

DUKE POWER COMPANY
USNRC POWER BUILDING
422 SOUTH CHURCH STREET, CHARLOTTE, N. C. 28242

WILLIAM O. PARKER, JR.
VICE PRESIDENT
STEAM PRODUCTION

19 AUG 20 All: 29
August 15, 1979

TELEPHONE: AREA 704
373-4083

Mr. James P. O'Reilly, Director
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region II
101 Marietta Street, Suite 3100
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Re: RII:WPA
50-269/79-17
40-287/79-16

Dear Sir:

With regard to Mr. C. E. Murphy's letter of July 24, 1979 which transmitted IE Inspection Report 50-269/79-17, -287/79-16, Duke Power Company does not consider the report to be proprietary.

Please find attached our response to the cited items of noncompliance.

Very truly yours,

William O. Parker Jr
William O. Parker, Jr.

KRW:scs
Attachment

1394 226

7911260

153
790437
OFFICIAL COPY

DUKE POWER COMPANY
OCONEE NUCLEAR STATION

Response to IE Inspection Report
50-269/79-17, 50-287/79-16

INFRACTION

As required by 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion V, and as implemented by DPC Topical Report 1A Section 17.2.5 and Oconee Technical Specification Section 6.4.1, activities affecting quality shall be prescribed by documented instructions, procedures or drawings ... and shall be accomplished in accordance with these instructions, procedures or drawings.

1. DPC Oconee Procedure MP/O/A/3018/51 paragraph 11.2.5 requires that bolts with less than minimum thread engagement (3/8" for 1/2" diameter bolts) must be replaced.

Contrary to the above, 1/2" diameter bolts for pipe supports 51A-H102 and 51A-H50G did not have minimum 3/8" thread engagement after repairs and were not replaced.

Response

Procedure MP/O/A/3018/51 was used for test and inspection of self drilling concrete expansion anchors with regard to the two referenced pipe supports. The cited paragraph (11.2.5) indeed requires replacement of bolts with less than the required thread engagement. However initial inspection of the supports in question verified adequate thread engagement, as required. Subsequent to the inspection it was determined that repairs were needed for the holes in the support which was accomplished by adding 1/4" washers to the support. This, of course, resulted in a commensurate reduction in thread engagement. At this point in time, prior to final QC inspection of the repaired support, the inspector noted the inadequacy of the thread engagement. At the time of the final QC inspection it was noted by our inspectors that this situation existed and would require the installation of longer anchor bolts. Further it was determined that, as a preventive measure, procedure MP/O/A/3018/54, Pipe Support Corrective Maintenance, would be modified to require reverification of thread engagement following repairs. It is considered that an item of noncompliance did not occur in this instance.

2. Sketch H-47G issued for repair of support 51A-O-1479E-H-47G showed two base plates that were not welded together. Contrary to the above, the two base plates were welded together.

Response

This item appears to imply, that on "...activity effecting quality..." was carried at contrary to a sketch provided to direct such activity (e.g., the repair of support 51A-O-1479H-H-47G). However, the contradiction was as a result in an error in the drawing rather than as a result of inappropriate activities. That is, sketch H-47G did not, apparently, reflect the "as-built" status of the support. The, support, "as built", was welded together. The welding occurred prior to the repair efforts, apparently during initial construction or subsequent modifications. This is simply another example of the type of situation which have given rise to the issuance and the resultant efforts toward the resolution of IE Bulletin 79-14. It is considered that an item of noncompliance did not occur in this instance.