



**Commonwealth Edison**  
One First National Plaza, Chicago, Illinois  
Address Reply to: Post Office Box 767  
Chicago, Illinois 60690

April 15, 1977

Mr. R. F. Heishman, Chief  
Reactor Construction and Engineering  
Support Branch - Region III  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
799 Roosevelt Road  
Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Subject: Braidwood Station Units 1 and 2  
Response to IE Inspection Report  
Nos. 50-456/77-01 and 50-457/77-01  
NRC Docket Nos. 50-456 and 50-457

Dear Mr. Heishman:

The following is in response to an inspection conducted by Messrs. C. C. Williams and K. R. Naidu of your office on January 25, 26, and 31, 1977, and the meeting held in the Region III office on January 20, 1977, of activities at Braidwood Station. Your inspection report letter dated March 17, 1977 indicated that certain activities appeared to be in noncompliance with NRC requirements. The Attachment to this letter addresses these items.

Please direct any further questions you might have to this office.

Very truly yours,

R. L. Bolger  
Assistant Vice President

Attachment

APR 15 1977

4006007765

AttachmentInfraction A:

Contrary to the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix B, Criterion V, and CECO QA Manual Quality Requirement QR-5.0, Rev. 5, and Quality Procedure 5-1, Rev. 2, the inspection and acceptance criteria of cadweld inspection procedure No. QC-CWI-1, Rev. 4, were not met relative to Unit 2 cadweld splice No. 4083. This #18 splice had been inspected and accepted although it did not meet the maximum cold allowances. (Paragraph 1.c.(2), Section I, Report Details)

Response

## 1) Corrective action taken and results achieved:

As was stated in the NRC report, the subject cadweld (#4083) was reinspected by a Pittsburgh Testing Laboratory supervisor and subsequently rejected, repaired, and reinspected.

## 2) Corrective action taken to avoid further noncompliance:

The cadweld inspector was reinstructed in cadweld inspection; all type B cadweld splices made previously were reinspected; and the Pittsburgh Testing Lab Quality Assurance auditor has increased his cadweld audit frequency.

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

Full compliance has been achieved, as of April 1, 1977.

Infraction B:

Contrary to the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix B, Criterion X and CECO QA Manual Quality Requirement QR-10, paragraph 10.7, the program for inspection of activities affecting quality was not adequately established or executed regarding rebar placement for pour 1S-24 as identified by RIII inspector on January 25, 1977 of several instances of improper spacing and positioning of rebar after completion of preplacement inspections by the contractors. (Paragraph 2.c.(1), Section II, Report Details)

1) Corrective action taken and results achieved:

The rebar tails were repositioned and the spacing violations were corrected immediately. Napoleon Steel Contractors have revised their inspection checklist to include acceptance criteria.

2) Corrective action taken to avoid further noncompliance:

The Gust K. Newberg pour sign-off sheet has been revised and all contractors have been reinstructed in its use. Napoleon Steel Contractors will reinstruct their Quality Control and Production personnel in acceptance criteria.

3) Date when full compliance will be achieved:

Full compliance has been achieved, as of April 15, 1977.