## DUKE POWER COMPANY

P.O. BOX 33189 CHARLOTTE, N.C. 28242

HAL B. TUGKER VICE PRESIDENT NUCLEAR PRODUCTION

January 26, 1984

TELEPHONE (704) 373-4531

TEI

Mr. James P. O'Reilly, Regional Administrator
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region II
101 Marietta Street, NW, Suite 2900
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Subject: Oconee Nuclear Station Docket No. 50-270

Dear Sir:

R

I declare under penalty of perjury that the statements set forth herein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, executed on January 26, 1984.

Very truly yours,

a B. Juler

Hal B. Tucker

PFG/php

Attachment

cc: Mr. J. C. Bryant NRC Resident Inspector Oconee Nuclear Station

> Mr. John F. Suermann Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D. C. 20555

#### Item 2

Threaded fasteners of closure connections, identified in the scope c bulletin, when opened for component inspection or maintenance shall be removed, cleaned, and inspected per IWA-2210 and IWA-2220 of ASME Code Section XI (1974 edition or later) before being reused.

### Response

The components that were removed for inspection or maintenance during Unit 2's latest refueling outage included the following:

- 1) Once Through Steam Generator (OTSG) upper and lower manways
- 2) Reactor Coolant Pump (RCP) main flange bolting on all four RCPs

#### Item 4

A written report signed under cath or affirmation under provisions of Section 182a, Atomic Energy Act of 1954 as amended, shall be submitted to the Regional Administrator of the appropriate NRC Regional Office within 60 days following the completion of the outage during which Action Item 2 was performed. The report is to include:

- a. A statement that Action Item 1 has been completed.
- b. Identification of the specific connections examined as required by Action Item 2.
- c. The results of the examinations performed on the threaded fasteners as required by Action Item 2. If no degradation was observed for a particular connection, a statement to that effect, identification of the connection, and whether the fasteners were examined in place or removed is all that is required. If degradation was observed, the report should provide detailed information.

#### Response

4

#### Sub-Item a

As was discussed in our November 15, 1982 submittal, the procedures as discussed in the bulletin have been completed and these along with a training program are on file.

#### Sub-Item b

Same as was listed in Item 2, plus the Control Rod Drive Mechanism (CRDM) bolting.

# Sub-Itea c

1

:

7

The method and results of the examination of the components listed in Sub-Item b are as follow:

.

xi

.

.

Component	Inspection Method	Inspection Results
<ol> <li>OTSG "A" upper manway bolting</li> </ol>	Visual	No degradation was observed. All studs were replaced with new studs due to redesign of fastener.
<ol> <li>OTSG "A" lower manway bolting</li> </ol>	∀isual	No degradation was observed. All studs were replaced with new studs due to redesign of fastener.
<ol> <li>OTSG "B" upper manway bolting</li> </ol>	Visual	No degradation was observed. All studs were replaced with new studs due to redesign of fastener.
<ol> <li>OTSG "B" lower manway bolting</li> </ol>	Visual	No degradation was observed. All studs were replaced with new studs due to redesign of fastener.
5. RCP main flange bolting, all four RCPs	Ultrasonic testing, Visual Dimensional	Two studs on RCP 2Bl were replaced due to unacceptable corrosion/erosion wastage. No rejectable indications were found on the remaining bolts. All studs on 2A2 RCP were replaced with new studs due to material change.
6. CRDMs	Visual (in place)	No leakage through the flange was observed.