

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION III

Report No: 50-341/85038(DRS)

Docket No: 50-341

License No: NPF-33

Licensee: The Detroit Edison Company
2000 Second Avenue
Detroit, MI 48224

Facility Name: Enrico Fermi Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 2

Inspection At: Enrico Fermi 2 Site, Monroe, MI

Inspection Conducted: June 25-27, 1985

Inspector: J. Jacobson

7/10/85
Date

Approved By: *D. H. Danielson*
D. H. Danielson, Chief
Materials and Processes Section

7/10/85
Date

Inspection Summary

Inspection on June 25-27, 1985 (Report No. 50-341/85038(DRS))

Areas Inspected: Unannounced, special inspection to review welding procedures used by the electrical contractor for cable trays and supports. This inspection involved a total of 16 inspector-hours onsite by one NRC inspector.

Results: Within the areas inspected, one violation was identified (failure to control special processes - Paragraph 2.a).

8507150408 850710
PDR ADOCK 05000341
Q PDR

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Detroit Edison Company

- *W. Jens, Vice President, Nuclear Operations
- L. Bregni, Licensing Engineer
- *J. Mullens, Welding Engineer
- *J. Conen, Licensing Engineer
- *G. Trahey, Director, Nuclear Quality Assurance
- *J. Rotondo, Supervisor, Quality Control

*Denotes those attending the exit meeting on June 27, 1985.

2. Review of L. K. Comstock Welding Procedures

A comprehensive review of all welding procedures used for fabrication and installation of cable trays and supports was performed. The procedures and revisions reviewed are as follows:

- a. Procedure 000-03001, revisions dated September 27, 1982; June 16, 1981; April 11, 1980; April 27, 1979; October 18, 1978; and February 22, 1977, do not address the progression for vertical welding nor the single pass/fillet size requirements of AWS D1.1-75 (the applicable welding code). The AWS code allows the use of certain welding procedures without having to perform a qualification test, provided all stated requirements are met. The "prequalified" fillet weld procedure requires that a specific size fillet be applied dependent material thickness, and that it be accomplished in a single pass thus controlling heat input. Failure to observe heat input requirements may result in weld cracking. All revisions of this procedure fail to incorporate this requirement. The AWS code further requires that the progression of vertical welding be in the upward direction. Again all revisions fail to incorporate this requirement.

Since these procedures claim to be "prequalified" yet do not incorporate all requirements, they require a qualification in accordance with AWS D1.1. Failure to properly qualify this welding procedure in accordance with AWS D1.1 code requirements is a violation of 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion IX (341/85038-01(DRS)).

- b. Procedure 000-03-04 dated May 20, 1980 was reviewed and found to be acceptable.

3. Review of Beam 502B Weld Repair

Beam 502B is a radial box beam which required repairs for linear indications identified during magnetic particle examination. The repair was attempted, however, linear indications remained under an attachment for a pipe whip restraint. S&L was asked to analyze the beam with the

linear indications present and recommend a solution. The analysis showed that a modification consisting of an additional reinforcing plate would be acceptable. This is considered an open item pending NRC review of the S&L analysis (341/85038-02(DRS)).

4. Open Item

Open items are matters which have been discussed with the licensee, which will be reviewed further by the inspectors, and which involve some action on the part of the NRC or licensee or both. Open items disclosed during the inspection are discussed in Paragraph 3.

5. Exit Interview

The inspector met with representatives (denoted in Persons Contacted paragraph) at the conclusion of the inspection. The inspector summarized the scope and findings of the inspections noted in this report. The inspector also discussed the likely informational content of the inspection report with regard to documents or processes reviewed by the inspector during the inspection. The licensee did not identify any such documents/processes as proprietary.