

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

REGION III

Report No. 50-373/78-23

Docket No. 50-373

License No. CPPR-99

Licensee: Commonwealth Edison Company
P. O. Box 767
Chicago, IL 60690

Facility Name: La Salle County Station, Unit 1

Inspection At: La Salle Site, Seneca, IL

Inspection Conducted: September 27, 28, and October 3-5, 1978

Inspectors:

F. Maura
F. Maura

11-28-78

R. Jettenmeier
R. Jettenmeier

11/28/78

Approved By:

J. F. Streeter
J. F. Streeter, Chief
Nuclear Support Section 1

11/28/78

Inspection Summary

Inspection on September 27, 28 and October 3-5, 1978 (Report No. 50-373/78-23)

Areas Inspected: Routine, unannounced inspection of preoperational test program, preoperational test procedures and turnover packages, and status of construction at it relates to the preoperational test program. The inspection involved 69 inspector-hours onsite by two NRC inspectors.

Results: No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

7901110069

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

- *R. Holyoak, Station Superintendent
- *G. Diedrick, Station Assistant Superintendent
- *R. Bishop, Technical Staff Supervisor
- *W. Huntington, Lead Special Projects Engineer
- E. Windorf, Station Construction Field Engineer

The inspectors also interviewed several other licensee employees including members of the technical, operating and construction quality assurance staff.

*Denotes those attending exit interview.

2. Overall Preoperational Test Program

The inspector reviewed the latest revisions of the Startup Manual procedures and verified that all previous comments have been incorporated and that new changes do not conflict with FSAR commitments. No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

3. Review of Preoperational Test Procedures

The following procedures were reviewed and found to meet the requirements of Reg. Guide 1.68, FSAR commitments, and Startup Manual requirements, unless noted below.

- a. PT-HP-101, "High Pressure Core Spray." The licensee will change the procedure to include verification of removal of the suppression pool suction strainer hood. The test involving the HPCS diesel generator will be a separate preoperational test procedure.
- b. PT-AP-102, "D. C. Distribution." The procedure fails to demonstrate that the battery chargers can recharge their respective Division 1 or 2 battery in 12 hours while supplying the normal plant d.c. loads as stated in paragraph 8.3.2.1.1 of the FSAR. In the case of the HPCS (Division 3) battery charger the FSAR states the recharge time from minimum charge to fully charged, while carrying maximum steady state load, is 24 hours. The licensee was asked to define what constituted a fully charged battery following a discharge test, and to show how he planned to demonstrate the battery chargers were capable of meeting the FSAR requirement. The licensee stated it may be necessary to amend the FSAR statements. This item remains unresolved.

Regarding cells jumpered during the test, the licensee was asked whether they would be replaced. The licensee's position is that any cells jumpered during the test would be recharged or replaced depending on their evaluation of the test results. On October 13, 1978, the inspector informed the licensee that either recharging or replacement would be satisfactory solutions as long as the test is repeated to demonstrate the corrective action taken was adequate.

- c. PT-PC-101, "Integrated Leak Rate Test." The inspector suggested that the valve lineup for the preoperational test be similar to what future tests will require. For example, the RHR system should be lined up with shutdown cooling running since that is the way it will be in future tests. The licensee will consider the suggestion.

The inspector objected to having instruments isolated at the root valve during the test, such as the drywell high pressure switches. The licensee stated the procedure would be revised to leave all instrument valves open.

The inspector questioned the licensee's plans to subtract the MSIV leakage from the ILRT results before comparing to the acceptance criteria, and the fact that the MSIV leakage is not included in the Type B and C test results. The inspector noted that the FSAR does not state that such exemptions to 10 CFR 50, Appendix J were acceptable. The licensee stated they plan to submit a change in the FSAR to eliminate the MSIV's from the ILRT and the B and C test acceptance criteria. The inspector stated his plans to discuss these items with IE:HQ. These items remain unresolved.

The inspector noted that a Rev. 1 to the procedure had been issued and stated he may have additional comments following his review of it.

- d. PT-PC-102, "Drywell Floor Test." The inspector inquired whether the drywell floor structural integrity test included an upward ΔP test, and whether the pre-op test included a high pressure and low pressure ΔP leakage determination. The inspector also noted that much information was missing from the test procedure making it extremely difficult to determine what was to be accomplished, whether the instrumentation to be used was satisfactory, etc.

The licensee stated that the procedure was being rewritten in its entirety. The licensee agreed to consider the inspectors' comments and the inspectors stated they would wait until the new procedure was issued before proceeding with their review.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

4. Review of Turnover Package

The inspectors reviewed the turnover of the D. C. Distribution System for preoperational testing. The system had been accepted for pre-operational testing on September 28, 1978, and the licensee had started to blue tag the equipment in accordance with the Startup Manual Procedures. The inspectors noted that the package did not include red lined drawings of the electrical drawings involved, which appeared to be in noncompliance with startup manual procedures LSU 100-2 and 100-6. The licensee's interpretation of the procedure, as written, was that red lining was only required of piping drawings and was optional for electrical and instrumentation drawings. To clarify the intent of the procedure, LSU 100-6 was revised.

5. Plant Familiarization

The inspectors continued their familiarization with plant systems and layout on October 3-5, 1978. No significant concerns were identified.

6. 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. Unresolved items disclosed during the inspection are discussed in Paragraph 3.b. and 3.c.

7. Exit Interview

The inspectors met with licensee representatives (denoted in Paragraph 1) on October 4, 1978. The inspectors summarized the scope and findings of the inspection.