Copy to: EW Willett
original: Mapp

NRC EXIT MEETING
June 10, 1983

400/401/83-20

where are we on this?

Attendees:

Mr. G. M. Simpson, Principal CI Specialist
Mr. F. R. Haney, Senior Construction Specialist
Mr. D. C. Whitehead, QA Supervisor - Surveillance
Mr. A. Fuller, Principal Engineer - Mechanical
Mr. E. E. Willett, Resident Engineer - Mechanical
Mr. G. L. Forehand, Director - QA/QC
Mr. M. F. Thompson, Jr., Senior Resident Engineer
Mr. R. M. Parsons, Project General Manager
Mr. N. J. Chiangi, Manager - QA/QC - Harris Plant
Mr. D. A. McGaw, Superintendent - QA
Mr. M. D. Vernon, Superintendent - QC
Mr. B. B. Isom, Construction Manager - Daniel
Mr. J. Pardi, Daniel General Manager
Mr. P. F. Foscolo, Assistant General Project Manager

NRC

Mr. R. Prevatte, SRIC
Mr. P. Bemis, USNRC Section Chief
Mr. G. F. Maxwell. USNRC Sr. Ops.
Mr. J. W. York. USNRC, Sr. Mech/Weld Engineer

The meeting was conducted by Mr. J. W. York, NRC, who advised he looked into three areas:

Previously identified items

Post-weld heat treatment on structural steel

Hanger Inspection Program

Previously Unresolved Items

CLOSED Unresolved 400/83-05-01 Ground Areas on Pipe Support Areas/Restraint No. 1-SW-H-376. Not sure at that time you had minimum wall requirements. Since then you have done ultrasonic tests and verified it is not under minimum wall requirements

A93

A93

-continued-

Post-Weld Heat - Turbine Steel

Checked for three welds on tower restraint for loop 1 - in various stages (one complete one in process of being post-weld heat treated and one getting ready for setting insulation) - no problem.

Hanger Inspection Program

Reinspected 10 hangers in Phase 1 (various stages); which means hanger may not have been totally inspected. Looked at these 10 and another one with weld inspection people (visual; fillet size; length, etc.). Had problems on three hangers which will be identified as violation 400/83-20-01 (Failure to follow procedure for Hanger Inspection).

CS 2457

In this particular case there was a plate welded to the embedment. Tubular steel was welded to the plate. Looking back through the paperwork there was a change (2-3 times). This plate and the material was not a vendor package type but had been field issued. The installed plate was 4" x 4" x 5/8". It had been initially requisitioned as 4" x 4" x 1/2". When the drawing was issued it was drawn as 5" x 5" x 5/8". The CI inspector inspected to the drawing and did not catch the variance.

RH 165

In this case there is a tubular steel welded to the embedment on the end of which is a clip to which you intend to attach a snubber. This clip, according to Bergen-Paterson catalog, is not to be used on the end where the snubber attachment is made. This is the wrong catalog number for the intended use. There is a slight dimensional difference between this clip and the one that is supposed to be used. Dimensions where snubber fits - 1/16" difference (smaller). All other dimensions are the same.

-continued-

Hanger # 29

Safety Injection System - tubular steel (box type hanger, safety injection piping - from the tubular steel you have a brace that runs over from embed. Brace had been called to be 6" x 4" x 1/2" (in thickness). It was 6" x 4" x 3/8". This particular piece was requisitioned from another hanger. CMR proves component from other hanger did nave 1/2" thickness on tubular steel. According to that package you should have put that particular part in. However, marked on the hanger is another hanger number; that is marked through; another hanger number is marked on the hanger and that hanger number is marked through and SI-H29 has been marked on it.

Mr. York expressed concern that CI inspector did not pick this up as it was signed off. He wondered about material control on these hangers. Will probably, in the future, take a look and see if you have material control problems.

Mr. Parsons asked Mr. Fuller regarding the 1/16" difference, could the snubber have gone in and Mr. Fuller noted he did not think so. He further stated at that point the inspection program did not provide enough information that catalog pieces matched. It is now a checkpoint. This hanger was inspected two years ago. Mr. Willett advised that this is what prompted us to make procedure change.

Mr. Parsons noted we have found 50 different items that need to be checked on Phase II as we went through the last 3 - 4 years.

Mr. York advised there was another clip hanging down and the clip had been visibly bent. Will probably leave this out. This was signed off by a field engineer. In early Phase I this was allowed. Mr. Parsons commented we do not allow it if they see it. Mr. York noted the problem is, did he see it at the time it occurred or did it happen after he was there? There is a pin through this and a long member is hanging down from it.

Mr. Parsons reitereated it is a fine point here. We need to support the inspectors and you could almost reverse intimidation if you held them responsible for deficiencies noted after the inspection is completed It is our responsibility to make sure the system in the end satches damage.

-continued-

Mr. York advised he walked through the receipt area and area where materials are issued in the plant itself. The area was closed but he could see the cage where the material is issued. Mr. Parsons noted these materials are surplus hangers and instead of scrapping them we use some pieces to modify other hangers.