

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

Report No. 50-352/79-08

Docket No. 50-382

Category A2

Licensee: Louisiana Power and Light Company
142 Delaronde Street
New Orleans, Louisiana 70174

Facility Name: Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit No. 3

Inspection at: Waterford Site, Taft, Louisiana

Inspection conducted: July 10-13, 1979

Inspectors: *L. D. Gilbert* 7/19/79
L. D. Gilbert, Reactor Inspector,
Engineering Support Section (Paragraphs 1,
3, 5 and 6) Date

A. E. Beach
A. E. Beach 7/19/79
A. E. Beach, Reactor Inspector, Engineering
Support Section (Paragraphs 2 and 4) Date

Reviewed by: *R. C. Stewart* 7/19/79
R. C. Stewart, Reactor Inspector, Projects
Section Date

Approved by: *W. A. Crossman* 7/19/79
W. A. Crossman, Chief, Projects Section Date

R. E. Hall 7/19/79
R. E. Hall, Chief, Engineering Support
Section Date

965 027

7909190217

Inspection Summary:

Inspection on July 10-13, 1979 (Report No. 50-382/79-08)

Areas Inspected: Routine, unannounced inspection of construction activities including observation of work in progress and review of procedures and records for welding of Reactor Coolant Pressure Boundary Piping; and review of procedures and inspection of facilities for placement of the concrete for the Reactor Containment Building dome. The inspection involved fifty inspector-hours by two NRC inspectors.

Results: No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

Details

1. Persons Contacted

Principal Licensee Personnel

- *T. F. Gerrets, QA Manager
- *R. E. Gautrean, Project Coordinator
- *J. Woods, QA Engineer
- *P. V. Prasankumar, Maintenance Engineer
- *S. A. Alleman, Assistant Station Superintendent
- *B. P. Brown, QA Engineer
- *P. A. Jackson, Project Coordinator
- *T. K. Armington, S/V Engineer
- *C. J. Chatelain, QA Engineer

Other Personnel

- *L. A. Stinson, QA Program, Ebasco
- *R. J. Milhiser, Project Superintendent, Ebasco
- *J. R. Moskwa, QA/QC Manager, NISCO
- *J. Britt, Site Manager, NISCO
- *K. Rogers, QC Technician, NISCO
- *J. Dale, Project Manager, Peabody
- *D. Thompson, Document Control, Peabody
- *N. Radabaugh, QA/QC Engineer, Fegles-Power

*Denotes those attending the exit interview.

The IE inspectors also interviewed other licensee and contractor personnel including members of the engineering and QA/QC staffs.

2. Site Tour

The IE inspectors walked through the reactor building and auxiliary building to inspect the status of construction and housekeeping.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

3. Reactor Coolant Pressure Boundary Piping

The IE inspector observed the following Reactor Coolant Pressure Boundary (RCPB) welds which were designated on Drawing Number 3015-003 and existed in various stages of completion:

<u>Weld No.</u>	<u>Weld No.</u>
P1W1	P6W1
P1W2	P9W2

P2W1

P10W1

P5W1

P14W1

P5W2

P18W1

Three of the welders used for welding the above welds were selected for review of qualification records for compliance with Section IX of the ASME B&PV Code.

Welder surveillance records were reviewed for compliance with the requirements of Welder Surveillance Procedure, ES No. 148, Revision B.

The certification records of three QA/QC personnel qualifications were reviewed for conformance to the requirements of ANSI N45.2.6.

In the areas inspected, no discrepancies with the above requirements were noted.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

4. Structural Concrete for the Reactor Containment Building Dome

The IE inspector reviewed Ebasco Specification No. LOU-1564.472 "Concrete Masonry", and discussed the plans with licensee and contractor personnel for the placement of concrete for the Reactor Containment Building dome. Topics of discussion included the actual concrete placement, as well as the mixing and the transporting of the concrete to the point of placement.

A tour of the batch plant facilities at the site was conducted, and all of the areas reviewed at the batch plant by the IE inspector were found to be in accordance with Louisiana Industries Contract W3-F-6. The central plant was recently inspected for conformance with the requirements of the "Check List for Ready Mixed Concrete Production Facilities" and the contractor had received the certificate of conformance for the "Shrink-Mix" plant April 13, 1979. However, because of its recent recertification, the check list documentation was not available at the site at the time of this inspection.

Fegles-Power Service is the sub-contractor responsible for the placement of the concrete for the dome. The following Fegles-Power Service Procedures were reviewed:

CP 303-2, "Placement Area Preparation and Inspection"

CP 303-3, "Concrete Placement and Inspection"

CP 303-4, "Concrete Finishing, Curing, and Inspection"

No discrepancies were found with the Ebasco Specification No. LOU-1564.472, "Concrete Masonry", for the procedures reviewed.

During a tour of the Concrete Testing Laboratory facilities, the IE inspector noted high temperatures in curing tank No. 7. A review of the "Daily Curing Reports" for the period of June 19, 1979, through July 5, 1979, also revealed high curing temperatures in tank No. 7, usually with an average temperature of approximately 80°F. ASTM C192, "Making and Curing Concrete Test Specimens in the Laboratory", requires that test specimens be moist cured at 73.4 ± 3°F from the time of molding until the moment of test.

A review of the Peabody Testing Quality Assurance Manual requires that all testing and inspection operations be in accordance with the appropriate standards. A review of the quality assurance procedures indicated that there were no provisions in the procedure to identify what corrective action should be taken when curing temperatures were not within the required limits. The only requirements identified in quality assurance procedures were that the curing temperatures be recorded.

Since it could not be ascertained by the IE inspector whether or not safety-related test specimens had been placed in curing tank No. 7 during the time period of high temperature, this matter is considered to be unresolved pending further review of curing records during a subsequent inspection.

5. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items are matters about which more information is required in order to ascertain whether they are acceptable items, items of noncompliance, or deviations. An unresolved item disclosed during the inspection is discussed in paragraph 4.

6. Exit Interview

The IE inspectors met with licensee representatives (denoted in paragraph 1) at the conclusion of the inspection on July 13, 1979. The IE inspectors summarized the scope and findings of the inspection.