

MAY 01 1984

Duke Power Company
ATTN: Mr. H. B. Tucker, Vice President
Nuclear Production Department
422 South Church Street
Charlotte, NC 28242

Gentlemen:

SUBJECT: MEETING SUMMARY - DOCKET NOS. 50-413 AND 50-414

This letter refers to the meeting conducted at your request in the NRC Region II Office on April 18, 1984, and subsequent discussions at the Catawba Nuclear Station on April 19, 1984. This meeting was held as a followup to the meeting of March 13, 1984, for the purpose of discussing welding irregularity findings at the Catawba site. It is our understanding that you have completed the investigative stage of the inquiry and are in the evaluative stage at this time. We also understand that you will be providing to Region II weld socket samples representative of the "burnt" socket issue.

It is our opinion that the meeting was beneficial and has provided better understanding of the nature and scope of the Duke Power Company's inquiry in this matter.

The Region II staff will continue its own evaluation of the concerns identified and will consider appropriate enforcement action, if any, resulting from our evaluation. Enclosed is a summary of the meeting topics.

In accordance with Section 2.790 of NRC's "Rules of Practice", Part 2, title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, a copy of this letter and the enclosure will be placed in the NRC's Public Document Room. Copies of this document will also be provided to the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board hearing the safety and environmental issues and the parties to the Catawba Operating Licensing proceeding on these issues.

Should you have any questions concerning this matter, we will be pleased to discuss them.

Sincerely,
ORIGINAL SIGNED BY
RICH C DANCE

Richard C. Lewis, Director
Division of Reactor Projects

Enclosure: (See Page 2)

8408310428 840501
PDR ADDCK 05000413
A PDR

IE31 10

MAY 01 1984

Duke Power Company

2

Enclosure:
Meeting Summary

cc w/encl:
R. L. Dick, Vice President - Construction
J. W. Hampton, Station Manager

bcc w/encl:
NRC Resident Inspector
Document Control Desk
State of North Carolina

RII

B
VLBrownlee:dr
4/27/84

RII

BUryc
BUryc
4/01/84

RII

HD
HCDance
4/27/84

RII

HRHerdt
HRHerdt
4/30/84

RII

RLLewis
RLLewis
4/1/84
SL

MAY 01 1984

ENCLOSURE

MEETING SUMMARY

Licensee: Duke Power Company

Facility: Catawba

Docket Nos.: 50-413 and 50-414

License Nos.: CPPR-116 and CPPR-117

SUBJECT: PROGRESS REPORT REGARDING ALLEGATIONS OF ALLEGED IMPROPER WELDING PRACTICES

A management meeting was held in the NRC Region II Office on April 18, 1984, at the request of the licensee in order to present a status report concerning the licensee's investigation related to information developed by members of the Region II staff concerning allegations that a foreman of a specific welding crew engaged in activities that were contrary to approved construction procedures. The licensee representative (hereinafter referred to as "Licensee") presented a detailed status of the Duke Power Company's investigation to date.

The Licensee stated that one manager has been appointed to oversee the investigation at the site. Another licensee employee not directly affiliated with the Catawba site has been assigned by licensee corporate management to conduct the actual work involved in the investigation. This individual has been with Duke Power Company for over ten years and is a licensed mechanical engineer. He also has extensive metallurgical experience and is considered by licensee corporate management to be well qualified to review the technical issues in this matter. In addition, licensee corporate management has appointed a review board to monitor the investigative effort. The Licensee stated that this review board is also expected to add a certain degree of independence regarding the review process.

The Licensee advised that the initial investigative plan was presented to corporate management and included the following strategy: 1) interview of individuals working in the welding craft, 2) interview of individuals working in other craft, and 3) evaluation of findings. This strategy was approached by first preparing a list of welders who worked for the welding foreman and lead man of the particular crew in question. Individuals were also identified who worked for the General Foreman. Another list was prepared which identified welders who worked for the foreman during the period 1980 to 1981. Skilled interviewers were selected from the Catawba Employee Relations group and these individuals were given training relative to technical terms associated with the welding craft. A guide was also prepared for the interviewers which provided an interview plan detailing certain questions and areas which were to be covered during the interview.

Enclosure

2

At the onset of the interview process, all interviewees were individually briefed by a welding superintendent with regards to the nature of the investigation, reason for the interview, and the fact that the interviewees should provide all information requested. They were encouraged to be as candid as possible with regards to the information they provided. The welding superintendent was not present during the interviews. A total of 147 employees were interviewed. In addition to the craft employees, the foreman and General Foreman were also interviewed. A total of 33 individuals were interviewed who were supervised by the foreman during 1980 and 1981; 19 welders were interviewed who were supervised by the foreman for at least a period in excess of two weeks; and, eight welders were interviewed who are presently working for the foreman. In addition, 68 other individuals were mentioned by other interviewees during the interviews and these individuals were also interviewed.

Some of the concerns identified by the Licensee during the meeting are characterized as follows: quality suffered because of production pressure; knowledge of interpass temperature violations; uncertainty about discussing problems with supervision; and improper welding procedures. There were also various other minor concerns reported. The licensee advised that in some cases mentioned above, one individual may have expressed several of the concerns characterized above. The Licensee is investigating and evaluating every issue identified during their investigation.

The Licensee also advised that an individual who alleged violating interpass temperature during the welding of stainless steel, agreed to fabricate several demonstration welds using the worst case weld he performed. The sockets were cut and several sections were removed for examination to determine the effects of overheating on the sockets. The Licensee stated that evaluation of this material is currently underway.

The Licensee was advised during this meeting that it may be prudent to fabricate additional samples representing different sizes of sockets and pipe in the presence of designated members of the Regional Staff. The licensee agreed with the proposal. The Regional staff requested that dual samples be fabricated and the second samples be released to the Regional Staff for the purpose of independent evaluation by a facility designated by NRC. The licensee agreed to provide the samples as discussed. The additional samples were fabricated, given to Region II staff and sent to the selected laboratory during the week of April 23, 1984 as discussed. In addition, the Licensee was requested and subsequently committed to keeping the Regional Staff informed of the progress of the DPC inquiry into the matters identified above. As previously agreed, the arrangements for a weekly telephonic briefing to a selected member of the Regional Staff was to continue.

The Licensee stated that every concern which can be traced to a specific piece of hardware has been nonconformed and processed through engineering for evaluation. In addition, the Licensee confirmed that there were problems involving employee relations between the foreman (as specifically identified) and certain crew members, and that there is also an indication that there may have been some employee relation-type problems involving the General Foreman of the specific welding crew.

MAY 01 1984

Enclosure

3

The Licensee stated that the investigation is now entering the evaluation phase which will involve a thorough examination of all the issues developed to date. Additional briefings will be given to corporate management and a decision made as to how the licensee should approach resolution of these problems.

The Licensee was advised that Region II staff will continue to closely monitor their activity, particularly inasmuch as the evaluation phase is beginning. It was reaffirmed to the Licensee that the Regional Staff will continue to monitor their overall activity in this matter and that the Regional Staff intends to conduct independent verification of selected technical matters related to this inquiry.