DUKE POWER COMPANY
P.O. BOX 33189
CHARLOTTE, N.C. 28242

HAL B. TUCKER
VICE PRESIDENT
NUCLEAR PRODUCTION

TELEPHONE
(704) 373-4531

84 MAY 24 P1:24

May 22, 1984

Mr. James P. O'Reilly, Regional Administrator
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region II
101 Marietta Street, NW, Suite 2900
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Re: Catawba Nuclear Station
Unit 1
Docket No. 50-413

Dear Mr. O'Reilly:

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55e, please find attached Significant Deficiency Report No. SD 413/84-11.

Very truly yours,

Hal B. Tucker
EGT

Hal B. Tucker

LTP/php

Attachment

cc: Director
Office of Inspection & Enforcement
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

NRC Resident Inspector
Catawba Nuclear Station

Palmetto Alliance
2135½ Devine Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29205

INPO Records Center
Suite 1500
1100 Circle 75 Parkway
Atlanta, Georgia 30339

Mr. Robert Guild, Esq.
Attorney-at-Law
P. O. Box 12097
Charleston, South Carolina 29412

Mr. Jesse L. Riley
Carolina Environmental Study Group
854 Henley Place
Charlotte, North Carolina 28207

IE 27
1/1

REPORT NO: SD 413/84-11

REPORT DATE: May 22, 1984

FACILITY: Catawba Nuclear Station
Unit 1

IDENTIFICATION OF DEFICIENCY:

Welding inspection revealed discrepancies between fabrication drawings and equipment. Deficiency was identified by Nonconforming Item 18132.

INITIAL REPORT:

On April 24, 1984, A. Ignatonis, NRC Region II, Atlanta, Georgia was notified of the deficiency by W. O. Henry and T. L. Utterback of Duke Power Company, Charlotte, North Carolina.

COMPONENT AND SUPPLIER:

Air Handling Units (2) fabricated by Bahnson Service Company (BSCo.), Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

DESCRIPTION OF DEFICIENCY:

As reported by NCIR 18132, a site inspection of air handling units fabricated by BSCo. revealed welding discrepancies documented in Bahnson Report BSC-W-289 dated March 2, 1984. Discrepancies included deviation from fabrication drawings and poor workmanship. Rejection was based on AWS D1.1 code requirements and BSCo. Inspection Procedures.

Welding problems were not discovered during shop inspection in violation of BSCo.'s QA program. These deficiencies were not identified by Duke Power prior to installation of the equipment.

Similar Bahnson equipment at another Duke location was also inspected. Minor welding discrepancies were identified. Discrepancies included overlap, convexity, weld spatter, considered cosmetic in nature, and one weld is being evaluated for lack of fusion.

ANALYSIS OF SAFETY IMPLICATIONS:

If the welding deficiencies had remained undetected, the equipment could have failed to perform its intended control complex cooling function during/after a seismic event.

CORRECTIVE ACTION:

BSCo. equipment was analyzed to determine if such failure modes existed. None was found. Engineering has accepted the equipment "as-is". Repair work was not required and none was recommended. All documentation is on file with the completed NCIP..

Generic industry concerns have been addressed in NRC IE Information Notice No. 84-30 dated April 18, 1984.

Evaluation of similar equipment is in progress. Evaluation will be completed by June 29, 1984.