



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

Report No. 50-389/80-08

Licensee: Florida Power & Light Company
9250 West Flagler Street
Miami, FL 33101

Facility Name: St. Lucie

Docket No. 50-389

License No. CPPR-144

Inspection at St. Lucie site near Ft. Pierce, Florida

Inspector: J. R. Harris

6/20/80

Date Signed

Approved by: T. E. Conlon
T. E. Conlon, Section Chief, RCES Branch

6/20/80

Date Signed

SUMMARY

Inspection on June 4-6, 1980

Areas Inspected

This routine, unannounced inspection involved 19 inspector-hours on site in the areas of structural concrete, foundations and previously identified items.

Results

Of the three areas inspected, no items of noncompliance or deviations were identified in two areas; one item of noncompliance was found in one area (Infraction - Inadequate procedural controls on sand-cement fill - paragraph 5).



DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Licensee Employees

- *J. Thompson, Assistant Site Manager
- *W. Hayward, QA Construction Supervisor
- *E. Sherman, QA Engineer
- *O. Karch, QA Engineer
- C. Carlos, Civil QC Supervisor
- *J. Parker, Project Quality Control Supervisor
- S. Piney, Coating Engineer

Other licensee employees contacted included two construction craftsmen, four technicians, and two office personnel.

Other Organizations

- *V. J. Gerley, ESSE Civil Design Supervisor, EBASCO
- *P. Gaboury, Resident Engineer Field, EBASCO

*Attended exit interview

2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on June 6, 1980 with those persons indicated in Paragraph 1 above.

3. Licensee Action on Previous Inspection Findings

(Open) Unresolved Item (389/79-18-01) Use of expansion joint filler inside containment not qualified to DBA conditions. Florida Power and Light Company has contacted Ameron and requested the technical basis for use of Nukem 750 as a qualified caulk. Submittal of this information is anticipated by July 30, 1980. This item remains open pending NRC review of the data submitted by Ameron.

(Closed) Infraction (389/79-18-02) Failure to follow procedure in procurement of protective coatings. The inspector reviewed the licensees response and implementation of that response presented in the licensees letters dated November 21, 1979, December 20, 1979 and March 4, 1980. Painting materials are now handled in accordance with SQP-3. Central receiving now retains all protective coating materials identified as safety-related in the warehouse until QC performs receipt inspection. This item is closed.

(Closed) Infraction (389/79-18-03) Failure to place discrepant material in hold areas. The inspector reviewed the licensees response and implementation of that response presented in the licensees letters dated November 21, 1979, December 20, 1979, and March 4, 1980. Nonconformance report 869R was initiated October 12, 1979 to assure protective coating materials would be

handled in the same manner as other safety-related material and not delivered to the paint storage facility. Protective coating materials are now segregated until receipt inspection approval. When painting materials are received, they are placed in a QC hold area and pending inspection labels are attached. NRC has no further questions.

4. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items were not identified during this inspection.

5. Independent Inspection

The inspector examined the following areas:

- a. Construction status
- b. Concrete and soils testing laboratory
- c. Backfill operations behind the retaining wall of the intake structure
- d. Sand-cement fill in the diesel generator building

Examination of sand-cement fill operations in the diesel generator building disclosed the following noncompliance. Paragraph TQR 5.1 of the Topical Quality Assurance Report states, "Activities affecting quality of nuclear safety-related structures, systems and components shall be prescribed by documented instructions, procedures or drawings of a type appropriate to the circumstances and shall be accomplished in accordance with these instructions procedures or drawings". These documents shall include appropriate quantitative criteria such as dimensions tolerances and operating limits and qualitative criteria such as comparative workmanship samples to assure that the quality assurance activity has been satisfactorily accomplished".

Examination of sand-cement backfill activities disclosed that drawings and instructions are not clear as to whether or not the specified 1-20 ratio of sand to cement is by volume or weight, that water and compaction requirements are not specific, that amounts of ingredients in the mix are not documented and that test data verifying design requirements are being met was not available. This was identified to the licensee as Infraction 389/80-08-01, "Inadequate procedural controls on Sand-cement Fill".

6. Containment (Structural Concrete II) - Observation of Work and Work Activities

The inspector performed a followup inspection of structural concrete activities. Concrete placements observed were pour number NRW 25 in the intake structure retaining wall and pour number CCB 55, west wall of the component cooling building. Acceptance criteria examined by the inspector appear in the following documents:

- a. PSAR, section 3.8.1 and 3.8.3
- b. QI's 10.3, 10.7, 10.70 and 10.71
- c. Flo-2998.473, EBASCO Specification Concrete



Forms were tight, clean and level, rebar was properly installed and clean. Placement activities pertaining to delivery time, free fall, flow distance, layer thickness and consolidation conformed to specifications. In process tests for slump, air content, unit weight and cylinder molding were performed in accordance with procedure requirements. Batch tickets indicated the specified design mix was being delivered. Activities were continuously monitored by QC personnel. An examination of the batch plant indicated materials were being controlled and accurate batch records were being generated.

No deviations or items of noncompliance were identified.

