

U. S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE OF REGULATORY OPERATIONS

REGION I

RO Inspection Report No.: 50-289/73-24

Docket No.: 50-289

Licensee: Metropolitan Edison Company

License No.: CPPR-

P.O. Box 542

Priority: _____

Reading, Pennsylvania 19603

Category: B

Location: Middletown, Pennsylvania (Three Mile Island 1)

Type of Licensee: PWR 831 MWe (B&W)

Type of Inspection: Base Line Inspection (Unannounced)

Dates of Inspection: December 4-5, 1973

Dates of Previous Inspection: November 26, 29 and 30, 1973

Reporting Inspector: W. F. Sanders
W. F. Sanders, Reactor Inspector

12-18-73
Date

Accompanying Inspectors: F. F. Barker
F. F. Barker, Reactor Inspector

12/17/73
Date

Other Accompanying Personnel: _____

_____ Date

Reviewed by: J. H. Tillou
J. H. Tillou, Senior Reactor Inspector, Facility
Construction and Engineering Support Branch

12/11/73
Date

1449 141

7910180 774

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Enforcement Action

None

Licensee Action on Previously Identified Enforcement Items

Not Inspected

Unusual Occurrences

None Identified

Other Significant Findings

A. Current Findings

1. The program does not define the responsibility for final evaluation of results and the compilation of the final report. (Details, Paragraph 3)
2. A revised Ultrasonic Test Procedure NIP 001, used in the testing did not have the required approvals. (Details, Paragraph 4)
3. Documentation was unavailable to show QA surveillance, inspections or audits of the testing performed. (Details, Paragraph 5)
4. Ultrasonic examination of (4) main steam line welds revealed (1) weld which required a repair. (Details, Paragraph 6)

B. Status of Previously Reported Unresolved Items

Not Inspected

Management Interview

Persons Attending

General Public Utilities Service Corporation (GPUSC)

Mr. S. Levin, Project Engineer
Mr. J. Wright, QA Project Manager
Mr. M. Stromberg, QA Site Auditor

Gilbert Associates Incorporated (G.A.I)

Mr. G. Joseph, Inservice Inspection Program Manager

Con Am

Mr. C. James, Ultrasonic Test, Field Supervisor

1449 142

The following subjects were discussed:

- A. The inspector stated that the program does not define responsibilities for the analysis and approval for the testing results and for the preparation of the final report. This was acknowledged with the commitment that these responsibilities would be defined. This item is unresolved. (Details, Paragraph 3)
- B. The inspector stated that the new revised procedure NIP 001 on site and used in testing programs did not show evidence of review and approval by G.P.U. as required. The CAI representative stated that the procedure had been reviewed and approved and that the signed copy was located in the GAI office in Reading, Pennsylvania. The inspector was informed that the approved procedure would be available on site by December 6, 1973. This item is unresolved. (Details, Paragraph 4)
- C. The inspector stated that the Inservice Inspection plan notes in Attachment "C" that the G.P.U. Representative has control of inspection activities. Evidence was not available to show any surveillance, inspections or audits performed that would show licensee activities in the performance of the testing. The GPU representative stated that inspection reports would be issued and audits would be performed on the test data. This is an open item. (Details, Paragraph 5)
- D. Four of the main steam welds were ultrasonically tested in response to the Atomic Energy Commission criteria for identification of postulated break locations in high energy piping systems. One of the four welds tested required weld repair. Further testing of other welds is not planned. This is an unresolved item. (Details, Paragraph 6)

1449 143

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

G. Josephs - Gilbert Associate Inc. - ISI Program Manager
C. James - Con Am - Ultrasonic Test Supervisor

2. General

This trip was made to the site for the purpose of inspecting the program for base line and inservice inspection.

3. The program has attachments which list and define the responsibilities of each of the groups which are involved with the base-line inspection of Metropolitan Edison: General Public Utilities Service Corporation, Gilbert Associates, Inc. and Con Am. These attachments are very definitive in the outline of program management, testing procedures, interface relations between groups, retention of records, etc. However, the responsibility for the final review, approval of test reports and the compilation of the final report was not defined.
4. The review of the testing procedures revealed one of the procedures NIP 001 Con Am had been revised on the site and reissued. The revised edition was used to perform the U.T. testing. The revised procedure did not show that the required approval had been made by G.P.U. The inspector was informed that the approval had been made by G.P.U. and that the signed copy of the procedure was located at the G.A.I. office in Reading, Pennsylvania and would be issued to the site by December 6, 1973.
5. Attachment "C" of the inservice inspection plan stated that the GPU/QA site representative has control of inspection activities. If in his judgement inspections are not satisfactory he may stop work until conflicts are satisfactorily resolved.

A review was made to determine the extent of GPU/QA involvement and activities in the performance of the actual testing performed or a surveillance activity to determine the compliance of the testing to the requirements of the approved procedures.

There was no documentation available to show any GPU/QA activity such as surveillance inspections, or auditing or involvement in this aspect of the testing program.

6. Welds Main Steam Line

The licensee's response to the AEC request, "General Information Required for Consideration of Effects of Piping System Break Outside Containment" of December 15, 1972 and supplemental letter dated June 1, 1973 stated that a design review had been performed. The design review identified the most highly stressed joints in these lines to be in the main steam lines. The licensee elected to

ultrasonically examine the 4 most highly stressed welds in the main steam line during the pre-operational base line inspection and to include these welds in future inservice inspections.

The inspector found that the licensee had ultrasonically examined main steam line welds MS50A-1, MS50B-1, MS51 and MS50-12. It was found that an unacceptable defect had been discovered in MS-50-12 on August 1, 1973. This was documented in DR-1030 which identified MS-50-12 to be a Grinnell Company Shop Weld; the defect was identified as 7/8 inches long and 3/8 inches below the finished surface of the weld. The weld defect was ground out and repaired in accordance with UE&C Weld Procedures Nos. 1 and 20 and ultrasonically reinspected and found to be acceptable. DR 1030 was closed on September 6, 1973.

The inspector stated he could not find any commitment in the Technical Specifications to examine these welds in the inservice inspection. The licensee stated that the Technical Specification would be revised to include the requirements for continuing examination of the four welds. This matter is considered unresolved pending verification of the inclusion of the 4 main steam line welds in the inservice inspection program.

1449 145