NIAGARA MOHAWK

NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION/300 ERIE BOULEVARD WEST, SYRACUSE, N.Y. 13202/TELEPHONE (315) 474-1511

January 31, 1985
(NMP2L 0332)

Mr. R. W. Starostecki, Director
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region I
Division of Project and Resident Programs
631 Park Avenue
King of Prussia, PA 19406

Re: Nine Mile Point - Unit 2
Docket No. 50-410

Dear Mr. Starostecki:

Enclosed is a final report, in accordance with 10CFR50.55(e), for the problem concerning W. J. Woolley Company's Quality Assurance documentation. This problem was reported via tel-con to H. Kister of your staff on May 4, 1983. Interim reports were submitted via our letters dated June 3, 1983, August 12, 1983, and October 31, 1984.

Very truly yours,

C. V. Mangan
Vice President
Nuclear Engineering and Licensing

CVM/GG:csb
(0712H)

xc: Director of Inspection and Enforcement
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

R. A. Gramm, NRC Resident Inspector

Project File (2)

IE27
1/1

NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION
NINE MILE POINT - UNIT 2
DOCKET NO. 50-410

Final Report Concerning
W. J. Woolley Company's
Quality Assurance Documentation

Description of the Problem

A review of the welding and in-process records available at W. J. Woolley Company's Canton, Ohio, facility was performed during the week of April 4, 1983. The review indicated discrepancies in the quality assurance documentation records for the fabrication of certain equipment manufactured by Irwin Steel Company. The Irwin Steel Company was subsequently acquired by W. J. Woolley Company. The following equipment was manufactured by the Irwin Steel Company and supplied to Nine Mile Point - Unit 2.

1. Combination equipment hatch and personnel airlock
2. Equipment hatch
3. Escape airlock
4. Control rod drive removal hatch
5. Suppression pool access hatches (2)

All of the equipment, with the exception of the personnel airlock, has been installed and is embedded in the primary containment concrete structure.

The available records were reviewed for compliance to Irwin Steel Company's Quality Assurance Manual, Revision 8, dated May 5, 1978, which was the manual in effect during fabrication. The following types of discrepancies were indicated:

1. Contrary to the requirement in Irwin Steel Company's quality assurance manual, weld cards were not available for certain components.

2. Welder qualification maintenance records were not available to show that the welders maintained their qualification by performing the welding process within a 6-month period prior to the use of the welding process in certain applications. The welder's original qualifications were on file except for one welder.

3. Inconsistencies were observed between weld maps, developed to coordinate the various parameters (e.g., weld number, welder number, weld procedure used, non-destructive test report number) and the cross-referencing documents.

IE27
1/1

4. From various magnetic particle test reports, it appears as if the testing was performed on a date prior to the date of the weld cards.

Analysis of Safety Implications

A detailed investigation of additional Woolley documentation (e.g., non-destructive examination reports, in-process data sheets, certified material test reports) and Woolley manufacturing practices was performed. In addition, an engineering evaluation was performed of the welds for which discrepancies could not be resolved from the above investigation. The evaluation indicates that the subject welds/components are technically acceptable as is and could not have adversely affected the safety of operations of the plant. Therefore, the criteria for reportability have not been met.