



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

Report No. 50-261/80-23

Licensee: Carolina Power and Light Company  
411 Fayetteville Street  
Raleigh, NC 27602

Facility Name: H. B. Robinson

Docket No. 50-261

License No. DPR-23

Inspection at H. B. Robinson site near Hartsville, S.C.

Inspector: J. Blake  
J. Blake

9/22/80  
Date Signed

Approved by: A. R. Herdt  
A. R. Herdt, Section Chief, RCES Branch

9/22/80  
Date Signed

SUMMARY

Inspection on September 3 through 5, 1980

Areas Inspected

This routine announced inspection involved 24 inspector-hours on site in the areas of Inservice Inspection Program, Procedures and Records, IE Bulletin 79-13 Followup Inspection, CRD Canopy Repair Work, Previously identified Inspection Findings.

Results

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

80110403517

## DETAILS

### 1. Persons Contacted

#### Licensee Employees

- \*R. B. Starkey, Sr., Site Manager
- \*J. M. Curly, Engineering Supervisor
- \*H. S. Zimmerman, Technical and Administrative Manager
- M. F. Page, Engineer
- B. W. Garrison, QA Supervisor
- D. H. Bauer, QA Specialist
- C. Hardee, Engineer
- T. Hudson, Associate Engineer

Other licensee employees contacted included several technicians, security force members and office personnel.

#### NRC Resident Inspector

- \*S. Weise

\*Attended exit interview

### 2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on September 5, 1980 with those persons indicated in Paragraph 1 above. The inspector expressed concern over the repetitive nature of the CRDM canopy leak problem.

### 3. Licensee Action on Previous Inspection Findings

(Closed) Unresolved Item (50-261/79-23-01) "Documentation of Inspection Coverage". The final report for the 1979 outage inservice inspection provided an explanation of the notation "PAR" which appeared on the inspection data report. In addition, during the 1980 outage inspections the data was being supplemented with descriptions or sketches.

### 4. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items were not identified during this inspection.

### 5. Inservice Inspection (ISI)

#### a. Program

The inspector reviewed the licensee's program for the control and conduct of the inservice inspection of Class 1, 2, and 3 systems. The licensee's inservice inspection responsibilities and reporting require-

ments, as described in the current administrative procedures are not up to date with the requirements of ASME Section XI, 74 and 75 which is the plant commitment. During discussion of this matter with the licensee's engineering personnel, the inspector was shown a draft change to sections 4 and 12 of the Administrative Procedures manual which describes the areas of responsibility and the reporting requirements for the Class 1, 2, and 3 inservice inspection. The inspector informed the licensee that the change to the procedure would be the subject of an inspector follow-up item, 50-261/80-23-01, Administrative Procedure - Inservice Inspection - Functional and Reporting Requirements.

b. Data Review - 1979 Outage

The report for the results of the inservice inspection during the 1979 refueling outage were reported by the licensee's letter Serial: RSEP/80-410 (undated), received by Region II on April 9, 1980.

This report was reviewed in detail in the Region II office and at this time the inspector has no questions concerning the content of the report.

c. Inservice Inspection - 1980 Outage

At the time of the inspection the inservice inspection work activities had been essentially completed and the data was being reviewed for preparation of the final report.

The licensee stated that the ISI contractor, Westinghouse Nuclear Service Division, was in the process of reviewing previous inspection records and fabrication radiographs in an effort to resolve an indication recorded during the ultrasonic inspection of a weld in the regenerative heat exchanger.

The inspector made a general review of the inspection generated during this outage. The detail review of the data records will be conducted after the licensee accepts the results presented by his contractor and forwards the report to the NRC.

These were no items of noncompliance or deviations in this area of the inspection.

6. IE Bulletin 79-13 Followup Inspection

The licensee had completed the re-inspection of the steam generator feedwater line welds and base material areas required by the IEB 79-13. This re-inspection was required because of the repairs required during the last outage.

The inspector reviewed the radiographs for the following welds:

16-FW-9-25-FW12  
16-FW-9-25-W2  
16-FW-10-37-FW21  
16-FW-10-37-W2  
16-FW-10-37-W1  
16-FW-10-FW20  
16-FW-11-51-FW33  
16-FW-11-51-W2  
16-FW-11-51-W1  
16-FW-11-FW32  
16-FW-11-FW27

The inspector also reviewed the radiographs for the feedwater base material adjacent to the auxiliary feedwater connection.

These were no items of noncompliance or deviations in this area of the inspection.

7. CRDM Seal Canopy Repairs

During inspection of the canopy seal welds, the inspector found indications of leakage through three of the canopies. The indications noted were as follows:

Mechanism	D-4	Four	Pinholes
Mechanism	K06	Two	Linears
Mechanism	L-5	Three	Pinholes

At the time of this inspection the repair welding operations had been completed by Westinghouse Nuclear Service Division using procedure No. RAN-51233-1 Rev. 3. The inspector reviewed the LER file for similar problems and noted that weld repairs were made to crdm canopies during the 1976, 78, 79 and 80 outages. (There was no outage in 1977). The mechanisms repaired were as follows:

1976	C-9; D-4; L-13
1978	D-4; G-7
1979	K-6; L-5; M-6; N-7
1980	D-4, K-6, L-5

This showed that all three mechanism positions repaired during this outage were repeats. This was discussed with the licensee as an area of concern. The licensee indicated that the repetitive nature of the problem was under review with consideration being given to additional work being done during the 1981 outage which is scheduled to be a major outage as it is the final outage interval.

There were no items of noncompliance or deviations noted in this area of the inspection.