UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION II
101 MARIETTA ST., N.W., SUITE 3100
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

Report Nos. 50-400/80-28, 50-401/80-26, 50-402/80-26, and 50-403/80-26

Licensee: Carolina Power and Light Company
411 Fayetteville Street
Raleigh, NC 27602

Docket Nos. 50-400, 50-401, 50-402 and 50-403

License Nos. CPPR-158, CPPR-159, CPPR-160 and CPPR-161

Inspection at Harris Site near Raleigh, North Carolina

Inspector: K. Landis for — 1-30-81
G. F. Maxwell — Date Signed

Approved by: K. Landis for — 1-30-81
J. C. Bryant, Section Chief, RCES Branch — Date Signed

SUMMARY

Inspection reporting period: December 1-26, 1980

Areas Inspected

This routine resident inspection involved 94 inspector-hours onsite in the areas of welding, material control, concrete, soils, cadwelding and containment testing.

Results

Of the six areas inspected, no violations or deviations were identified.

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

   Licensee Employees

   *S. D. Smith, Vice-President, Construction
   *R. M. Parsons, Site Manager
   *A. M. Lucas, Senior Resident Engineer
   *G. L. Forehand, Principal QA Specialist
   *C. S. Hinnant, Resident Electrical Engineer
   *E. E. Willett, Principal Mechanical Engineer

   Other licensee employees contacted included 10 construction craftsmen, 2 technicians, 3 security force members, and 14 office personnel.

   Other Organizations

   *W. D. Goodman, Project Manager, Daniel Construction Company

2. Exit Interview

   The inspection scope and findings were summarized on December 24, 1980, with those persons indicated in Paragraph 1 above.

3. Licensee Action on Previous Inspection Findings

   Not inspected.

4. Unresolved Items

   Unresolved items were not identified during this inspection.

5. Welding and Material Control

   a. Participated in observation of welding activities with another RII inspector; which included in-process observation of welding on four weld joints, review of the applicable welder's qualifications and records for the filler material being used. Also, observed the testing that was in-process for three welders. The details of the NRC inspection associated with the above activities are documented in IE Reports Numbered - 400/80-26, 401/402/403/80-24.

   b. Observed the method used by construction personnel relative to requisition of pipe spool pieces numbered A5-236-1-SW-61-3, A3-216-1-SW-27-3 and A3-216-1-SW-27-3A. The construction procedure used for issuance of materials is numbered AP-XIII-08.

c. Observed the stored condition of the reactor vessels for Units 2, 3 and 4 and the stored condition of the steam generators for Unit 2. Observed the in-process weekly inspections of the yard fire hydrant stations and accessories, reference construction procedure AP-VII-05 paragraph 4.3.

In the areas inspected, no violations or deviations were identified.

6. Concrete and Soil

a. Interviewed responsible CP&L personnel, evaluated documentation relative to the installation of piezometers at the west auxiliary dam and observed the installed condition of the piezometers at the west auxiliary dam. Nine of the twenty-three piezometers had been installed. These nine were installed downstream of the dam (reference CP&L procedure WP-32, EBASCO specifications CAR-SH-CH-24, CAR-SH-CH-11 and drawings CAR-2167-G-6239, CAR-2167-G-6240 and CAR-2167-G-6270).

b. Observed the installed condition of the shoring and forms to be used in conjunction with the concrete and grout that will be placed inside the two diversionary pipes located beneath the main dam (reference EBASCO drawing CAR-2167-G-6232).

c. Observed portions of the placement of concrete in the following locations:

(1) Reactor auxiliary building common to both units 1 and 2; pour 1ACIW301009A.

(2) Unit 1 containment building, inside wall, pour 1CBSL286002.

Placement activities pertaining to delivery time, free fall, consolidation and testing conformed to specification requirements. Concrete placement activities were continuously monitored by inspection personnel. The batch tickets indicated that the specified design mixes were being delivered (reference CP&L PSAR section 5, EBASCO specification CAR-SH-CH-6, procedures CQC-13. CQA-6, WP-5, TP-15 and QCI-13.3).

In the areas inspected, no violations or deviations were identified.

7. Cadwelding and Containment Testing

a. Observed the installed condition of four T-series cadwelds on number 18 rebar which is located adjacent to the main steam penetrations for unit 1 containment elevation 271 feet. The four cadwelds were installed in the horizontal position on the east outside containment wall. Observed responsible inspection personnel inspecting the installed condition of the cadwelds being installed at the east side of unit 1 containment elevation 271 feet. Procedures referenced during the observations include CP&L procedures; WP-01, CQC-15, CQA-19 and CP&L PSAR Appendix 5F.

b. Observed the installation of five T-series cadwelds on number 11 rebar which is located in the south wall of unit 1 reactor auxiliary building elevation 261 feet. The cadwelders applying the special process had records which indicated that their qualifications were current for the process being applied; reference construction procedure WP-01.

c. Observed the testing of two sister cadwelds. The tests were conducted on one vertical splice using number 11 rebar for cadwelder assigned symbol CO-089 and one horizontal splice using number 11 rebar for cadwelder asigned symbol CO-125. The tests were conducted and documented in accordance with CP&L procedure QCI-15.1.

d. Observed the installed condition of four strain gauges located on rebar near the main steam penetrations for unit 1 containment, elevation 271 feet. As a result, the conditions were noted:

(1) Since October 1978, there have been four occasions whereby work activities were in progress on the installation of strain gauges for Unit 1 containment. In each instance, the work was in progress for only about 5 days.

(2) There was only one instance whereby site CP&L inspection personnel documented surveillance or monitoring of the strain gauge installation activities.

Informed responsible CP&L management personnel of the above observations. Subsequently, a CP&L inspector was dispatched to the work area, the applicable contractor's QA program was located and a CP&L surveillance checklist was generated and implemented. The surveillance by CP&L was documented in a QA field report and a nonconformance report (DDR). The inspector discussed the above observations with RII supervision and has no further questions about this matter, at this time.

In the areas inspected, no violations or deviations were identified.