

OCT 23 1985

Docket Nos.: 50-498  
and 50-499

Mr. H. Goldberg  
Group Vice President - Nuclear  
Houston Lighting and Power Company  
Post Office Box 1700  
Houston, Texas 77001

Dear Mr. Goldberg:

SUBJECT: IMPLEMENTATION OF NCIG-01, REV. 2 "VISUAL WELD ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA  
FOR STRUCTURAL WELDING AT NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS" FOR THE SOUTH TEXAS  
PROJECT UNITS 1 AND 2.

Your letter of August 29, 1985 provided information on implementation of the subject acceptance criteria, including the proposed changes to the FSAR. The NRC staff has reviewed the submittal and found the proposed changes to be acceptable. The results of this review are contained in the enclosed Safety Evaluation Report. We expect that the FSAR changes will be formally incorporated in a future amendment.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:  
George W. Knighton

George W. Knighton, Chief  
Licensing Branch No. 3  
Division of Licensing

Enclosure:  
As stated

cc: See next page

Distribution:

Docket File

NRC PDR

Local PDR

PRC System

NSIC

LB#3 Reading

JLee

NPKadambi

OELD, Attorney

ACRS (16)

JPartlow

BGrimes

EJordan

NPK  
DL:LB#3

NPKadambi/es

10/21/85

DL:LB#3

GWNighton

10/22/85

8510310362 851023  
PDR ADOCK 05000498  
A PDR

Mr. J. H. Goldberg  
Houston Lighting and Power Company

South Texas Project

cc:  
Brian Berwick, Esq.  
Assistant Attorney General  
Environmental Protection Division  
P. O. Box 12548  
Capitol Station  
Austin, Texas 78711

Resident Inspector/South Texas  
Project  
c/o U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
P. O. Box 910  
Bay City, Texas 77414

Mr. J. T. Westermeir  
Manager, South Texas Project  
Houston Lighting and Power Company  
P. O. Box 1700  
Houston, Texas 77001

Mr. Jonathan Davis  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Austin  
P. O. Box 1088  
Austin, Texas 78767

Mr. H. L. Peterson  
Mr. G. Pokorny  
City of Austin  
P. O. Box 1088  
Austin, Texas 78767

Ms. Pat Coy  
Citizens Concerned About Nuclear  
Power  
5106 Casa Oro  
San Antonio, Texas 78233

Mr. J. B. Poston  
Mr. A. Von Rosenberg  
City Public Service Board  
P. O. Box 1771  
San Antonio, Texas 78296

Mr. Mark R. Wisenberg  
Manager, Nuclear Licensing  
Houston Lighting and Power Company  
P. O. Box 1700  
Houston, Texas 77001

Jack R. Newman, Esq.  
Newman & Holtzinger, P.C.  
1615 L Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mr. Charles Halligan  
Mr. Burton L. Lex  
Bechtel Corporation  
P. O. Box 2166  
Houston, Texas 77001

Melbert Schwartz, Jr., Esq.  
Baker & Botts  
One Shell Plaza  
Houston, Texas 77002

Mr. E. R. Brooks  
Mr. R. L. Range  
Central Power and Light Company  
P. O. Box 2122  
Corpus Christi, Texas 78403

Mrs. Peggy Buchorn  
Executive Director  
Citizens for Equitable Utilities, Inc.  
Route 1, Box 1684  
Brazoria, Texas 77422

Houston Lighting & Power Company      - 2 -      South Texas Project

cc:

Regional Administrator, Region IV  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Office of Executive Director  
for Operations  
611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 1000  
Arlington, Texas 76011

Mr. Lanny Sinkin  
Citizens Concerned About Nuclear Power  
3022 Porter Street, NW #304  
Washington, D.C. 20008

Mr. S. Head, Representative  
Houston Lighting and Power Company  
Suite 1309  
7910 Woodmont Avenue  
Bethesda, Maryland 20814

Enclosure

Houston Lighting & Power  
South Texas Project Units 1 and 2  
Docket Nos. 498/499

Visual Inspection Acceptance Criteria for Structural Steel and  
Miscellaneous Steel Welding to Meet Design Requirements

The staff concludes that the use of Nuclear Construction Issues Group (NCIG)-01, Rev. 2, 05/07/85, "Visual Weld Acceptance Criteria for Structural Welding at Nuclear Power Plants" (VWAC) will provide adequate quality of non-ASME Code structural steel welds. These criteria are limited to non-ASME class welded steel structures where fatigue is not the governing design consideration. Typical examples of structures to which these criteria may be applied are main building framing members and connecting members, supports for equipment and piping (non-ASME Code), cable trays and conduit, HVAC ducts and duct supports, and miscellaneous steel including bracing and stiffeners, embedments, stairways and handrails, doors and door frames, windows and window frames, gratings, covers, etc.

There are eleven criteria addressed in VWAC. For cracks, the same criteria as exists in AWS D 1.1 is specified; the welds shall have no cracks. For under-filled craters, if proper weld size is achieved and cracks are absent, there is no reason for rejecting them and, therefore, they are acceptable.

For arc strikes, surface slag and weld spatter, the VWAC criteria are based more on the effects on structural strength rather than workmanship. Arc strikes are acceptable provided cracks are not visually detectable. Weld spatter remaining after cleaning is acceptable. For surface slag, the criteria are designed to prevent the acceptance of a weld which shows a gross lack of control by the welder. Isolated surface slag which remains after weld cleaning has no structural significance.

Criteria for the following types of defects/faults are also provided in VWAC:

- a) fillet weld size
- b) incomplete fusion
- c) weld overlap
- d) weld profiles
- e) undercut
- f) surface porosity
- g) weld length and location

The basis for the acceptance criteria in VWAC is the amount of reduction in cross sectional area caused by the defect or fault. In such calculations, the conservative approach used is to consider the length of weld in which a defect occurs as being non-existent, i.e., does not support any of the load. Such cross section reductions are usually less than 12.5 percent.

There are some exceptions to this, particularly in thinner section members. This occurs because measurements of defects/faults are rounded off up to the smallest measurement unit specified. For instance, a 1/32 inch maximum undercut for the entire length on one side for 3/16 inch thickness material results in a 16.7 percent reduction in area. Because the 1/32 inch undercut will not be uniform along the entire length, most of the undercut will be less than 1/32 inch in depth. Although the 16.7 percent maximum reduction is a theoretical possibility, it is not likely to occur.

The 12.5 percent "benchmark" was chosen based upon the presently allowed percent reduction in area affected by the undercut criteria in AWS D 1.1-85 for the most limiting case in the thinnest member. The reasoning behind this is that if undercut is allowed to reduce the load carrying capability by a given number, other defects/faults that would result in a reduction of similar or less magnitude should also be acceptable.

The acceptance by engineering evaluation of thousands of field weldments with similar defects/faults not meeting the criteria of AWS D 1.1 has resulted in the decision to use the weldments "as is" without repair. This is possible because common engineering design practices result in significant margins above design requirements, such that a small reduction of 10 to 12 percent can be easily accommodated. The present undercut criteria in AWS D 1.1-85 is a practical demonstration of this.

The deviations from AWS D 1.1 as proposed in VWAC are relatively insignificant in that the redundancy of these structures and their individual welds, and the conservative design practices used, allow non-ASME Code structural steel weldments (which are not designed for fatigue) to use alternative criteria as provided in Criterion II of 10 CFR, Part 50, Appendix B. We find these criteria are appropriate and provide adequate integrity of the affected structures and, accordingly, General Design Criterion 1 of Appendix A to 10 CFR Part 50 has been met.