LIMITED DISTRIBUTION -- NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE

FEB 05 1986 FW 2 40 Request No. 1E-86-02 (Region-year-No.)

TO:

Ben B. Haves, Director Office of Investigations

FROM:

Victor Stello, Jr.

Acting Executive Director

for Operations

REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION

Telemecanique Vendor

99901011 Docket No.

Westminster, Maryland 21157 Facility Location

James M. Taylor Office Director

Request

What is the matter that is being requested for investigation?

Telemecanique, formerly known as Gould Inc., manufactured/assembled and continues to supply safety related Motor Control Centers (MCC) with Certificates of Conformance (COC) stating that the MCCs meet all the applicable technical and quality requirements. Tests and inspections performed at nuclear stations where the MCCs are installed have identified nonconforming starters and circuit breakers, which indicate that the COCs are incorrect and may be fradulent.

B. Purpose of Investigation

- What wrongdoing is suspected; explain the basis for this view.
 - Telemecanique may have issued COCs without performing adequate tests. For example, as noted in the paragraph captioned "Problems noted at Nuclear Power Plants" of our letter dated December 31, 1985 to Telemecanique, Telemecanique provided COCs for Class 1E MCCs supplied to Millstone 3 and Seabrook. The COCs certified that inspections and tests were performed on the MCCs and that they were free from defects. However, both plants identified various problems on receipt of the MCCs which should have surfaced during tests and inspections. Recently, Trojan procured four Class 1E circuit breaker trip units with COCs certifying that they meet the published technical trip data. However, receipt inspections determined that the circuit breakers were shipped without the overcurrent trip elements having been installed in the trip units as required.

LIMITED DISTRIBUTION -- NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE W/O OI APPROVAL

Refer to EDU

- b. Telemecanique may have established a system of purchasing components such as circuit breakers and components from Siemens-Allis without imposing the requirements of 10 CFR 50 Appendix B.
- c. Telemechanique may have supplied spare circuit breakers and trip units without actually testing them and furnished COCs stating that the components meet the relevant purchase order requirements.
- What are the potential regulatory requirements that may have been violated?

10 CFR Part 21 10 CFR 50 Appendix B

3. If no violation is suspected, what is the specific regulatory concern?

Licensees may install circuit breakers which may not trip when required.

4. If allegations are involved, is there a view that the allegation occurred?

Allegations are not involved.

C. Requester's Priority

- 1. Is the priority of the investigation high, normal, or low? Normal
- What is the estimated date when the results of the investigation are needed? June 1986
- 3. What is the basis for the date and the impact of not meeting this date?

The safety issue is that circuit breakers may not trip to isolate a fault condition, requiring a circuit breaker upstream to trip which could disable one train of a system.

D. Contact

- 1. Staff members:
 - K. R. Naidu, RIS/VPB/DQAVT
 - E. W. Merschoff, Chief, RIS/VPB/DOAVT

LIMITED DISTRIBUTION -- NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE

- 3 -

 Allegers identification with address and telephone number if not confidential.

Not applicable.

F. Other Relevant Information

Enclosed is an inspection report 99900278/84-01 and related correspondence, including our letter dated December 31, 1985 to Telemecanique which provides examples of deficiencies with products supplied by Telemecanique.

Victor Stello, Jr.
Acting Executive Director
for Operations

cc w/o enclosures: H. Denton, NRR J. Taylor, IE G. Cunningham, OELD Regional Administrators PRIORITY ATTENTION REQUIRED MORNING REPORT-REGION IV JULY 22, 1988

LICENSEE/FACILITY

NOTIFICATION/SUBJECT

FORT CALHOUN STATION DN: 50-285 IDENTIFICATION OF BREAKERS
RELATED TO INFORMATION
PROVIDED IN IEN 88-46.
"LICENSEE REPORT OF DEFECTIVE
REFURBISHED CIRCUIT BREAKERS"

EVENT

ON JULY 19. 1988, THE NRC RESIDENT INSPECTOR NOTIFIED THE LICENSEE THAT THE NRC HAD RECEIVED INFORMATION THAT THE LICENSEE MAY HAVE PURCHASED TWO BREAKERS (MODEL GE THEF136m1100) FROM THE GESCO COMPANY IN OMAHA, NE THAT HAD BEEN SUPPLIED BY THE GENERAL MAGNETICS COMPANY OF COMMERCE, CA. THE LICENSEE WAS INFORMED THAT THE BREAKERS WERE RELATED TO THE INFORMATION SUPPLIED IN 1N 88-46 IN THAT THE BREAKERS HAD BEEN REFURBISHED AND THEN SOLD AS NEW BREAKERS.

THE LICENSEE IMMEDIATELY COMMENCED A SEARCH OF THEIR PROCUREMENT RECORDS. ON JULY 21, 1982, THE LICENSEE INFORMED THE NRC RESIDENT INSPECTOR THAT THEY HAD LOCATED THE BREAKERS. IN FEBRUARY 1985 THE LICENSEE HAD INSTALLED ONE OF THE BREAKERS IN THE ELECTRICAL SUPPLY CIRCUIT FOR THE NUCLEAR DETECTOR WELL COOLING FAN (VA-12A) MOTOR. APPROXIMATELY 5 MONTHS AFTER INSTALLATION OF THE BREAKER, THE BREAKER BURNED OUT AN INTERNAL COIL. THE LICENSEE REMOVED THE SECOND BREAKER FROM THE WARE-HOUSE AND TESTED THE BREAKER PRIOR TO INSTALLATION. THE BREAKER FAILED THE TEST AND WAS DISCARDED BY THE LICENSEE. THE TEST FAILURE WAS CAUSED BY AN INTERNAL COIL BURNING UP. THE LICENSEE REPLACED THE BREAKER FOR FAN VA-12A WITH A BREAKER THAT TESTED SATISFACTORILY. THE LICENSEE CURRENTLY, TO THE BEST OF THEIR KNOWLEDGE, DOES NOT HAVE ANY MODEL GE THEF136m1100 BREAKERS INSTALLED IN THE PLANT.

THE NRC RESIDENT INSPECTOR NOTIFIED THE FCS PROJECT MANAGER IN NRR OF THE INFORMATION DISCUSSED ABOVE ON JULY 22, 1988. ROUTINE FOLLOWUP WILL BE PERFORMED BY THE NRC RESIDENT INSPECTORS AND WILL INCLUDE A REVIEW OF THE TESTING PERFORMED BY THE LICENSEE ON THE INITIAL BREAKER THAT FAILED.

THIS DAILY REPORT WAS SUBMITTED FOR INFORMATION ONLY.

