SSER

Task: Allegation A-298

Reference No.: 4-84-A-06-178b

Characterization: It is alleged that the EBASCO vendor reviews are inadequate and that Quality Control (QC) was not checking structural items for defects such as shop welds by Peden Steel.

Assessment of Allegation: A review of this allegation by the NRC staff concerning Peden Steel indicated that vendor reviews were performed at the vendor's facility by a vendor quality assurance representative (VQAR) who was employed by EBASCO. A review of records by the NRC staff confirmed that the VQAR performed inspections of safety-related structural items fabricated by Peden. These records date from June 1976 to November 1983.

The EBASCO QC organization for receiving and inspecting vendor-fabricated structural items did review and inspect such items as received at the site. In addition, the Ebasco records review group reviewed all vendor documentation in accordance with QAI-1, Revision 11, "Quality Assurance Records Management Instruction," dated July 12, 1983.

Review of a nonconformance report NCR W3-4776 by the NRC staff indicated that EBASCO QC rejected a shipment of reactor auxiliary building (RAB) restraint steel, by Peden steel upon arrival at the site. The steel was rejected because the shop welds on the whip restraints did not conform to the design drawings and the requirements in American Welding Society, AWS D1.1. The welds were undersize and indicated undercut and a lack of fusion. This illustrated that a QC program was in effect onsite and offsite. In this particular case, the onsite reinspection of Peden Steel was a part of the overall quality program and performed its function by identifying problems not previously found by the offsite QAR.

The NRC Construction Appraisal Team (CAT) inspection findings also indicated weld deficiencies in Peden Steel shop welds. This CAT finding led to the preparation of NCR W3-5805. Attachments 7 through 10 of the NCR inspection report listed welded connections that were evaluated by Ebasco Site Support Engineering (ESSE). A total of 720 welds were examined, of these 28 had aspects not in accordance with the specifications and needed to be reevaluated. They were evaluated by ESSE and none required reworking.

From the results of the staff evaluation, it appeared that this allegation has neither safety significance nor generic implications.

Potential Violations: None. 4

Actions Required: None.

8510020117 840619
PDR ADOCK 05000382
E PDR

References

1. NCR-W3-4776
2. NCR-W3-5805
3. Procedure QA-III-5, Revision 3, "Supplier Contractor Surveillance" dated October 8, 1982.
4. Procedure QAS-10, Revision 4, "Vendor Documentation Audit," dated July 20, 1979.
5. Significant Construction Deficiency No. 78.
6. Significant Construction Deficiency No. 73.
7. Discrepancy Notice No. SQ-2167
8. NCR-W3-1072.
9. VQAD-8, Revision 3, "Preparation and Control of Vendor Quality Assurance Report - Release for Shipment Form," dated January 18, 1982 (Ebasco).
10. VQAD-10, Revision 3, "Preparation and Control of Implementing Procedures," dated January 18, 1982 (Ebasco).
11. VQAD-13, Revision 2 "Review of Vendor Documentation,: dated June 12, 1981 (Ebasco).
12. QA-P.1, Revision 5, "Review of Vendor's Procedures," dated December 15, 1980 (Ebasco).

Statement Prepared By: _____ _____
Claude E. Johnson Date

Reviewed By: _____ _____
Team Leader Date

Reviewed By: _____ _____
Site Team Leader(s) Date

Approved By: _____ _____
Task Management Date

Document Name:
SSER A-298

Requestor's ID:
PATTYN

✓ 4

Author's Name:

Document Comments:

Document Name:
SSER A-298

Requestor's ID:
PATTYN

Author's Name:

Document Comments:

√4

A-298, REV. 0, 6/19/84

RETYPE, FILE FINAL

FINAL SSER ROUTING A298

Revision :	0	1	2	3
Denny Crutchfield	[signature] 6/14			FINAL
Jim Gagliardo	[signature] 6/15			

REVISION 0
06/19/84

SSER

Task: Allegation A-298

Reference No.: 4-84-A-06-178b

Characterization: It is alleged that the EBASCO vendor reviews are inadequate and that Quality Control (QC) was not checking structural items for defects such as shop welds by Peden Steel.

Assessment of Allegation: A review of this allegation by the NRC staff concerning Peden Steel indicated that vendor reviews were performed at the vendor's facility by a vendor quality assurance representative (VQAR) who was employed by EBASCO. A review of records by the NRC staff confirmed that the VQAR performed inspections of safety-related structural items fabricated by Peden. These records date from June 1976 to November 1983.

The EBASCO QC organization for receiving and inspecting vendor-fabricated structural items did review and inspect such items as received at the site. In addition, the Ebasco records review group reviewed all vendor documentation in accordance with QAI-1, Revision 11, "Quality Assurance Records Management Instruction," dated July 12, 1983.

Review of a nonconformance report NCR W3-4776 by the NRC staff indicated that EBASCO QC rejected a shipment of reactor auxiliary building (RAB) restraint steel, by Peden steel upon arrival at the site. The steel was rejected because the shop welds on the whip restraints did not conform to the design drawings and the requirements in American Welding Society, AWS D1.1. The welds were undersize and indicated undercut and a lack of fusion. This illustrated that a QC program was in effect onsite and offsite. In this particular case, the onsite reinspection of Peden Steel was a part of the overall quality program and performed its function by identifying problems not previously found by the offsite VQAR.

The NRC Construction Appraisal Team (CAT) inspection findings also indicated weld deficiencies in Peden Steel shop welds. This CAT finding led to the preparation of NCR W3-5805. Attachments 7 through 10 of the NCR inspection report listed welded connections that were evaluated by Ebasco Site Support Engineering (ESSE). A total of 720 welds were examined, of these 28 had aspects not in accordance with the specifications and needed to be reevaluated. They were evaluated by ESSE and none required reworking.

From the results of the staff evaluation, it appeared that this allegation has neither safety significance nor generic implications.

Potential Violations: None. 4

Actions Required: None.

References

1. NCR-W3-4776
2. NCR-W3-5805
3. Procedure QA-III-5, Revision 3, "Supplier Contractor Surveillance" dated October 8, 1982.
4. Procedure QAS-10, Revision 4, "Vendor Documentation Audit," dated July 20, 1979.
5. Significant Construction Deficiency No. 78.
6. Significant Construction Deficiency No. 73.
7. Discrepancy Notice No. SQ-2167
8. NCR-W3-1072.
9. VQAD-8, Revision 3, "Preparation and Control of Vendor Quality Assurance Report - Release for Shipment Form," dated January 18, 1982 (Ebasco).
10. VQAD-10, Revision 3, "Preparation and Control of Implementing Procedures," dated January 18, 1982 (Ebasco).
11. VQAD-13, Revision 2 "Review of Vendor Documentaticn,: dated June 12, 1981 (Ebasco).
12. QA-P.1, Revision 5, "Review of Vendor's Procedures," dated December 15, 1980 (Ebasco).

Statement Prepared By: _____ _____
Claude E. Johnson Date

Reviewed By: _____ _____
Team Leader Date

Reviewed By: _____ _____
Site Team Leader(s) Date

Approved By: _____ _____
Task Management Date

Document Name:
SSER A-298

Requestor's ID:
CONNIE

Author's Name:

Document Comments:

✓4

ON Route to Gags/Denny

~~DRAFT 2~~ Revision 0
~~06/07/84~~ Stet

SSER

Task: Allegation A-298

Reference No.: 4-84-A-06-178b

Characterization: It is alleged that the Ebasco vendor reviews are inadequate and that Quality Control (QC) is not checking structural items for defects such as shop welds by Peden Steel.

Assessment of Allegation: A review of this allegation by the NRC staff concerning Peden Steel indicates that vendor reviews were performed at the vendor's facility by a vendor quality assurance representative (VQAR) who is employed by Ebasco. A review of records by the NRC staff confirmed that the VQAR performed inspections ~~on~~ of safety-related structural items fabricated by Peden. These records date from June 1976 to November 1983.

The Ebasco QC organization for receiving and inspection onsite reviewed and inspected vendor-fabricated structural items received at the site. In addition, the Ebasco records review group reviewed all vendor documentation in accordance with QAI-1, Revision 11, "Quality Assurance Records Management Instruction," dated July 12, 1983.

Review of a nonconformance report NCR W3-4776 by the NRC staff indicated that ~~upon receipt~~ of reactor auxiliary building (RAB) restraint steel, Ebasco QC rejected a shipment by Peden steel upon arrival at the site. The steel was rejected because the shop welds on whip restraints did not conform to the design drawings and the requirements in American Welding Society, AWS D1.1. The welds were undersize and indicated undercut and a lack of fusion. This clearly illustrates that a QC program was in effect onsite and offsite. In this particular case, the onsite reinspection of Peden Steel was a backup for the obvious oversights by the VQAR offsite.

The NRC staff review of the Construction Appraisal Team (CAT) inspection findings indicated more weld deficiencies in Peden Steel shop welds. This finding by the CAT initiated NCR W3-5805, attachments 7 through 10, which

listed welded connections that were evaluated by Ebasco Site Support Engineering (ESSE). A total of 720 welds were examined, of these 28 were evaluated by ESSE and none required reworking.

From the results of the staff evaluation, it appears that this allegation has neither safety significance nor generic implications.

Potential Violations: None. 4

Actions Required: None.

References

1. NCR-W3-4776
2. NCR-W3-5805
3. Procedure QA-III-5, Revision 3, "Supplier Contractor Surveillance" dated October 8, 1982.
4. Procedure QAS-10, Revision 4, "Vendor Documentation Audit," dated July 20, 1979.
5. Significant Construction Deficiency No. 78.
6. Significant Construction Deficiency No. 73.
7. Discrepancy Notice No. SQ-2167
8. NCR-W3-1072.
9. VQAD-8, Revision 3, "Preparation and Control of Vendor Quality Assurance Report - Release for Shipment Form," dated January 18, 1982 (Ebasco).
10. VQAD-10, Revision 3, "Preparation and Control of Implementing Procedures," dated January 18, 1982 (Ebasco).
11. VQAD-13, Revision 2 "Review of Vendor Documentation,: dated June 12, 1981 (Ebasco).
12. QA-P.1, Revision 5, "Review of Vendor's Procedures," dated December 15, 1980 (Ebasco).

Statement Prepared By: _____ _____
Claude E. Johnson Date

Reviewed By: _____ _____
Team Leader Date

Reviewed By: _____ _____
Site Team Leader(s) Date

Approved By: _____ _____
Task Management Date

~~A-298~~ ~~DRAFT 2~~ Revision 0
06/07/84

V4

FILE A-298

SSER

Task: Allegation A-298

Reference No.: 4-84-A-06-178b

Characterization: It is ~~alleged~~ WAS THE EBASCO that vendor reviews are inadequate and that Quality Control (QC) ~~is~~ not checking structural items for defects such as shop welds by Peden Steel.

Assessment of Allegation: A review of this allegation by the NRC staff concerning Peden Steel indicates that vendor reviews were performed at the vendor's facility by a vendor quality assurance representative (VQAR) who ~~is~~ WAS employed by Ebasco. A review of records by the NRC staff confirmed that the VQAR performed inspections ~~on~~ OF safety-related structural items fabricated by Peden. These records date from June 1976 to November 1983.

The Ebasco QC organization for receiving and inspection ~~onsite~~ reviewed and inspected vendor-fabricated structural items received at the site. In addition, the Ebasco records review group reviewed all vendor documentation in accordance with QAI-1, Revision 11, "Quality Assurance Records Management Instruction," dated July 12, 1983.

Review of a nonconformance report NCR W3-4776 by the NRC staff indicated that ~~upon receipt~~ of reactor auxiliary building (RAB) restraint steel, Ebasco QC rejected a shipment by Peden steel upon arrival at the site. The steel was rejected because the shop welds on whip restraints did not conform to the design drawings and the requirements in AWS D1.1. The welds were undersize and indicated undercut and a lack of fusion. This ~~clearly~~ illustrates that a QC program was in effect onsite and offsite. In this particular case, the onsite reinspection of Peden Steel ~~was a backup for the obvious oversights by the VQAR offsite.~~

~~The NRC staff review of~~ The NRC Construction Appraisal Team (CAT) inspection findings also indicated ~~more~~ weld deficiencies in Peden Steel shop welds. This finding ~~by the CAT initiated~~ led to the fabrication of NCR W3-5805. Attachments 7 through 10, ~~which~~ CAT INSPECTION REPORT of the NRC was a part of the overall quality program and performed its function by identifying problems not previously found by the offsite VQAR.

RETYPE (REV. 1) RECIRCULATED
TO DC & JG.

had aspects not in accordance with the specifications and needed to be reevaluated. They

listed welded connections that were evaluated by Ebasco Site Support Engineering (ESSE). A total of 720 welds were examined, of these 28 were evaluated by ESSE and none required reworking.

From the results of the staff evaluation, it appears that this allegation has neither safety significance nor generic implications.

Potential Violations: None. 4

Actions Required: None.

References

1. NCR-W3-4776
2. NCR-W3-5805
3. Procedure QA-III-5, Revision 3, "Supplier Contractor Surveillance" dated October 8, 1982.
4. Procedure QAS-10, Revision 4, "Vendor Documentation Audit," dated July 20, 1979.
5. Significant Construction Deficiency No. 78.
6. Significant Construction Deficiency No. 73.
7. Discrepancy Notice No. SQ-2167
8. NCR-W3-1072.
9. VQAD-8, Revision 3, "Preparation and Control of Vendor Quality Assurance Report - Release for Shipment Form," dated January 18, 1982 (Ebasco).
10. VQAD-10, Revision 3, "Preparation and Control of Implementing Procedures," dated January 18, 1982 (Ebasco).
11. VQAD-13, Revision 2 "Review of Vendor Documentation,: dated June 12, 1981 (Ebasco).
12. QA-P.1, Revision 5, "Review of Vendor's Procedures," dated December 15, 1980 (Ebasco).

Statement Prepared By: _____ _____
Claude E. Johnson Date

Reviewed By: _____ _____
Team Leader Date

Reviewed By: _____ _____
Site Team Leader(s) Date

Approved By: _____ _____
Task Management Date