

12 JAN 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR: C. E. Rossi, Director
Division of Operational Events Assessment

FROM: W. F. Kane, Director
Division of Reactor Projects, Region I

SUBJECT: EVENTS CONSIDERED FOR INFORMATION NOTICES

Enclosed are two Licensee Event Reports (LERs) from Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation describing recent events at Unit 2 (in the power ascension testing phase) that should be considered for Information Notices. Although these two events could have been prevented by licensee personnel and neither resulted in a major safety concern, there are generic implications that may be of value to other licensees.

Original Signed By:

William F. Kane, Director
Division of Reactor Projects

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/o enclosures:

C. Berlinger

B. Boger

R. Capra

M. Haughey

J014

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

EVENTS CONSIDERED FOR IN - 0001.0.0
12/23/87

9102060113 901011
PDR FOIA
PERSON PDR

50-410.
file

TELEPHONE REPORT

DATE 11/6/81 TIME 4:50 PM
FACILITY NINE MILE POINT #2 DOCKET NO. 50-410
LICENSEE'S OCCURRENCE IDENTIFICATION NO. (IF ANY) N/A
BRIEF SUBJECT: POWER STRUT 10CFR21 REPORT

DESCRIPTION OF OCCURENCE, DEFICIENCY OR INCIDENT:

MR. LAURANCE MEYERS, Quality Manager 216-372-1711
Power Strut Div., Van Huffer Tube Corp. X112
P.O. Box 1540, Warren, Ohio 44482

REPORTS POTENTIAL 10CFR21 REPORT ON
PS-9227-1/2-RS-STRUT NUTS

WHICH ARE FOUND TO SLIP IN ENCLOSING
SUPPORT CHANNEL AT LOW SLIP LOADS. A
SMALL LOT PROBLEM DUE TO SHALLOW TEETH,
THE LATER DESIGNED TO GRIP CHANNEL AND
PREVENT EARLY SLIP. PROBLEM IDENTIFIED ^{ON 11/5/81} BY
STEVE SWANSON (RIVERBOND NUC. STATION) WHILE
SLIP TESTING. PARTS USED AT

- ① RIVER BOND NUC STATION
- ② WAPS 134
- ③ NMP 2 (NOW CLASS 2 OR 2)

NOTIFICATION SENT TO SPW RIVERBOND, CHERRY HILL AND
BOSTON; WASHINGTON STATE POWER; IE HQ AND R.I. THE
RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL IS JAMES E. POSS, V.P. POWER STRUT DIV.

NOTIFICATION RECEIVED BY T. MARTIN, R.I

RO:I Form 50
June 74

CC: H. KISTER, R.I
G. MAOSEN, R.IV
D. STERNBERG, R.IV

JH/1

81-43
50-410

TO Unit 2 Licensing File

DISTRICT Syracuse

DATE December 29, 1981 FILE CODE

SUBJECT Notes of Telecon with NRC Regarding
Reporting of 50.55(e) deficiencies and
NRC Personnel Access to Unit 2

81-45

QUALITY ASSURANCE
DEPARTMENT - NRP-2

On Tuesday, December 15, 1981, I talked with the NRC's Mr. Harry Kister regarding the reporting of 10 CFR 50.55(e) deficiencies.

I indicated to Mr. Kister that I was following up on our previous conversation regarding the reporting of 50.55(e)'s. Mr. Kister indicated that NRC's policy on reporting 50.55(e) deficiencies was similar to the reporting of LER's by operating plants. He indicated that the 24 hour notification applies to working days, that is, if we received information of a reportable condition on Friday at 4:00, it is acceptable to report the condition on Monday if we were not able to get all of the information together to report to the NRC before the close of business on Friday.

I also asked Mr. Kister when the 24 hours required by the 50.55(e) starts. I said it has been Niagara Mohawk's interpretation that the 24 hour period begins when the evaluation is completed and the condition is determined reportable. I said Niagara Mohawk's procedure allows five days for Stone & Webster (our A/E) to evaluate. However, this is only the first reviewer as there are two more reviewers within Stone & Webster. Niagara Mohawk then has five days to evaluate the first reviewer's evaluation and at the end of this period, the other two Stone & Webster reviewers have also completed their review and made their determination.

I indicated to Mr. Kister that regarding the specific 50.55(e) deficiency on Power Strut, I had received the information from Stone & Webster with the first reviewer's determination that it was reportable. I agreed with this determination, but I wanted to discuss it with the Unit 2 Manager Project Engineering who was out of the office until the following Monday. I indicated that I was going to wait until Monday because a) 24 hours from when I was informed of the condition was into our Thanksgiving holiday (the next working day for Niagara Mohawk was Monday, November 30); b) Our evaluation was not complete, and by procedure we had five days to complete our internal evaluation.

I said my intent was not to withhold information from the NRC, but I just wanted to discuss it with the MPE. Mr. Kister said he understood and although we were legally and technically in compliance, if the condition is reported as a Part 21 and the material is supplied to your plant, there is no further evaluation required (i.e., it has already been evaluated by whoever reported it as a Part 21).

Mr. Kister indicated that if we were notified of the condition at 4:00 p.m., he would understand if we didn't report it until Monday, but if we were informed of the condition in the morning, they wanted it reported that day and cancel it on Monday if need be.

JR/2

I also talked to Mr. Kister about an MRC letter dated November 27, 1981 regarding NRC personnel access to our facility. I indicated that the letter referred to NRC personnel obtaining picture badges as authorized by 10 CFR 73.21. I indicated that Unit 2 had only normal construction security. Mr. Kister indicated that this letter should not have been sent to plants under construction. I indicated that I could write a letter responding to their letter clarifying this. Mr. Kister said that wouldn't be necessary, and that he would take care of it. I said for his information for NRC inspectors to receive unescorted access in the same manner as a permanent non-employee, the inspector should inform his Niagara Mohawk contact the next time he is on site. They would process a request for a picture badge and escort him to the time alley where he could have his picture taken. They would receive a five to ten minute orientation on the use of cards and evacuation signals. The cards would also have instructions on them for the various signals.

PEF:ja

xc: S. W. Wilczek, Jr./P. A. Mazzaferro
C. V. Mangan
C. D. Terry
S. F. Manno
G. K. Rhode