



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
REGION IV  
611 RYAN PLAZA DRIVE, SUITE 1000  
ARLINGTON, TEXAS 76011

*MR. Hays*

20 DEC 1978

Docket No. 99900521/78-03

Bechtel Power Corporation  
Los Angeles Power Division  
ATTN: Mr. I. R. Caraco  
Vice President and General Manager  
P. O. Box 60860 Terminal Annex  
Los Angeles, California 90060

Gentlemen:

This refers to the QA program inspection conducted by M. R. H. Brickley of this office on November 27-30, 1978, of your facility at Los Angeles, California, and to the discussions of our findings with J. V. Morowski and members of your staff at the conclusion of the inspection.

Areas examined during the QA program inspection and our findings are discussed in the enclosed report. Within these areas, the inspection consisted of an examination of procedures and representative records, interviews with personnel, and observations by the inspectors.

During this inspection it was found that the implementation of your QA program failed to meet certain NRC commitments. The specific findings and references to the pertinent requirements are identified in the enclosures to this letter.

Please provide us within thirty (30) days a written statement containing, (1) a description of steps that have been or will be taken to correct these items, (2) a description of steps that have been or will be taken to prevent recurrence, and (3) the dates your corrective actions and preventive measures were or will be completed.

In accordance with Section 2.790 of the Commission's "Rules of Practice," Part 2, Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, a copy of this letter with enclosure and your reply together with the enclosed inspection report will be placed in the Commission's Public Document Room. If this report contains any information that you believe to be proprietary, it is necessary that you make a written application within thirty (30) days to this office to withhold such information from public disclosure. Any such application must include a full statement of the reasons on the basis of which it is claimed that the information is proprietary, and should be prepared so that proprietary information identified in the application is contained

7902080328

Details Section I

(Prepared by R. H. Brickley)

A. Persons Contacted

- \*A. G. Coutoumanos, Supervisor. Assurance
- J. R. Miller, Quality Assurance Engineer
- R. W. Trepp, Project Quality Assurance Engineer
- K. R. Walvekar, Mechanical Engineering Group Supervisor
- J. B. Roberts, Mechanical Engineer

\*Denotes those present at the exit interview.

B. Action on Previous Inspection Findings

(Closed) Deviation (Report No. 78-02) The size of a pipe support fillet weld specified on drawing 13-SI-002-H-001 was less than that required by Appendix XVII to Section III of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code. The inspector verified the following actions taken by the LAPD:

1. SONGS Project: Eight thousand eight hundred twenty (8820) drawings were reviewed with three hundred sixty-two (362) found with nonconforming (undersized) welds specified. Seventy-two (72) pipe supports with undersized welds have been installed. Fifty-nine (59) of these are under supports of the salt water cooling system and are potentially inaccessible for rework. (Note: A 10 CFR 50.55(e) report has been submitted by the Licensee) Bechtels corrective action was to revise the drawings on those pipe supports that have not been installed, change the classification of installed supports from linear to plate and shell (Note: A forthcoming revision of Subsection NF3291 is believed to provide relief for this problem), revise the Pipe Support Group Design Criteria to include Table XVII 2452.1-1 of the Code, and conduct training classes for the Pipe Support Group.
2. Vogtle Project: LAPD personnel verified that Table XVII 2452.1-1 of the Code was included on the designer's checklist and had been used by project designers and checkers.
3. Palo Verde Project: Two thousand eight hundred twenty-two (2822) drawings were reviewed with ninety-three (93) found with nonconforming (undersized), welds specified. None of these had been installed and all have been revised to bring them into conformance with the code. Additionally, the Pipe Support Standards and Procedures

manual has been revised to include the requirements of Table XVII 2452.1-1 of the Code and classes were conducted for Pipe Support Engineers and Designers to review ASME III, NF Welding Standards and discuss compliance with Code requirements.

The documentation that was examined by the inspector indicated that the LAPD had performed calculations on these welds and concluded that the undersized welds were adequately sized to carry the design basis loading conditions.

C. Design Inspection

1. Objective

The objective of this area of the inspection was to select a single component, system, structure, or major part of one of these and verify that:

- a. Design inputs are identified and include all applicable requirements; documented; reviewed and approved; specified on a timely basis and in necessary detail; prepared, processed, and controlled in accordance with applicable procedures; accurate in specifying design requirements, particularly design codes and standards; and distributed to those responsible for preparing production designs and associated documents.
- b. Design calculations, and their review and approval, have been performed as prescribed by procedures.
- c. Final design documents have accurately transcribed design input in accordance with procedures.
- d. Internal and external design interface responsibilities and activities have been performed in accordance with procedures.
- e. Verification of the design has been properly and effectively performed as prescribed by procedures, including design review (including checking), alternate calculations, and qualification testing, where applicable.
- f. Changes to the design, through all design activities from input to output, have been performed in accordance with procedure requirements.