



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

FEB - 5 1981

Report Nos. 50-424/81-01 and 50-425/81-01

Licensee: Georgia Power Company  
270 Peachtree Street  
Atlanta, GA 30303

Facility Name: Vogtle

Docket Nos. 50-424 and 50-425

License Nos. CPPR-108 and CPPR-109

Inspection at Vogtle site near Waynesboro, Georgia

Inspector: J. R. Harris

1/28/81  
Date Signed

Approved by: T. E. Conlon  
T. E. Conlon, Section Chief, RC&ES Branch

2-3-81  
Date Signed

SUMMARY

Inspection on January 6-9, 1981

Areas Inspected

This routine, unannounced inspection involved 29 inspector-hours on site in the areas of structural concrete and construction status.

Results

Of the two areas inspected, no violations or deviations were identified in one area; one violation was found in one area (Violation - Failure to sample concrete test cylinders in accordance with procedure and specifications, paragraph 6).

8103240 686

## DETAILS

### 1. Persons Contacted

#### Licensee Employees

- \*K. M. Gillespie, Construction Manager
- \*D. Dutton, General Manager, GPC/SCS
- \*H. H. Gregory, Assistant Construction Manager
- \*E. D. Groover, QA Site Supervisor
- \*R. W. McManus, Civil QC Supervisor
- \*M. H. Googe, Manager, Quality Control
- \*J. R. Petro, QA Inspector
- \*N. Brooks, Civil Assistant Project Supervisor
- J. Seagraves, Civil QC Engineer

Other licensee employees included three construction craftsmen, three technicians, and three office personnel.

#### Other Organizations

D. P. Armstrong, Civil Resident Engineer, Bechtel

\*Attended exit interview

### 2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on January 9, 1981 with those persons indicated in Paragraph 1 above.

### 3. Licensee Action on Previous Inspection Findings

Not inspected.

### 4. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items were not identified during this inspection.

### 5. Independent Inspection

The inspector observed ongoing work activities in the Unit 1 and 2 powerhouse block and in the concrete and soils testing laboratory.

No violations or deviations were identified.

### 6. Containment (Structural Concrete I) - Review of Quality Records, Unit 1

The inspector examined quality records for pour number 1-01C-001 and 002 in the Unit 1 basemat. Acceptance criteria examined by the inspector appear in the following documents:

- a. Specification X2A-P01, forming, placing finishing and curing concrete
- b. CD-T-02, Concrete quality control
- c. PSAR sections 3 and 17.

Records examined by the inspector included batch tickets, batch plant inspection reports, concrete pour card inspection, test data for air, slump, temperature and concrete strength test cylinders. Examination of the above disclosed the following violation.

On pumped concrete, Vogtle specification X2AP01 and procedure CD-T-02 state that concrete must be sampled at the pump line discharge every 100 cubic yards for the molding of concrete test cylinders. Sampling for test cylinders is permitted at the truck discharge if correlation sampling for air temperature and slump is performed every 200 yards at the pump line discharge. Records showed that sampling was performed alternately at the truck discharge and pump discharge at a frequency varying from 100 yards to 300 cubic yards. Taking credit for sampling at both the pump line discharge and truck discharge resulted in a sampling frequency varying from 100 cubic yards to 150 cubic yards. Failure to sample concrete test cylinders in accordance with procedure was identified to the licensee as Violation number 50-424/81-01-01.

7. Containment (Structural Concrete II) - Observation of Work and Work Activities, Unit 1

The inspector observed partial placement of pour number A-09C-016 in the fuel handling building. Acceptance criteria examined by the inspector are the same as listed in paragraph 6.

Forms were tight and clean. Rebar was properly installed and clean. Preplacement inspection was indicated by the signed preinspection form. Placement activities pertaining to delivery time, free fall, flow distance and layer thickness conformed to specifications. Activities were continuously monitored by QC personnel. Samples for temperature, slump, air content and test cylinders met frequency and acceptance criteria.

No violations or deviations were identified in this area.