DUKE POWER COMPANY
P.O. BOX 33189
CHARLOTTE, N.C. 28242

HAL B. TUCKER
VICE PRESIDENT
NUCLEAR PRODUCTION

TELEPHONE
(704) 373-4531

October 8, 1982

Mr. James P. O'Reilly, Regional Administrator
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region II
101 Marietta Street, Suite 3100
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Re: Catawba Nuclear Station
Unit 1
Docket No. 50-413

Dear Mr. O'Reilly:

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55e, please find attached Significant Deficiency Report SD 413/82-19.

Very truly yours,

Hal B. Tucker

Hal B. Tucker

RWO/php
Attachment

cc: Director
Office of Inspection & Enforcement
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Mr. P. K. Van Doorn
NRC Resident Inspector
Catawba Nuclear Station

Mr. Robert Guild, Esq.
Attorney-at-Law
314 Pall Mall
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Palmetto Alliance
2135½ Devine Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29205

Duke Power Company
Catawba Nuclear Station
Significant Deficiency

Report Number: SD 413/82-19

Report Date: October 8, 1982

Facility: Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 1

Identification of Deficiency:

Linear indications on a Kerotest item 9J-551 valve were identified on the (end) body. The deficiency was identified on August 19, 1982.

Initial Report:

Initial report was made to Mr. A. Ignatonis, Region II NRC, on September 9, 1982 by Messrs. G. D. Rowland and W. O. Henry, of Duke Power Company, Charlotte, North Carolina 28242.

Component and Supplier:

Kerotest valve item 9J-551, S/N UB13-8, Duke tag 1ND117.

Description of Deficiency:

During a surface inspection of this valve, linear indications were identified on the above referenced valve body. These indications violate Construction document NDE 30J. Light grinding was used in an attempt to remove the indications. A grinding depth of 1/16" was not sufficient to completely remove the indications.

Analysis of Safety Implications:

If the indications exceed the minimum required wall thickness for the valve, the pressure boundary integrity will be violated.

Corrective Action:

The affected valve has been sent back to the manufacturer for evaluation. The indications will be removed by grinding and the remaining wall thickness will be determined. If the actual wall thickness is greater than the minimum wall thickness required, the valve will be returned to Duke. If not, the valve will be weld repaired and then returned. A final analysis and corrective actions will be complete by November 8, 1982. A final report will be provided at this time.