assistant
✓ H. Pastis, NRR
Document Control Desk

RII
car
TCooper:vcw
11/7/88
12

RII
6/16
GABelisle
11/7/88
12

RII
[Signature]
CJulian
11/1/88
12/7/88

RII
TAPeables
11/7/88
12

RII
VLBrownlee
11-7/88
12

RII
[Signature]
LPeys
12/7/88

RII
[Signature]
AFGibson
For 12/7/88

ENCLOSURE

STAFF EVALUATION OF LICENSEE RESPONSE DATED SEPTEMBER 2, 1988

Violation E.2.

The violation is valid as stated.

The Duke Power Company Nuclear Station Modification Manual (NSMM), Appendix E, Section 7.0 states:

Any proposed change to a structure, system, or component should be subjected to a 10 CFR 50.59 Applicability Screening to determine whether a 10 CFR 50.59 Evaluation needs to be performed.

This implies that for those changes where the screen determines that no Unreviewed Safety Question (USQ) evaluation is required, the 10 CFR 50.59 evaluation is not being performed. All of the Exempt Changes in the first list determined that no USQ evaluation was required, nor was one performed. The statement in your response that one was performed for each of these Exempt Changes is not supported by the NSMM, which implies that the 10 CFR 50.59 Applicability Screening is not a 10 CFR 50.59 evaluation.

Inspection and Enforcement Manual Part 9800, 01/01/84, Section D.5 states:

Maintenance activities which do not result in a change to a system (Permanent or temporary), or which replace components with replacement parts procured to same (or equivalent) purchase specification, do not require a written safety evaluation to meet 10 CFR 50.59 requirements. However, if components described in the SAR are removed, or their function is altered, or if substitute components are utilized, or if changes remain following completion of a maintenance activity, a safety evaluation is required to meet the provisions of 10 CFR 50.59 and the change must be reported to the NRC as required by 10 CFR 50.59(b).

Even though it states on the evaluations that these were equivalent parts, there was no documentation to support this statement. The fact that Design Engineering approved the use of these valves does not make them equivalent parts. When asked to provide the analysis that proved equivalency, Design Engineering was unable to, stating that they had not been told to maintain the records.

As discussed in Section D.5 of I&EM 9800, there is a difference in a component ordered to the same (or equivalent) specifications and a substitute component. A substitute component is one ordered to a different specification that is acceptable for use in place of the original component.

Enclosure

2

Many of these valve replacements involved changes in valve type, pressure rating, size, weight, and materials. These components, even though they may be acceptable for use in lieu of the original component, are substitute components and therefore require a 10 CFR 50.59 evaluation, which must provide the basis for determining that the proposed change does not involve an unreviewed safety question. During the inspection, the licensee could not produce an engineering analysis sufficient to convince a reviewer that these valves possess the some characteristics as the originals.