10029

ONE HUNDRED PIRET CONGRESS

MORRIS K. UDALL ARIZONA CHAIRMAN

GEORGE MILLER CALIFORNIA

GEORGE MILLER CALIFORNIA

PHILIP R JAMPI INDIAMA

EDWARD J MARKEY MASSACHUSETTS

AUSTIN J MURPHY PENNSYLVANIA

BRUCE P VERTO MINNESOTA

PAT WILLIAMS MONTANA

EVERYER Y B EYRON MARYUAND

RON OI LUGO VIRGIN ISLANDS

SAM GELIDERISON CONNECTICUT

PETER N KOSTMAYER PENNSYLVANIA

SINCHARD N LEHMAN CALIFORNIA

RICHARD N LEHMAN CALIFORNIA

BILL RICHARDSON NEW MEXICO

GEORGE RUDOYI DARDEN GEORGIA

PETER J VISCLOSKY INDIANA

JAMES MECLURE CLARRE NORTH CAROLINA

WAYNE OWENS LITAH

JOHN LEWIS GEORGIA

BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL COLORADO

PETER A DEFAZIO. OREGON

EN IF H FALEOMAVAEGA AMERICAR SAMOA

JAMES A MCDERMOTT WASHINGTON

TIM JOHNSON SOUTH DARDTA

DON YOUNG ALASKA
ROBERT J. LAGOMANSINO CALIFORNIA
RON MARKENEE MONTAMA
LARRY CRAIG, IDANO
DENNY SMITH, OREGON
JAMES V HANSEN UTAH
BARBARA F VUCANOVICH, NEVADA
SEN BLAZ, GUAN
JOHN J. RHODES III. ARIZONA
ELTON GALLEGLY. CALIFORNIA
STAN PARTIS. VIRGINIA
ROBERT F SMITH DREGON
JIM LEGHTFOOTI IOWA
CRAIG THOMAS WYOMING
JOHN J. DUNCAN JR., TENNESSEE

PROD. & UTIL FAC. 50-443/444-0C

AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

U.S. HOUSE OF RESPESSING THE PIZ :31

STAFF DIRECTOR

ASSOCIATE STAFF DIRECTOR AND COUNSEL

GENERAL COUNSEL

RICHARD AGNEW CHIEF MINORITY COUNSEL

DOCKETING & SECRETARY

SERVED MAR - 8 1990

March 7, 1990

Honorable Kenneth Carr Chairman United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am writing about questions raised by Mr. Joseph D. Wampler concerning defects in radiographs of welds at the Seabrook site. Information provided the Subcommittee to date on this matter engenders the following additional questions.

- I. Seabrook IR 90-80 (p. 92) states that "... as documented in CAT IR 84-07 and discussed in IR 85-31; the licensee conducted an independent third party review of all RT film stored onsite, whether provided by vendors or shot by site contractors."
 - A. What findings or other events precipitated the review of radiographs referred to on page 92 of Seabrook IR 90-80?
 - B. Did employees of the licensee or its contractors prepare a nonconformance report that stated that such a review would constitute a corrective action resulting from deficiencies identified in the course of reviews by the licensee and/or its contractors? If so, what nonconformance report led to this review?
 - C. If no specific nonconformance report resulted in the radiograph review, what group of nonconformance or deficiency reports led to this review?
 - D. What is the name of the entity that conducted the third party review of all RT film stored onsite, whether provided by vendors or shot by site contractors? How many person-months were expended upon this review? On what date was the review initiated? On what date was it completed?

9443234248XA

- E. With regard to the licensee's third party review of all RT film stored onsite, whether provided by vendors or shot by site contractors, what did the report on this review state to be its purpose, objective, findings and conclusions?
- F. Please provide a copy of those portions of Seabrook IR 84-07 which the staff believes documents the licensee's third party review of all RT film stored onsite, whether provided by vendors or shot by site contractors.
- G. With respect to the third party NDE review, the report of inspection 85-31, conducted October 21 thru December 6, 1985 states:

The inspector discussed the licensee's third party review of nondestructive examinations for different fabricators onsite and also the licensee program for review of radiographic film for vendor supplied welds. The third party review involved a random selection of welds inspected by liquid penetrant, magnetic particle and radiography. The licensee implemented this program until approximately April 1984 when it was discontinued because additional problems were not being found and very little activity requiring NDE remained to be completed.

The inspector also reviewed the results of the licensee's overview of radiographic film for vendor supplied welds. To date, the licensee has performed an overview of virtually all vendor supplied radiographic film. Where problems were found, such as geometric unsharpness failing to meet the ASME Code, radiography was reperformed onsite and repairs were made, if necessary.

The inspector found all areas of review acceptable. No violations were identified.

- Why was the foregoing discussion of the third party review not included in the report of CAT inspection 84-07, conducted in May 1984?
- With respect to the foregoing statement from 85-31:
 - a. what specific "problems were found?"
 - b. how many welds were re-radiographed?
 - c. how many weld repairs were made and what was the nature of any such repairs?

- H. While IR 90-80, citing IR 84-07 and 85-31, implies that all radiographs of safety-related welds, including the Pullman-Higgins radiographs, were reviewed by an independent third party, it is unclear from the text of IR 84-07 and IR 85-31 that all such radiographs were in fact reviewed by the third party. Is it the NRC staff position that all such radiographs were reviewed by the independent third party? If so, what is the specific text in an inspection report upon which the NRC staff bases this position?
- II. Please provide an enumeration of nuclear reactor projects wherein the first review by a Level III examiner (employed by a major welding entity on the site such as Pullman-Higgins at Seabrook) resulted in a 20% reject rate.
- III. The February 28 memorandum from Mr. Russell to Mr. Murley states in Item 4, that:

On January 12, 1984, the examiner [i.e. Wampler] was advised ... that the completion of those NCRs would be reviewed during routine NRC inspection.

Was a review of Wampler's 16 incomplete NCRs conducted? If not, why not? Why did Seabrook IR 83-22 not mention the 16 incomplete NCRs which NRC officials, during the period covered by IR 83-22, had stated would be the subject of review?

- IV. The February 28 memorandum from Mr. Russell to Mr. Murley states in Item 4 that Seabrook IR 83-22 had "documented acceptable completion of the last two NCRs generated by the examiner." This appears to be a reference to Wampler's last two nonconformance reports, NCR 5689 and NCR 5773. Inspection Report 83-22 stated that these two NCRs "initiated by the departed Level III had been properly tracked and were already dispositioned." The discussion of NRC 5689 and NRC 5773 in Item 4 and IR 83-22 gives rise to the following questions:
 - A. What deficiencies were described in NCR 5689 and NCR 5773?
 - B. What was the root cause of the deficiencies described in NCR 5689 and NCR 5773?
 - C. What corrective actions were specified to remedy the deficiencies described in NCR 5689 and NCR 5773?
 - D. What did Item 4 in the February 28 memorandum mean when it stated that IR 83-22 had "documented acceptable completion of the last two NCRs generated by the examiner?"

- E. What did IR 83-22 mean when it stated that NCR 5689 and NRC 5773 "had been properly tracked and were already dispositioned?"
- V. To date, we have been provided no evidence that the review, which NRC staff said would be conducted, of Wampler's 16 incomplete NCRs was ever conducted. If this review was not conducted, do NRC officials know the substance of the deficiencies described in Mr. Wampler's 16 not-completed nonconformance reports? If so, what is the substance of the deficiencies described in these 16 NCRs? If not, what is the basis for the implication in Mr. Russell's February 28 memorandum to the effect that deficiencies identified by Mr. Wampler had been corrected?
- VI. Russell's Fabruary 28, 1990 memorandum leaves the impression that NRC staff have confidence that Mr. Wampler's findings regarding radiographs and/or welds had been recognized and the deficiencies implicit therein corrected. This confidence, we infer, was derived from a series of inspections. Yet, the various inspection reports provided us to date (e.g. 82-06, 83-22, 84-07 and 90-80), as far as we can tell, do not even recognize that problems of the magnitude described by Wampler even occurred; nor do these reports contain sufficient documentation to enable an independent reviewer to determine the qualitative and quantitative nature of deficiencies in activities carried out by the contractor responsible for a significant portion of the safety-related welding a Seabrook. What then is the basis for NRC management and/or the Commission to make a finding that safety-related welding activities at Seabrook were conducted in accord with the Commission's regulations?

I have been informed that NRC staff is seeking to interview Mr. Wampler on or about March 13. I would assume that, prior to any such interview, the NRC interviewers would wish to be fully informed on this matter and would, therefore, have in hand the information requested in this letter. I would also assume that the Commission had this information prior to making its decision to allow the Seabrook reactor to operate at full power.

The Commission's basis for finding that safety-related welds at Seabrook complied with NRC regulations will be one of the issues addressed at the Subcommittee's March 14 hearing on the Seabrook project. Accordingly, I would appreciate your providing prior to March 13, 1990 the answers to the foregoing questions. To provide the answers prior to March 13 should require no substantive effort

since, as I have indicated in the preceding paragraph, the Commission presumably possessed the requested information before authorizing full power operation.

Thank you.

Singerely,

Heter H. Kostmayer

chairman

Subcommittee on General

Oversight and Investigations

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, ET AL. (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2)

Docket No. (s) 50-443/444-OL

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing LTR TO CARR RE WAMPLER QUEST. have been served upon the following persons by U.S. mail, first class, except as otherwise noted and in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR Sec. 2.712.

Administrative Judge
6. Paul Bollwerk, III
Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal
Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Administrative Judge
Howard A. Wilber
Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal
Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Administrative Judge
Richard F. Cole
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Robert R. Pierce, Esquire Atomic Safety and Licensing Board U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, DC 20555

Edwin J. Reis, Esq.

Office of the Beneral Counsel

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Administrative Judge
Thomas B. Moore, Chairman
Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal
Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Administrative Law Judge
Ivan W. Smith, Chairman
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Administrative Judge
Kenneth A. McCollom
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Administrative Judge
James H. Carpenter
Alternate Technical Member
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Mitzi A. Young Attorney Office of the Beneral Counsel U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, DC 20555 Docket No. (8) 50-443/444-OL LTR TO CARR RE WAMPLER QUEST.

Diane Curran, Esq.
Harmon, Curran & Tousley
2001 S Street, N.W., Suite 430
Washington, DC 20009

Robert A. Backus, Esq. Backus, Meyer & Solomon 116 Lowell Street Manchester, NH 03106

Bary W. Holmes, Esq. Holmes & Ells 47 Winnacunnet Road Hampton, NH 03842

Suzanne P. Egan City Solicitor Lagoulis, Hill-Wilton and Rotondi 79 State Street Newburyport, MA 01950

Ashod N. Amirian, Esq. 145 South Main Street, P.O. Box 38 Bradford, MA 01830

George W. Watson, Esq. Federal Emergency Management Agency 500 C Street, S.W. Washington, DC 20472

Beorge D. Bisbee, Esq.
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
25 Capitol Street
Concord, NH 03301

Thomas B. Dignan, Jr., Esq. Ropes & Bray One International Place Boston, MA 02110

Paul McEachern, Esq.
Shaines & McEachern
25 Maplewood Avenue, P.O. Box 360
Portsmouth, NH 03801

Judith H. Mizner Counsel for Newburyport 79 State Street Newburyport, MA 01950

Jane Doherty Seacoast Anti-Pollution League 5 Market Street Portsmouth, NH 03801

Beorge Iverson, Director
N. H. Office of Emergency Management
State House Office Park Bouth
107 Pleasant Street
Concord,, NH 03301

Jack Dolan Federal Emergency Management Agency 442 J.W. McCormack (PDCH) Boston, MA 02109

Suzanne Breiseth Board of Selectmen Town of Hampton Falls Drinkwater Road Hampton Falls, NH 03844 Docket No. (8)50-443/444-DL LTR TO CARR RE WAMPLER QUEST.

John Traficonte, Esq. Chief, Nuclear Safety Unit Office of the Attorney General One Ashburton Place, 19th Floor Boston, MA 02108

Allen Lempert
Civil Defense Director
Town of Brentwood
20 Franklin Street
Exeter, NH 03833

Anne Goodman, Chairman Board of Selectmen 13-15 Newmarket Road Durham, NH 03824

R. Scott Hill-Whilton, Esquire Lagoulis, Hill-Whilton & McBuire 79 State Street Newburyport,, MA 01950

Norman C. Katner Superintendent of Schools School Administrative Unit No. 21 Alumni Drive Hampton, NH 03842

The Honorable Sordon J. Humphrey ATTN: Janet Coit United States Senate Washington, DC 20510

Dated at Rockville, Md. this 8 day of March 1990 Peter J. Brann, Esq.
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
State House Station, #6
Augusta, ME 04333

William Armstrong Civil Defense Director Town of Exeter 10 Front Street Exeter, NH 03833

Michael Santosuosso, Chairman Board of Selectmen South Hampton, NH 03827

Stanley W. Knowles, Chairman Board of Selectmen P.D. Box 710 North Hampton, NH 03862

Sandra F. Mitchell Civil Defense Director Town of Kensington Box 10, RR1 East Kingston, NH 03827

Tatty Clanderson

Office of the Becretary of the Commission