* Dake Power Company Catawba Nuclear Generation Department 4800 Concord Road York, SC 20745 WILLIAM R. McCollism, Jr. Vice Fresident (803)831-3200 Office (803)831-3426 Fax



DUKE POWER

December 21, 1995

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission ATTN: Document Control Desk Washington, D.C. 20555

Subject:

Catawba Nuclear Station Dockets 50-413 and 50-414

Supplement to Reply to Notice of Violation (NOV)

Inspection Report 50-413, 414/95-20

The purpose of this supplement is to provide additional information which was not included in our December 4, 1995, NOV response. That response did not include information associated with assessments/inspections that were performed and a planned SITA that will further ensure continued reliability of the Catawba diesel generators (DG) and will also ensure that problems similar to the one addressed in this violation are identified and corrected if they do exist.

The following assessments/inspections were conducted subsequent to the September 1995 2B DG turbocharger bolt failure:

1) A review of general maintenance activities was conducted during 2EOC7 refueling to determine the adequacy and consistency of maintenance work practices. This assessment was performed October 16 through 19, 1995. This general review was redirected by station management to concentrate on 2A and 2B DG activities [reference SA-95-51(CN)(SRG)]. The results of this review identified work package preparation and procedure verification as areas needing attention. These specific problems were immediately corrected at the time of the review. The importance of procedure and drawing verification will be continuously reinforced.

Details of this review are contained in assessment report SA-95-50(CN)(SRG) and are documented in problem investigation process (PIP) 2-C95-2373.

260004

9512260051 951221 PDR ADOCK 05000413 PDR

JE01 1/0

 U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission December 21, 1995
Page 2

Pollowing the discovery of the three broken turbocharger bolts on 2B DG, an inplant review was performed October 16 through 30, 1995 to evaluate possible DG problems. The review was primarily focused on configuration management and identification of any possible changes that may not have been properly documented and/or detect discrepancies between DG assembly and associated drawings. The focus was on all four DG engines, with a visual inspection of each engine per manual drawings, a work request review of DG work requests, a review of associated diesel manuals, and personnel interviews. Although this report has not received final review and approval, it was noted that there were some minor configuration, housekeeping, and procedural accuracy items identified.

Details of this review are contained in assessment report SA-95-47(CN)(GA)(MA). A PIP will be generated to track items identified during this assessment.

3) An assessment of the 2A DG work activities was performed by a diesel expert from another utility to establish a comparison between the DG work practices at Catawba with that of the assessor's utility from October 18 through November 1, 1995. This review identified strengths in the areas of personnel safety, preparation/pre-job briefings, communication and teamwork. The review identified some of the same work package preparation and procedural verification problems found in SA-95-50(CN)(SRG). Employee commitment to and understanding of foreign material exclusion guidance appeared to be shallow. This was quickly acted on by station management. There were no significant problems identified in this assessment.

Details and recommendations from this review are contained in assessment report SA-95-51(CN)(SRG) and also documented in PIP 2-C95-2374.

4) A detailed non-obtrusive inspection of the 2B DG was conducted on November 16, 1995. The inspection team consisted of two mechanical and two electrical quality control (QC) inspectors. This team conducted an end-to-end visual

* U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission December 21, 1995 Page 3

inspection of the DG looking for discrepancies in flanges, fittings, and cabinets. This inspection resulted in the identification of several minor discrepancies that did not impact DG reliability.

In addition, a Self-Initiated Technical Audit (SITA) will be conducted at Catawba in March 1996 on the DGs and their support systems. The scope of this audit will include the design, operation, maintenance, testing, and surveillance aspects, as well as the corrective actions associated with the DG. The details of this assessment will be documented in assessment report SA-96-01(CN)(SITA). Performing this SITA is the only commitment contained in this document.

It should be noted that the above listed assessments/inspections did not identify any safety or DG reliability concerns. Therefore, we feel that these actions, in addition to the corrective actions previously communicated in our NOV response will both resolve the specific problem cited as well as provide added assurance that similar problems do not occur.

If there are any questions concerning this response, please contact Kay Nicholson at (803) 831-3237.

Sincerely,

W. R. McCollum

\KEN:RESP95.20S

xc: S. D. Ebneter, Regional Administrator

R. E. Martin, ONRR

R. J. Freudenberger, SRI