# MAR 25 1988

MEMORANDUM FOR: Region III Files (Braidwood 1 and 2)

FROM:

P. R. Pelke, Project Inspector, Braidwood

SUBJECT:

WELDING AND VALVES AT BRAIDWOOD (50-456; 50-457)

(AMS NO. RIII-85-A-0204)

On March 24, 1986, the Allegation Review Board met to discuss the subject allegation. The outline of the meeting is enclosed.

P. R. Pelke Project Inspector

Enclosure: Outline for Allegation Review Board

cc w/enclosure:

A. Davis

C. Norelius

C. Paperiello

E. Greenman

W. Little

J. Harrison

R. Gardner

D. Danielson

J. Jacobson

C. Weil

W. Kropp

J. Stevens, NRR

M. Farber

Pelke/SITE

8603310056 860325 PDR ADOCK 05000456

111

# OUTLINE FOR ALLEGATION REVIEW BOARD (AMS NO. RIII-85-A-0204)

References: (1) Memorandum from Charles H. Weil to Charles E. Norelius dated December 16, 1985

(2) Letter from Charles H. Weil to alleger dated December 16, 1985

(3) Letter from alleger to Charles H. Weil dated December 17, 1985

(4) Letter from alleger to Charles H. Weil dated December 19, 1985

(5) Letter from alleger to Charles H. Weil dated December 21, 1985

(6) Memorandum from T.N. Tambling to Charles E. Norelius dated December 26, 1985

(7) Memorandum from P.R. Pelke to RIII Files dated February 25, 1986

Recommended Inspector: John Jacobson

\*Reference (2) numbered the individual concerns as documented in Reference (1). Additionally, the alleger expands on those concerns in References (3), (4), and (5). Reference (6) documented the first Allegation Review Board on this allegation.

Attached are the interview results and revised action plan developed in response to the initial Allegation Review Board meeting.

Scheduled Completion Date: 07/01/86, however, the inspector should accomplish interim inspections if possible.

# INTERVIEW RESULTS - ALLEGATION RIII-85-A-0204

The alleger was interviewed on 2/26/86 from approximately 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. at a location near his home by J. Jacobson and W. Kropp. The alleger was told that the purpose of the interview was to attempt to clarify his concerns as outlined in C. Weil's letter to the alleger, dated 12/16/85 and to afford the opportunity to voice any additional concerns he may have. The points discussed and the NRC inspector's recommended actions are as follows:

#### Item 1:

The alleger made a general statement that productivity was stressed above quality. When asked for specifics he could offer none. He stated that his only "real" concerns were Items 5 and 7.

# Recommended NRC Action:

None.

# Item 2:

The alleger referred to the "tack in place/weld in place" program at Braidwood. The alleger stated that this program was developed because "engineering was so screwed up," however, he had no hardware related

concerns. The alleger was told that the NRC had reviewed this program and accepted it. He said that he had no real problem with it.

## Recommended NRC Action:

None.

# Item 3:

The alleger stated that often secondary hangers are attached to primary hangers and that many clearance problems existed. He stated that he had seen situations where the pipe was not even touching the hanger, i.e. bearing no load. When asked for specifics he could give none and added that most of his experience was with class "D" nonsafety related piping.

#### Recommended NRC Action:

The Region III staff is currently aware of the clearance issue and will continue to monitor licensee progress.

Item 4:

See Item 3.

#### Item 5:

The alleger stated that he had seen large porosity holes in the completed and flat topped RC piping welds. He stated that he had brought this to the attention of a Q.C. inspector in late 1984 or early 1985. The alleger could not remember the name of the inspector and added that he has since gone back to look for these "holes" and could not find them. The alleger agreed that possibly the "holes" had since been repaired.

#### Recommended NRC Action:

Review RC piping repair packages to ascertain if repairs have in fact been made. The inspector will also visually examine a sample of the RC piping, including welds 1RCO1-8 and 1RCO3-8 which the alleger stated contains some small minor porosity.

# Item 6:

The alleger stated that he was part of a work crew assigned to torque the body to bonnet bolts on pressurizer valves 1AOV-RY455-A and 1AOV-RY456. The alleger described the modification of the torque wrench as an 8" extension fit onto the head of the wrench. He stated that an engineer made torque correction calculations as the wrench was positioned on the difficult to reach bolt heads. The alleger doubts the validity of the calculations.

#### Recommended NRC Action:

Review the bolt up records and associated calculations for these valves. In addition, verify a sample of actual bolt torque.

#### Item 7:

The alleger stated that the welding electrode weave width as stated in the welding procedure (4 X electrode diameter) was violated in that some welders used only 3 weld passes for a joint approximately 3" wide. His concern is that excessive heat was applied to the pipe joint, and that he knew about the pipe cracking problem at Dresden. The NRC inspector explained that the problem at Dresden was associated with the BWR system only and did not apply to Braidwood. The alleger also stated that root repairs were made from the inside on the RC piping due to "suck back." The NRC inspector explained that the method of repair was technically acceptable and that the final radiography would detect any unacceptable repair. The alleger stated that he had no problem with that.

#### Recommended NRC Action:

Review the welding procedure and joint design to ascertain welding requirements.

Review delta ferrite records for a sample of RC welds and verify some actual ferrite readings. If ferrite is present in sufficient quantity in

the welds, this will indicate that "excessive" heat was not used during weldings.

Review a sample of radiographs of RC welds or reference a previous NRC review of radiographs to establish soundness of RC joints.

#### Item 8:

The alleger stated that he had no personal knowledge, but had heard that CEAs were being improperly installed. He also stated that "failed" CEAs were being dispositioned use-as-is via the Getschow 9006 Form.

#### Recommended NRC Action:

The Region III staff is currently aware of the CEA installation issue and will continue to monitor licensee progress on the 50.55(e). The inspector will review a sample of the completed 9006 Forms for proper disposition.

# Item 9:

The alleger stated that many structural welds contained undercut. When asked for specifics he replied "just look anywhere in the plant." The NRC inspector explained the recently adopted VWAC provisions for undercut

and the reasons behind this provision. He replied that he had no problem with it then.

# Recommended NRC Action:

Perform a visual weld inspection of a sample of structural welds.

#### Additional Items of Concern:

a. Inspect hanger 1CV15014S for proper installation. The alleger stated that this hanger was installed misaligned and that the supervision said to "wait and see if Q.C. catches it."

# Recommended NRC Action:

Inspect hanger.

b. Hanger 1FP12005R had to be drilled out for load pin to fit. His concern is that this may not be the proper hanger.

# Recommended NRC Action:

Inspect hanger.

The alleger was told the extent of the proposed action for each item and indicated satisfaction with our response.