

Stephen H. Howell Senior Vice President

General Offices: 1945 West Parnall Road, Jackson, Michigan 49201 • (517) 788-0453

January 15, 1979 Howe 16-79

Mr J G Keppler, Regional Director Office of Inspection and Enforcement US Nuclear Regulatory Commission Region III 799 Roosevelt Road Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

MIDLAND NUCLEAR PLANT -UNIT NO. 1, DOCKET NO. 50-329 UNIT NO. 2, DOCKET NO. 50-330 ELECTRICAL PENETRATION ASSEMBLY

In accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.55(e), this letter constitutes an interim report on the status of discrepancies found in the inboard terminal boxes of Unit 1 and 2 electrical penetration assemblies.

A description of the discrepancy, potential safety implications, investigation and planned corrective actions are documented in the attachments to this letter.

Another report, either interim or final, will be sent on or before March 31, 1979.

Styph-OD Dowell

 Attachment: 1. Quality Assurance Program, Management Corrective Action Report, MCAR-1, Report 26, dated December 19, 1978.
 2. Letter, P. A. Martinez to G. S. Keeley. BLC 6993, MCAR-26,

- Interim Report #1, with attached report
- CC: Director of Office Inspection and Enforcement Att: Mr. John G. Davis, Acting Director, USNRC (15)

Director of Office of Management Information and Program Control, USNRC (1)

790122005



Bechtel Associates Professional Corporation

CAR 26 INTERIM REPORT 1 Page 3 January 8, 1979 Attachment to BLC-6993

Safety Implication

Most of the discrepancies identified are of a nature that would be suspect to a failure mode. The failure mode would most likely be an electrical circuit disruption. The discrepancies were identified in penetration assemblies for Class IE circuits. Therefore, a circuit disruption would be classified as a failure of the electrical penetration assembly to perform its intended safety function.

Based on the potential failure mode and resulting safety implication, these deficiencies are considered to be reportable as stated in the MCAR.

Forecast Date on Corrective Action

A schedule for the corrective actions will be provided in Interim Report .

Teduer Concurrence by:

JK/js 1/5/4

Bechtel Associates Professional Corporation

MCAR 26 INTERIM REPORT 1 Page 2 January 8, 1979 Attachment to BLC-6993

Probable Cause

Electrical connections are visually checked at random by Bechtel Supplier Quality Representative (SQR) as part of inprocess inspection. Electrical connections are subjected to a 100% electrical check according to the supplier's acceptance test procedure. Electrical tests are randomly witnessed by Bechtel SQR. All verification documents, including the required electrical tests (insulation resistance and continuity) are checked by Bechtel SQR prior to releasing material for shipment. Further investigation is being made to determine why the random check by the SQR did not discover any discrepancies.

The crimping tools which were used for the Midland work were subjected to regular calibration checks and pull tests to verify calibration. Pull tests were randomly witnessed by Bechtel SQR. The records for the calibration and pull test were rechecked in late December 1978 by Bechtel SQR and found satisfactory.

The supplier's QA manual and their acceptance test procedures require inspection and verification of each manufacturing operation. Based on this requirement and in view of the discrepancies identified, it would appear that there was a breakdown in the supplier's quality control program. The supplier (Bunker Ramo-Amphenol Sams Division) will be requested to provide their own assessment of the probable cause of the apparent breakdown in their quality control program.

Corrective Action

Although al of Midland's presently known electrical penetration assemblies have been delivered to the jobsite, the supplier will be notified to identify corrective action to be taken to prevent recurrence for potential add-on orders.

With regard to the assemblies on the site, investigate the inboard terminal boxes on all penetrations for inadequate terminations and document the findings. Each individual nonconforming termination will be dispositioned accordingly. It is noted that of the total 92 electrical penetration assemblies (46 per unit), 26 assemblies (13 per unit) are designated for Class IE circuits.

Bechtel Associates Professional Corporation

Attachment to BLC-6993 Page 1

SUBJECT: MCAR 26 (Issued 12/19/78)

Electrical Penetration Assembly, Inadequate Wire Terminations

INTERIM REPORT 1

DATE: January 8, 1979

PROJECT: Consumers Power Company Midland Plant Units 1 & 2 Bechtel Job 7220

Introduction

This report is submitted to advise regarding the interim status and course of action required pursuant to MCAR 26 and CPCo NCR M-01-4-8-107.

Description of Discrepancy

Field inspection by CPCo of three installed electrical penetration assemblies revealed the following discrepancies associated with wire terminations located in the penetration assemblies' inboard terminal boxes:

- 1. Inadequate crimping of lugs wires pulled out easily
- 2. Inadequate crimp g of lugs crimps not tight
- Inadequate crimping of lugs wires not fully penetrating lug barrel
- 4. Inadequate crimping of lugs crimps caught the very tip of w re
- Inadequate crimping of lugs barrel of lug collapsed, prevering full wire compression
- Incorrect type of lug used insulated lugs specified, but uniasulated types found on some terminations
- Inadequate termination of lug to terminal block connections loose on terminal blocks

ATTACHMENT 2 Howe 16-79

Bechtel Power Corporation

777 East Eisenhower Parkway Ann Arbor, Michigan



Mail Address: P.O. Box 1000, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

January 10, 1979

BLC-6993

Mr. G. S. Keeley Project Manager CONSUMERS POWER COMPANY 1945 West Parnall Road Jackson, Michigan 49201

> Midland Units 1 and 2 Consumers Power Company Bechtel Job 7220 MCAR 26 INTERIM REPORT 1 Files 2417/2801

Dear Mr. Keeley:

Transmitted for your information and use is the first interim report submitted for the electrical penetration assembly inadequate wire terminations (MCAR 26).

The next interim report is scheduled for March 15, 1979.

Very truly yours,

. Conteberin

.

-for P. A. Martinez Project Manager

PAM/AEB/pp cc: Mr. R. C. Bauman Mr. W. R. Bird Mr. J. L. Corley

Attachment (3 pages).



MCAR Report No. 26

Page 2

Description (continued)

- 1. Terminal box for 22113
 - a) Terminals B-17 and K-4 wires pulled easily out of terminal lugs.
 - b) Terminals L-3 and L-8 connections were very loose on terminal block.
- 2. Terminal box for 12129
 - a) Terminals F-1, L-1 and E-15 wires pulled easily out of terminal lugs.
 b) Terminals C-15 and E-19 have uninsulated lugs installed.
- 3. Terminal box for 12131
 - a) Terminal G-10 wire pulled easily out of terminal lug.
 - b) Terminals J-10, K-1, K-2, K-3, and K-4 connections were very loose on terminal block.

In addition to these discrepancies, approximately 20% of the wiring in the three terminal boxes exhibited the following:

- 1. Wires not fully penetrating lug barrel
- 2. Crimps not tight
- 3. Crimps caught very tip of wire
- 4. Barrel of lug collapsed preventing full wire compression.
- Note: There are no field inspections required to verify vendors workmanship. After the penetrations are released from the vendors and accepted by Bechtel's shop inspectors the penetrations are shipped to the site for installation.

Recommended Actica: (continued)

 Determine if there was a breakdown in the vendor quality control program and/or the Bechtel shop inspection program.

MANA MANA Re-typed from tele/copy ro 12/20/78 signed by E. Smin JOB NO. 7220	QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAM GEMENT CORRECTIVE ACTION eccived MCAR-1 th on 12/19/78 Q NO. 3.002	ATTACHMENT 1 REPORT Howe 16-79 REPORT NO. <u>26</u> DATE December 19, 1978
1° DESCRIPTION (Including references): A client inspection of three installed electrical penetrations revealed inadequate crimping of wires located in the penetrations inboard terminal boxes. This has been documented in CPCo NCR M-01-4-8-107 issued 12/19/78. These terminations were done by the manufacturer Amphenol 'ams/Bunker Ramo prior to shipment. This inspection as witnessed by Bechtel Field Engineering and Quality Control, identified the following discrepancies:		
	(see page two)	
*RECOMMENDED ACTION (Optional) 1. Determine what effect these discrepancies, if gone undetected, would have on		
 Investigate the inboard terminal boxes on all penetrations for inadequate terminations and correct accordingly. 		
 Determine the root cause of the discrepancies and take appropriate corrective action to preclude recurrence. (see page two) 		
REFERRED TO		
PROCUREMENT	. ISS	WED BY W GINISTUNG 12/20/78 project an Engineer Date
II REPORTABLE DEFICIENCY	X YES	TIFIED CLIENT 12/21/78 Date 12/21/78
III CAUSE		. 4
CORRECTIVE ACTION TAKEN		DEC 2 2 1978
		QUALITY ASSUMATES
	AUTHORIZED BY	Date
DISTRIBUTION DIV. QA Manager Pgr. of QA-TFO DIV. Frocurement Pgr. Project Esnager	FORM/ (If S	AL REPORT TO CLIENT Section II Applies) Date
Construction Manager Ingliseering Manager Project Engineer Proj.Supt/Proj.Const.Mgr. or Proj. Fraument Manager	CORRE	ECTIVE ACTION IMPLEMENTED
Chief Const. QC Instance or QE Supervisor or Procurement Supplier Quality Hgr. and Div. Supplier Quality Fgr. QA Supervisor Client * Describe in space Provided and atlact	VERIF	TED BY Project OA Engineer Date