



LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY

175 EAST OLD COUNTRY ROAD • HICKSVILLE, NEW YORK 11801

MILLARD S. POLLOCK
VICE PRESIDENT - NUCLEAR

April 25, 1984

SNRC-1042

Mr. Richard Starostecki, Director
Division of Project and Resident Programs
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission-Region I
631 Park Avenue
King of Prussia, PA 19406

NRC Inspection of August 9-11, 1983
Shoreham Nuclear Power Station - Unit 1
Report No. 50-322/83-26

Dear Mr. Starostecki:

During a recent inspection conducted here at the Shoreham Nuclear Power Station by several members of your staff, a typographical error was discovered in our response to the violation contained in your inspection report 50-322/83-26. The amended page is attached and a bar in the right hand margin indicates our correction. As you can see, the studs installed were manufactured using alloy A193 GR B7 not A1 93 GR 97 as previously stated.

It is our understanding from discussions with the inspector who brought this typographical error to our attention, that the actions we took as described in our letter SNRC-969 dated September 30, 1983, were sufficient to close this violation. We look forward to reviewing that in Region I's forthcoming inspection report 50-322/84-14.

Very truly yours,

M. S. Pollock
Vice President-Nuclear

MSP:lb

Attachments

cc: C. Petrone, I&E Resident Inspector

8405220350 840516
PDR ADOCK 05000322
PDR
Q

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF NEW YORK)
: ss: SHOREHAM
COUNTY OF SUFFOLK)

MILLARD S. POLLOCK, being dully sworn, deposes and says that I am a Vice President of Long Island Lighting Company, the owner of the Shoreham Nuclear Power Station. I am authorized on the part of said Company to sign and file with U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission the foregoing response to the Notice of Violation contained in Inspection Report No. 50-322/83-26; the response was prepared under my supervision and direction; and the statements contained therein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Millard S. Pollock

Millard S. Pollock

Sworn to before me this
26 day of April 1984

Connie Maria Pardo

CONNIE-MARIA PARDO
NOTARY PUBLIC, State of New York
No. 52-46158-10
Qualified in Suffolk County
Commission Expires March 30, 1985

Attachment 2

RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF VIOLATION

Violation

10CFR50, Appendix B, Criterion X, and Shoreham FSAR Section 17.1.10A require that inspections verify conformance of completed construction activities to documented instructions, procedures, and drawings.

Contrary to the above, as of August 11, 1983 documentation recording final Quality Control bolt torquing inspections of hanger 1P41-PSR-5332 was not consistent with hanger as-built condition, in that the inspection record indicated bolts and nuts were torqued whereas the actual installation utilized studs and nuts.

Response

(1) Corrective steps taken and results achieved:

The condition details of support 1P41-PSR-5332 are identified on LILCO Deficiency Report (LDR) #1559. LILCO performed a reinspection of this support to determine if the actual installation meets all the existing site requirements. The results of this reinspection revealed that although the FQC inspection report references bolts instead of studs, all conditions of installation including the use of studs are in conformance with approved installation requirements.

The studs installed were verified to have been manufactured using alloy A193 GR B7 which is an approved stud material. The nuts utilized were confirmed to be ANCO nuts, also site approved for this installation. In addition, the torque requirements were verified to be within limits specified for this installation. Based upon the material confirmation and torque verification required by LDR # 1559, no further corrective action is required for this support.

(2) Corrective steps taken to prevent recurrence of similar violations:

The Verification Program instituted by LILCO and implemented by our Field Quality Assurance Division as described in section 4.a of I&E Inspection Report 50-322/83-13 provides us with reasonable assurance that, among other things, the actual installation of hangers is in accordance with the design documents. To provide further assurance, a sample of 23 similar hangers received a quality control inspection and all were found to be in compliance with design specification requirements. Based upon the extensive verification programs instituted on site and the results of our reinspection of 23 similar hangers, LILCO believes this condition to be an isolated occurrence.

Attachment 2, Continued

- (3) The date when full compliance will be achieved:

Based upon the acceptability of the installed hanger, the extensive verification program, and the results of our sample reinspection, full compliance has been achieved.