



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

January 25, 1983

The Honorable Leon E. Panetta
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Panetta:

This is in response to your November 19, 1982 letter to me expressing your concern regarding the Raychem-Flamtrol issue and requesting that you be kept informed of the actions being taken by the Commission to resolve this matter. In this regard, your letter highlights three points made in our August 23, 1982 letter to Congressman Udall. The first point: We can no longer conclude that the suspect cable has been demonstrated to meet all requirements. The second: We would be notifying the affected utilities of our new position. The third: Those using the suspect cable in systems important to safety will be required to demonstrate its qualification for its intended function.

Subsequent to our August 23, 1982 letter to Congressman Udall, the staff has taken several actions to resolve the Flamtrol issue, the more relevant of which are enumerated below. As a result of these actions, it appears that the Flamtrol issue only involves Carolina Power and Light Company (CP&L) and its Brunswick facility.

1. Raychem's records were examined to determine who purchased the suspect cable. The records maintained by Raychem cross-reference each product sold by user and end product. As a result of this examination, it was determined that the suspect cable was sold only to the following utilities: Washington Public Power Supply System, Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, Florida Power and Light Company, and CP&L.
2. Each utility listed above was contacted by telephone to determine if the suspect cable was being used in safety-related applications. During the course of these calls, only CP&L, the Brunswick licensee, indicated that they used the suspect cable in safety-related applications. Subsequent to the oral responses, we issued letters to the three other utilities requesting written confirmation regarding the use or disposition of the suspect cable.
3. On November 30, 1982, the staff met with CP&L to inform them that they would have to demonstrate the cable's ability to perform its intended functions at Brunswick in accordance with the applicable requirements of industry standards IEEE 323 and IEEE 383. (Minutes of our November 30, 1982 meeting are contained in Enclosure 1).

As stated in our August 23, 1982 letter, this matter is being resolved under the auspices of our equipment qualification program. Under the requirements of this program, CP&L must demonstrate that the suspect cable is qualified for use in safety-related applications at its Brunswick plant by the end of the second refueling outage after March 31, 1982 or by March 31, 1985, whichever is earlier.

Our Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation issued a Safety Evaluation Report (SER) (Enclosure 2) to CP&L on December 20, 1982 addressing the environmental qualification of safety-related electrical equipment for Brunswick Units 1 & 2. A Technical Evaluation Report (TER) prepared by our contractor, Franklin Research Center (FRC), for each Unit is attached to the SER. These TERs indicate that qualification of the suspect cable has not been established. An excerpt from the Brunswick Unit 1 TER describing FRC's evaluation of this cable is included as Enclosure 3. By letter dated December 23, 1982 (Enclosure 4) we also formally sent CP&L a copy of reports, prepared by FRC, that provide the results of their investigation of the environmental qualification of Raychem cable installed in the Brunswick plants.

By letter dated December 31, 1982, (Enclosure 5) CP&L submitted justification for continued operation of the Brunswick plants pending demonstrated qualification of the subject cable. Both we and FRC have reviewed this justification and have concluded that CP&L has provided an adequate technical basis to support continued operation. CP&L has already committed to perform qualification testing of the suspect cable and to provide periodic updates on the progress of the test program.

Based on the above, we believe this issue is being resolved in an acceptable manner and we will henceforth handle it as part of the overall electrical equipment environmental qualification review we are conducting for all operating plants.

We appreciate your interest in this matter. If you have any further questions please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,



Nunzio J. Palladino

Enclosures:

1. Minutes of the 11/30/82 Meeting
2. Brunswick Units 1 and 2 SER
3. Excerpt from Brunswick Unit 1 TER
4. December 23, 1982 Letter to CP&L
5. December 31, 1982 Letter from CP&L