

ř

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

February 11, 1985 (NMP2L 0337)

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 an ITT Grinnell weld that was accepted on the basis of an incorrect radiograph. This problem was reported via tel-con to P. Russ of your staff on September 13, 1984. An interim report was submitted via our letter dated October 15, 1984.

Very truly yours,

comanzan

C. V. Mangan Vice President Nuclear Engineering and Licensing

CVM/GG:csb (0715H)

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

> R. A. Gramm, NRC Resident Inspector Project File (2)

8502220023 850211 PDR ADDCK 05000410 S PDR

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

Final Report for a Problem Concerning Incorrect Radiograph (55(e)-84-39)

Description of the Problem

During a review of ITT Grinnell weld radiographs, it was observed that radiographs for welds CSH 25-7 FW015 and CSH 25-7 FW017 are identical. Radiographic interpretation reports for both welds had been signed off as approved. Apparently, one of the welds had not been radiographed. This weld joint has since been radiographed and found acceptable. The subject weld is located in the high pressure core spray system.

As a result of the above condition, an investigation of the radiographs performed by the same radiographer who radiographed the above welds was conducted by ITT Grinnell. Eight out of a total of 129 welds were selected at random, reradiographed and compared to the originals. No discrepancies were found with the welds which were reradiographed. However, during this investigation, another case of duplication of radiographs was identified. These welds were also reradiographed and found to be acceptable.

Additional evaluation of the two cases of radiograph duplication, including an interview of the radiographer involved, was performed. Based on our evaluations, we believe the cause of the duplication may be the method (flagging) used by Construction to identify welds requiring radiography.

Analysis of Safety Implications

The reradiography has indicated that the welds for which duplicate radiographs were found are acceptable. Therefore, had the subject condition remained uncorrected, it could not have adversely affected the safety of operations of the plant. Therefore, the criteria for reportability have not been met.

Corrective Action

To provide additional assurance of the acceptability of the completed work and prevent recurrence of the subject condition, the following actions have been or will be taken:

- On January 3, 1984, ITT Grinnell revised its training procedure, RT-001, to require verification of the weld joint by ITT Grinnell prior to radiography.
- 2. A sampling plan will be developed by April 1, 1985, to review the welds radiographed by ITT Grinnell prior to January 3, 1984. If this review identifies any reportable deficiency, the NRC will be notified.