

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INSPECTION AND ENFORCEMENT
REGION IV

Report No. 99900025/80-03

Program No. 51300

Company: Southwest Fabricating & Welding Company Inc.
7525 Sherman Street, P. O. Box 9449
Houston, Texas 77011

Inspection Conducted: August 18-20, 1980

Inspector: I. Barnes 9-8-80
for H. W. Roberds, Contractor Inspector Date
Components Section II
Vendor Inspection Branch

Approved by: I. Barnes 9-8-80
I. Barnes, Chief Date
Components Section II
Vendor Inspection Branch

Summary

Special Inspection on August 18-20, 1980 (99900025/80-03)

Areas Inspected: Review and evaluation of reported radiographic deficiencies of welds on nuclear piping assemblies, that had been furnished to the V. C. Summer Unit 1 site. The inspection involved a total of twelve (12) inspector-hours on site by one (1) NRC inspector.

Results: In the one (1) area inspected, no deviations from commitments or unresolved items were identified.

DETAILS SECTION

A. Persons Contacted

N. H. Moerke, Vice President Engineering
R. P. Bornes, Manager, Quality Assurance

B. Non-Performance of Radiographic Examination of Repair Welds1. Introduction

Southwest Fabrication & Welding Co. Inc. (SWF) were contacted on October 5, 1979, by South Carolina Electric and Gas V. C. Summer site personnel and informed that discrepancies had been detected in radiography performed by SWF on fabricated pipe spools. On S. O. Q4166-S-1, containing four (4) butt welds, the steel stamping on butt welds one (1) and three (3) had been reversed from those located and identified on the shop drawing. Subsequently, weld one (1) was radiographed two (2) times, one time in accordance with identification and location on the shop drawing and later by the identification stamped on the pipe spool. On S. O. Q4166-S-54, containing two (2) butt welds, the welds were radiographed and one repair made with instructions issued to re-radiograph both welds 100%. The RT operator failed to follow instructions and re-radiographed the repair weld location only, but on the wrong weld.

2. Inspection Objectives

The objectives of this area of the inspection were to review the nature and scope of the reported discrepancies and determine if the problem had generic implications.

In addition to the inspection performed at SWF on December 19, and 20, 1979, Report No. 99900025/79-03, a further inspection of the subject was conducted at South Texas NPS on August 18-20, 1980.

3. Method of Accomplishment

The preceding objectives were accomplished by:

- a. Review of Standard Procedure SPRT-1 of 1-9-80.
- b. Review of radiographs of fifty-two (52) weld repairs.

4. Findings

- a. Deviations from Commitment

Within the scope of this inspection no deviations from commitments were identified.

b. Comments

In order to determine if a generic problem did exist, relative to radiography of repair areas, the inspector reviewed radiographs of fifty-two (52) weld repairs. Positive correlation of fifty-one (51) of the original and repair radiographs was established and that the repaired areas had been re-radiographed and the defects had been removed or brought within acceptable limits. This was accomplished by comparison of certain land marks in the weld and/or the parent base material on the original and the repair radiographs. Of the one (1) repairs where positive correlation of the original and the repair radiographs could not be established, owing to absence of any identifying land marks, there was no reason to suspect that the repaired area had not been re-radiographed as required.

In view of the above and the results of the inspection of SWF facility, report No. 99900025/79-03, it is concluded that the problem identified at the V. C. Summers site was an isolated case of confusion of weld joint identities and that a generic problem did not exist.

c. Exit Meeting

The inspector met with the management representatives denoted in paragraph A. above on August 20, 1980. The inspector informed management that the inspection was a follow-up of inspection report No. 99900025/79-03. Management was informed that there were no adverse findings and made no comments relative to the inspection.