

U. S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
REGION I
DIVISION OF COMPLIANCE

Report of Inspection

CO Report No. 286/70-1

Licensee: Consolidated Edison Company
Indian Point No. 3
Construction Permit No. CPPR - 62
Category A

Date of Inspection: January 16, 1970

Dates of Previous Inspection: November 17 - 20, 1969

Inspected By: *R. F. Heishman* 1/26/70
R. F. Heishman, Reactor Inspector Date

R. T. Carlson 1/26/70
R. T. Carlson, Senior Reactor Inspector Date

Reviewed By: *R. T. Carlson* 1/26/70
R. T. Carlson, Senior Reactor Inspector Date

Proprietary Information: None

SUMMARY

The inspectors informed management representatives of Consolidated Edison Company (Con Ed) and their principal contractors that the results of the special QA inspection conducted on November 17 - 20, 1969, indicated the Quality Assurance Program for the IP-3 project was being implemented generally in accordance with the application and the inspectors' understanding of the intent of the 18 QA criteria,* except as noted below:

1. The Wedco Corporation (Wedco) organization and procedures had not been documented or completed to a degree sufficient to adequately review. (Section II.B)
2. QA Records Retention policy had not been formalized or the procedure written. (Section II.B)

IS/OR/Staff
2/16/70
*10 CFR 50, Appendix B (Proposed)

3. Procedures covering some site activities had not been reviewed. Con Ed informed the inspectors they were available on-site for review. (Section II.B)

A number of specific areas that will receive followup by CO were identified to those present.

DETAILS

I. Scope of Inspection

An exit interview with management and senior project representatives of Consolidated Edison Company and their principal contractors associated with the Indian Point No. 3 project was conducted on January 16, 1970. The meeting was held to discuss the results of the initial quality assurance inspection conducted on November 17 - 20, 1969. The objectives of the meeting were to:

- A. Verify that Compliance's understanding of the QA program was correct.
- B. Clarify minor questions regarding the QA program which arose during review of the inspection report.
- C. Identify areas which require followup inspection effort.
- D. Discuss aspects of the QA program which appear to deviate from the commitments in the application and the intent of the QA criteria.

The following persons attended the exit interview:

Consolidated Edison Company

Mr. W. J. Cahill, Jr., Vice President, Engineering
Mr. J. J. Grob, Chief Mechanical Engineer
Mr. G. Wasilenko, Assistant Division Engineer, Steam Division
Mr. O. Gluck, Engineer, Mechanical Plant Bureau
Mr. F. D. McElwee, Resident Construction Manager
Dr. A. Flynn, Mechanical Engineer, Plant Bureau
Mr. J. A. Corcoran, Project Superintendent
Mr. S. Dambra, Engineer, Construction Division
Mr. E. Dadson, QA Engineer, Construction Division

U. S. Testing Company

Mr. C. H. McDonnell, Manager, Nuclear Services
Mr. A. A. Repetti, Nuclear Engineer

Westinghouse Electric Company

Mr. R. F. Devine, Project Manager

Wedco Corporation

Mr. M. L. Snow, Manager, Reliability

United Engineers and Constructors

Mr. J. B. Silverwood, Manager, Quality Assurance

Mr. R. F. Duerr, Supervising Engineer

Mr. R. J. Vurpillat, Assistant Manager, Reliability and Quality Control

Division of Compliance

Mr. R. T. Carlson, Senior Reactor Inspector, CO:I

Mr. R. F. Heishman, Reactor Inspector, CO:I

II. Results of Inspection

A. General

The meeting was opened by Mr. Carlson stating the purpose. It was emphasized that the meeting was an attempt to clarify any areas which appeared to deviate from the commitments and the inspectors' understanding of the intent of the QA criteria and to fully understand the licensee's position and plans for future action. The following general comments were made regarding the inspection:

1. The inspectors found the QA program being implemented to be as described in the application and in accordance with the intent of the QA criteria except as noted. (Section II.B)
2. The inspectors found Con Ed was more deeply involved in the QA program than was committed in the application.
3. Wedco's organization and involvement was not completed sufficiently to provide a basis for review at the time of the inspection. Followup action is required.
4. Not all the procedures described in the application have been written and approved. (Section II.B)

B. Specific Observations

1. Wedco Organization and Responsibilities

Con Ed was informed that due to the lack of information in the application regarding the Wedco Organization and responsibilities,

a complete review was not possible during the inspection. Mr. Cahill informed the inspectors that the Wedco involvement had since been approved by Con Ed and had been submitted to DRL as part of Indian Point No. 2 FSAR but nothing had yet been submitted on IP-3. He stated a submittal was being considered for the near future adding that the delay was caused by legal matters regarding methods of submitting information that represent changes to the PSAR. The inspectors informed Con Ed that followup action will be required in this area.

Mr. Snow informed the inspectors that the reliability and quality assurance group of Wedco was continuing to be staffed and at present six personnel were on site and two additional were hired and would join the organization on or about February 1, 1970. He estimated procedures would be available in approximately 45 to 60 days.

Con Ed informed the inspectors that they have reviewed and commented on the Wedco organization and procedures developed to date and will continue to do so.

2. QA Records Retention

Con Ed was informed by the inspectors of their observation that procedures for QA records retention had not been written or approved. Con Ed stated the procedure would be written prior to the time QA records were turned over by the prime contractor (Westinghouse). No time estimate was given. Followup is required.

3. Internal Audit Procedures

Discussions with the various parties present regarding internal audit procedures of Con Ed and their principal contractors indicated the inspectors' understanding of the formal procedures was correct. However, audits are being conducted which are not outlined in formal procedures but which appear to satisfy the commitments of the application and the inspectors' understanding of the intent of the QA criteria. No further action is considered necessary at this time.

4. Handling and Storage of Materials on Site

The inspectors informed Con Ed that sufficient evidence of adequate handling and storage of materials was not found during the inspection. Con Ed assured the inspectors that the procedures and documentation were available at the site. CO will review this item during subsequent inspections.

5. Field QC Procedures

The inspectors informed Con Ed that various items regarding field QC procedures were not found during the inspection. Included were:

- a. Written procedures for special processes.
- b. Establishment of acceptance standards.
- c. Frequency of calibration of test equipment.

Con Ed informed the inspectors that these items were covered on site. CO will review these matters during subsequent inspections.

JAN 23 1970

R. S. Boyd, Assistant Director for Reactor Projects
Division of Reactor Licensing (2)

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY (INDIAN POINT UNIT 3) - DOCKET
NO. 50-286/69-10

The enclosed report on the initial quality assurance inspection of the subject facility is transmitted for information.

As you are aware, Westinghouse, the turnkey contractor for this facility, is establishing a wholly owned subsidiary, Wedco, to manage this project. As of the time of the inspection, the owner had not formally accepted this concept, although the transition was in progress. We are advised that the licensee plans to submit shortly a change to the application describing the reorganization.

As described in the report, certain weaknesses in the overall QA program were identified. These were discussed with licensee management in a meeting conducted on January 16, 1970. The results of this meeting will be reported in CO Report No. 286/70-1.

The inspectors did not find any evidence of deficiencies in the QA program attributable to the transition of program management from Westinghouse/UE&C to Wedco, but some information on Wedco's procedures for implementation of the QA program were not available at the time of the inspection. This information will be developed during the continuing inspection program.

J. P. O'Reilly, Chief
Reactor Inspection and
Enforcement Branch
Division of Compliance

Enclosure:
CO Rpt No. 286/69-9

cc w/enclosure:

E. G. Case, DRS	J. G. Davis, CO:II
S. Levine, DRL (6)	B. H. Grier, CO:III
D. J. Skovholt, DRL (3)	D. I. Walker, CO:IV
L. Kornblith, Jr., CO	R. W. Smith, CO:V
R. W. Kirkman, CO:I	R. T. Carlson, CO:I

OFFICE ▶	CO <i>JS</i>	CO <i>Fn</i>	REG Central File	CO <i>Reilly</i>
SURNAME ▶	JBHenderson:mjc	FJNolan		JPO Reilly
DATE ▶	1/22/70	1/22/70		1/22/70