



RECEIVED
NRC

Arizona Nuclear Power Project

P.O. BOX 52034 • PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85072-2034

JUL 19 AM 10:50

July 15, 1985
ANPP-32752-TDS/TPS

50-538
50-529
50-538

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region V
1450 Maria Lane - Suite 210
Walnut Creek, California 94596-5368

Attention: Mr. D. F. Kirsch, Acting Director
Division of Reactor Safety and Projects

Subject: Final Report - DER 85-15
A 50.55(e) Condition Relating to
Thin Wall Pipe from Hub, Inc.
File: 85-019-026; D.4.33.2

Reference: A) Telephone Conversation between R. C. Sorensen
and P. J. Coffin on April 24, 1985
B) Letter from E. E. Van Brunt, Jr. to D. F. Kirsch,
dated May 24, 1985
C) Telephone Conversation between A. Hon and
P. J. Coffin on May 28, 1985
D) ANPP-32752, dated May 30, 1985 (Interim Report)

Dear Sir:

Attached is our final written report of the Deficiency referenced above,
which has been determined to be Not Reportable under the requirements
of 10CFR 50.55(e) and 10 CFR Part 21.

Very truly yours,

EE Van Brunt / ASK

E. E. Van Brunt, Jr.
Executive Vice President
Project Director

EEVB/TPS/jb

Attachment

cc: See Page Two

8508050330 850715
PDR ADOCK 05000528
S PDR

11
IE-27

Mr. D. F. Kirsch
DER 85-15
Page Two

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

D. B. Karner
W. E. Ide
D. B. Fasnacht
A. C. Rogers
L. A. Souza
D. E. Fowler
T. D. Shriver
C. N. Russo
B. S. Kaplan
J. R. Bynum
J. M. Allen
D. Canady
A. C. Gehr
W. J. Stubblefield
W. G. Bingham
R. L. Patterson
R. W. Welcher
H. D. Foster
D. R. Hawkinson
R. P. Zimmerman
M. L. Clyde
B. T. Parker
T. J. Bloom
D. N. Stover
J. D. Houchen
J. E. Kirby

Records Center
Institute of Nuclear Power Operations
1100 Circle 75 Parkway, Suite 1500
Atlanta Georgia 30339

FINAL REPORT - DER 85-15

DEFICIENCY EVALUATION 50.55(e)

ARIZONA NUCLEAR POWER PROJECT (ANPP)

PVNGS UNITS 1, 2, 3

I. Description of Deficiency

Hub, Inc. has notified Bechtel under 10 CFR 21 that, based upon the inspection method used by Phoenix Steel Corporation, certain pipe material manufactured by Phoenix Steel Corporation may have undersize wall thickness. Discussion with Guyon Alloys (piping supplier) revealed that two years ago they found a short piece of forged pipe which was under minimum wall. Phoenix Steel Corporation considered this to be an isolated case. The NRC, after learning of the incident in a recent visit to Guyon Alloys, visited Phoenix Steel Corporation to determine the extent of the problem. From a sample of four pieces, one was found to be 12 percent under minimum wall thickness (12-1/2 percent is permitted). The NRC concluded that a potential problem exists and required the issuance of the Part 21 notice. A Bechtel QA review of the Phoenix Steel process for producing forged pipe showed that all their production equipment fabricated pipe with a 5-digit heat number beginning with an 8 or 9. A review of heat number records at PVNGS revealed only one heat number from Phoenix Steel in this category. Heat number 93213 was procured on P. O. F152319 from Guyon Alloys and consists of 8 feet of schedule 40, SA106 Grade B pipe. A total of four pipe spools have been fabricated from this piece and installed in Unit 2 under DCP 2SP-EW-016. The fabrication of these spools used a total of 1 foot, 3 inches of the 8 feet supplied.

In a letter dated May 21, 1985 (MIC #246053), Hub Inc. states that pipe made of material other than SA-106 was suspect. Since the Bechtel review addressed all material grades within the affected heat numbers, this new information has no impact on this DER.

Evaluation

The records of Guyon Alloys show the 8 foot pipe spool was furnished to an order on December 23, 1981, and processed under their quality assurance program, which required the ends of all pipe to be completely measured for minimum wall thickness prior to shipment for nuclear or safety-related use. Bechtel issued NCR PX-10851 to measure the ends of the remaining 6 foot 9 inches of the above-mentioned pipe. Both measurements were within the allowable code and industry standards, so it is concluded that a nonconforming condition does not exist.

Final Report
DER 85-15
Page Two

II. Analysis of Safety Implications

Based on the above, this condition is evaluated as not reportable under the requirements of 10 CFR 50.55(e) or 10CFR 21, since it does not represent a safety significant condition.

III. Corrective Action

None Required.