



UNITED STATES
 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF SPECIAL PROJECTS

SEQUOYAH NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2

NRC WELDING CATEGORY - WELDING PROCEDURES

I. SUBJECT

NRC Essential Element - "Welding Procedures"

TVA Category: WELDING

TVA Subcategories: WE 50822

The employee concerns were evaluated by TVA as potentially safety related and applicable to the Sequoyah site or as potentially applicable to the Sequoyah site on a generic basis. The staff believes that there are five essential elements which must be functioning for a welding program to be viable. The staff placed each of the individual employee concerns into one of these essential element categories. A miscellaneous grouping was established to cover those employee concerns which are not directly related to the welding program at the Sequoyah site, or are not easily placed in one of the essential element categories. These program essential element categories are as follows:

- Welding Procedures
- Welder Qualification/Training
- Welding Inspection
- Weld Design and Configuration
- Filler Material Control
- Miscellaneous/One of a Kind

The staff evaluated each individual employee concern and assigned it to one of these essential elements. None of the employee concerns considered by October 1986 (first draft of the Welding SER) were assigned to the NRC essential element category "Welding Procedures." Subsequently the following concern was assigned by TVA a generic label, and was, therefore, applicable to the Sequoyah site.

<u>EMPLOYEE CONCERN NO.</u>	<u>TVA FINAL ELEMENT REPORT RESPONDING TO CONCERN</u>	<u>BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF CONCERN</u>
JLH-85-003	WP-22-SQN	Inadequate weld procedure

II. SUMMARY OF ISSUES

The issue involved with the employee concern JLH-85-003 covered in WP-22-SQN is summarized as follows:

Inadequate weld procedure and/or failure to include or reference a weld detail drawing in the work package.

III. EVALUATION

The concern as stated is misleading. The licensee had established a procedure for a routine task involving welding. The issue can be described as a minor work package drawing omission which was corrected by adding a note to the data sheet referencing the applicable standard drawing for installing a plug to an access hole for radiography, a routine pipe welding task.

Although the action taken by TVA to resolve this particular incident is acceptable, there remains the question of this being another example of the drawings not reflecting the as-built status of fabrications. There are many other examples of drawings not showing the as-built conditions, and this is being addressed by TVA's Design Base Verification Program.

IV. CONCLUSION

The staff concludes that this concern had no effect on hardware and is of no concern to public health and safety.