

DUKE POWER COMPANY

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

HAL B. TUCKER  
VICE PRESIDENT  
NUCLEAR PRODUCTION

TELEPHONE  
(704) 373-4531

May 22, 1984

84 MAY 24 P 1:24

Mr. James P. O'Reilly, Regional Administrator  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Region II  
101 Marietta Street, NW, Suite 2900  
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  
No. SD 413/84-11.

Very truly yours,

*Hal B. Tucker*  
EAT

Hal B. Tucker

LTP/php

Attachment

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

NRC Resident Inspector  
Catawba Nuclear Station

Palmetto Alliance  
2135½ Devine Street  
Columbia, South Carolina 29205

INPO Records Center  
Suite 1500  
1100 Circle 75 Parkway  
Atlanta, Georgia 30339

Mr. Robert Guild, Esq.  
Attorney-at-Law  
P. O. Box 12097  
Charleston, South Carolina 29412

Mr. Jesse L. Riley  
Carolina Environmental Study Group  
854 Henley Place  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28207

8406110214 840522  
PDR ADOCK 05000413  
S PDR

OFFICIAL COPY

IE 27 1/4

REPORT NO: SD 413/84-11

REPORT DATE: May 22, 1984

FACILITY: Catawba Nuclear Station  
Unit 1

IDENTIFICATION OF DEFICIENCY:

Welding inspection revealed discrepancies between fabrication drawings and equipment. Deficiency was identified by Nonconforming Item 18132.

INITIAL REPORT:

On April 24, 1984, A. Ignatonis, NRC Region II, Atlanta, Georgia was notified of the deficiency by W. O. Henry and T. L. Utterback of Duke Power Company, Charlotte, North Carolina.

COMPONENT AND SUPPLIER:

Air Handling Units (2) fabricated by Bahnson Service Company (BSCo.), Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

DESCRIPTION OF DEFICIENCY:

As reported by NCIR 18132, a site inspection of air handling units fabricated by BSCo. revealed welding discrepancies documented in Bahnson Report BSC-W-289 dated March 2, 1984. Discrepancies included deviation from fabrication drawings and poor workmanship. Rejection was based on AWS D1.1 code requirements and BSCo. Inspection Procedures.

Welding problems were not discovered during shop inspection in violation of BSCo.'s QA program. These deficiencies were not identified by Duke Power prior to installation of the equipment.

Similar Bahnson equipment at another Duke location was also inspected. Minor welding discrepancies were identified. Discrepancies included overlap, convexity, weld spatter, considered cosmetic in nature, and one weld is being evaluated for lack of fusion.

ANALYSIS OF SAFETY IMPLICATIONS:

If the welding deficiencies had remained undetected, the equipment could have failed to perform its intended control complex cooling function during/after a seismic event.

CORRECTIVE ACTION:

BSCo. equipment was analyzed to determine if such failure modes existed. None was found. Engineering has accepted the equipment "as-is". Repair work was not required and none was recommended. All documentation is on file with the completed NCIP.

Generic industry concerns have been addressed in NRC IE Information Notice No. 84-30 dated April 18, 1984.

Evaluation of similar equipment is in progress. Evaluation will be completed by June 29, 1984.