

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

REGION III

Report No. 50-341/80-11

Docket No. 50-341

License No. CPPR-87

Licensee: Detroit Edison Company
2000 Second Avenue
Detroit, MI 48226

Facility Name: Enrico Fermi Nuclear Station, Unit 2

Inspection Conducted: July 28-30, August 13, and September 10-12, 1980

Inspectors: R. B. Landsman

RB Landsman
RC Knop for

10-6-80

P. A. Barrett

10-7-80

Accompanied by: R. C. Knop
(September 11, 1980)

G. Fiorelli
(September 11, 1980)

Approved by: R. C. Knop, Chief
Projects Section 1

RC Knop

10-7-80

Inspection Summary

Inspection on July 28-30, August 13, and September 10-12, 1980 (Report No. 50-341/80-11)

Areas Inspected: Follow-up of previously identified noncompliances, 10 CFR 50.55(e) reports, and unresolved items; plant tour, and review of nonconformance reports. The inspection involved 53 inspector-hours onsite by two NRC inspectors.

Results: Of the areas inspected, one item of noncompliance was identified. (Infraction - failure to take prompt corrective action to control design change documents. Licensee Action on Previous Inspection Findings 79-17-02

DETAILS

Persons Contacted

+T. A. Alessi, Director Project Quality Assurance
+W. J. Fahrner, Manager Fermi 2
*+H. A. Walker, Supervisor Construction QA
*+R. A. Vance, General Director Engineer
*+G. J. Carter, QA Engineer
* J. J. Gessner, Assistant Director Project Quality Assurance
* J. A. Cartmill, Assistant Project Construction Superintendent
* R. F. McCraney, Quality Verification Supervisor
* C. R. Bacon, Assistant Director Field Engineering
* S. H. Noetzel, Director Project Field Engineering
* M. Albertin, Assistant Project Manager, Daniel International
* L. Jones, Director Project Records Management
* T. H. Dickson, Director Project Design
D. Cawood, Project Quality Verification Lead Inspector
S. Spence, QA Engineer

+Denotes those attending the exit interview on July 30, 1980.

*Denotes those attending the exit interview on August 13, 1980.

Licensee Action on Previous Inspection Findings

(Open) Upgraded Noncompliance (341/79-17-02): Design documents which have had numerous unincorporated design changes listed. Inadequate corrective action to assure accurate and current documents were being used at controlled distribution locations.

As address in the IE Reports No. 80-01, No. 80-04, and No. 80-06, a problem in which design change documents could not be assured to adequately be controlled at distribution locations, was identified. As part of the assurance to correct the problem, the licensee committed to issue a directive by June 6, 1980 requiring a 100 percent purge of all documents at all distribution locations using an updated (accurate) control reference (Automatic Records Management System, ARMS). The directive was issued. However, as of August 13, 1980, the directive had not been implemented. The apparent holdup of the implementation appeared to be a combination of an individual decision to wait until the ARMS was completely updated and the lack of communication to obtain the needed manpower to update the ARMS. This inadequate corrective action is contrary to the requirements of 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion XVI and the Enrico Fermi Unit 2 Quality Assurance Manual, Section 17.0 as described in Appendix A to the transmittal letter to this report. (341/79-17-02) Subsequent to this finding, the licensee gave a letter (EF2-49, 840) dated September 8, 1980 to this inspector, which stated that the update of the ARMS was completed on August 25, 1980 and the purge of the design documents was expected to be completed before September 30, 1980.

(Closed) Unresolved Item (341/79-4--03): Satisfactory completion of concrete anchor testing. The licensee indicated that testing is being done with respect to IE Bulletin No. 79-02. The inspector reviewed the proposed 79-02 verification program and determined that the licensee will test one anchor in every pipe hanger plate.

(Open) Noncompliance (79-05-06): Failure to take required density tests by RHR Building. Density tests were performed which indicated that the backfill in question does not meet density requirements. The licensee is waiting for the engineers evaluation.

(Open) Noncompliance (79-05-07): Failure to document nonconforming density tests by RHR Building. Additional density tests were performed which indicated that the backfill in question does not meet density requirements. The licensee is waiting for the engineers evaluation.

10 CFR 50.55(e) Reportable Items

(Open) 10 CFR 50.55(e) (79-XX-11): Cut reinforcing Bar in 12 floor slabs. An engineering evaluation has been completed on five slabs using detailed field as-built layouts, and the analysis indicates that rebar cuts have not significantly reduced the capacity of the slabs. The original analysis, based on preliminary information, of the remaining seven slabs indicated that derating the original design live load was necessary. However, the licensee is now reanalyzing these seven slabs utilizing detailed field as-built layouts to determine if derating is necessary.

(Closed) 10 CFR 50.55(e), (79-XX-05): Damaged penetrations. An engineering evaluation by the assembly manufacturer indicates that the penetration bellows should function in accordance with the design specification. Also, each of the bellows, except X-17, has been successfully leak tested. Penetration X-17 is documented on a Deviation Disposition Request (nonconformance report), which will require a leak test of the bellows.

(Closed) 10 CFR 50.55(e), (79-XX-08): Reactor Building HVAC fire damper closure springs failure. The closure spring failures are documented on a DDR (nonconformance report). The disposition is to replace the defective springs with new springs which will be documented to conform to the site design requirements.

(Closed) 10 CFR 50.55(e), (79-XX-10): Defective Westinghouse switches. The defective switches are identified on a nonconformance report. The switches will be replaced with other suitable equipment.

(Open) 10 CFR 50.55(e), (80-XX-02): General Electric receptacle pins for the main reactor control panels. A number of wire connections appeared to be loose. A G.E. Field Deviation Disposition Request (FDDR) has been written to identify the conditions. The corrective action, which was in progress at the Fermi 2 plant control room, was to reterminate all of the G.E. terminations in the above panels. The reterminations, the scope, and the impact will be reviewed during a subsequent inspection.

Section 1

Prepared by P. A. Barrett

Reviewed by R. C. Knop, Chief
Projects Section 1

1. Review of Deviation Disposition Requests (Nonconformances)

The RIII inspector reviewed and researched the dispositions to Wismer & Becker Deviation Disposition Requests #394, 1301, 1302, and 1318. These DDRs were selected on the basis of the type of disposition (i.e., use as is, void, and other). The types of dispositions to these DDRs initially looked inappropriate. However, research into the background information revealed that the dispositions were appropriate.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

2. Plant Tour

On September 11, 1980, the RIII inspector, accompanied by NRC regional supervision, took a thorough tour of the Residual Heat Removal Building, the Reactor Building, and the Auxiliary Building. The general plant conditions were observed. The plant status, including current and scheduled activities were discussed.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

Section 1

Prepared by R. E. Landsman

Reviewed by D. W. Hayes, Chief
Engineering Support Section 1

1. Site Tour

A site tour was conducted following the entrance interview on July 28, 1980.

The inspector observed numerous form tie holes on the exterior walls which were never patched. The licensee indicated that they were never noticed before. The walls have been standing since 1976. Specification 3071-17, Revision B, "Concrete Construction" states that form tie holes will be filled. The licensee, when questioned about this, indicated that they would issue a DDR on the holes and require that they be filled.

Subsequent to the inspection, the licensee located a letter listing the remaining civil activities to be performed dated January 5, 1979. The letter lists the patchwork of form tie holes to be completed by May 1979. This item is considered unresolved pending the licensee's response to when the form tie holes will be filled. (341/80-11-01).

2. Shore Protection

The licensee is preparing to construct a 1000 foot shore protection barrier on Lake Erie. Excavation work was begun during the inspection. The following documents were reviewed for consistency with industry practice:

Specification 3071-176, Revision A, May 1980, "Shore Barrier Construction."

QA Procedure 9.513, Revision 0, July 1980, "Inspection and Testing of Shore Barrier Construction."

Specification 176 requires that clay be placed in 12 inch layers and compacted to 95 percent modified proctor density. The inspector cautioned the licensee as to whether a 12 inch layer of clay could be compacted. The licensee indicated that the matter would be pursued. The remaining portions of the specification and procedure appear to be satisfactory.

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. An unresolved item disclosed during the inspection is discussed in Section 2, Paragraph 1.

Exit Interviews

The inspectors met with the licensee representatives on July 30, 1980 and August 13, 1980. The inspectors summarized the scope and findings of the inspection. The licensee acknowledged the findings as reported.