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

REGION V

Report No. 50-508/79-02

Docket No. 50-508 License No. CPPR-1[illegible] Safeguards Group

Licensee: Washington Public Power Supply System

P. O. Box 468

Richland, Washington 99352

Facility Name: WNP-3

Inspection at: WNP-3 Site (Satsop)

Inspection conducted: February 6-7, 1979

Inspectors: T. W. Hutson, Reactor Inspector — 3-1-79 Date Signed

G. Hernandez, Reactor Inspector — 3-1-79 Date Signed

Date Signed

Approved By: R. C. Haynes, ~~Chief,~~ Project Section, Reactor Construction and Engineering Support Branch — 3/1/79 Date Signed

Summary:

Inspection on February 6-7, 1979 (Report No. 50-508/79-02)
Areas Inspected: Unannounced, routine inspection by regional based inspectors of construction activities including structural concrete placement of the Unit 3 shield wall, review of structural concrete records and licensee audit followup actions. The inspection involved 16 inspector-hours onsite by two NRC inspectors.

Results: Of the areas inspected, no items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

RV Form 219 (

790413 0014

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Washington Public Power Supply System (WPPSS)

*J. C. Lockhart, Project QA Manager
*D. H. Walker, Principal QA Engineer
L. E. Nilsen, QA Engineer
J. M. Walker, Lead QA Engineer
E. L. Stephens, QA Engineer

Ebasco Services Inc. (Ebasco)

D. L. Chatham, Concrete Manager
T. F. Tully, Project Quality Engineer

Boecon-Fegle

D. Davis, QA Engineer

*Denotes those present at the exit interview.

2. Containment Structural Concrete

a. Observation of Work and Work Activities

The inspector observed the concrete placement activities utilized in the slip forming of the ringwall for Unit 3 to ascertain compliance with Boecon-Fegle procedures CP 219-005-Material Placement and Inspection - Shield Wall and CP 219-006-Concrete Placement and Inspection. The rate of movement of the form is regulated so that the forms leave the formed concrete only after the concrete is strong enough to retain its shape while supporting its own weight. Form movement is also dependent upon concrete placing speed. During this inspection, the rate of form movement varied from two to three inches on one day due to inclement weather, to almost eight inches the next day as ideal weather conditions existed.

As a result of heavy rainfall, standing water was observed in several areas on top of the freshly placed concrete. Licensee personnel stated that due to the slipforming method used in the construction of the shield wall, adverse weather protection is precluded and would be extremely difficult because of the lengths of rebar extending above the area of immediate placement. Water in the forms was being removed by suction hoses

and placement of the concrete was such that the water was not mixed with the placed concrete. The licensee stated that more suction hoses would be made available to prevent water accumulation. The inspectors noted that a member of a vibrating crew was using an improper technique and that the rebar tie wires were not always being bent away from the forms. Corrective action was taken immediately to instruct the vibrator operator in the proper technique and caution the ironworkers to bend the tie wires away from the forms.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

b. Review of Quality Records

The quality records associated with Unit 3 basemat placements BMS-007-335, BMS-009-335 and BMS-013-335 were reviewed by the inspector to ascertain compliance with Specification No. 3290-415, Testing and Inspection Requirements for Concrete Materials and Concrete. These records included Concrete Tracking Records, Preplacement Checkoffs, Placement Checkoffs, Batch Plant Inspection Reports, Concrete Testing Records, Truck Tickets, and 7 and 28 day Compression Strength Test Records.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

3. Licensee Audits

The inspectors reviewed the responses by GFA to the Quality Finding Reports (QFR) issued by WPPSS as a result of their in-depth audit of GFA conducted on December 12-14, 1978. (See IE Report No. 50-508/78-09, Paragraph 8.) This review was to ascertain whether followup actions were being taken as required by the licensee's QA Program. The inspectors found that of the 38 QFRs issued to and answered by GFA, 28 responses were rejected by the WPPSS quality organization. Ten responses were acceptable and were awaiting verification of the corrective actions. It appears that WPPSS is continuing followup of the discrepant conditions identified during the audit and is following the procedure established for audits and followup actions. The final resolution of the audit findings will be examined during a future inspection.

4. Exit Interview

The inspectors met with licensee representatives (denoted in Paragraph 1) at the conclusion of the inspection on February 7, 1979 and summarized the scope and findings of the inspection. The accumulation of water on top of the freshly placed concrete was discussed and the licensee stated that additional suction hoses would be made available.