

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

Report Nos. 50-400/80-17, 50-401/80-15, 50-402/80-15 and 50-403/80-15

1

Licensee: Carolina Power and Light Company 411 Fayetteville Street Raleigh, NC 276

Facility Name: Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant near Merry Oaks, NC Docket Nos. 50-400, 50-401, 50-402, 50-403 License Nos. CPPR-158, CPPR-159, CPPR-160, CPPR-161 Inspection at Shearon Harris Nuclear Plant, New Hill, N.C.

Inspector: Cunningham Approved by: G. R. Jenkins, Section Chief, FFMS Branch

SUMMARY

Inspection on July 14-16, 1980

Areas Inspected

This routine, unannounced inspection involved 22 inspector-hours onsite in the areas of: fugitive dust control; erosion and runoff control; construction waste management; and construction effects monitoring.

## Results

Of the four areas inspected, one item of noncompliance was identified in one area (paragraph 5).

## DETAILS

## 1. Persons Contacted

Licensee Employees

\*R. M. Parsons, Site Manager

- \*N. J. Chiangi, Manager of Engineering and Construction Quality Assurance
- \*S. R. Zimmerman, Manager of Licensing and Permits
- \*A. Fuller, Senior Civil Engineer
- \*G. L. Forehand, Principal Q.A. Specialist
- \*T. Pritchett, Senior Construction Specialist
- \*G. M. Simpson, Principal Construction Specialist

Other Organizations

\*F. D. Bard, Engineer (Nello and Teer Company) \*W. D. Goodman, Engineer (Daniel Construction Company)

NRC Resident Inspector

\*R. L. Landsman (Acting Resident)

\*Attended exit interview

2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on July 16, 1980 with those persons indicated in Paragraph 1 above. The item of noncompliance identified herein was discussed.

3. Licensee Action on Previous Inspection Findings

No previous inspection findings were disclosed.

4. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items were not identified during this inspection.

5. Dust Control

Section 4.6.c of the Revised Final Environmental Statement (RFES) referenced in Section 2.F.(5) of the Construction Permits, requires that road dust will be minimized. Further, Section 3.8 of the licensee's Environmental Report states: "if road dust presents an unacceptable impact, efforts will be made to minimize the effect." Upon the inspector's initial arrival at the plant site on July 16, 1980, and during the remainder of the inspection, viz. July 15-16, 1980, the inspector observed the following: (1) excessive road dust attending routine vehicular traffic on roads throughout the plant site; (2) infrequent watering of subject roads as required for effective





. \*

.

.

.

dust abatement and control; (3) visual and safety hazards to drivers of vehicles on such roads as a consequence of excessive road dust. The inspector informed licensee representatives of these findings, and discussed with them the above criteria and commitments requiring them to minimize road dust and to implement efforts to minimize its' adverse effects. The inspector informed licensee representatives that their failure to control road dust and to minimize the effects thereof constituted an item of noncompliance (50-400/80-17-01, 50-401/80-15-01, 50-402/80-15-01 and 50-403/80-15-01). The inspector emphasized that the cited finding was a repeat item of noncompliance (50-400/78-08, 50-401/78-08, 50-402/78-08 and 50-403/78-08) and that efforts should be implemented to consistently control and minimize road dust attending routine onsite vehicular traffic. Licensee representatives stated the above findings would be reviewed and responded to upon receipt of this inspection report.

6. Erosion Control

2

- a. Section 4.6.e of the RFES, referenced in Section 2.F.(5) of the Construction Permits requires that erosion and soil runoff causing contamination of surface water will be minimized. The inspection included a tour and observation of drainage systems and erosion control practices within the plant site and at the main dam constuction area. Inspection of the plant site disclosed that virtually all surface erosion attending constuction activities settled in the main reservior area, and hence minimized the mass of constuction related sediment reaching the Cape Fear River.
- b. Inspection of the main dam construction site disclosed that erosion and runoff control measures committed to by the licensee were being implemented. Such controls included: sediment ponds; ditches; burlap fences; intercept; check dams; cofferdams; and grassing of berms, where necessary. Inspection also included a review and discussion of the licensee's constuction effects monitoring program to assess, more specifically, the effect of construction related runoff on Buckhorn and Whitoak Creeks, and the zone of the Cape Fear River influenced by the Buckhorn Creek outfall. These monitoring parameters included: pH; total suspended solids; plankton and benthic communities; and the species diversity within such communities. Inspection time precluded completion of the above assessment; however, the licensee was informed that such an assessment would be followed up during a succeeding inspection (50-400/80-17-02, 50-401/80-25-02, 50-402/50-15-02 and 50-403/80-15-02).
- 7. Inspection of construction waste management included a detailed review of the disposal and management of construction wastes. The following items, were inspected: (1) spoil storage and borrow areas; (2) onsite landfill; (3) onsite incinerator; (4) concrete batch plant liquid effluent; (5) waste motor oil and related sump; (6) merchantable metal waste. Inspection disclosed that disposal and management of the above construction wastes were consistent with accepted industry practices. There were no questions regarding this item.



· ·

•

· \_

8