

DUKE POWER COMPANY

P.O. BOX 33189
CHARLOTTE, N.C. 28242

HAL B. TUCKER
VICE PRESIDENT
NUCLEAR PRODUCTION

TELEPHONE
(704) 373-4531

November 29, 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 2
Docket No. 50-414

Dear Mr. O'Reilly:

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55e, please find attached a second Supplemental Response to Significant Deficiency Report SD 414/81-30.

Very truly yours,

H. B. Tucker / TW

Hal B. Tucker

RWO/php
Attachment

cc: Director
Office of Inspection and 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
P. O. Box 12097
Charleston, South Carolina 29412

Palmetto Alliance
2135½ Devine Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29205

NOV 30 1982
U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
600 FIFTH AVENUE - 58

OFFICIAL COPY
IE 27

8212090079 821129
PDR ADOCK 05000414
S PDR

Duke Power Company
Catawba Nuclear Station

Report Number: SD 414/81-30, Supplement 2

Report Date: November 29, 1982

Facility: Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 2

Second Supplemental Response:

The following supplements our initial report SD 414/81-30 (December 31, 1981) and First Supplement (March 31, 1982) in regard to Swepco 8" schedule 40 min-wall violation. This report is based on information that has developed since our last report.

A total of 14 Nonconforming Items (NCIs) have identified that six out of ten heat numbers received on this order had min-wall less than required by the ASME Code for 8" schedule 40 pipe. After extensive investigation, it has been concluded that these min-wall violations were order related (P.O. E3887-12, SO Release 608) rather than isolated to heat #181033.

The NCIs and Heat numbers are as follow:

<u>NCI</u>	<u>Heat #</u>
13409	181033
9518	181032
	281003
	28569
9585	281002
9904	28569
9905	281002
10058	281003
10380	28569
10477	281003
14779	281003
14793	28569
15396	281003
15425	281003
15442	281003
15504	181031

An engineering evaluation has been performed on all of the heats from this order. Our evaluation concludes that the pipe as found satisfies our design requirements. Based on this, the pipe will be used as installed.

Duke Power Company has required that Swepco and Gulf Alloy investigate the cause, extent and corrective action taken.

The results of their investigation only serve to fortify Duke's conclusion.

- (1) The starting material was ordered below nominal wall by Swepeco. Nominal for 8" schedule 40 pipe is 0.322". However, Swepeco ordered starting material. $0.305" \pm .007"$
 $-.010"$
- (2) The controls for the sanding of the weld seam were misadjusted during the manufacturing of the pipe, causing over-sanding and subsequent below min-wall condition.
- (3) Swepeco's review of the inspection process revealed that wall thickness of the starting material was checked and found acceptable in all cases.

Apparently, the conditions exist because Swepeco ordered materials below nominal wall; this coupled with the over-sanding caused the below min-wall condition.

Subsequent to this, as mentioned in the March 31, 1982 supplemental response, Swepeco has provided for additional QC checks (i.e., UT thickness check of the weld and heat affected zone on both sides of the initial piece of pipe on every production run that would require flush grinding).

Duke Power has reviewed this situation from a generic point of view and finds no further evidence of a wide-spread significant problem.