

JUN 29 1984

Docket No. 50-454

Docket No. 50-455

Commonwealth Edison Company

ATTN: Mr. Cordell Reed

Vice President

Post Office Box 767

Chicago, IL 60690

Gentlemen:

Enclosed is a list of questions which was given by our inspectors to the Byron Station staff on June 13, 1984. The questions describe information we need to enable us to complete our special inspection in progress in the area of equipment supplied to the Byron Station by Systems Control Corporation. As discussed by Mr. T. Tramm of your staff and myself on June 28, 1984, you are not required to respond to this letter since your staff has provided responses to all questions and is providing additional supplementary information as our inspectors identify the need for such information.

Your cooperation with us is appreciated.

Sincerely,

original signed by J. F. Streeter

J. F. Streeter, Director
Byron Project Division

Enclosures As stated

cc w/encl:

D. L. Farrar, Director of
Nuclear Licensing

V. I. Schlosser, Project
Manager

Gunner Sorensen, Site Project
Superintendent

R. E. Querio, Station
Superintendent

DMB/Document Control Desk (RIDS)

Resident Inspector, RIII Byron/Braidwood
Phyllis Dunton, Attorney General's
Office, Environmental Control
Division

Ms. Jane M. Whicher
Diane Chavez, DAARE/SA FE
Stephen Lewis, Esq.

B407060198 B40629
PDR ADOCK 05000454
G PDR

IE01

OFFICE	RIII	RIII					
SURNAME	Hayes, rt	Streeter					
DATE	6/29/84						

NRC QUESTIONS PROVIDED TO BYRON STATION STAFF ON JUNE 13, 1984, RELATED TO
SPECIAL INSPECTION IN PROGRESS IN THE AREA OF EQUIPMENT SUPPLIED TO THE BYRON
STATION BY SYSTEMS CONTROL CORPORATION

1. Provide description of all types of cable pan weld defects identified as a result of NCR F-105 and the basis for Sargent and Lundy's (S&L) conclusion that cable pan welds were structurally adequate. In view of Systems Control Corporation's (SCC) continued inability to provide welds in conformance with AWS D1.1 1975, please also include a discussion of the structural significance of all welds on equipment (except hangers) procured under S&L specification F/L 2815.
2. Provide your position regarding the adequacy of cable pan stiffener welds for cable pans added to the total population of cable pans considered in the resolution of NCR F-529.
3. Provide position regarding the adequacy of cable pan and hanger inspections conducted by Industrial Contract Services in light of the results of overinspection by Peabody Testing Services.
4. Provide your position regarding the acceptability of DV-2 connections covered by NCR F-813 and the basis for your position including engineering evaluation assumptions, methods and results. Include justification for any assumptions made concerning weld size and quality.
5. Provide a description of all identified nonconforming conditions on equipment supplied by SCC which were dispositioned on the basis of engineering evaluations of samples of affected items in lieu of evaluation or repair of the total population of such items.
6. In several instances of nonconformance resolution it appears you have attempted to envelop the entire range of structural design margins and the entire spectrum of defects. We are concerned that these samples may not have been representative. For these nonconforming conditions identified in Item 5 above, discuss the parameters considered to assure that the samples were representative of the total populations dispositioned. Also provide the basis for assuring that the uncertainties associated with the statistical methodologies represented acceptable risk.
7. Identify all hangers reinspected and repaired by Hatfield Electric Company (HECo) personnel as directed by Commonwealth Edison Company (CECo) Project Construction Department and as documented in HECo QA/QC No. 345 dated September 19, 1982. Indicate for each hanger the date shipped from SCC and whether or not the subject hangers were previously inspected and if so by whom.
8. Provide information and any supporting documents relative to CECO's reviews and approvals of SCC as a supplier of safety-related equipment under S&L specifications F/L 2788, F/L 2809, and F/L 2815.
9. It is our understanding that SCC was included on the approved bidder's list for only two product lines; cable pans and fittings and cable pan hangers. Please discuss the circumstances which led to the Approved Bidders List (ABL) not including all product lines for which SCC was a supplier and why this condition has persisted. Also discuss the impact of such inaccuracies in the ABL on safety-related procurement activities.

NRC QUESTIONS PROVIDED TO BYRON STATION STAFF (CON'T)

10. Identify all items ordered from SCC since February 17, 1984, regardless of how such orders were initiated or processed.
11. Provide copies of all audit, surveillance, inspection reports, etc., pertaining to CECO's oversight of SCC to verify conformance with specification requirements. Include documentation relative to followup corrective actions for identified audit findings, observations, deviations, deficiencies, etc.