C-E Power Systems
Combustion Engineering, Inc.
1000 Prospect Hill Road
Windsor, Connecticut 06095

Tel. 203/688-1911
Telex 9-9237

POWER SYSTEMS

July 8, 1981
Docket No. 99900002/81-02
Program No. 51500
CENPM No. 81-009

Mr. Uldis Potapovs
Chief, Vendor Inspection Branch
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission Region IV
611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 1000
Arlington, Texas 76012

Dear Mr. Potapovs:

This is in reply to your letter of June 11, 1981 regarding NRC inspection of our Nuclear Power Systems Manufacturing Quality Assurance activities in Windsor, Connecticut.

The requested corrective actions, preventive measures, and related completion dates regarding the items listed in the Notice of Nonconformance enclosure of your memo are given in the attachment hereto.

We have reviewed your letter and the attached report and do not find any information of a proprietary nature.

Very truly yours,

COMBUSTION ENGINEERING, INC.
POWER SYSTEMS GROUP

H. V. Lichtenberger
Vice President-Manufacturing

HVL/sam
Attachment

Attachment
Docket No. 99900002/81-02
Program No. 51500
CENPM No. NQA 81-009

RESPONSE REGARDING NOTICE OF NONCONFORMANCE

1. Nonconformances

1.1 Corrective Action

A) The current revision was issued to the floor and obsolete copies (see Paragraph 1.2 below) were destroyed. Revisions four through six added repairs not covered by revision three. Instructions for repairs not covered by revision three were accomplished in accordance with hand written instructions on the standard deviation notice form.

B) A review of the records indicates that although conditions were not specifically classified, significant conditions adverse to quality were investigated for cause, corrective action was taken, and the deficient areas reaudited.

C) Although literally not defined, the intent of Paragraph 13.6.8.1 was to summarize the DN's so that the summary could be reviewed for significant conditions adverse to quality. The report is prepared by the Engineering Staff and significant conditions are summarized.

1.2 Preventive Measures

A) Investigation of the incident revealed that the documents in question were never issued as controlled documents and therefore the old revisions did not require return to Central Document Control (CDC). The documents in question were clearly stamped "For Information Only" and such designation is permitted by the Quality Assurance Manual. Use of documents in this classification during fabrication is not permitted. Instructions in the documents noted by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Inspector were being used to repair production components. The proper use of informational documents will be stressed to shop supervision.

B) Findings and recommendations will be specifically identified in future audit reports.

C) The Quality Assurance Manual will be revised to reflect current practice.

1.3 Preventive Measure Completion Dates

A) A memorandum detailing the use of informational documents was transmitted to shop supervision on July 8, 1981.

B) Classification of audit conditions (findings vs recommendations) has already been implemented.

C) The Quality Assurance Manual will be revised by the end of December 1981.