DMB

50-329

Transmittal No: CSC-7836

PRINCIPAL STAFF

File

Date: June 1, 1984

)/RA

ENF

To: Stone & Webster

P 0 Box 1963

Midland, MI 48640

Attached 1s: Partial Response To

X Complete Response To

For Your Information

Other

Description:

Tracked Recommendation Item 082.

NIRsignature:

CC: JGKeppler, NRC Region III w/a
JJHarrison, NRC Region III w/a
BLBurgess, NRC Site w/a
RAWells, MPQAD w/a
BHPeck, MEC w/a
NIReichel, MEC w/a
DDJohnson, MEC w/a

8406150168 840601 PDR ADDCK 05000329 S PDR JUN 11 1984

1101

# ITEM/HOLD POINT NOTIFICATION FORM

Sheet 1 of 2

STON	E & WEBSTER		1TEM NUMBER 082	HOLD POINT NUMBER
CONSTRUCTION IMPLEMENTATION		TRACKED ACTION ITEM		
OVERVIEW				
MIDLAND NUCLEAR PLANT J.O. NO. 14509			TRACKED RECOMMENDATION ITEM	
REFERENCE(S)		UNTRACKED TEM		
CIO Evaluation No. MP-MIS-092-001			HOLD POINT NOTIFICATION	
the following exception requirements of 10CFR 50		anagement Syste		
had been audited for located on site. revealed some criple and the site these requirements. mechanism to matrix	apparent that all of or each of the major s A matrix was devel teria had not been au audit branch had per Furthermore, it was audits performed in that A&MS review past	ite contractors oped of the aud dited, however formed audits v s observed that 1984 to 10CFR56	s and their sudits performed r, it was not which may meet A&MS has alr D, Appx B crit	btier contractors by A&MS which ed that DQAE-Ann all or some of eady instituted a eria.
	een audited for on an			50, APPX 5
(Continued on Sheet 2)		(2)	YES NO'S)	□ 110
DATE RESPONSE REQ'D.	INITIATOR/DATE KON	re totiado 3/0/2	INITIATION APPI	ROVED/DATE
6/4/84	MUDICUN	5/10/14	PElan	5-14-84
RESPONSE (SEE NOTE)  Attached memo DJones to	BHPeck dated May 30,	1984 provides	Our response t	to this item.
			ATTACHMENTS	
COMPLETION DATE	RESPONDENT		n st Sign	
RESPONSE ACCEPTED	DATE	RESPONSE VE	THE RESERVE AND ADDRESS OF THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN	

## Condition Details (Cont.)

- 2) It was noted that two audits remained open from 1982 (M01-25-02-04F and M03-03-02 OIF). CIO recommends review of findings and an expeditious closure to these reports.
- 3) A review of audit reports revealed the use of liquid paper or correction tape. It was noted that Mr. Dave Jones, Section Head, Audits and Management Systems, had issued a letter on 4/25/84 to all A&MS Personnel providing direction as to the proper method of making changes to audit reports.

Some audit forms/checklists were not complete (ie., AMS-84-09 blank spaces, no indication as to audit results (satisfactory or unsatisfactory), signatures etc.).

It is recommended that these instructions be proceduralized.

4) During microfilming of audits, reports were assigned (dummy) cartridge numbers.

Although no records were lost, some difficulty was experienced in retrievability of specific audit data. CIO recommends that original copies of records should not be destroyed until microfilming is complete and accuracy has been checked.

To BHPeck, Midland

From DJones, JSC-200B

May 30, 1984 COMPANY

Subject MIDLAND ENERGY CENTER GWO 7020

CIO TRACKED RECOMMENDATION ITEM 082 Correspondence

CC BWMarguglio, JSC-220A DJ-84-84

WCCarr, JSC-205

Following is Audit and Management Systems' response to the subject Tracked Recommendation Item.

## Exception 1

Date

It was not readily apparent that all of the applicable criteria of 10CFR50, Appendix B had been audited for each of the major site contractors and their subtier contractors located on site. A matrix was developed of the audits performed by A&MS which revealed some criteria had not been audited, however, it was noted that DQAE-Ann Arbor and the Site Audit Branch had performed audits which may meet all or some of these requirements. Furthermore, it was observed that A&MS has already instituted a mechanism to matrix audits performed in 1984 to 10CFR50, Appendix B criteria.

## Response

A&MS is planning to review 1983 Midland audits of CP Co's principal suppliers and develop a matrix of 10CFR50 Appendix b criteria audited. (Note that subtier contractors are audited by the Site Audit Branch, not by A&MS). This matrix will be provided to Stone and Webster by July 1, 1984. As noted in the evaluation, A&MS has developed a new Audit Plan and an Audit Scope and Summary Form to plan audits on an 18 criteria basis and record the criteria actually audited.

## Exception 2

It was noted that two audits remained open from 1982 (MO1-25-O2-O4F and MO3-O3-O2-O1F).

## Response

AFR M01-25-02-04F was closed on 5/3/84 and A&MS has received a further response to M03-03-02-01F. A&MS is requesting additional action from B&W, Lynchburg before the finding can be closed. The estimated date for completion of this additional action is 6/30/84.

## Exception 3

A review of audit reports revealed the use of liquid paper or correction tape. It was noted that Mr Dave Jones, Section Head, Audits and Management Systems, had issued a letter on 4/25/84 to all A&MS Personnel providing direction as to the proper method of making changes to audit reports.

## Response

Audit Procedure, F-1, is in the process of being revised and will include instructions for corrections to audit documents and will emphasize the need to complete checklists. This revision is expected to be complete by August 1, 1984.

## Exception 4

During microfilming of audits, reports were assigned (dummy) cartridge numbers. Although no records were lost, some difficulty was experienced in retrievability of specific audit data.

#### Response

The DCCs are no longer using dummy cartridge numbers (since 1981) and A&MS will review the current STAIRS Index to ensure all past A&MS audits are retrievable. This review is expected to be complete by August 15, 1984. As acknowledgements of audit report microfilming are received from the DCC, the STAIRS Index will be reviewed to ensure the reports have been indexed correctly.

Should you have any questions regarding these response, please contact me or WCCarr.

DJ/11b