

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

Region I

Report No. 50-289/80-25

Docket No. 50-289

License No. DPR-50 Priority -- Category C

Licensee: Metropolitan Edison Company

100 Interpace Parkway

Parsippany, New Jersey 07054

Facility Name: Three Mile Island Nuclear Station - Unit 1

Inspection at: Middletown, Pennsylvania

Inspection conducted: August 25-29, 1980

Inspectors: *S. K. Chaudhary*
S. K. Chaudhary, Reactor Inspector

9/15/80
date signed

date signed

date signed

Approved by: *S. D. Ebner*
S. D. Ebner, Chief, Engineering Support
Section No. 2, RC&ES Branch

9/16/80
date signed

Inspection Summary:

Inspection on August 25-29, 1980 (Report No. 50-289/80-25)

Areas Inspected: Routine, announced inspection by one regional based inspector of licensee's action in response to IE Bulletin 80-11, Masonry Walls. The inspector reviewed documents, held discussions with licensee personnel, and conducted visual inspection of masonry walls.

Results: No items of noncompliance were identified.

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

GPUSC - Met Ed

- *W. G. Heysek, Auditor, GPUSC
- *L. R. Hillman, Gen. Engineer, GPUSC
- *D. G. Mitchell, Licensing - Met Ed
G. Schrader, Lead Electrical Designer
- *M. R. Shafer, Engineer Start-up/Test - Met Ed
- *R. L. Summers, Mechanical Engineer - Met Ed
J. L. Wright, QC Manager, GPUSC
J. Zaldaris, Administrator, As-Built Program

* denotes persons attending exit interview.

2. Follow-up Inspection to Review Licensee Actions in Response to IEB 80-11

a. Records Review and Discussion

The inspector reviewed the licensee's actions taken in response to the above bulletin to verify that masonry walls that could affect safety-related systems or components have been identified, and the associated systems and components have been adequately described in the written response. The inspector also reviewed the priorities established for re-evaluation program, the schedule therefor, and the criteria developed for assigning priorities. The inspector held a discussion with the responsible engineer and other licensee personnel to determine the adequacy of the methods used in identifying affected walls, and criteria for assigning priority of re-evaluation. The inspector was informed by the licensee as follows:

- (1) The walls were identified by physical walk-down of the systems in the plant.
- (2) Most walls are un-reinforced and the licensee is treating all walls as un-reinforced, unless they can determine definitely the reinforcement design and installation of the wall.
- (3) The priority of re-evaluation is based on the effect of wall failure on the shutdown capability of the plant.
- (4) The effect of the wall's failure and its affect on shut-down of the plant are a matter of engineering judgment.

- (5) All walls in Auxiliary Building are assigned priority one because of the significant equipment in vicinity.
- (6) Design loads on the walls cannot be directly determined from the existing design documents.
- (7) Design loads are being developed by piping stress analysis reports, direct physical measurements, hand calculations, and other available load information in design documents.
- (8) The licensee expects to meet the final response schedule of November 1980.

b. Visual Verification

The inspector conducted a visual inspection of masonry walls identified by the licensee. Following walls were visually inspected and the affected equipment was verified:

AB-1, AB-2, AB-3, AB-4
AB-5, AB-6, AB-7, TB-1
AB-11, AB-12

The inspector determined that the safety related equipment affected by the walls has been surveyed and reported by the licensee in his response.

Based on the review of documents, discussions with licensee personnel, and visual verification, the inspector determined that the licensee has taken adequate steps to comply with the requirements of the bulletin for interim response. However, in response to the inspector's concern regarding unavailability of any documented criteria for assigning re-evaluation priority, the licensee committed that such a document will be available for inspector's review by September 15, 1980.

No items of noncompliance were identified.

3. Exit Interview

At the conclusion of the inspection the inspector met with the licensee representatives (denoted in paragraph 1) and the inspector summarized the scope and the findings of his inspection.