



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

Report Nos. 50-280/79-28 and 50-281/79-45

Licensee: Virginia Electric and Power Company
 Richmond, Virginia 23261
 Facility Name: Surry Units 1 and 2

Docket Nos. 50-280 and 50-281

License Nos. DPR-32 and DPR-37

Inspection at Surry Site near Williamsburg, Virginia

Inspector: S. A. Elrod
 S. A. Elrod

25 June 79
 Date Signed

Approved by: P. J. Kellogg
 P. J. Kellogg, Section Chief, RONS Branch

June 26, 1979
 Date Signed

SUMMARY

Inspection on June 4-8, 1979

Areas Inspected

This routine, unannounced inspection involved 29 inspector-hours onsite in the area of seismic reanalysis of safety related piping.

Results

No apparent items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

7908240 213

Q

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Licensee Employees

- *W. L. Stewart, Station Manager
- *J. L. Wilson, Superintendent Operations
- *R. F. Saunders, Superintendent Maintenance
- *T. A. Peebles, Superintendent Technical Services
- *F. L. Rentz, Resident QC Engineer
- *R. L. Baldwin, Supervisor Administrative Services
- *E. P. Dewandel, Staff Assistant
- *W. R. Skelley, Jr., Staff Assistant - SGRP
- *A. L. Parrish, III, Project Manager - SGRP
- *J. Goodson, Resident QC Engineer - SGRP
- *J. S. Fisher, Fire Marshall
- *R. E. Culberson, Engineer
- *T. J. Kenny, Outage Coordinator - SGRP
- D. Kildoo, QC Engineer
- *C. Gillette, Administrative Supervisor - SGRP

Other Organizations

Stone and Webster

- *L. A. Budlong
- *L. B. Reynolds

NRC Resident Inspector

- *D. J. Burke

*Attended exit interview.

2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on June 8, 1979 with those persons indicated in Paragraph 1 above. The items listed in paragraph 5 of this report were discussed.

3. Licensee Action on Previous Inspection Findings

Not inspected

4. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items were not identified during this inspection.

5. Seismic Reanalysis of Safety Related Piping

During the course of this inspection, the status of the seismic reanalysis of safety related piping and the licensee's request for startup of Unit No. 1 was reviewed with site management. The inspector took sample dimensions of safety related piping to compare with approved drawings (MKSs). The inspector also took sample dimensions of pipe hangers to compare with the unverified hanger drawings presently being used for input into a hanger analysis program which the licensee is just starting. Results are discussed in the paragraphs below.

Approximately seventy five dimensions of spent fuel pool cooling piping, pressurizer relief piping, auxiliary feedwater piping, and low head safety injection piping were made. All but one, which appeared to be an isolated case, were within the tolerance specified. Licensee Quality Control personnel noted for correction the one dimension outside tolerance. The inspector had no further question on generation of as-built piping drawings.

The sketches of hangers that had recently been field sketched appeared to have adequate detail, dimensions and workmanship but had not yet been verified by the quality control organization. Seventy two of the hangers inside containment (estimated 15-20%) have been sketched as of the completion of this inspection. These were hangers which the contractor performing the analysis (Stone and Webster) needed more information about. No documented verification program was presently being conducted for existing hanger drawings. Existing hanger drawings provided no tolerances for dimensions or cold spring settings (for spring hangers) and usually did not detail the entire hanger, only the parts provided by the vendor. Reference was frequently made to "Existing Beam" or other similar support. During the inspection, Surry management requested Stone and Webster to provide tolerances. The inspector noted several dimensional and cold spring setting deviations from the drawings. Examples for the auxiliary feedwater system are:

- a. Spring hanger - SH 16 Foundation not as shown on sketch SK411, Cold load 345 pounds vice 339 pounds, springs are 1'-2" vice 1'-0" center to center.
- b. Spring Hanger - SH 17 Foundation not as shown, Springs are 11" vice 1'-0" center to center.
- c. Hanger 19 Channel Beam is 5 pounds vice 4.1 pounds; Welded pad dimensions not on drawing.
- d. Hanger 23 Cold load is 258 pounds for both springs, drawing specifies 243 pounds for one and 294 pounds for the other.

e. Hanger 24 Cold load 420 pounds vice 373 pounds shown on drawing.

f. Sketch 3549 Insulation saddles shown but not installed.

The lack of stated tolerances on hanger sketches, the inability of Stone and Webster to readily provide tolerances and the observed deviations shown above combined with the lack of a hanger drawing verification program decreases the credibility of the existing hanger drawings as sole basis for analysis of hangers. Surry management agreed to commence a hanger drawing verification program with anticipated completion of containment hangers on June 15, 1979. Several days subsequent to the inspection, the inspector was informed by Surry management that hanger dimension tolerances had been provided by Stone and Webster. The hanger drawing verification program will be further inspected in a subsequent inspection (280/79-28-01).

No deviations or noncompliance were observed in this area.