U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INSPECTION AND ENFORCEMENT

REGION V

Report No. 50-275/79-18

Docket No. 50-275 License No. CPPR-39 Safeguards Group

Licensee: Pacific Gas and Electric Company
77 Beale Street
San Francisco, California 94106

Facility Name: Diablo Canyon Unit 1

Inspection at: Diablo Canyon Site, San Luis Obispo County, California

Inspection conducted: August 17-31, 1979

Inspectors: R. Mowill for T. YOUNG, JR. 9/20/79
T. Young, Jr., Resident Reactor Inspector Date Signed

Date Signed

Date Signed

Approved By: D M Sternberg 9/21/79
D. M. Sternberg, Chief, Reactor Projects Section 1, Reactor Operations and Nuclear Support Branch Date Signed

Summary:

Inspection on August 17-31, 1979 (Report No. 50-275/79-18)
Areas Inspected: Routine inspection of preoperational testing, licensee actions on previous inspection findings, plant tour, QA for preoperational testing, preoperational test program controls, nuclear plant problem reports (NPPR), and fire protection/ prevention. This inspection involved 42 inspector-hours onsite by one NRC Resident Inspector.

Results: No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

*R. D. Ramsay, Plant Superintendent
R. D. Etzler, Project Superintendent
*M. N. Norem, Resident Startup Engineer
M. E. Leppke, QA Supervisor
*J. S. Diamonon, QC Supervisor
J. M. Gisclon, Power Plant Engineer
D. A. Backons, Supervisor of Maintenance
R. Patterson, Supervisor of Operations
K. C. Doss, Instrument and Controls Supervisor

The inspector also talked with and interviewed a number of other licensee employees including members of general construction, the operations staff and QA personnel.

*Denotes those attending the exit interview.

2. Licensee Action on Previous Inspection Findings

(Closed) Item of noncompliance (50-79-15-01): Amendment No. 80 to the FSAR, dated August, 1979, changes the responsibilities of the training coordinator from the maintenance of adequate training records to assuring that adequate training records are maintained and kept at the site. This item is considered resolved.

3. Plant Tour

The inspector walked through various areas of the plant on a weekly basis to observe activities in progress; to inspect the general state of cleanliness, housekeeping and adherence to fire protection rules; to check the proper approval of "man on the line, caution and clearance" tags on equipment; and to review with operations personnel the status of various systems in the plant.

The inspector noted that the status of the systems and the housekeeping appeared consistent with construction activities. The reactor cavity is still being maintained as a clean area and extra personnel are still assigned to cleanup crews. Cleanliness and housekeeping of the plant is still improving.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

4. Preoperational Testing

The inspector examined in depth test package 37.12 (auxiliary feedwater and steam generator level control). The test is complete but has not been approved by the resident startup engineer or accepted by the plant superintendent. Discussions with operators revealed

that they were unhappy with the operations of the level control of the auxiliary feedwater (AF) valves. An examination of the records revealed that there is a history of problems with the actuators on these valves. The actuators were redesigned and rebuilt in 1977; however, this did not significantly increase the reliability of these valves. The licensee has decided to replace these valve actuators with actuators from a different vendor. The actuators have been ordered and are scheduled to be delivered in mid-November. An engineering evaluation has been performed and the licensee states that if the plant must start up before the new actuators are installed, then these actuators will be de-energized with the valves full open and locked during plant operations.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

5. Preoperational Test Program Controls

The inspector verified by record review and/or observation that (a) jurisdictional controls were being observed for system turnover, (b) tagging was being accomplished consistent with jurisdictional controls of the administrative procedures and (c) controls were being observed prior to and subsequent to testing. A schedule is being maintained for preoperational testing and updated when necessary.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

6. QA for Preoperational Testing

The inspector examined all QA audit reports of preoperational testing audits conducted within the last three months. The inspector verified that the audits were conducted in accordance with approved procedures and that corrective actions for all identified discrepancies had been taken. System turnover from construction to the startup test group and to the operations division was conducted in accordance with established procedures and administrative controls.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

7. Fire Protection/Prevention

The control room and the cable spreading rooms were inspected. The fire alarm, extinguishing equipment, actuating controls and fire-fighting equipment were verified to be operable in the cable spreading rooms and 25% of the balance of the plant. The new cable penetration seal material was verified not to be flammable.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

8. Nuclear Plant Problem Reports (NPPR)

The requirements of Administrative Procedure No. C-12 (Resolution and Reporting of Plant Problems) and its implementation were examined. The intent of this implementing procedure and that of QA Procedure No. 8.1 (Nonconformances and Corrective Actions, which is

required to be implemented 90 days before licensing) is that any member of the plant staff including the QA staff may initiate a NPPR. The inspector found that at least one foreman required the technicians working for him to discuss with him the potential problem before initiating a NPPR. If the foreman did not agree, then a NPPR would not be initiated. Plant management agreed that this practice on the part of the foreman, in effect, was circumventing the intent of the procedures. A licensee representative stated that, in the future, any member of the plant staff may initiate a NPPR by filling out items 2 and 3 on NPPR (Form 76-682). If the foreman did not agree that the potential problem should be sent through the review process, he would then assign a number and give a brief explanation as to why it should not go through the complete review. This form would then be reviewed by the foreman's supervisor and the QC department, then filed.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

9. Exit Interview

The inspector met with a senior licensee representative on a weekly basis and with the representatives denoted in Paragraph 1 on August 31, 1979. The scope and findings of the inspection were summarized by the inspector. No other statements or commitments aside from those in Paragraph 8 were made.