NONCONFORMANCE - REPORT LOG & STATUS BOOK

12. REPORT DATE 5-2-75, 3-3-75, 4-7-75
PAGE COMPL.
Q.C. ENG. SIGN

1. PROJECT NO. 7220

NCR NO.	3. ORIG. DATE	4. PREPARED BY	5. NONCONFORMANCE DESCRIPTION/REMARKS	STATUS 6. ROUTE	7. DATE XMTD	8. DATE RETD	9. DATE CLOSED	10. CLOSED BY
268	1-17-75	J.C.Aldridge	C-38. Beam connectors damaged, shipment C-14 1.201	Field 1-17-75	1-30-75	2-13-75		
269	1-20-75	A.L.Boulden	C-111. Liner Plate X-Ray of repair not available 1.109	Field 1-20-75	1-29-75	4-10-75	4-10-75	A. L. Boulden
270	1-21-75	J.C.Aldridge	C-38. Damaged beams, nine each, shipment C-15 1.201	Field 1-21-75	2-3-75	2-13-75		
271	1-21-75	C.F.Clark	C-111. Welding procedures P1-F(A-CO_2) 1.109	Field 1-21-75	1-22-75	4-10-75	5-7-75	A.L.Boulden
272	1-21-75	C.F.Clark	C-111. Leak noted at Knuckle Plate, lamination 1.109	Field 1-21-75	No	1-22-75	1-29-75	B.Lussier
273	1-21-75	R.A.Moray	Bulk Material. ½" & 5/8" Round bars, 7220-F-11452	Field 1-22-75	No	1-24-75	5-29-75	R.A.Moray
274	1-22-75	J.C.Aldridge	C-38. Material shipped without release 1.201	M.S. Field 1-22-75	No	1-24-75	1-28-75	R.A.Moray
275	1-27-75	R.A.Moray	M-201. M-104A ITT-Grinnell marking of X-Rayed joints not per M-201 ASME 4.192	Field 1-28-75	2-7-75	2-28-75		
276	1-28-75	J.P.Betts	C-39. Rebars cut of do not match Dwg C-324 Rev 10. 1.103	Field 1-29-75	1-29-75	2-7-75	2-10-75	L.R.Albert
277	1-29-75	R.A.Moray	M-104A. Improper G-3210 Form ASME,4.104	M.S. 1-30-75	No	2-4-A75	4-18-75	R. A. Moray
278	1-29-75	R.A.Moray	M-104A. Improper G-321D, X-Rays improper, Code Data Name Plate. ASME,4.124	M.S 1-30-75	No	2-4-75	4-18-75	R. A. Moray
279	1-30-75	C.F.Clark	C-111. Liner Plate radius out of tolerance after concreting before 1.109	Field 1-31-75	1-31-75	2-7-75	2-6-75	L. R. Albert

8006180 473

NONCONFORMANCE - REPORT LOG & STATUS BOOK

12. REPORT DATE 3-3-75 thru 5-2-75
PAGE COMPL. _____
Q.C. ENG. SIGN _____

1. PROJECT NO. 7220

NR NO.	3. ORIG. DATE	4. PREPARED BY	5. NONCONFORMANCE DESCRIPTION/REMARKS	STATUS 6. ROUTE	7. DATE XMTD	8. DATE RETD	9. DATE CLOSED	10. CLOSED BY
292	2-25 -75	R. A. Moray	C-38. Documentation not Rcd for welding studs 1.101/1.201	M.S 2-26-75	No	2-28 -75	3-17 -75	R.A.Moray
293	2-25 -75	R. A. Moray	C-39. Rebar does not conform to aprvd drawings 1.103	~~Field~~ 2-26-75	3-3-75	4-9-75	4-11 -75	R. A. Moray
294	2-26 -75	L.R.Albert	C-231. Curing temp below Spec on 6th day of cure, CC(593.5)e 1.105	~~Field~~ 2-26-75	3-3-75	5-16 -75	5-19 -75	L.R.Albert
295	3-3- -75	A. Boos	C-231. Aux. Bldg Slab placed without required rebars 1.203	~~Field~~ 3-3-75	3-3-75	3-24 -75	4-8- -75	L. R. Albert
296	3-4 -75	A. Boos	C-231. Aux Bdlg wall missing one bar 1.203	Field 3-4-75	No	3-4-75	5-15 -75	D.C.Thompson
297	3-5 -75	R. A. Moray	M-104A. Two spools with same number ASME 4.134	~~Field~~ 3-12-75	3=13= 75	4-10 -75		
298	3-10 -75	A. Boos	C-231. Aux Bldg walls, rebar lengths vary from requirements 1.203	~~Field~~ 3-11-75	3-11- 75	3-24 -75	3-24 -75	L.R.Albert
299	3-13 -75	R.A.Moray	C-38. Documentation on ASTM A-325 Bolts/Nuts 1.101/1.201	M.S. 3-16-75	No	4=1=75	4-7 -75	R. A. Moray
300	3-26 -75	R. L. Bowren	C-38. Damaged Beam upon receipt inspection. 1.201	~~Field~~ 3-26-75	4-10 -75	4-21 -75		
301	4-2 -75	R. A. Moray	C-38. Damaged Beams, Shipment C-21 1.201	Field 4-3-75	4-10 -75	4-21 -75		
302	4-2- -75	R.A.Moray	C-38. Damaged Beam, Shipment C-23	Field 4-3-75	4-10- -75	4-21 -75		
303	4-7 -75	R. A. Moray	M-104A. Spool fab sheet not Engineering approved. ASME 4.134	Field 4-8-75	5-5- 75			

NONCONFORMANCE - REPORT LOG & STATUS BOOK

12. REPORT DA
PAGE COMP.
Q.C. ENG. SIGN

1. PROJECT NO. 7220

CR O.	3. ORIG. DATE	4. PREPARED BY	5. NONCONFORMANCE DESCRIPTION/REMARKS	STATUS 6. ROUTE	7. DATE XMTD	8. DATE RETD	9. DATE CLOSED	10. C
04	4-7 -75	R. A. Moray	M-104A. Spool marking differs from reader sheet markings ASME 4.114	M.S. 4-8-75	No	4-11 -75	5-12 -75	R. A.
05	4-9- -75	R. L. Bowren	FIP G-~~4~~ 5. Storage on Steam Generator 2E-51A. ASME 4.021	Field 4-9-75				
06	4-9- -75	L.R.Albert	C-231. Concrete temperature, A(600)a' 1.205	~~Field~~ ~~4-9-75~~	4-11- -75	5-16 -75	5-19 -75	L.R.Albert
07	4-9- -75	R. A. Moray	M-204. Fittings,F-10577, AEO-328, Marking and Documentation. ASME	M.S 4-11-75	No	4=18 -75	=	
08	4-17 -75	R. A. Moray	M-104A. Reader sheet has incorrect spool numbers. ASME4.114	M.S. 4-21-75	No	4-22 -75	5-12 -75	R. A. Moray
09	4-23 -75	L. R. Albert	C-230. Batch Plant qualification past due. 1.105,1.205	~~Field~~ ~~4-23-75~~	5-7- 75			
10	4-28 -75	R. A. Moray	C-38. Damaged Beam, Shipment C-24 1.201	~~Field~~ ~~4-28-75~~	5-1-75	5-16 -75		
11	4-30 -75	R. A. Moray	C-38. Beams shipped, not on Shipping List 1.201	M.S. 5-1-75	No	5-12- 75	5-12 -75	R. A. Moray
2	4-30 -75	R. A. Moray	C-38. Damaged Beams, Shipment C-25 1.201	~~Field~~ ~~5-1-75~~	5-5- -75	5-27 -75		
13	5-2-75	J.M.Miller	C-38. Beam material tensile strength over ASTM A-36 limit 1.201	~~Field~~ ~~5-2-75~~	5-2- 75 =	5-27 -75	5-29 -75	L.R.Albert
14	5-29 -75	R.A.Moray	C-38. Beams, Shipment C-27 without weight or orientation marking 1.201	Field 5-30-75				
15	5-29 -75	R.A.Moray	C-38. Damaged Beams, Shipment C-26 1.201	Field 5-30-75				

BECHTEL

NONCONFORMANCE REPORT

1. PAGE 1 OF 54
14. NCR NO. 271

Field	Entry
2. DRAWING/PART NO. Specs.	7220-C-111
REV.	6
3. ITEM DESCRIPTION	Liner Plate
4. SERIAL NUMBER	N/A
5. PURCHASE ORDER NO.	N/A
6. CONTRACTOR/LOCATION	N/A
7. PROJECT NO	07220
8. ITEM LOCATION	Containment #1 & #2
9. STARTUP SYSTEM NO.	N/A
10. QC FIELD INSPECTION PLAN NO.	N/A
11. ASME CODE ITEM	☐ YES ☒ NO
12. REPORTED BY	C. F. Clarke — DATE 1/21/75
13. VALIDATED BY	J. Carrolly — DATE 1-21-75
15. REPLACEMENT PART NO.	N/A — REV.
16. REPLACEMENT SERIAL NO.	N/A
17. SOURCE	Construction

18. ROUTING INSTRUCTIONS: ☒ ROUTE TO FIELD ENGINEERING ☐ ROUTE TO MATERIAL SUPERVISOR

25. DISPOSITION CONCURRENCE

REWORK	REJECT	REPAIR	USE AS IS	DOC.
			X	

Signature	Title	Date
for J. C. Wolenzano		4-10-75
	PROJECT FIELD ENGINEER	3-31-75
J. Carrolly	PROJECT FIELD QC ENGINEER	4-10-75
	AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR	

19. NONCONFORMING CONDITION:

Certain Areas of the Containment liners have been welded with a combination of two welding procedures, (i.e.) the base or seal pass is made with procedure P1-AC-LH and the balance of weld deposit being made with procedures P1-F(A CO_2) 1,2,3 AND P1-F-CO_2 (STRUCTURAL) 1/21/75. This is contrary to Spec. 7220-C-111, para 7.2.2.

"Q" NO 1,109 HOLD TAGS 2 APPLIED BY MAN WAY UNIT #1 & #2.

20. ☐ FIELD DISPOSITION ☒ FIELD RECOMMENDATION/ROUTE TO PROJECT ENGINEERING

Use as is. Although the use of a combination of welding procedures is contrary to the specification, there is no detrimental effect to weld quality or structural integrity. The specification intent was to minimize numbers of procedures used so as to better control and monitor welder performance and to enable more precise applications of proper frequency of NDE. (see Sheet 2)

21. FIELD DISPOSITION RESULTS:

22. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION

Project Engineering concurs with Field Recommendation to use as is. The subject welds are acceptable because of the following: ASME Section IX requirements are that a single welding procedure specification (WPS) be prepared for each type of weldment. Contrary to this requirement, combinations of two WPSs were used in making the subject weldments. The welding processes which are represented by the

23. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION RESULTS:

Procedure qualification records received with Specification 7220-C-27Q on 4/29/75. [illegible] 4/30/75
Revised Spec. Received 5/7/75 [illegible]

24. IS DESIGN CHANGE REQUIRED ☐ NO ☒ YES, SEE ATTACHED:

DRAWING ______ REV. ______ DCN ______

SPEC. C-111 REV. 7 ADD. ______

26. REJECTED MATERIAL DISPOSITION ☐ RETURN TO SUPPLIER ☐ SCRAP

REMARKS

27. QC ACCEPTANCE
[illegible] — QC ENGINEER — DATE 5/7/75
AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR — DATE

10098-1

White Copy – Originator
Canary Copy – Field Engineer
Pink Copy – PQAE
Goldenrod Copy – QC

QC-G3-2

(Block 20 continued)

Further, ASME Section IX paragraph QW 201 specifically allows combinations of procedures and processes in the same weld joint. These procedural combinations will be covered in another procedure combining the Shielded Metal Arc (SMA) and Flux Core Arc Welding (FCAW) processes. Since no essential variables of either process or procedure have changed, the issuance of a new procedure is simplified and does not require testing or re-qualifications. Thus, the new Welding Procedure Specification will only reference previously run Procedural Qualification Reports (PQR's). The MF&QCS & Project Engineering groups have already begun the procedural modification process and assure us our situation is not adverse to weld quality.

T C Valenzano 1-22-75

Welding may continue based on TWX #4 dated 1-22-75 from M. Butterworth of MF&QCS to E E Felton.

T Valenzano 1-22-75

Block 22 cont.:

combinations of WPSs used can, in accordance with ASME Section IX, be combined into single WPSs. Therefore, the weldments have met the technical requirements of ASME Section IX, but the proper documentation was not available. To correct the nonconformance, new WPSs permitting the subject welding have been prepared by MF&QCS, and are being issued. In order to clarify the requirements for WPSs, Specification C-111 will be revised to delete Section 7.2.2, and ASME Section IX shall govern.

[signature] 3-19-75

[signature] 3-21-75

J-2777

BECHTEL MIDL

BECHTEL SF

910-372-7961 BECHTEL CORP SF CLG 310-266-9497
TWX 4 1/22/75 0920
BECHTEL CORP
MIDLAND MICH
ATTN: E. E. FELTON

SUBJECT: COMBINATION OF WELDING PROCEDURES
JOB NO. 7220.
PER YOUR REQUEST, AS AN INTERIM MEASURE, THE FOLLOWING WELDING PROCEDURES MAY BE USED IN COMBINATION WITH P1-A-C-LH (STRUCTURAL) REV. 0 IN ACCORDANCE WITH ASME SECTION IX, QW 201.3
P1-F(CO2)-2 REV. 0; P1-F(CO2) STRUCTURAL, REV. 0
P1-F(ACO2)-1, -2, 3U-4, REV. 0, EXCEPT 3U REV. 1
COMBINATION PROCEDURES OF THESE PROCESSES ARE AT THIS TIME BEING PREPARED AND WILL BE FORWARDED AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

MIKE BUTTERWORTH
PROCEDURE C[illegible]
MF&QCS
CHG 7220 7N[illegible]
BE/301-2
9L
BECHTEL MIDL

JOB 7220 ROUTING	ACTION	INITIAL
P C MGR.		
P SUP		
P P ENG		
A P E ENG		
CUST - SCH		
AREA C-1		
AREA C-2		
AREA AUX		
AREA T - G-1		
AREA T - G-2		
AREA YARD		
AREA STEAM		
CIV SUP		
CIV ENG		
ARCH SUP		
ARCH ENG		
ELEC SUP		
ELEC ENG		
CC		
QA		
WELD		
ADM - ACCT		
PURCH		
SUBCON		
P.A. - SAFETY		
LABOR REL		
SPEC		
FILE		
TICKLER		

INT DATE

8271 Pg 394

BECHTEL

Telephone call

BY T. Valmyano OF

TO R. Straiton OF MFQCS

DATE Jan 22 19 75 TIME

SUBJECT NCR-271

ROUTE Connolly, Langtin, Hicks

JOB NO. 7220

I questioned the words in M. Butterworth's TWX of 1-22-75 on combinations of procedures wherein the words "Except 3u Rev 1" are used. Dick indicated these words meant P.1.F (A-CO_2) 1, 2, 3u, 4 were approved all Rev 0 and 3u was approved also for Rev 1. Therefore Rev 1 can be used with P1-AcLH.

NCR 271 Pg 4 of 4

Telephone call

Copies Connolly
R. C. Bertossa
E. E. Felton
J. Hink
R. W. Straiton
T. Velanzano

BY R. C. Sommerfeld (RCS-015-030) OF MF&QCS - Ann Arbor

TO R. W. Straiton OF MF&QCS SFHO

DATE January 22, 1975 TIME

SUBJECT Midland Units 1 & 2
Combined Process Welding Procedures
for Liner Plate Welds
File: 7220-Civil

JOB NO. 7220

While transmitting the Projects request for preparation of Welding Procedures utilizing cellulosic and low hydrogen electrodes in combination with flux-cored electrodes, Mr. Straiton was inadvertently told to combine P1-A-c-Lh (Structural) with the flux-cored procedures. This should have been P1-A-c-Lh without the (Structural) designation.

He authorized me to inform T. Valenzano and J. Hink of his intent to utilize P1-A-c-Lh for development of the combined process procedures. This is a modification of his TWX to E. E. Felton/T. Valenzano of January 21, 1975.

R. C. Sommerfeld
R. C. Sommerfeld
Materials Engineering Supervisor

RCS:id

JAN 27 R. L. BOWREN

NONCONFORMANCE REPORT

BECHTEL

Field	Entry
1. PAGE 1 OF	2
14. NCR NO.	273
2. DRAWING/PART NO.	Bulk Material List
REV.	
7. PROJECT NO.	07220
12. REPORTED BY	R. A. Moray (signature)
DATE	1/21/75
3. ITEM DESCRIPTION	~~100 pc~~ 50 pc of ½" round bar & 5/8" round bar
8. ITEM LOCATION	QC Hold Area
13. VALIDATED BY	J. Connolly (signature)
DATE	1-21-75
4. SERIAL NUMBER	Ht. D82021 & Y88283 respectively
9. STARTUP SYSTEM NO.	N/A
15. REPLACEMENT PART NO.	N/A
REV.	
5. PURCHASE ORDER NO.	7220-F-11452
10. QC FIELD INSPECTION PLAN NO.	B-1-R-25 Rev. 0
16. REPLACEMENT SERIAL NO.	N/A
6. CONTRACTOR/LOCATION	J. T. Ryerson Detroit, Michigan
11. ASME CODE ITEM	☐ YES ☒ NO
17. SOURCE	Vendor
18. ROUTING INSTRUCTIONS	☐ ROUTE TO FIELD ENGINEERING ☐ ROUTE TO MATERIAL SUPERVISOR

50 pc 4-28-75

25. DISPOSITION CONCURRENCE

REWORK	REJECT	REPAIR	USE AS IS	DOC
	X			X

- PROJECT FIELD ENGINEER: (signature) — DATE: 1-24-75
- PROJECT FIELD QC ENGINEER: J. Connolly (signature) — DATE: 1-24-75
- AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR: — DATE:

19. NONCONFORMING CONDITION:

1. The ½" round bar requires the following in order to meet the conditions of the P. O. 7220-F-11452.
   a. Certified Materials Tests Report to include tensile properties and bend test results.
   b. "Statement of Conformance."
   c. Tagging needs to include size and length of pieces, number of pieces, heat number and manufacturing mill.
   d. 1 pc. is damaged - bent.

Continued on Page 2

20. ☒ FIELD DISPOSITION ☐ FIELD RECOMMENDATION/ROUTE TO PROJECT ENGINEERING

Material Supervisor to obtain missing documentation from vendor for items 1-a, b, c and 2-a, b, c as listed in block 19. Items 1-d and 2-d listed in block 19 will have bent portions cut away and rejected. Estimated implementation date is 3-1-75. R. [illegible] 1/23/75

21. FIELD DISPOSITION RESULTS:

Fifty pcs of ½" round bar painted [illegible] stripes at less than [illegible] centers along its length and released for use in non-Q application. R. A. Moray 4-28

22. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION

23. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION RESULTS:

24. IS DESIGN CHANGE REQUIRED ☐ NO ☐ YES, SEE ATTACHED:

DRAWING ______ REV. ______ DCN ______

SPEC. ______ REV. ______ ADD. ______

26. REJECTED MATERIAL DISPOSITION ☐ RETURN TO SUPPLIER ☐ SCRAP

REMARKS

27. QC ACCEPTANCE

- QC ENGINEER: R. A. Moray (signature) — DATE: 5-21-75
- AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR: — DATE:

10098-1

White Copy — Originator
Canary Copy — Field Engineer
Pink Copy — PQAE
Goldenrod Copy — QC

QC-G3-2

Block No. 19 Continued.

2. The 5/8" round bar requires the following in order to meet the conditions of the P.O. 7220-F-11452.

a. Certified Material Test Reports to include tensile properties and bend test results.

b. "Statement of Conformance."

c. Tagging needs to include heat number and manufacturing mill.

d. 2 pcs. are damaged - bent.

Nonconformance noted during receipt inspection. 2 Hold tags applied.

Block 20 (continued)

Fifty (50) pieces x 40' of ½" dia. round bar to be used as non-Q and released for use by painting with white stripes at no less than 2 feet centers along its length per FPG-5 Rev. 0

Richard [illegible] 4/29/75

Block 21 Continued

Note: Heat Nos are:
5/8" - C1247
½" - C0392

a. Certified material test reports received and are acceptable.
b. Statement of Conformance received and is acceptable.
c. Tagging information received and material is now properly tagged. Ryerson originally sent
d. Bent portions have been cut away and scrapped. documentation for heat # YE8283 & A82021 which was sent in error.

[illegible signature] 5/-/75

[illegible signature] 5/-/75

NONCONFORMANCE REPORT

1. PAGE 1 OF X 2				14. NCR NO. 294	
2. DRAWING/PART NO. 7220-C-231-Q	REV. 6	7. PROJECT NO. 07220	12. REPORTED BY L. R. Albert	DATE 2/26/75	25. DISPOSITION CONCURRENCE: REWORK / REJECT / REPAIR / USE AS IS / DO
3. ITEM DESCRIPTION Cont. #2 Cover Slab		8. ITEM LOCATION Reactor Building #2	13. VALIDATED BY	DATE 2-26-75	PROJECT FIELD ENGINEER — DATE 5-16-75
4. SERIAL NUMBER N/A		9. STARTUP SYSTEM NO. N/A	15. REPLACEMENT PART NO. N/A	REV.	PROJECT ENGINEER — DATE 2-6-75
5. PURCHASE ORDER NO. N/A		10. QC FIELD INSPECTION PLAN NO. C-231-4-482 Rev. 0	16. REPLACEMENT SERIAL NO. N/A		PROJECT FIELD QC ENGINEER — DATE 5-16-75
6. CONTRACTOR/LOCATION		11. ASME CODE ITEM ☐ YES ☒ NO	17. SOURCE Construction		AUTHORIZE INSPECTOR — DATE

18. ROUTING INSTRUCTIONS: ☒ ROUTE TO FIELD ENGINEERING ☐ ROUTE TO MATERIAL SUPERVISOR

19. NONCONFORMING CONDITION:

Specification 7220-C-231-Q Rev. 6 Section 13.2.4 requires that concrete surface temperatures be maintained at no less than 50°F during the curing period. Contrary to the above, recording thermometers in the cover slab concrete indicated temperatures of 40° and 45° during the sixth day of curing. Nonconformance noted during routine QC surveillance. "Q" No. is 1.105.

One Tag applied.

20. ☐ FIELD DISPOSITION ☒ FIELD RECOMMENDATION/ROUTE TO PROJECT ENGINEERING

Use as is. The lowest concrete temperature recorded was 40°F which occurred during the 6th day of curing. This condition was discovered at 8:30 a.m. on the 7th day of curing. The heaters were immediately readjusted and the curing period was extended to insure that all of the affected concrete (Cont. #2 cover slab - approx. from azimuth 220° to 342°) received

Continued on Sheet 2

21. FIELD DISPOSITION RESULTS:

22. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION

Temperatures below 50° (and above freezing) during curing of fresh concrete have no detrimental effect on the concrete. It merely extends the curing time required to reach a specified strength. The curing period was extended to compensate for the lower temperature and, hence, Engineering concurs with Field Recommendation to use as is. RLC 5-1-75

J. L. Hinds 5-1-75

23. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION RESULTS:

24. IS DESIGN CHANGE REQUIRED ☒ NO ☐ YES, SEE ATTACHED:

DRAWING _____ REV. _____ DCN _____

SPEC. _____ REV. _____ ADD. _____

26. REJECTED MATERIAL DISPOSITION ☐ RETURN TO SUPPLIER ☐ SCRAP

REMARKS

27. QC ACCEPTANCE E. C. Hurt — QC ENGINEER — DATE 5/19/75

AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR — DATE

098-1

ORIGINATOR

QC-G3

Block 20 Continued

the required 7 days at 50°F. Wet burlap continually covered the slab and at no time was the concrete exposed to freezing temperatures. Concrete surface temperatures of 40° and 45° will have no detrimental effect on the durability or strength of the concrete.

Brent
3/3/75

BECHTEL

NONCONFORMANCE REPORT

1. PAGE 1 OF 1 | 14. NCR NO. 296

2. DRAWING/PART NO. 7220-C-282 (Q) | REV. 4
3. ITEM DESCRIPTION: Reinforcing Steel
4. SERIAL NUMBER: N/A
5. PURCHASE ORDER NO.: N/A
6. CONTRACTOR/LOCATION: N/A
7. PROJECT NO.: 07220
8. ITEM LOCATION: Aux. Bldg.
9. STARTUP SYSTEM NO.: N/A
10. QC FIELD INSPECTION PLAN NO.: C-231-2-313 Rev. 2
11. ASME CODE ITEM ☐ YES ☒ NO
12. REPORTED BY: A. Boos A J Boos | DATE: 3/3/75
13. VALIDATED BY: [signature] | DATE: 3/4/75
15. REPLACEMENT PART NO.: N/A | REV.
16. REPLACEMENT SERIAL NO.: N/A
17. SOURCE: Construction

23. DISPOSITION CONCURRENCE

REWORK	REJECT	REPAIR	USE AS-IS	DOC.
X				

[signature] 3-4-75 PROJECT FIELD ENGINEER DATE
[signature] 3-4-75 PROJECT ENGINEER DATE
PROJECT FIELD QC ENGINEER DATE
AUTHORIZE INSPECTOR DATE

18. ROUTING INSTRUCTIONS: ☒ ROUTE TO FIELD ENGINEERING ☐ ROUTE TO MATERIAL SUPERVISOR

19. NONCONFORMING CONDITION: The referenced drawing specifies that the horiz. reinforcing for wall 27 shall be #8 bars 12" on center. One (1) #8 horizontal dowel has been omitted on the east face of the 7.4 wall line below elevation 584'. This will produce a 24" spacing in the #8 horiz. wall reinforcing for the south face of wall 27. "Q" # 1.203.

A. J. Boos 3/4/75

20. ☒ FIELD DISPOSITION ☐ FIELD RECOMMENDATION/ROUTE TO PROJECT ENGINEERING

Drill a hole for the missing dowel in the 7.4 line wall. Fill the hole with non-shrink grout (EMBECO 636) and set the required dowel. The embedment length of the dowel shall be in accordance with Table 36 of drawing C-211 (Q) Rev. 4.

A. J. Boos 3/4/75

21. FIELD DISPOSITION RESULTS:

Hole Drilled and Dowel grouted as per MFG Recommendation and Dwg C-211 and Spec C-2319. QC-C5 attached to FIP C-231-2-397a

Paul C Thomson 4-3-75

22. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION

23. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION RESULTS:

24. IS DESIGN CHANGE REQUIRED ☐ NO ☐ YES, SEE ATTACHED:
DRAWING _____ REV. _____ DCN _____
SPEC. _____ REV. _____ ADD. _____

25. REJECTED MATERIAL DISPOSITION ☐ RETURN TO SUPPLIER ☐ SCRAP
REMARKS

27. QC ACCEPTANCE
Paul C Thomson 5-15-75
QC ENGINEER DATE
AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR DATE

10098-1

White Copy – Originator
Canary Copy – Field Engineer
Pink Copy – PQAE
Goldenrod Copy – QC

QC-G3-2

BECHTEL

NONCONFORMANCE REPORT

1. PAGE 1 OF 1	14. NCR NO. 304

2. DRAWING/PART NO.: Spec. M-201	REV.: 5	7. PROJECT NO.: 07220	12. ORIGINATED BY: R. A. Moray — DATE: 4/2/75
3. ITEM DESCRIPTION: Pipe Spool		8. ITEM LOCATION: QC Hold Area	13. VALIDATED BY: [signature] — DATE: 4/7/75
4. SERIAL NUMBER: 2GCB-25-S611-5-4		9. STARTUP SYSTEM NO.: N/A	15. REPLACEMENT PART NO.: N/A — REV.: —
5. PURCHASE ORDER NO.: 7220-M-104A		10. QC FIELD INSPECTION PLAN NO.: M-104A-R-9	16. REPLACEMENT SERIAL NO.: N/A
6. CONTRACTOR/LOCATION: ITT Grinnell/Kernersville, N.C.		11. ASME CODE ITEM: [X] YES [ ] NO	17. SOURCE: Vendor

25. DISPOSITION CONCURRENCE

REWORK	REJECT	REPAIR	USE AS IS	DOC.
				X

PROJECT FIELD ENGINEER — DATE

PROJECT ENGINEER: J. Connelly — DATE: 4-11-75

PROJECT FIELD QC ENGINEER: R. G. Carlson — DATE: 4-18-75

AUTHORIZE INSPECTOR — DATE

18. ROUTING INSTRUCTIONS: [ ] ROUTE TO FIELD ENGINEERING [X] ROUTE TO MATERIAL SUPERVISOR

19. NONCONFORMING CONDITION:

Form G-321-D for P.O. 7220-M-104A requires vendor to supply radiographic verification reports. The radiographic verification reports (Reader Sheets) supplied for spool 2-GCB-25-S611-5-4 (MR-78-59) welds A & B read 2-GCB-25-5611-5-4 A & 2GCB-25-5611-5-4 B. The verification reports therefore do not correspond with identification markings on the spool or spool dwg. Nonconformance noted during receipt inspection.

"Q" No. is 4.114. Unit 2. 1 Hold Tag applied. (Ref. Laddry Sheet 7144)

20. [X] FIELD DISPOSITION [ ] FIELD RECOMMENDATION/ROUTE TO PROJECT ENGINEERING

Contact fabricator to provide correct radiographic reports and insure they correspond with identification markings on spool.

[signature] 4-11-75

21. FIELD DISPOSITION RESULTS:

Revised verification reports received and are acceptable.

R. A. Moray 5-6-75

22. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION

23. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION RESULTS:

24. IS DESIGN CHANGE REQUIRED [ ] NO [ ] YES, SEE ATTACHED:

DRAWING ______ REV. ______ DCN ______

SPEC. ______ REV. ______ ADD. ______

26. REJECTED MATERIAL DISPOSITION [ ] RETURN TO SUPPLIER [ ] SCRAP

REMARKS

27. QC ACCEPTANCE: R. A. Moray — 5-12-75 — DATE

QC ENGINEER: [signature] — 5-?-75 — DATE

AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR — DATE

10098-1

White Copy – Originator
Canary Copy – Field Engineer
Pink Copy – PQAE
Goldenrod Copy – QC

QC-G3-2

BECHTEL

NONCONFORMANCE REPORT

1. PAGE 1 OF 2	14. NCR NO. 306

2. DRAWING/PART NO.: 7220-C-230 — REV.: 5

7. PROJECT NO.: 07220

12. REPORTED BY: L. R. Albert — DATE: 4/9/75

3. ITEM DESCRIPTION: Concrete

8. ITEM LOCATION: Placement No. A(609)a'

13. VALIDATED BY: J. Connolly — DATE: 4-9-75

4. SERIAL NUMBER: N/A

9. STARTUP SYSTEM NO.: N/A

15. REPLACEMENT PART NO.: N/A — REV.:

5. PURCHASE ORDER NO.: N/A

10. QC FIELD INSPECTION PLAN NO.: C-231-3-502

16. REPLACEMENT SERIAL NO.: N/A

6. CONTRACTOR/LOCATION: Champion - Midland

11. ASME CODE ITEM: ☐ YES ☒ NO

17. SOURCE: Subcontractor

25. DISPOSITION CONCURRENCE

REWORK	REJECT	REPAIR	USE AS IS	DOC
			X	

PROJECT FIELD ENGINEER	DATE 5-16-75
PQCE ENGINEER	DATE 5-6-75
J. Connolly — PROJECT FIELD QC ENGINEER	DATE 5-16-75
AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR	DATE

18. ROUTING INSTRUCTIONS: ☒ ROUTE TO FIELD ENGINEERING ☐ ROUTE TO MATERIAL SUPERVISOR

19. NONCONFORMING CONDITION:

Spec. 7220-C-230 Rev. 5 in the cold weather concreting temperature chart in Section 11.1 specifies that mass concrete deposited in the forms during cold weather when the ambient air temperature is between 31° and 45° shall have a temperature range from 45° - 65°. Contrary to the above 8 CU YDs. of concrete with a temperature of 67° while ambient temperature was 42° was placed in A(609)a'. Placement A(609)a' has a least dimension greater than 2½' and contains 102 CU YDs. Nonconformance noted during routine QC testing of concrete during placement. "Q" No. 1.205. 1 QC HOLD TAG AFFIXED

20. ☐ FIELD DISPOSITION ☒ FIELD RECOMMENDATION/ROUTE TO PROJECT ENGINEERING

Field recommends "Use As Is" based on the following rationale:

1. The temperature was only 2° over the upper limit allowed by the referenced Specification.
2. The 8 cu. yds. which failed was the first concrete to be deposited in the form.

Corrective action was taken as evidenced by the test taken on the next 8 cu. yd.

21. FIELD DISPOSITION RESULTS:

22. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION

The higher placement temperature will tend to increase shrinkage, setting rate, and water demand while reducing slump, durability and strength. A 2°F temperature difference for 8 c.y. will not have an appreciable effect on any of these factors. Engineering concurs with Field Recommendation to use as is. RCL 5-1-75

J. Fink 5-1-75

23. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION RESULTS:

24. IS DESIGN CHANGE REQUIRED ☒ NO ☐ YES, SEE ATTACHED:

DRAWING ______ REV. ______ DCN ______

SPEC. ______ REV. ______ ADD. ______

26. REJECTED MATERIAL DISPOSITION ☐ RETURN TO SUPPLIER ☐ SCRAP

REMARKS

27. QC ACCEPTANCE

QC ENGINEER — DATE 5/19/75

AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR — DATE

10098-1

White Copy – Originator
Canary Copy – Field Engineer
Pink Copy – PQAE
Goldenrod Copy – QC

QC-G3-2

BLOCK 20 CON'T.

load of concrete, which was within the specification limit.

3. The 8 cu. yd. in question represents only 8% of the total concrete placement.

4. The temperature of the 8 cu. yds. in question was 62° at the truck discharge.

A J Bean 4/10/75

BECHTEL

NONCONFORMANCE REPORT

1. PAGE 1 OF 1 | 14. NCR NO. 308

2. DRAWING/PART NO.: Spec. 7220-M-201 | REV.: 5
3. ITEM DESCRIPTION: Pipe Spools
4. SERIAL NUMBER: See Block 19
5. PURCHASE ORDER NO.: 7220-M-104A
6. CONTRACTOR/LOCATION: ITT Grinnel/Kernersville N.C.

7. PROJECT NO.: 07220
8. ITEM LOCATION: QC Hold Area
9. STARTUP SYSTEM NO.: N/A
10. QC FIELD INSPECTION PLAN NO.: M-104A-R-10
11. ASME CODE ITEM: [X] YES [ ] NO

12. REPORTED BY: R. A. Moray | DATE: 4/17/75
13. VALIDATED BY: [signature] | DATE: 4/17/75
15. REPLACEMENT PART NO.: N/A | REV.:
16. REPLACEMENT SERIAL NO.: N/A
17. SOURCE: Vendor

25. DISPOSITION CONCURRENCE

REWORK	REJECT	REPAIR	USE AS IS	DOC.
				✓

	DATE
PROJECT FIELD ENGINEER	
PROJECT ENGINEER [signature]	4/22/75
PROJECT FIELD QC ENGINEER [signature]	5-9-75
AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR	

18. ROUTING INSTRUCTIONS: [ ] ROUTE TO FIELD ENGINEERING [X] ROUTE TO MATERIAL SUPERVISOR

19. NONCONFORMING CONDITION: Form G-321-D for P.O. M-104A requires vendor to supply radiographic verification reports. The radiographic verification report (Reader Sheet) supplied for 1-HCB-20-S612-3-3 (MR-66-15) Weld C reads 1-HCB-20-5612-3-3 and report supplied for 2-GCB-25-S611-3-4 (MR-78-19) Weld A reads 2-GCB-25-5611-3-4. The verification reports do not correspond with identification markings on the spool or spool drawing. Nonconformance noted during receipt inspection. "Q" No's. are 4.114 and 4.124. Unit 2 and 1. 2 Hold tags applied.

20. [X] FIELD DISPOSITION [ ] FIELD RECOMMENDATION/ROUTE TO PROJECT ENGINEERING

1. Vendor to supply corrected reading sheets to conform to marking on pipe spools.
[signature]
Proj. Supv. of Fld. Proc.
4/22/75

21. FIELD DISPOSITION RESULTS: Corrected Reader Sheets received and are now acceptable. [signature] 5-6-75

22. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION

23. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION RESULTS:

24. IS DESIGN CHANGE REQUIRED [ ] NO [ ] YES, SEE ATTACHED:
DRAWING ______ REV. ______ DCN ______
SPEC. ______ REV. ______ ADD. ______

26. REJECTED MATERIAL DISPOSITION [ ] RETURN TO SUPPLIER [ ] SCRAP
REMARKS

27. QC ACCEPTANCE [signature] 5-12-75
QC ENGINEER | DATE
[signature] 5-9-75
AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR | DATE

10098-1

White Copy – Originator
Canary Copy – Field Engineer
Pink Copy – PQAE
Goldenrod Copy – QC

QC-G3-2

BECHTEL

NONCONFORMANCE REPORT

2. DRAWING/PART NO.: Spec. C-38	REV.: 5	7. PROJECT NO.: 07220	12. REPORTED BY: A. A. Moray	DATE: 4/29/75	1. PAGE 1 OF 1 — 14. NCR NO.: 311
3. ITEM DESCRIPTION: Aux. Bldg. Beams		8. ITEM LOCATION: QC Hold Area	13. VALIDATED BY: [signature]	DATE: 4-30-75	25. DISPOSITION CONCURRENCE
4. SERIAL NUMBER: See Block 19		9. STARTUP SYSTEM NO.: N/A	15. REPLACEMENT PART NO.: N/A	REV.	REWORK / REJECT / REPAIR / USE AS IS / OTH: X
5. PURCHASE ORDER NO.: 7220-C-38 C-25		10. QC FIELD INSPECTION PLAN NO.: C-38-R-47	16. REPLACEMENT SERIAL NO.: N/A		PROJECT FIELD ENGINEER: [signature] DATE: 5.9.75
6. CONTRACTOR/LOCATION: Ingalls Iron Works/Verona, Pa.		11. ASME CODE ITEM: ☐ YES ☒ NO	17. SOURCE: Vendor		PROJECT ENGINEER: [signature] DATE: 5-7-75
					PROJECT FIELD QC ENGINEER: [signature] DATE:
					AUTHORIZE INSPECTOR: DATE:

18. ROUTING INSTRUCTIONS: ☐ ROUTE TO FIELD ENGINEERING ☒ ROUTE TO MATERIAL SUPERVISOR

19. NONCONFORMING CONDITION:

Form G-321-D and Shop Inspectors Release TWX both refer to and certify material on Shipping LIst C-25. The following three (3) beams were received with shipment C-25 but were not included on the Shipping List C-25. "Q" No. is 1.201. 3 Hold Tags Applied.

421B9

439B10

401B21

20. ☒ FIELD DISPOSITION ☐ FIELD RECOMMENDATION/ROUTE TO PROJECT ENGINEERING

Material Supervisor to obtain corrected Shipping List C-25 listing above beams. Material Supervisor also will obtain TWX from Shop Inspector showing above beams were released for Shipment. J C Tilton 5/6/75

21. FIELD DISPOSITION RESULTS:

Corrected Shipping List and above TWX received for subject beams.

22. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION

23. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION RESULTS:

24. IS DESIGN CHANGE REQUIRED ☐ NO ☐ YES, SEE ATTACHED:

DRAWING _____ REV. _____ DCN _____

SPEC. _____ REV. _____ ADD. _____

25. REJECTED MATERIAL DISPOSITION ☐ RETURN TO SUPPLIER ☐ SCRAP

REMARKS

27. QC ACCEPTANCE: [signature] 5-12-75

QC ENGINEER DATE

AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR DATE

10098-1

QC-G3-2

White Copy – Originator
Canary Copy – Field Engineer
Pink Copy – PQAE
Goldenrod Copy – QC

NONCONFORMANCE REPORT

1. PAGE 1 OF 1	14. NCR NO. 313

Field	Entry
2. DRAWING/PART NO.	Spec. 7220-C-38
REV.	6
7. PROJECT NO.	7220
12. REPORTED BY	Jesse D. Miller
DATE	5-2-75
3. ITEM DESCRIPTION	Structural Steel Beam(s)
8. ITEM LOCATION	QC HOLD AREA ~~Auxiliary Building~~
13. VALIDATED BY	R. L. [illegible]
DATE	5/2/75
4. SERIAL NUMBER	Heat No. H4[illegible]53
9. STARTUP SYSTEM NO.	N/A
15. REPLACEMENT PART NO.	N/A
REV.	
5. PURCHASE ORDER NO.	7220-C-38
10. QC FIELD INSPECTION PLAN NO.	N/A 6-24-75
16. REPLACEMENT SERIAL NO.	N/A
6. CONTRACTOR/LOCATION	Ingalls Iron Works, Verona, PA.
11. ASME CODE ITEM	☐ YES ☒ NO
17. SOURCE	Vendor

25. DISPOSITION CONCURRENCE

REWORK	REJECT	REPAIR	USE AS IS	DO
			X	

Signature	Title	Date
[signature]	PROJECT FIELD ENGINEER	5-28-7[illegible]
[signature]	PROJECT ENGINEER	5/16/7[illegible]
J. J. Connolly	PROJECT FIELD QC ENGINEER	5-27-7[illegible]
	AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR	DATE

18. ROUTING INSTRUCTIONS: ☒ ROUTE TO FIELD ENGINEERING ☐ ROUTE TO MATERIAL SUPERVISOR

19. NONCONFORMING CONDITION: In accordance with 7220-C-38, Rev. 6 the applicable specification for structural steel specifies ASTM-A-36. Certified mill test report for subject heat number (H43353) states tensile strength to be 81,290 psi which exceeds the allowable specified tensile strength range which is 58,000-80,000 psi. Nonconformance noted during document review. Q-Number is 1.201.

One tag applied.

20. ☐ FIELD DISPOSITION ☒ FIELD RECOMMENDATION/ROUTE TO PROJECT ENGINEERING

David [illegible] 5-2-75

21. FIELD DISPOSITION RESULTS:

22. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION

Use as is. The mill test report for the heat gives an elongation of 24.5%, which passes the 20% minimum in ASTM A-36. Thus, the material elongation properties have not been detrimentally affected by the 1.6% additional tensile strength, and are acceptable. Therefore, the material is acceptable for use. R. L. Ryder 5-15-75
J. C. [illegible] 5/15/75

23. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION RESULTS:

24. IS DESIGN CHANGE REQUIRED ☒ NO ☐ YES, SEE ATTACHED:

DRAWING ______ REV. ______ DCN ______

SPEC. ______ REV. ______ ADD. ______

26. REJECTED MATERIAL DISPOSITION ☐ RETURN TO SUPPLIER ☐ SCRAP

REMARKS

27. QC ACCEPTANCE [signature] QC ENGINEER DATE 5/29/75

AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR DATE

10098-1

ORIGINATOR

BECHTEL

NONCONFORMANCE REPORT

1. PAGE 1 OF 1				14. NCR NO. 314	
2. DRAWING/PART NO. Spec. 7220-C-38	REV. 6	7. PROJECT NO. 07220	12. REPORTED BY R. A. Moray	DATE 5/29/75	25. DISPOSITION CONCURRENCE
3. ITEM DESCRIPTION (4) Aux. Bldg. Beams		8. ITEM LOCATION Sasse Rd. Laydown Area	13. VALIDATED BY	DATE 5/29/75	REWORK / REJECT / REPAIR / USE AS IS / DOC
4. SERIAL NUMBER See Block 19		9. STARTUP SYSTEM NO. N/A	15. REPLACEMENT PART NO. N/A	REV.	PROJECT FIELD ENGINEER — DATE
5. PURCHASE ORDER NO. 7220-C-38 C-27		10. QC FIELD INSPECTION PLAN NO. C-38-R-49	16. REPLACEMENT SERIAL NO. N/A		PROJECT ENGINEER — DATE
6. CONTRACTOR/LOCATION Ingalls Iron Works/Verona, Pa.		11. ASME CODE ITEM ☐ YES ☒ NO	17. SOURCE Vendor		PROJECT FIELD QC ENGINEER — DATE
					AUTHORIZE INSPECTOR — DATE

18. ROUTING INSTRUCTIONS: ☒ ROUTE TO FIELD ENGINEERING ☐ ROUTE TO MATERIAL SUPERVISOR

19. NONCONFORMING CONDITION: Specification 7220-C-38 Rev. 6 paragraph 7.5 states, "The weight of all members 6,000 lbs. and heavier shall be clearly stenciled thereupon and together with an orientation north or east." Contrary to the above, beams 516B1[F], 516B2[F], 52087[G] and 520B8[G] are all listed as weighing more than 6,000 lbs. on shipping notice C-27 but they are not marked with their weight or orientation. Nonconformance noted during receipt inspection. "Q" No. is 1.201. hold tags applied.

20. ☐ FIELD DISPOSITION ☐ FIELD RECOMMENDATION/ROUTE TO PROJECT ENGINEERING

21. FIELD DISPOSITION RESULTS:

22. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION

23. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION RESULTS:

24. IS DESIGN CHANGE REQUIRED ☐ NO ☐ YES, SEE ATTACHED:
DRAWING _____ REV. _____ DCN _____
SPEC. _____ REV. _____ ADD. _____

26. REJECTED MATERIAL DISPOSITION ☐ RETURN TO SUPPLIER ☐ SCRAP
REMARKS

27. QC ACCEPTANCE
QC ENGINEER — DATE
AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR — DATE

1008 1-1

White Copy – Originator
Canary Copy – Field Engineer
Pink Copy – PQAE
Goldenrod Copy – QC

QC-G3-2

BECHTEL

NONCONFORMANCE REPORT

2. DRAWING/PART NO.	REV.	7. PROJECT NO.	12. REPORTED BY	DATE	1. PAGE 1 OF 1
Specification 7220-C-38	6	07220	R. A. Moray	5/29/75	14. NCR NO. 315
3. ITEM DESCRIPTION		8. ITEM LOCATION	13. VALIDATED BY	DATE	25. DISPOSITION CONCURRENCE
(2) Aux. Bldg. Beams		QC Hold & Sasse Road		5/29/75	REWORK / REJECT / REPAIR / USE AS IS / DOC.
4. SERIAL NUMBER		9. STARTUP SYSTEM NO.	15. REPLACEMENT PART NO.	REV.	PROJECT FIELD ENGINEER — DATE
41381[E] and 42483[E]		N/A	N/A		PROJECT ENGINEER — DATE
5. PURCHASE ORDER NO.		10. QC FIELD INSPECTION PLAN NO.	16. REPLACEMENT SERIAL NO.		PROJECT FIELD ENGINEER — DATE
7220-C-38 C-26		C-38-R-48	N/A		AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR — DATE
6. CONTRACTOR/LOCATION		11. ASME CODE ITEM ☐ YES ☒ NO	17. SOURCE		
Ingalls Iron Works/Verona, Pa.			Vendor		

18. ROUTING INSTRUCTIONS: ☒ ROUTE TO FIELD ENGINEERING ☐ ROUTE TO MATERIAL SUPERVISOR

19. NONCONFORMING CONDITION:

Beam 41381[E] has a bent stiffener plate. Beam 42483[E] has two (2) bent angles with cracked welds. Damage noted during receipt inspection. "Q" No. is 1.201. _____ hold tags applied.

20. ☐ FIELD DISPOSITION ☐ FIELD RECOMMENDATION/ROUTE TO PROJECT ENGINEERING

21. FIELD DISPOSITION RESULTS:

22. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION

23. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION RESULTS:

24. IS DESIGN CHANGE REQUIRED ☐ NO ☐ YES, SEE ATTACHED:

DRAWING _____ REV. _____ DCN _____

SPEC. _____ REV. _____ ADD. _____

26. REJECTED MATERIAL DISPOSITION ☐ RETURN TO SUPPLIER ☐ SCRAP

REMARKS

27. QC ACCEPTANCE

QC ENGINEER — DATE

AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR — DATE

10098-1

White Copy — Originator
Canary Copy — Field Engineer
Pink Copy — PQAE
Goldenrod Copy — QC

QC-G3-2

QUALITY ASSURANCE DISCREPANCY REPORT

1. PROJECT/DEPT./CONTRACTOR 07220 - Midland		2. POINT OF ORIGIN ☒ FIELD ☐ OFFICE	4. ISSUE DATE 02/27/75 5. QAD PREPARED BY: R. Sevo
6. WORK PLAN DATE 02/28/75	7. CHECKLIST ITEM 25.3	8. WHERE FOUND Champion Files	9. DISCUSSED WITH J. Connolly P. Schmanski

10. CONTROLLING DOCUMENT, SECTION, PARAGRAPH, ETC.

Champion Quality Assurance Manual, Rev. 3

11. QUOTATION

Section VII Document Control

"The issuance and receival of instructions ..... are controlled by the assignment of a document control number. All such documents are recorded on a log sheet ..... . Maintenance of a log sheet is the responsibility of the Plant Supervisor."

Section XVIII Quality Assurance Records

"All data and correspondence relative to Quality Assurance shall be filed under the proper heading and logged. These logs and files shall be available for the

12. DISCREPANCY DESCRIPTION

Continued.

Contrary to the above; (a) a log sheet is not being maintained by the Plant Supervisor. (b) Correspondence relative to Quality Assurance is not logged. (c) Copy of audit logs as of 12/10/73 are not available at the jobsite for review.

13. RECOMMENDED CORRECTIVE ACTION

a. Prepare and maintain log sheet as required.

b. Log data and correspondence relative to Quality Assurance.

c. Make audit logs as of 12/10/73 available at the jobsite.

14. SCHEDULED COMPLETION DATE 03/31/75	15. RESPONSIBILITY FOR CORRECTIVE ACTION J. P. Connolly

16. CORRECTIVE ACTION TAKEN

Champion has submitted for approval Rev. 3 of their QA Manual. This revision adds a Document Control Log Form to their QA Manual. Copies of the audit logs are now available at the jobsite.

17. DATE COMPLETED 4-5-75	18. SUBMITTED BY RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY J. Connolly PFXE

19. CORRECTIVE ACTION VERIFIED BY QAE

James L. Richardson LQAE

20. DATE 5/16/75

AA0-86 9/17/740

Quality Assurance Discrepancy Report - 053

Block No. 11 Continued.

audit by contractor ..... ."

Section XIX Audits

"..... A copy of the audit logs will be kept at the jobsite for review".

QUALITY AUDIT FINDING

055 (25-2-1)

AUDIT DATE: 3/31/75

AAR ITEM: 1

PROJECT/DEPARTMENT/SELLER: Midland 1 & 2 Job No. 07220

TYPE OF AUDIT: Construction [X] FIELD [ ] OFFICE

AUDITOR: G. Richardson

AGENDA ITEM: 1

CHECKLIST ITEM: 10

WHERE FOUND: U. S. Testing Files

DISCUSSED WITH:

CONTROLLING DOCUMENT, SECTION, PARAGRAPH, ETC.: U. S. Testing QA Manual, Rev. 3

SAME AS B.

QUOTATION

17.1 Conditons adverse to quality shall be promply identified and reported ..... . These conditions shall be corrected as soon as practicable ..... .

19.1 A comprehensive system of planned and documented audits shall be carried out quarterly ..... . Deficient areas shall be re-audited until corrective actions have been accomplished.

FINDING

1. An audit report dated 11/7/74 identified a deficiency in the storage of records. No corrective action to resolve this problem has been taken and the area has not been re-audited.

2. The last audit was conducted on 11/7/74. That audit (No. 4) covered a period of four months rather than the specified three months. Audit No.5 should have been accomplished early in February.

CORRECTIVE ACTION

Instruct U. S. Testing to conduct an audit within 30 days and take action to assure that future audits will be accomplished quarterly. Also instruct U. S. Testing to initiate timely action to correct deficiencies which are identified during these audits.

SCHEDULE COMPLETION DATE: 5/2/75

RESPONSIBILITY FOR CORRECTIVE ACTION: PFOCE

CORRECTIVE ACTION TAKEN

An internal audit was performed by US Testing on April 11, 1975. E.J. Zadina, the US Testing auditor, stated that a new audit schedule would assure that audits are performed quarterly. He also stated that deficiencies uncovered during audits would be closed out and verified in a timely manner.

DATE COMPLETED: 5-5-75

SUBMITTED BY RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY: PFOCE

CORRECTIVE ACTION VERIFIED BY QAR

DATE

QUALITY AUDIT FINDING

	AUDIT DATE: 05/06/75
	AAR ITEM NO.: N/A

PROJECT/DEPARTMENT/SELLER: [redacted]nd 1 & 2, Job No. 07220	TYPE OF AUDIT: Construction	[X] FIELD [ ] OFFICE	AUDITOR: G. Richardson
AGENDA NO.: 1	CHECKLIST ITEM: 8	WHERE FOUND: QC Files	DISCUSSED WITH: J. Connolly
CONTROLLING DOCUMENT, SECTION, PARAGRAPH, ETC.: FIM G-5, Rev. 0	SAME AS:		

QUOTATION

Para. 3.3.3 "Purchased items which do not require release by Bechtel PID may require quality verification documents .... . The documentation requirements will be designated in the P.O. and shall be itemized on the Field Receiving Inspection Plan. Documents received shall be reviewed for .... compliance with the requirements of the technical specifications and procurement documents."

FINDING

Contrary to the above the Field Inspection Plan C-66-R for receiving materials to Spec. 7220-C-66 does not itemize the required material test reports and there is no evidence of review of complaince by a QCE. The same condition was also noted for FIP C-233A-R-1 which is used to receive materials purchased to Spec. 7220-C-233.

Th[redacted]wo package checked:

C-66, MRR AEO 636
C-233, MRR AEO 315

NOTE: Spec. 7220-C-66 is no longer in use at this site. Therefore revision of the FIP is not necessary.

CORRECTIVE ACTION

1. For C-66 materials review all material test reports for compliance.

2. For C-233 review MRR AEO 316 for compliance and revise the FIP or utilize FIP B-1-R to receive non shop inspected materials from this P.O. as these materials also appear on the bulk items list.

3. Assure that this condition has not occurred elsewhere by reviewing FIP's used to receive other non shop inspected items.

SCHEDULE COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/75	RESPONSIBILITY FOR CORRECTIVE ACTION: PFQCE

CORRECTIVE ACTION TAKEN

COMPLETED	SUBMITTED BY RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY
CORRECTIVE ACTION VERIFIED BY QAE	DATE

QUALITY AUDIT FINDING

058 (14-1-1)

AUDIT DATE: 05/06/75

AAS ITEM: N/A

PRO[illegible] DEPARTMENT/SELLER	TYPE OF AUDIT	AUDITOR
[illegible]land 1 & 2, Job No. 07220	Construction ☒ FIELD ☐ OFFICE	G. Richardson

NDA ITEM	CHECKLIST ITEM	WHERE FOUND	DISCUSSED WITH
1	11	QC and Maintenance files	G. Butler D. Martin

CONTROLLING DOCUMENT, SECTION, PARAGRAPH, ETC.	SAME AS 5.
#QCNM SF/PSP #11, Rev. 0	Field Proc. FPG-3, Rev. 2

QUOTATION

PSP #11, para. 2.2	"A storage and storage maintenance package is prepared by the MSE on permanent plant equipment in accordance with the storage and storage maintenance procedure." The storage ... package consists of Form FPG-3, F-1..... .
Field Proc. FPG-3 para. 3.0	"The MSE is responsible .... for indicating established requirements on associated forms."
para. 5.1	"The MSE enters storage requirements on Form FPG-3, F-1".

FINDING

Contrary to the above no FPG-3, F-1 Form has been prepared for materials purchased to Specification 7220-C-2. This material includes trumpet assemblies and sem. rigid [illegible]athing.

CORRECTIVE ACTION

1. Prepare a F-1 Form for the above item and assure present storage is adequate.
2. Review existing F-1 Forms to assure the above condition does not occur elsewhere.

SCHEDULE COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBILITY FOR CORRECTIVE ACTION
06/20/75	Project Superintendent

CORRECTIVE ACTION TAKEN

[illegible] COMPLETED	SUBMITTED BY RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY

CORRECTIVE ACTION VERIFIED BY QAE	DATE

Route To	This Copy For
GSKeeley HWSlager CQHills	SHHowell WEKessler (2) TCCooke JMilandin WFHolub GLRichardson Subject File

CONSUMERS POWER

Nonconformance Report No QE-48

File 16.3.6
Issue Date May 9, 1975
Project Midland 1 & 2

File Title NCR's on Bechtel Quality Control

This Nonconformance Report is Issued To:

Mr. J. P. Connolly
Bechtel Project Field Quality Control Engineer

who is responsible for corrective action.

Prepared By [illegible] Date 5-9-75
Approved By [illegible] Date 5/9/75
Written Reply Requested By Date 6-6-75
Corrective Action Requested By Date 6-6-75

Nonconformance Description and Supporting Details: (1) Specification C-208, Rev. 4 section 7.3.2 states "A slump measurement shall be made for every 35 cubic yards or fraction thereof of concrete produced for Class I structures." For concrete placements CC(652.75)a' and CC(621.0)a', 56 cubic yards of concrete was placed between slump measurements. (2) The C12-1 form (In-Process Concrete Test Report) for CC(652.75)a' indicates one air meter and one thermometer was used in the field for testing. However, at least three air meters and two thermometers were used in the field. One air meter and one thermometer was needed at the pump discharge. One air meter and one thermometer was needed at the truck discharge. Also, the QC inspector noted on the C12-1 form an air meter change after obtaining 7.5% and 6.5% air with the original air meter. Limits on air content are 3.0%-6.0%.

AEC Reportable Yes ☐ No ☒ See Procedure 9 (For Nuclear Projects Only)

Stop Work Necessary Yes ☐ No ☒ See Procedure 16 - Stop Work No _____

Recommended Corrective Action: (a) For item (1) above, receive an Engineering evaluation of the acceptability of the concrete placed without the required slump measurement. No additional corrective action is necessary, because it has already been covered in letter C-208-56 from Bechtel to U.S. Testing, concerning concrete testing frequencies and test locations. The written reply to this item is requested with the Engineering evaluation. (b) For item (2) above, take corrective action to preclude these occurrences. Written reply and corrective action requested for both by June 6, 1975.

Corrective Action Taken:

[1] Verification of Corrective Action Required Yes ☐ No ☐

[1] Method of Verification:

[1] Nonconformance Closure Confirmed By _____
Date _____

[1] To be completed at time of closure by Consumers Power QA Services.

Attachment A

Route To	This Copy For
GSKeeley	SHHowell
HWSlager	WEKessler (2)
CQHills	TCCooke
	JMilandin
	WFHolub
	GLRichardson
	Subject File

Consumers Power

Nonconformance Report No QF-49

File 16.3.4 & 16.3.6
Issue Date May 22, 1975
Project Midland 1 & 2

File Title NCR's on Bechtel Construction & Quality Contr

This Nonconformance Report is Issued To:
Mr. J. F. Newgen
Bechtel Project Superintendent
Mr. J. P. Connolly
Bechtel Project Field Quality Control Engineer
who is responsible for corrective action.

Prepared By [signature] Date 5-22-7
Approved By [signature] Date 5/22/75
Written Reply Requested By Date 6-23-7
Corrective Action Requested By Date 6-23-7

Nonconformance Description and Supporting Details: Additional emphasis on concrete testing frequencies and locations were expanded beyond Specifications C-208 and C-230, in letter C-208-56 dated March 19, 1975, to U.S. Testing. Item 1 in this letter states in part "The point of record testing for concrete slump, air content, and temperature is at the truck discharge...". Item 5 in this letter states "Slump, air content, and temperature tests taken at the batch plant must always be backed-up with a record test at the truck discharge". Contrary to items 1 and 5, no slump or air content tests were taken at the truck discharge for concrete placement A(589)b, four cubic yards of A-1 mix.

AEC Reportable Yes ☐ No ☒ See Procedure 9 (For Nuclear Projects Only)

Stop Work Necessary Yes ☐ No ☒ See Procedure 16 - Stop Work No _____

Recommended Corrective Action: (a) Receive an Engineering evaluation of the acceptability of the concrete placed without the record tests being run. The written reply to this item is requested with the Engineering evaluation.
(b) Implement the requirements emphasized in Letter C-208-56 to preclude repetition.

[1] Corrective Action Taken:

[1] Verification of Corrective Action Required Yes ☐ No ☐

[1] Method of Verification:

[1] Nonconformance Closure Confirmed By _____
Date _____

[1] To be completed at time of closure by Consumers Power QA Services.

NONCONFORMANCE - REPORT LOG & STATUS BOOK

12. REPORT DATE 2-3-75, 3-3-75, 4-1-75
PAGE COMPL.
Q.C. ENG. SIGN

1. PROJECT NO. 7220

2. NCR NO.	3. ORIG. DATE	4. PREPARED BY	5. NONCONFORMANCE DESCRIPTION/REMARKS	STATUS 6. ROUTE	7. DATE XMTD	8. DATE RETD	9. DATE CLOSED	10. CLOSED BY
268	1-17 -75	J.C.Aldridge	C-38. Beam connectors damaged, shipment C-14 1.201	Field 1-17-75	1-30 -75	2-13 -75		
269	1-20 -75	A.L.Boulden	C-111. Liner Plate X-Ray of repair not available 1.109	Field 1-20-75	1-29 -75	4-10 -75	4-10 -75	A. L. Boulden
270	1-21 -75	J.C.Aldridge	C-38. Damaged beams, nine each, shipment C-15 1.201	Field 1-21-75	2-3- 75	2-13 -75		
271	1-21- -75	C.F.Clark	C-111. Welding procedures P1-F(A-CO_2) 1.109	Field 1-21-75	1-22 -75	4-10 -75	5-7-75	A.L.Boulden
272	1-21- -75	C.F.Clark	C-111. Leak noted at Knuckle Plate, Lamination 1.109	Field 1-21-75	No	1-22 -75=	1-29 -75	B.Lussier
273	1-21 -75	R.A.Moray	Bulk Material. ½" & 5/3" Round bars. 7220-F-11452	Field 1-22-75	No	1-24 -75	5-29 -75	R.A.Moray
274	1-22 -75	J.C.Aldridge	C-38. Material shiped without release 1.201	M.S. Field 1-22-75	No	1-24- 75	1-28- -75	R.A.Moray
275	1-27 -75	R.A.Moray	M-201. M-104A ITT-Grinnell marking of X-Rayed joints nor per M-201 ASME 4.192	Field 1-28-75	2-7- 75	2-28- 75		
276	1-28 -75	J.P.Betts	C-39. Rebars cut of do not match Dwg C-324 Rev 10. 1.103	Field 1-28-75	1-29 -75	2-7- -75	2-10 -75	L.R.Albert
277	1-29 -75==	R.A.Moray	M-104A. Improper G-3210 Form ASME,4.104	M.S. 1-30-75	No	2-4- A75	4-18 -75	R. A. Moray
278	1-29 -75	R.A.Moray	M-104A. Improper G-321D, X-Rays improper, Code Data Name Plate. ASME,4.124	M.S 1-30-75	No	2-4- 75	4-18 -75	R. A. Moray
279	1-30 -75	C.F.Clark	C-111. Liner Plate radius out of tolerance after concreti before	Field 1-31-75	1-31 75	2-7-78	2-6-75	L. R. ALBERT

NONCONFORMANCE - REPORT LOG & STATUS BOOK

1. PROJECT NO. 7220

12. REPORT DATE 3-3-75 [illegible], 5-2-75
PAGE COMPL.
Q.C. ENG. SIGN

NCR NO.	3. ORIG. DATE	4. PREPARED BY	5. NONCONFORMANCE DESCRIPTION/REMARKS	STATUS 6. ROUTE	7. DATE XMTD	8. DATE RETD	9. DATE CLOSED	10. CLOSED BY
292	2-25-75	R. A. Moray	C-38. Documentation not Rcd for welding studs 1.101/1.201	M.S. 2-26-75	No	2-28-75	3-17-75	R.A.Moray
293	2-25-75	R. A. Moray	C-39. Rebar does not conform to aprvd drawings 1.103	~~Field 2-26-75~~	3-3-75	4-9-75	4-11-75	R. A. Moray
294	2-26-75	L.R.Albert	C-231. Curing temp below Spec on 6th day of cure, CC(593.5)e 1.105	~~Field 2-26-75~~	3-3-75	5-16-75	5-19-75	L.R.Albert
295	3-3-75	A. Boos	C-231. Aux. Bldg Slab placed without required rebars 1.203	~~Field 3-3-75~~	3-3-75	3-24-75	4-8-75	L. R. Albert
296	3-4-75	A. Boos	C-231. Aux Bdlg wall missing one bar 1.203	Field 3-4-75	No	3-4-[illegible]	5-15-75	D.C.Thompson
297	3-5-75	R. A. Moray	M-104A. Two spools with same number ASME 4.134	~~Field 3-12-75~~	3=13=75	4-10-75		
298	3-10-75	A. Boos	C-231. Aux Bldg walls, rebar lengths vary from requirements 1.203	~~Field 3-11-75~~	3-11-75	3-24-75	3-24-75	L.R.Albert
299	3-13-75	R.A.Moray	C-38. Documentation on ASTM A-325 Bolts/Nuts 1.101/1.201	M.S. 3-16-75	No	4=1=75	4-7-75	R. A. Moray
[illegible]	3-26-75	R. L. Bowren	C-38. Damaged Beam upon receipt inspection. 1.201	~~Field 3-26-75~~	4-10-75	4-21-75		
301	4-2-75	R. A. Moray	C-38. Damaged Beams, Shipment C-21 1.201	~~Field 4-8-75~~	4-10-75	4-21-75		
302	4-2-75	R.A.Moray	C-38. Damaged Beam, Shipment C-23	~~Field 4-9-75~~	4-10-75	4-21-75		
303	4-7-75	R. A. Moray	M-104A. Spool fab sheet not Engineering approved. AS[illegible] 4.134	~~Field 4-8-75~~	5-5-75			

NONCONFORMANCE - REPORT LOG & STATUS BOOK

12. REPORT DATE 5-2-75
PAGE COMPL. _____
Q.C. ENG. SIGN _____

1. PROJECT NO 7220

NCR NO.	3. ORIG. DATE	4. PREPARED BY	5. NONCONFORMANCE DESCRIPTION/REMARKS	STATUS 6. ROUTE	7. DATE XMTD	8. DATE RETD	9. DATE CLOSED	10. CLOSED BY
304	4-7 -75	R. A. Moray	M-104A. Spool marking differs from reader sheet markings ASME 4.114	M.S. 4-8-75	No	4-11 -75	5-12 -75	R. A. Moray
305	4-9- -75	R. L. Bowren	FIP C-5. Storage on Steam Generator 2E-51A. ASME 4.021	Field 4-9-75				
306	4-9- -75	L.R.Albert	C-231. Concrete temperature, A(602)a' 1.205	~~Field~~ ~~4-9-75~~	4-11- -75	5-16 -75	5-19 -75	L.R.Albert
307	4-9- -75	R. A. Moray	M-204. Fittings,F-10577, AEO-328. Marking and Documentation. ASME	M.S. 4-11-75	No	4=18 -75	=	
308	4-17 -75	R. A. Moray	M-104A. Reader sheet has incorrect spool numbers. ASME4.114	M.S. 4-21-75	No	4-22 -75	5-12 -75	R. A. Moray
309	4-23 -75	L. R. Albert	C-230. Batch Plant qualification past due. 1.105,1.205	~~Field~~ ~~4-23-75~~	5-7- 75			
310	4-28 -75	R. A. Moray	C-38. Damaged Beam, Shipment C-24 1.201	~~Field~~ ~~4-28-75~~	5-1-75	5-16 -75		
311	4-30 -75	R. A. Moray	C-38. Beams shipped, not on Shipping List 1.201	M.S. 5-1-75	No	5-12- 75	5-12 -75	R. A. Moray
12	4-30 -75	R. A. Moray	C-38. Damaged Beams, Shipment C-25 1.201	~~Field~~ ~~5-1-75~~	5-5- -75	5-27 -75		
313	5-2-75	J.W.Miller	C-38. Beam material tensile strength over ASTM A-36 limit 1.201	~~Field~~ ~~5-2-75~~	5-2- 75 =	5-27 -75	5-29 -75	L.R.Albert
314	5-29 -75	R.A.Moray	C-38. Beams, Shipment C-27 without weight or orientation marking 1.201	Field 5-30-75				
315	5-29 -75	R.A.Moray	C-38. Damaged Beams, Shipment C-26 1.201	Field 5-30-75				

NONCONFORMANCE REPORT

1. PAGE 1 OF 24	14. NCR NO. 271

2. DRAWING/~~PART NO.~~ Specs. 7220-C-111 — REV. 6 — 7. PROJECT NO. 07220 — 12. REPORTED BY C.F. Clark — DATE 1/21/75

3. ITEM DESCRIPTION: Liner Plate — 8. ITEM LOCATION: Containment #1 & #2 — 13. VALIDATED BY J. Carolly — DATE 1-21-75

4. SERIAL NUMBER: N/A — 9. STARTUP SYSTEM NO.: N/A — 15. REPLACEMENT PART NO.: N/A — REV.

5. PURCHASE ORDER NO.: N/A — 10. QC FIELD INSPECTION PLAN NO.: N/A — 16. REPLACEMENT SERIAL NO.: N/A

6. CONTRACTOR/LOCATION: N/A — 11. ASME CODE ITEM ☐ YES ☒ NO — 17. SOURCE: Construction

25. DISPOSITION CONCURRENCE

REWORK	REJECT	REPAIR	USE AS IS	DOC.
			X	

Signature	Title	Date
for J.C. Wolenzano	PROJECT FIELD ENGINEER	4-10-75
[signature]	PROJECT ENGINEER	3-31-75
J. Carolly	PROJECT FIELD QC ENGINEER	4-10-75
	AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR	DATE

18. ROUTING INSTRUCTIONS: ☒ ROUTE TO FIELD ENGINEERING ☐ ROUTE TO MATERIAL SUPERVISOR

19. NONCONFORMING CONDITION:

Certain Areas of the Containment liners have been welded with a combination of two welding procedures, (i.e.) the base or seal pass is made with procedure P1-AC-LH and the balance of weld deposit being made with procedures P1-F(A-CO_2) 1,2,3 AND P1-F-CO_2 (STRUCTURAL) [initials] 4/4/75. This is contrary to Spec. 7220-C-111, para 7.2.2.

"Q" NO 1,109 HOLD TAGS 2 APPLIED BY MAN WAY UNIT #1 & #2

20. ☐ FIELD DISPOSITION ☒ FIELD RECOMMENDATION/ROUTE TO PROJECT ENGINEERING

Use as is. Although the use of a combination of welding procedures is contrary to the specification, there is no detrimental effect to weld quality or structural integrity. The specification intent was to minimize numbers of procedures used so as to better control and monitor welder performance and to enable more precise applications of proper frequency of NDE. (see Sheet 2)

21. FIELD DISPOSITION RESULTS:

22. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION

Project Engineering concurs with Field Recommendation to use as is. The subject welds are acceptable because of the following: ASME Section IX requirements are that a single welding procedure specification (WPS) be prepared for each type of weldment. Contrary to this requirement, combinations of two WPSs were used in making the subject weldments. The welding processes which are represented by the

23. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION RESULTS:

Procedure qualification records received with Specification 7220-C-270 on 4/24/75. [signature] 4/30/75
Revised Spec. Received 5/7/75 [initials]

24. IS DESIGN CHANGE REQUIRED ☐ NO ☒ YES, SEE ATTACHED:

DRAWING ______ REV. ______ DCN ______

SPEC. C-111 REV. 7 ADD. ______

26. REJECTED MATERIAL DISPOSITION ☐ RETURN TO SUPPLIER ☐ SCRAP

REMARKS

27. QC ACCEPTANCE: [signature] 5/7/75 — QC ENGINEER — DATE

AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR — DATE

10098-1

White Copy – Originator
Canary Copy – Field Engineer
Pink Copy – PQAE
Goldenrod Copy – QC

QC-G3-2

(Block 20 continued)

Further, ASME Section IX paragraph QW 201 specifically allows combinations of procedures and processes in the same weld joint. These procedural combinations will be covered in another procedure combining the Shielded Metal Arc (SMA) and Flux Core Arc Welding (FCAW) processes. Since no essential variables of either process or procedure have changed, the issuance of a new procedure is simplified and does not require testing or re-qualifications. Thus, the new Welding Procedure Specification will only reference previously run Procedural Qualification Reports (PQR's). The MF&QCS & Project Engineering groups have already begun the procedural modification process and assure us our situation is not adverse to weld quality.

T C Valenzano 1-22-75

Welding may continue based on TWX #4 dated 1-22-75 from M. Butterworth of MF&QCS to E E Felton.

T Valenzano 1-22-75

Block 22 cont.:

combinations of WPSs used can, in accordance with ASME Section IX, be combined into single WPSs. Therefore, the weldments have met the technical requirements of ASME Section IX, but the proper documentation was not available. To correct the nonconformance, new WPSs permitting the subject welding have been prepared by MF&QCS, and are being issued. In order to clarify the requirements for WPSs, Specification C-111 will be revised to delete Section 7.2.2, and ASME Section IX shall govern.

[illegible signature] 3-19-75

J E [illegible signature] 3-21-75

J-2777

BECHTEL MIDL

BECHTEL SF

910-372-7961 BECHTEL CORP SF CLG 810-266-9497
TWX 4 1/22/75 0920
BECHTEL CORP
MIDLAND MICH
ATTN: E. E. FELTON

SUBJECT: COMBINATION OF WELDING PROCEDURES
JOB NO. 7220.
PER YOUR REQUEST, AS AN INTERIM MEASURE, THE FOLLOWING WELDING PROCEDURES MAY BE USED IN COMBINATION WITH P1-A-C-LH (STRUCTURAL) REV. 0 IN ACCORDANCE WITH ASME SECTION IX, QW 201.3
P1-F(CO2)-2 REV. 0; P1-F(CO2) STRUCTURAL, REV. 0
P1-F(AC02)-1, -2, 3U-4, REV. 0, EXCEPT 3U REV. 1
COMBINATION PROCEDURES OF THESE PROCESSES ARE AT THIS TIME BEING PREPARED AND WILL BE FORWARDED AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

MIKE BUTTERWORTH
PROCEDURE C[illegible]
MF&QCS
CHG 7220 7ND-86[illegible]
BE/301-2
9L
BECHTEL MIDL

JOB 7220 ROUTING	E C MGR.	E SUP	P E ENG	A P E ENG	CONST - ECH	AREA C-1	AREA C-2	AREA AUX	AREA T - G-1	AREA T - G-2	AREA YARD	AREA MISCELLANEOUS	CIV SUP	CIV ENG	MECH SUP	MECH ENG	ELEC SUP	ELEC ENG	CC	QA	WELD	ADM - ACCT	PURCH	SUBCON	P.A. - SAFETY	LABOR REL	CPCO	IME			TICKLER
ACTION NOT																															
USE																															

NCR 271 Pg 344

Telephone call

BY T. Nakayama OF
TO R. Straton OF MFQCS
DATE Jan 22 19 75 TIME
SUBJECT NCR-271

ROUTE Connolly
Langtin
Hicks

JOB NO. 7220

I questioned the words in M. Butterworth's TWX of 1-22-75 on combinations of procedures wherein the words "Except 3u Rev 1" are used. Dick indicated these words meant P-1-F (A-CO_2) 1, 2, 3u, 4 were approved all Rev 0 and 3u was approved also for Rev 1. Therefore Rev 1 can be used with P1-A-LH.

NCR 271 Pg 4 of 4

RECEIVED
JAN 24 1975
BECHTEL POWER CORP.
JOB 7220
D-2788

Telephone call

Copies Connolly
R. C. Bertossa
E. E. Felton
J. Hink
R. W. Straiton
T. Velanzano

BY R. C. Sommerfeld (RCS-015-030) OF MF&QCS - Ann Arbor

TO R. W. Straiton OF MF&QCS SFHO

DATE January 22, 1975 TIME

SUBJECT Midland Units 1 & 2
Combined Process Welding Procedures
for Liner Plate Welds
File: 7220-Civil

JOB NO. 7220

While transmitting the Projects request for preparation of Welding Procedures utilizing cellulosic and low hydrogen electrodes in combination with flux-cored electrodes, Mr. Straiton was inadvertently told to combine P1-A-c-Lh (Structural) with the flux-cored procedures. This should have been P1-A-c-Lh without the (Structural) designation.

He authorized me to inform T. Valenzano and J. Hink of his intent to utilize P1-A-c-Lh for development of the combined process procedures. This is a modification of his TWX to E. E. Felton/T. Valenzano of January 21, 1975.

R. C. Sommerfeld

R. C. Sommerfeld
Materials Engineering Supervisor

RCS:id

JAN 27 R. L. POWREN

BECHTEL

NONCONFORMANCE REPORT

1. PAGE 1 OF 2	14. NCR NO. 273	

2. DRAWING/PART NO.: Bulk Material List | REV.: | 7. PROJECT NO.: 07220

12. REPORTED BY: R. A. Moray | DATE: 1/21/75

3. ITEM DESCRIPTION: ~~100 pc~~ 50 pc ½" round bar & 5/8" round bar | 8. ITEM LOCATION: QC Hold Area

13. VALIDATED BY: [signature] | DATE: 1-21-75

4. SERIAL NUMBER: Ht. D82021 & Y88283 respectively | 9. STARTUP SYSTEM NO.: N/A

15. REPLACEMENT PART NO.: N/A | REV.:

5. PURCHASE ORDER NO.: 7220-F-11452 | 10. QC FIELD INSPECTION PLAN NO.: B-1-R-2 Rev. 0

16. REPLACEMENT SERIAL NO.: N/A

6. CONTRACTOR/LOCATION: J. T. Ryerson Detroit, Michigan | 11. ASME CODE ITEM: ☐ YES ☒ NO

17. SOURCE: Vendor

25. DISPOSITION CONCURRENCE

REWORK	REJECT	REPAIR	USE AS IS	DOC.
	X			X

PROJECT FIELD ENGINEER: [signature] DATE: 1-24-75

PROJECT ENGINEER / PROJECT FIELD QC ENGINEER: [signature] DATE: 1-24-75

AUTHORIZE INSPECTOR: DATE:

18. ROUTING INSTRUCTIONS: ☐ ROUTE TO FIELD ENGINEERING ☐ ROUTE TO MATERIAL SUPERVISOR

19. NONCONFORMING CONDITION:

1. The ½" round bar requires the following in order to meet the conditions of the P. O. 7220-F-11452.
   a. Certified Materials Tests Report to include tensile properties and bend test results.
   b. "Statement of Conformance."
   c. Tagging needs to include size and length of pieces, number of pieces, heat number and manufacturing mill.
   d. 1 pc. is damaged - bent.

Continued on Page 2

20. ☒ FIELD DISPOSITION ☐ FIELD RECOMMENDATION/ROUTE TO PROJECT ENGINEERING

Material Supervisor to obtain missing documentation from vendor for items 1-a, b, c and 2-a, b, c as listed in block 19. Items 1-d and 2-d listed in block 19 will have bent portions cut away and rejected. Estimated implementation date is 3-1-75. R. [signature] 1/23/75

21. FIELD DISPOSITION RESULTS: Fifty pcs of ½" round bar [illegible] ... released for use in [illegible] application. [signature] 4-2[illegible]

22. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION

23. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION RESULTS:

24. IS DESIGN CHANGE REQUIRED ☐ NO ☐ YES, SEE ATTACHED:

DRAWING ______ REV. ______ DCN ______

SPEC. ______ REV. ______ ADD. ______

26. REJECTED MATERIAL DISPOSITION ☐ RETURN TO SUPPLIER ☐ SCRAP

REMARKS

27. QC ACCEPTANCE: [signature] DATE: 5-24-75

QC ENGINEER

AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR DATE

10098-1

White Copy — Originator
Canary Copy — Field Engineer
Pink Copy — PQAE
Goldenrod Copy — QC

QC-G3-2

Block No. 19 Continued.

2. The 5/8" round bar requires the following in order to meet the conditions of the P.O. 7220-F-11452.
   a. Certified Material Test Reports to include tensile properties and bend test results.
   b. "Statement of Conformance."
   c. Tagging needs to include heat number and manufacturing mill.
   d. 2 pcs. are damaged - bent.

Nonconformance noted during receipt inspection. 2 Hold tags applied.

Block 20 (continued)

Fifty (50) pieces x 40' of 1/2" dia. round bar to be used as non-Q and released for use by painting with white stripes at no less than 2 feet centers along its length per FPG-5 Rev. 0.

Richard [illegible] 4/29/75

Block 21 Continued

Note: Heat No's are:
5/8" - C1247
1/2" - C0392

a. Certified material test reports received and are acceptable.
b. Statement of Conformance received and is acceptable.
c. Tagging information received and material is now properly tagged. Ryerson originally sent documentation for Heat # Y[illegible]83 & D8ZC21 which was sent in error.
d. Bent portions have been cut away and scrapped.

[illegible signature] 5/[illegible]/75

[illegible signature] 5/[illegible]/75

White Copy – Originator
Canary Copy – Field Engineer
Pink Copy – PQAE
Goldenrod Copy – QC

NONCONFORMANCE REPORT

1. PAGE 1 OF X 2				14. NCR NO. 294	
2. DRAWING/PART NO. 7220-C-231-Q	REV. 6	7. PROJECT NO. 07220	12. REPORTED BY L. R. Albert	DATE 2/26/75	25. DISPOSITION CONCURRENCE: REWORK / REJECT / REPAIR / USE AS IS (X)
3. ITEM DESCRIPTION Cont. #2 Cover Slab		8. ITEM LOCATION Reactor Building #2	13. VALIDATED BY J. Connelly	DATE 2-26-75	
4. SERIAL NUMBER N/A		9. STARTUP SYSTEM NO. N/A	15. REPLACEMENT PART NO. N/A	REV.	PROJECT FIELD ENGINEER — DATE 5-16-
5. PURCHASE ORDER NO. N/A		10. QC FIELD INSPECTION PLAN NO. C-231-4-482 Rev. 0	16. REPLACEMENT SERIAL NO. N/A		PROJECT ENGINEER — DATE 2-6-7
6. CONTRACTOR/LOCATION		11. ASME CODE ITEM ☐ YES ☒ NO	17. SOURCE Construction		PROJECT FIELD QC ENGINEER — DATE 5-16-
					AUTHORIZE INSPECTOR — DATE

18. ROUTING INSTRUCTIONS: ☒ ROUTE TO FIELD ENGINEERING ☐ ROUTE TO MATERIAL SUPERVISOR

19. NONCONFORMING CONDITION:

Specification 7220-C-231-Q Rev. 6 Section 13.2.4 requires that concrete surface temperatures be maintained at no less than 50°F during the curing period. Contrary to the above, recording thermometers in the cover slab concrete indicated temperatures of 40° and 45° during the sixth day of curing. Nonconformance noted during routine QC surveillance. "Q" No. is 1.105.

One Tag applied.

20. ☐ FIELD DISPOSITION ☒ FIELD RECOMMENDATION/ROUTE TO PROJECT ENGINEERING

Use as is. The lowest concrete temperature recorded was 40°F which occurred during the 6th day of curing. This condition was discovered at 8:30 a.m. on the 7th day of curing. The heaters were immediately readjusted and the curing period was extended to insure that all of the affected concrete (Cont. #2 cover slab - approx. from azimuth 220° to 342°) received

Continued on Sheet 2

21. FIELD DISPOSITION RESULTS:

22. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION

Temperatures below 50° (and above freezing) during curing of fresh concrete have no detrimental effect on the concrete. It merely extends the curing time required to reach a specified strength. The curing period was extended to compensate for the lower temperature and, hence, Engineering concurs with Field Recommendation to use as is. RLR 5-1-75

J. Gotsch 5-1-75

23. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION RESULTS:

24. IS DESIGN CHANGE REQUIRED ☒ NO ☐ YES, SEE ATTACHED:

DRAWING _____ REV. _____ DCN _____

SPEC. _____ REV. _____ ADD. _____

26. REJECTED MATERIAL DISPOSITION ☐ RETURN TO SUPPLIER ☐ SCRAP

REMARKS

27. QC ACCEPTANCE L. R. Albert — QC ENGINEER — DATE 5/10/75

AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR — DATE

0098-1

ORIGINATOR

QC Cy

Block 20 Continued

the required 7 days at 50°F. Wet burlap continually covered the slab and at no time was the concrete exposed to freezing temperatures. Concrete surface temperatures of 40° and 45° will have no detrimental effect on the durability or strength of the concrete.

Brent
3/3/75

BECHTEL

NONCONFORMANCE REPORT

1. PAGE 1 OF 1	14. NCR NO. 296		
2. DRAWING/PART NO. 7220-C-282 (Q)	REV. 4	7. PROJECT NO. 07220	12. REPORTED BY A. Boos A. J. Boos — DATE 3/3/75
3. ITEM DESCRIPTION Reinforcing Steel		8. ITEM LOCATION Aux. Bldg.	13. VALIDATED BY [signature] — DATE 3/4/75
4. SERIAL NUMBER N/A		9. STARTUP SYSTEM NO. N/A	15. REPLACEMENT PART NO. N/A — REV.
5. PURCHASE ORDER NO. N/A		10. QC FIELD INSPECTION PLAN NO. C-231-2-313 Rev. 2	16. REPLACEMENT SERIAL NO. N/A
6. CONTRACTOR/LOCATION N/A		11. ASME CODE ITEM ☐ YES ☒ NO	17. SOURCE Construction

25. DISPOSITION CONCURRENCE

REWORK	REJECT	REPAIR	USE AS IS	DOC
X				

[signature] 3-4-75 — PROJECT FIELD ENGINEER — DATE

[signature: J. Connolly] 3-4-75 — PROJECT ENGINEER — DATE

PROJECT FIELD QC ENGINEER — DATE

AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR — DATE

18. ROUTING INSTRUCTIONS ☒ ROUTE TO FIELD ENGINEERING ☐ ROUTE TO MATERIAL SUPERVISOR

19. NONCONFORMING CONDITION: The referenced drawing specifies that the horiz. reinforcing for wall 27 shall be #8 bars 12" on center. One (1) #8 horizontal dowel has been omitted on the east face of the 7.4 wall line below elevation 584'. This will produce a 24" spacing in the #8 horiz. wall reinforcing for the south face of wall 27. "Q" # 1.203.

A. J. Boos 3/4/75

20. ☒ FIELD DISPOSITION ☐ FIELD RECOMMENDATION/ROUTE TO PROJECT ENGINEERING

Drill a hole for the missing dowel in the 7.4 line wall. Fill the hole with non-shrink grout (EMBECO 636) and set the required dowel. The embedment length of the dowel shall be in accordance with Table 36 of drawing C-211 (Q) Rev. 4.

A. J. Boos 3/4/75

21. FIELD DISPOSITION RESULTS:

Hole Drilled and Dowel grouted as per MFG Recommendation and Dwg C-211 and Spec C-2319. QC-C5 attached to FIP C-231-2-397a

[signature: Thompson] 4-3-75

22. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION

23. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION RESULTS:

24. IS DESIGN CHANGE REQUIRED ☐ NO ☐ YES, SEE ATTACHED:

DRAWING ______ REV. ______ DCN ______

SPEC ______ REV. ______ ADD. ______

26. REJECTED MATERIAL DISPOSITION ☐ RETURN TO SUPPLIER ☐ SCRAP

REMARKS

27. QC ACCEPTANCE [signature: Thompson] 5-15-75 — QC ENGINEER — DATE

AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR — DATE

10098-1

White Copy – Originator
Canary Copy – Field Engineer
Pink Copy – PQAE
Goldenrod Copy – QC

QC-G3-2

BECHTEL

NONCONFORMANCE REPORT

1. PAGE 1 OF 1				14. NCR NO. 304	
2. DRAWING/PART NO. Spec. M-201	REV. 5	7. PROJECT NO. 07220	12. ACQUIRED BY R. A. Moray	DATE 4/2/75	25. DISPOSITION CONCURRENCE: REWORK / REJECT / REPAIR / USE AS IS / DNC X
3. ITEM DESCRIPTION Pipe Spool		8. ITEM LOCATION QC Hold Area	13. VALIDATED BY	DATE 4/4/75	
4. SERIAL NUMBER 2GCB-25-S611-5-4		9. STARTUP SYSTEM NO. N/A	15. REPLACEMENT PART NO. N/A	REV.	PROJECT FIELD ENGINEER / DATE
5. PURCHASE ORDER NO. 7220-M-104A		10. QC FIELD INSPECTION PLAN NO. M-104A-R-9	16. REPLACEMENT SERIAL NO. N/A		PROJECT ENGINEER: [signature] DATE 4-11-75
6. CONTRACTOR/LOCATION ITT Grinnell/Kernersville, N.C.		11. ASME CODE ITEM ☒ YES ☐ NO	17. SOURCE Vendor		PROJECT FIELD QC ENGINEER: [signature] DATE 4-18-75 AUTHORIZE INSPECTOR

18. ROUTING INSTRUCTIONS: ☐ ROUTE TO FIELD ENGINEERING ☒ ROUTE TO MATERIAL SUPERVISOR

19. NONCONFORMING CONDITION:

Form G-321-D for P.O. 7220-M-104A requires vendor to supply radiographic verification reports. The radiographic verification reports (Reader Sheets) supplied for spool 2-GCB-25-S611-5-4 (MR-78-59) welds A & B read 2-GCB-25-5611-5-4 A & 2GCB-25-5611-5-4 B. The verification reports therefore do not correspond with identification markings on the spool or spool dwg. Nonconformance noted during receipt inspection.

"O" No. is 4.114. Unit 2. 1 Hold Tags applied. (Ref Ledger Sheet 7141)

20. ☒ FIELD DISPOSITION ☐ FIELD RECOMMENDATION/ROUTE TO PROJECT ENGINEERING

Contact fabricator to provide correct radiographic reports and insure they correspond with identification markings on spool

[signature] 4-11-75

21. FIELD DISPOSITION RESULTS:

Revised Verification reports received and are satisfactory

[signature] 5-6-75

22. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION

23. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION RESULTS:

24. IS DESIGN CHANGE REQUIRED ☐ NO ☐ YES, SEE ATTACHED:

DRAWING _____ REV. _____ DCN _____

SPEC. _____ REV. _____ ADD. _____

26. REJECTED MATERIAL DISPOSITION ☐ RETURN TO SUPPLIER ☐ SCRAP

REMARKS

27. QC ACCEPTANCE [signature] 5-17-75

QC ENGINEER / DATE

[signature] 5-6-75

AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR / DATE

10098-1

White Copy – Originator
Canary Copy – Field Engineer
Pink Copy – PQAE
Goldenrod Copy – QC

QC-G3-2

NONCONFORMANCE REPORT

1. PAGE 1 OF 2 | 14. NCR NO. 306

2. DRAWING/PART NO.	REV.	7. PROJECT NO.	12. REPORTED BY / DATE	25. DISPOSITION CONCURRENCE
7220-C-230	5	07220	L. R. Albert 4/9/75	NEWORK / REJECT / REPAIR / USE AS IS (X) / OBS
3. ITEM DESCRIPTION		8. ITEM LOCATION	13. VALIDATED BY / DATE	
Concrete		Placement No. A(609)a'	4-9-75	PROJECT FIELD ENGINEER 5-16-75
4. SERIAL NUMBER		9. STARTUP SYSTEM NO.	15. REPLACEMENT PART NO. / REV.	PROJECT ENGINEER 5-16-75
N/A		N/A	N/A	PROJECT FIELD QC ENGINEER 5-16-75
5. PURCHASE ORDER NO.		10. QC FIELD INSPECTION PLAN NO.	16. REPLACEMENT SERIAL NO.	AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR / DATE
N/A		C-231-3-502	N/A	
6. CONTRACTOR/LOCATION		11. ASME CODE ITEM ☐ YES ☒ NO	17. SOURCE	
Champion - Midland			Subcontractor	

18. ROUTING INSTRUCTIONS: ☒ ROUTE TO FIELD ENGINEERING ☐ ROUTE TO MATERIAL SUPERVISOR

19. NONCONFORMING CONDITION:

Spec. 7220-C-230 Rev. 5 in the cold weather concreting temperature chart in Section 11.1 specifies that mass concrete deposited in the forms during cold weather when the ambient air temperature is between 31° and 45° shall have a temperature range from 45° - 65°. Contrary to the above 8 CU YDs. of concrete with a temperature of 67° while ambient temperature was 42° was placed in A(609)a'. Placement A(609)a' has a least dimension greater than 2½' and contains 102 CU YDs. Nonconformance noted during routine QC testing of concrete during placement. "Q" No. 1.205. 1 QC HOLD TAG AFFIXED

20. ☐ FIELD DISPOSITION ☒ FIELD RECOMMENDATION/ROUTE TO PROJECT ENGINEERING

Field recommends "Use As Is" based on the following rationale:

1. The temperature was only 2° over the upper limit allowed by the referenced Specification.
2. The 8 cu. yds. which failed was the first concrete to be deposited in the form. Corrective action was taken as evidenced by the test taken on the next 8 cu. yd.

21. FIELD DISPOSITION RESULTS:

22. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION

The higher placement temperature will tend to increase shrinkage, setting rate, and water demand while reducing slump, durability and strength. A 2°F temperature difference for 8 c.y. will not have an appreciable effect on any of these factors. Engineering concurs with Field Recommendation to use as is. 5-1-75

5-1-75

23. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION RESULTS:

24. IS DESIGN CHANGE REQUIRED ☒ NO ☐ YES, SEE ATTACHED:

DRAWING _____ REV. _____ DCN _____

SPEC. _____ REV. _____ ADD. _____

26. REJECTED MATERIAL DISPOSITION ☐ RETURN TO SUPPLIER ☐ SCRAP

REMARKS

27. QC ACCEPTANCE 5/2/75

QC ENGINEER / DATE

AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR / DATE

10098-1

White Copy – Originator
Canary Copy – Field Engineer
Pink Copy – PQAE
Goldenrod Copy – QC

QC-G3-2

BLOCK 20 CON'T.

load of concrete, which was within the specification limit.

3. The 8 cu. yd. in question represents only 8% of the total concrete placement.

4. The temperature of the 8 cu. yds. in question was 62° at the truck discharge.

A J Boer 4/10/75

BECHTEL

NONCONFORMANCE REPORT

1. PAGE 1 OF 1
14. NCR NO. 308

2. DRAWING/PART NO.: Spec. 7220-M-201 REV. 5
7. PROJECT NO.: 07220
12. REPORTED BY: R. A. Moray DATE 4/17/75
3. ITEM DESCRIPTION: Pipe Spools
8. ITEM LOCATION: QC Hold Area
13. VALIDATED BY: [signature] DATE 4/17/75
4. SERIAL NUMBER: See Block 19
9. STARTUP SYSTEM NO.: N/A
15. REPLACEMENT PART NO.: N/A REV.
5. PURCHASE ORDER NO.: 7220-M-104A
10. QC FIELD INSPECTION PLAN NO.: M-104A-R-10
16. REPLACEMENT SERIAL NO.: N/A
6. CONTRACTOR/LOCATION: ITT Grinnel/Kernersville N.C.
11. ASME CODE ITEM ☒ YES ☐ NO
17. SOURCE: Vendor

25. DISPOSITION CONCURRENCE

REWORK	REJECT	REPAIR	USE AS IS	DOC.
				✓

PROJECT FIELD ENGINEER — DATE
PROJECT ENGINEER [signature] — DATE 4/22/75
PROJECT FIELD QC ENGINEER [signature] — DATE 5-9-75
AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR — DATE

18. ROUTING INSTRUCTIONS: ☐ ROUTE TO FIELD ENGINEERING ☒ ROUTE TO MATERIAL SUPERVISOR

19. NONCONFORMING CONDITION: Form G-321-D for P.O. M-104A requires vendor to supply radiographic verification reports. The radiographic verification report (Reader Sheet) supplied for 1-HCB-20-S612-3-3 (MR-66-15) Weld C reads 1-HCB-20-5612-3-3 and report supplied for 2-GCB-25-S611-3-4 (MR-78-19) Weld A reads 2-GCB-25-5611-3-4. The verification reports do not correspond with identification markings on the spool or spool drawing. Nonconformance noted during receipt inspection. "Q" No's. are 4.114 and 4.124. Unit 2 and 1. 2 Hold tags applied.

20. ☒ FIELD DISPOSITION ☐ FIELD RECOMMENDATION/ROUTE TO PROJECT ENGINEERING

Vendor to supply corrected reading sheets to conform to markings on pipe spools.
[signature]
Proj. Engr. of Fld. Proc.
4/22/75

21. FIELD DISPOSITION RESULTS: Corrected Reader Sheets received and are now acceptable [signature] 5-6-75

22. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION

23. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION RESULTS:

24. IS DESIGN CHANGE REQUIRED ☐ NO ☐ YES, SEE ATTACHED:
DRAWING ______ REV. ______ DCN ______
SPEC. ______ REV. ______ ADD. ______

26. REJECTED MATERIAL DISPOSITION ☐ RETURN TO SUPPLIER ☐ SCRAP
REMARKS

27. QC ACCEPTANCE [signature] 5-12-75
QC/ENGINEER [signature] DATE 5-9-75
AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR DATE

10098-1

White Copy — Originator
Canary Copy — Field Engineer
Pink Copy — PQAE
Goldenrod Copy — QC

QC-G3-2

BECHTEL

NONCONFORMANCE REPORT

Field	Entry
1. PAGE 1 OF	1
14. NCR NO.	311
2. DRAWING/PART NO.	Spec. C-38
REV.	5
7. PROJECT NO.	07220
12. REPORTED BY	R. A. Moray
DATE	4/29/75
3. ITEM DESCRIPTION	Aux. Bldg. Beams
8. ITEM LOCATION	QC Hold Area
13. VALIDATED BY	J. Connolly
DATE	4-30-75
4. SERIAL NUMBER	See Block 19
9. STARTUP SYSTEM NO.	N/A
15. REPLACEMENT PART NO.	N/A
REV.	
5. PURCHASE ORDER NO.	7220-C-38 C-25
10. QC FIELD INSPECTION PLAN NO.	C-38-R-47
16. REPLACEMENT SERIAL NO.	N/A
6. CONTRACTOR/LOCATION	Ingalls Iron Works/Verona, Pa.
11. ASME CODE ITEM	☐ YES ☒ NO
17. SOURCE	Vendor

25. DISPOSITION CONCURRENCE

REWORK	REJECT	REPAIR	USE AS IS	DOC
				✓

PROJECT FIELD ENGINEER	[signature]	DATE 5-9-75
PROJECT ENGINEER / PROJECT FIELD QC ENGINEER	J. Connolly	DATE 5-9-75
AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR		DATE

18. ROUTING INSTRUCTIONS: ☐ ROUTE TO FIELD ENGINEERING ☒ ROUTE TO MATERIAL SUPERVISOR

19. NONCONFORMING CONDITION:

Form G-321-D and Shop Inspectors Release TWX both refer to and certify material on Shipping LIst C-25. The following three (3) beams were received with shipment C-25 but were not included on the Shipping List C-25. "Q" No. is 1.201. 3 Hold Tags Applied.

421B9

439B10

401B21

20. ☒ FIELD DISPOSITION ☐ FIELD RECOMMENDATION/ROUTE TO PROJECT ENGINEERING

Material Supervisor to obtain corrected Shipping List C-25 listing above beams. Material Supervisor also will obtain TWX from Shop Inspector showing above beams were released for Shipment. J. C. [signature] 5/6/75

21. FIELD DISPOSITION RESULTS:

Revised Shipping List and release TWX received for subject beams.

22. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION

23. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION RESULTS:

24. IS DESIGN CHANGE REQUIRED ☐ NO ☐ YES, SEE ATTACHED:

DRAWING ______ REV. ______ DCN ______

SPEC. ______ REV. ______ ADD. ______

26. REJECTED MATERIAL DISPOSITION ☐ RETURN TO SUPPLIER ☐ SCRAP

REMARKS

27. QC ACCEPTANCE

QC ENGINEER	R. A. Moray	DATE 5-12-75
AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR		DATE

10098-1

QC-G3-2

White Copy — Originator
Canary Copy — Field Engineer
Pink Copy — PQAE
Goldenrod Copy — QC

NONCONFORMANCE REPORT

1. PAGE 1 OF 1 | 14. NCR NO. 313

2. DRAWING/PART NO. Spec. 7220-C-38	REV. 6	7. PROJECT NO. 7220	12. REPORTED BY [signature] DATE 5-2-75
3. ITEM DESCRIPTION Structural Steel Beam(s)		8. ITEM LOCATION QC HOLD AREA ~~Auxiliary Building~~	13. VALIDATED BY [signature] DATE 5/2/75
4. SERIAL NUMBER Heat No. H43353		9. STARTUP SYSTEM NO. N/A	15. REPLACEMENT PART NO. N/A REV.
5. PURCHASE ORDER NO. 7220-C-38		10. QC FIELD INSPECTION PLAN NO. N/A 6-24-75	16. REPLACEMENT SERIAL NO. N/A
6. CONTRACTOR/LOCATION Ingalls Iron Works, Verona, PA.		11. ASME CODE ITEM ☐ YES ☒ NO	17. SOURCE Vendor

25. DISPOSITION CONCURRENCE: REWORK ☐ REJECT ☐ REPAIR ☐ USE AS IS ☒

- [signature] 5-28 — PROJECT FIELD ENGINEER DATE
- [signature] 5/16 — PROJECT ENGINEER DATE
- [signature] 5-27 — PROJECT FIELD QC ENGINEER DATE
- AUTHORIZE INSPECTOR DATE

18. ROUTING INSTRUCTIONS: ☒ ROUTE TO FIELD ENGINEERING ☐ ROUTE TO MATERIAL SUPERVISOR

19. NONCONFORMING CONDITION:

In accordance with 7220-C-38, Rev. 6 the applicable specification for structural steel specifies ASTM-A-36. Certified mill test report for subject heat number (H43353) states tensile strength to be 81,290 psi which exceeds the allowable specified tensile strength range which is 58,000-80,000 psi. Nonconformance noted during document review. Q-Number is 1.201.

One tag applied.

20. ☐ FIELD DISPOSITION ☒ FIELD RECOMMENDATION/ROUTE TO PROJECT ENGINEERING

[signature] 5-2-75

21. FIELD DISPOSITION RESULTS:

22. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION

Use as is. The mill test report for the heat gives an elongation of 24.5%, which passes the 20% minimum in ASTM A-36. Thus, the material elongation properties have not been detrimentally affected by the 1.6% additional tensile strength, and are acceptable. Therefore, the material is acceptable for use. [signature] 5-15-75 [signature] 5/15/75

23. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION RESULTS:

24. IS DESIGN CHANGE REQUIRED ☒ NO ☐ YES, SEE ATTACHED:

DRAWING ____ REV. ____ DCN ____

SPEC. ____ REV. ____ ADD. ____

26. REJECTED MATERIAL DISPOSITION ☐ RETURN TO SUPPLIER ☐ SCRAP

REMARKS

27. QC ACCEPTANCE [signature] 5/29/75 — QC ENGINEER DATE

AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR DATE

10098-1

ORIGINATOR

BECHTEL

NONCONFORMANCE REPORT

1. PAGE 1 OF 1				14. NCR NO. 314	
2. DRAWING/PART NO. Spec. 7220-C-38	REV. 6	7. PROJECT NO. 07220	12. REPORTED BY R. A. Moray	DATE 5/29/75	1. DISPOSITION CONCURRENCE: REWORK / REJECT / REPAIR / USE AS IS / DISC.
3. ITEM DESCRIPTION (4) Aux. Bldg. Beams		8. ITEM LOCATION Sasse Rd. Laydown Area	13. VALIDATED BY	DATE 5-27-75	PROJECT FIELD ENGINEER / DATE
4. SERIAL NUMBER See Block 19		9. STARTUP SYSTEM NO. N/A	15. REPLACEMENT PART NO. N/A	REV.	PROJECT ENGINEER / DATE
5. PURCHASE ORDER NO. 7220-C-38 C-27		10. QC FIELD INSPECTION PLAN NO. C-38-R-49	16. REPLACEMENT SERIAL NO. N/A		PROJECT FIELD QC ENGINEER / DATE
6. CONTRACTOR/LOCATION Ingalls Iron Works/Verona, Pa.		11. ASME CODE ITEM ☐ YES ☒ NO	17. SOURCE Vendor		AUTHORIZE INSPECTOR / DATE

18. ROUTING INSTRUCTIONS: ☒ ROUTE TO FIELD ENGINEERING ☐ ROUTE TO MATERIAL SUPERVISOR

19. NONCONFORMING CONDITION: Specification 7220-C-38 Rev. 6 paragraph 7.5 states, "The weight of all members 6,000 lbs. and heavier shall be clearly stenciled thereupon and together with an orientation north or east." Contrary to the above, beams 516B1[F], 516B2[F], 520B7[C] and 520B8[G] are all listed as weighing more than 6,000 lbs. on shipping notice C-27 but they are not marked with their weight or orientation. Nonconformance noted during receipt inspection. "Q" No. is 1.201. hold tags applied.

20. ☐ FIELD DISPOSITION ☐ FIELD RECOMMENDATION/ROUTE TO PROJECT ENGINEERING

21. FIELD DISPOSITION RESULTS:

22. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION

23. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION RESULTS:

24. IS DESIGN CHANGE REQUIRED ☐ NO ☐ YES, SEE ATTACHED:
DRAWING _____ REV. _____ DCN _____
SPEC. _____ REV. _____ ADD. _____

26. REJECTED MATERIAL DISPOSITION ☐ RETURN TO SUPPLIER ☐ SCRAP
REMARKS

27. QC ACCEPTANCE
QC ENGINEER / DATE
AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR / DATE

10098-1

White Copy – Originator
Canary Copy – Field Engineer
Pink Copy – PQAE
Goldenrod Copy – QC

QC-G3-2

BECHTEL

NONCONFORMANCE REPORT

1. PAGE 1 OF 1				14. NCR NO. 315	
2. DRAWING/PART NO. Specification 7220-C-38	REV. 6	7. PROJECT NO. 07220	12. REPORTED BY R. A. Moray	DATE 5/29/75	25. DISPOSITION CONCURRENCE
3. ITEM DESCRIPTION (2) Aux. Bldg. Beams		8. ITEM LOCATION OC Hold & Sasse Road	13. VALIDATED BY	DATE 5-29-75	REWORK / REJECT / REPAIR / USE AS IS / DCC
4. SERIAL NUMBER 418B1[E] and 424B3[E]		9. STARTUP SYSTEM NO. N/A	15. REPLACEMENT PART NO. N/A	REV.	PROJECT FIELD ENGINEER — DATE
5. PURCHASE ORDER NO. 7220-C-38 C-26		10. QC FIELD INSPECTION PLAN NO. C-3S-R-48	16. REPLACEMENT SERIAL NO. N/A		PROJECT ENGINEER — DATE
6. CONTRACTOR/LOCATION Ingalls Iron Works/Verona, Pa.		11. ASME CODE ITEM ☐ YES ☐ NO	17. SOURCE Vendor		PROJECT FIELD QC ENGINEER — DATE
					AUTHORIZE INSPECTOR — DATE

18. ROUTING INSTRUCTIONS: ☑ ROUTE TO FIELD ENGINEERING ☐ ROUTE TO MATERIAL SUPERVISOR

19. NONCONFORMING CONDITION:

Beam 418B1[E] has a bent stiffener plate. Beam 424B3[E] has two (2) bent angles with cracked welds. Damage noted during receipt inspection. "Q" No. is 1.201. _____ hold tags applied.

20. ☐ FIELD DISPOSITION ☐ FIELD RECOMMENDATION/ROUTE TO PROJECT ENGINEERING

21. FIELD DISPOSITION RESULTS:

22. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION

23. ENGINEERING DISPOSITION RESULTS:

24. IS DESIGN CHANGE REQUIRED ☐ NO ☐ YES, SEE ATTACHED:

DRAWING _____ REV. _____ DCN _____

SPEC. _____ REV. _____ ADD. _____

26. REJECTED MATERIAL DISPOSITION ☐ RETURN TO SUPPLIER ☐ SCRAP

REMARKS

27. QC ACCEPTANCE

QC ENGINEER — DATE

AUTHORIZED INSPECTOR — DATE

10088-1

White Copy – Originator
Canary Copy – Field Engineer
Pink Copy – PQAE
Goldenrod Copy – QC

QC-G3-2

QUALITY ASSURANCE DISCREPANCY REPORT

053

4. ISSUE DATE: 02/27/75

1. PROJECT/DEPT./CONTRACTOR: 07220 - Midland

2. POINT OF ORIGIN: [X] FIELD [ ] OFFICE

5. QAD PREPARED BY: R. Sevo

6. WORK PLAN DATE: 02/28/75

7. CHECKLIST ITEM: 25.3

8. WHERE FOUND: Champion Files

9. DISCUSSED WITH: J. Connolly, P. Schmanski

10. CONTROLLING DOCUMENT, SECTION, PARAGRAPH, ETC.

Champion Quality Assurance Manual, Rev. 3

11. QUOTATION

Section VII Document Control

"The issuance and receival of instructions ..... are controlled by the assignment of a document control number. All such documents are recorded on a log sheet ..... . Maintenance of a log sheet is the responsibility of the Plant Supervisor."

Section XVIII Quality Assurance Records

"All data and correspondence relative to Quality Assurance shall be filed under the proper heading and logged. These logs and files shall be available for the

12. DISCREPANCY DESCRIPTION (Continued.)

Contrary to the above; (a) a log sheet is not being maintained by the Plant Supervisor. (b) Correspondence relative to Quality Assurance is not logged. (c) Copy of audit logs as of 12/10/73 are not available at the jobsite for review.

13. RECOMMENDED CORRECTIVE ACTION

a. Prepare and maintain log sheet as required.

b. Log data and correspondence relative to Quality Assurance.

c. Make audit logs as of 12/10/73 available at the jobsite.

14. SCHEDULED COMPLETION DATE: 03/31/75

15. RESPONSIBILITY FOR CORRECTIVE ACTION: J. P. Connolly

16. CORRECTIVE ACTION TAKEN

Champion has submitted for approval Rev. 3 of their QA Manual. This revision adds a Document Control Log Form to their QA Manual. Copies of the audit logs are now available at the jobsite.

17. DATE COMPLETED: 4-5-75

18. SUBMITTED BY RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY: J. P. Connolly PEOXE

19. CORRECTIVE ACTION VERIFIED BY QAE: Gary L. Richardson LQAE

20. DATE: 5/16/75

AA0-86 9/17/74

Quality Assurance Discrepancy Report - 053

Block No. 11 Continued.

audit by contractor ..... ."

Section XIX Audits

"..... A copy of the audit logs will be kept at the jobsite for review".

QUALITY AUDIT FINDING

055 (25-2-1)

AUDIT DATE: 3/31/75

AAS ITEM: 1

DEPARTMENT/SELLER: Midland 1 & 2 Job No. 07220

TYPE OF AUDIT: Construction [X] FIELD [ ] OFFICE

AUDITOR: G. Richardson

NRDA ITEM: 1

CHECKLIST ITEM: 10

WHERE FOUND: U. S. Testing Files

DISCUSSED WITH:

CONTROLLING DOCUMENT, SECTION, PARAGRAPH, ETC.: U. S. Testing QA Manual, Rev. 3

SAME AS #:

QUOTATION

17.1 Conditons adverse to quality shall be promply identified and reported ..... . These conditions shall be corrected as soon as practicable ..... .

19.1 A comprehensive system of planned and documented audits shall be carried out quarterly ..... . Deficient areas shall be re-audited until corrective actions have been accomplished.

FINDING

1. An audit report dated 11/7/74 identified a deficiency in the storage of records. No corrective action to resolve this problem has been taken and the area has not been re-audited.

2. The last audit was conducted on 11/7/74. That audit (No. 4) covered a period of four months rather than the specified three months. Audit No.5 should have been accomplished early in February.

CORRECTIVE ACTION

Instruct U. S. Testing to conduct an audit within 30 days and take action to assure that future audits will be accomplished quarterly. Also instruct U. S. Testing to initiate timely action to correct deficiencies which are identified during these audits.

SCHEDULE COMPLETION DATE: 5/2/75

RESPONSIBILITY FOR CORRECTIVE ACTION: PFOCE

CORRECTIVE ACTION TAKEN

An internal audit was performed by US Testing on April 11, 1975. E.J. Zadina, the US Testing auditor, stated that a new audit schedule would assure that audits are performed quarterly. He also stated that deficiencies uncovered during audits would be closed out and verified in a timely manner.

DATE COMPLETED: 5-5-75

SUBMITTED BY RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY: PFOCE

CORRECTIVE ACTION VERIFIED BY QAR

DATE

QU''ITY AUDIT FINDING

057 (14-1-1)

AUDIT DATE: 05/06/75

AAS ITEM: N/A

PROJECT/DEPARTMENT/SELLER: Midland 1 & 2, Job No. 07220

TYPE OF AUDIT: Construction [X] FIELD [ ] OFFICE

AUDITOR: G. Richardson

AGENDA ITEM: 1

CHECKLIST ITEM: 8

WHERE FOUND: QC Files

DISCUSSED WITH: J. Connolly

CONTROLLING DOCUMENT, SECTION, PARAGRAPH, ETC.: FIM G-5, Rev. 0

SAME AS 5.

QUOTATION

Para. 3.3.3 "Purchased items which do not require release by Bechtel PID may require quality verification documents .... . The documentation requirements will be designated in the P.O. and shall be itemized on the Field Receiving Inspection Plan. Documents received shall be reviewed for .... compliance with the requirements of the technical specifications and procurement documents."

FINDING

Contrary to the above the Field Inspection Plan C-66-R for receiving materials to Spec. 7220-C-66 does not itemize the required material tes reports and there is no evidence of review of complaince by a QCE. The same condi ion was also noted for FI -233A-R-1 which is used to receive materials purchased to Spec. 7220-C-233.

The two package checked:

C-66, MRR AEO 636
C-233, MRR AEO 316

NOTE: Spec. 7220-C-66 is no longer in use at this site. Therefore revision of the FIP is not necessary.

CORRECTIVE ACTION

1. For C-66 materials review all material test reports for compliance.

2. For C-233 review MRR AEO 316 for compliance and revise the FIP or utilize FIP B-1-R to receive non shop inspected materials from this P.O. as these materials also appear on the bulk items list.

3. Assure that this condition has not occurred elsewhere by reviewing FIP's used to receive other non shop inspected items.

SCHEDULE COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/75

RESPONSIBILITY FOR CORRECTIVE ACTION: PFQCE

CORRECTIVE ACTION TAKEN

COMPLETED

SUBMITTED BY RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY

CORRECTIVE ACTION VERIFIED BY QAE

DATE

QUALITY AUDIT FINDING

AUDIT IDENT. 19	058 (14-1-1)
AUDIT DATE	05/06/75
AAS ITEM 20	N/A

PROJECT/DEPARTMENT/SELLER 1	TYPE OF AUDIT 2		AUDITOR 4
Midland 1 & 2, Job No. 07220	Construction	☒ FIELD ☐ OFFICE	G. Richardson
QA ITEM 5	CHECKLIST ITEM 6	WHERE FOUND 7	DISCUSSED WITH 8
1	11	QC and Maintenance files	G. Butler D. Martin
CONTROLLING DOCUMENT, SECTION, PARAGRAPH, ETC. 9		SAME AS 9.	
#QCNM SF/PSP #11, Rev. 0		Field Proc. FPG-3, Rev. 2	

QUOTATION 10

PSP #11, para. 2.2 "A storage and storage maintenance package is prepared by the MSE on permanent plant equipment in accordance with the storage and storage maintenance procedure."
The storage ... package consists of Form FPG-3, F-1..... .

Field Proc. FPG-3 para. 3.0 "The MSE is responsible .... for indicating established requirements on associated forms."

para. 5.1 "The MSE enters storage requirements on Form FPG-3, F-1".

FINDING 11

Contrary to the above no FPG-3, F-1 Form has been prepared for materials purchased to Specification 7220-C-2. This material includes trumpet assemblies and sem. rigid [illegible]thing.

CORRECTIVE ACTION 12

1. Prepare a F-1 Form for the above item and assure present storage is adequate.
2. Review existing F-1 Forms to assure the above condition does not occur elsewhere.

SCHEDULE COMPLETION DATE 13	RESPONSIBILITY FOR CORRECTIVE ACTION 14
06/20/75	Project Superintendent

CORRECTIVE ACTION TAKEN 15

COMPLETED 16	SUBMITTED BY RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY 17

CORRECTIVE ACTION VERIFIED BY QAE 18 — DATE

Route To	This Copy For
GSKeeley	SHHowell
HWSlager	WEKessler (2)
CQHills	TCCooke
	JMilandin
	WFHolub
	CLRichardson
	~~Subject File~~

CONSUMERS POWER

Nonconformance Report No QF-48

File 16.3.6
Issue Date May 9, 1975
Project Midland 1 & 2

File Title NCR's on Bechtel Quality Control

This Nonconformance Report is Issued To:

Mr. J. P. Connolly
Bechtel Project Field Quality Control Engineer

who is responsible for corrective action.

Prepared By [illegible] Date 5-9-75
Approved By D. J. Vooys Date 5/9/75
Written Reply Requested By Date 6-6-75
Corrective Action Requested By Date 6-6-75

Nonconformance Description and Supporting Details: (1) Specification C-208, Rev. 4 section 7.3.2 states "A slump measurement shall be made for every 35 cubic yards or fraction thereof of concrete produced for Class I structures." For concrete placements CC(652.75)a' and CC(621.0)a', 56 cubic yards of concrete was placed between slump measurements. (2) The C12-1 form (In-Process Concrete Test Report) for CC(652.75)a' indicates one air meter and one thermometer was used in the field for testing. However, at least three air meters and two thermometers were used in the field. One air meter and one thermometer was needed at the pump discharge. One air meter and one thermometer was needed at the truck discharge. Also, the QC inspector noted on the C12-1 form an air meter change after obtaining 7.5% and 6.5% air with the original air meter. Limits on air content are 3.0%-6.0%.

AEC Reportable Yes ☐ No ☒ See Procedure 9 (For Nuclear Projects Only)

Stop Work Necessary Yes ☐ No ☒ See Procedure 16 - Stop Work No _____

Recommended Corrective Action: (a) For item (1) above, receive an Engineering evaluation of the acceptability of the concrete placed without the required slump measurement. No additional corrective action is necessary, because it has already been covered in letter C-208-56 from Bechtel to U.S. Testing, concerning concrete testing frequencies and test locations. The written reply to this item is requested with the Engineering evaluation. (b) For item (2) above, take corrective action to preclude these occurrences. Written reply and corrective action requested for both by June 6, 1975.

Corrective Action Taken:

[1] Verification of Corrective Action Required Yes ☐ No ☐

[1] Method of Verification:

[1] Nonconformance Closure Confirmed By _____
Date _____

[1] To be completed at time of closure by Consumers Power QA Services.

Attachment A

Route To	This Copy For
GSKeeley	SHHowell
HWSlager	WEKessler (2)
CQHills	TCCooke
	JMilandin
	WFHolub
	GLRichardson
	Subject File

Consumers Power

Nonconformance Report No QF-49

File 16.3.4 & 16.3.6
Issue Date May 22, 1975
Project Midland 1 & 2

File Title NCR's on Bechtel Construction & Quality Contr

This Nonconformance Report is Issued To:
Mr. J. F. Newgen
Bechtel Project Superintendent
Mr. J. P. Connolly
Bechtel Project Field Quality Control Engineer
who is responsible for corrective action.

Prepared By [signature] Date 5-22-7
Approved By [signature] Date 5/22/75
Written Reply Requested By Date 6-23-7
Corrective Action Requested By Date 6-23-7

Nonconformance Description and Supporting Details: Additional emphasis on concrete testing frequencies and locations were expanded beyond Specifications C-208 and C-230, in letter C-208-56 dated March 19, 1975, to U.S. Testing. Item 1 in this letter states in part "The point of record testing for concrete slump, air content, and temperature is at the truck discharge...". Item 5 in this letter states "Slump, air content, and temperature tests taken at the batch plant must always be backed-up with a record test at the truck discharge". Contrary to items 1 and 5, no slump or air content tests were taken at the truck discharge for concrete placement A(589)b, four cubic yards of A-1 mix.

AEC Reportable Yes ☐ No ☒ See Procedure 9 (For Nuclear Projects Only)

Stop Work Necessary Yes ☐ No ☒ See Procedure 16 - Stop Work No _____

Recommended Corrective Action: (a) Receive an Engineering evaluation of the acceptability of the concrete placed without the record tests being run. The written reply to this item is requested with the Engineering evaluation.
(b) Implement the requirements emphasized in Letter C-208-56 to preclude repetition.

[1] Corrective Action Taken:

[1] Verification of Corrective Action Required Yes ☐ No ☐

[1] Method of Verification:

[1] Nonconformance Closure Confirmed By _____
Date _____

[1] To be completed at time of closure by Consumers Power QA Services.