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

REGION V

Report No. 50-206/81-12

Docket No. 50-206 License No. DPR-13 Safeguards Group

Licensee: Southern California Edison Company

P. O. Box 800 - 2244 Walnut Grove Avenue

Rosemead, California 91770

Facility Name: San Onofre Unit 1

Inspection at: San Onofre, California

Inspection conducted: April 13-17, 1981

Inspectors: A. Chaffee 5/1/81
A. Chaffee, Reactor Inspector — Date Signed

Date Signed

Date Signed

Approved By: G B Zwetzig 5/1/81
G. B. Zwetzig, Acting Chief, Reactor Projects Section #2 — Date Signed

Summary:

Inspection on April 13-17, 1981 (Report No. 50-206/81-12)

Areas Inspected: Routine, unannounced inspection of licensee's audit program, implementation of audit program, design changes and modifications, seismic event monitoring equipment, and implementation of one TMI Action Plan Item. This inspection involved 32 inspector-hours onsite by one NRC inspector.

Results: No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

8106080519

RV Form 219 (2)

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

*N. Dickinson, SCE Construction/Startup Supervisor
*M. Matter, Administrative Supervisor, Unit 1
*R. Brunet, Unit 1 Superintendent
*B. Katz, Supervising Engineer
*F. Briggs, Compliance Engineer
*J. Haynes, Manager, Nuclear Operations
*R. Montroy, Quality Assurance Engineer
*M. Wharton, Supervising Engineer
*K. Hadley, Plant Security Supervisor
*G. McDonald, QA/QC Supervisor
*D. Nunn, Manager, QA
*H. Morgan, Superintendent Units 2 & 3
W. McGhee, Training Administrator

*Denotes those persons who attended the exit interview. Also present at the exit interview was the resident inspector, L. Miller.

2. Audit Program

The inspector reviewed the following documents relating to the licensee's audit program: Chapter 18 of Southern California Edison Quality Assurance Manual, as revised on January 23, 1981; procedures N18.04 and N18.05 of Southern California Edison Quality Assurance Reference Procedures Manual as revised on March 20, 1981; and Southern California Edison SONGS-1 Audit Schedule for the period August 1980 to July 1981 as approved by the Manager of Quality Assurance, D. E. Nunn.

Based on this review the inspector noted the following:

a. The scope of the audit program is defined in the above mentioned documentation and appears to be consistent with the licensee's FSAR commitments and technical specifications.

b. The Manager of Quality Assurance is assigned the responsibility of designating qualified auditors. The licensee has committed to ANSI N45.2.23 as qualification criteria for auditors in procedure Q.A.P. N18.05.

c. Chapter 18 of the licensee's Quality Assurance Manual requires audits to be performed by auditors who are independent of the activity being audited.

d. The licensee has a Corrective Action Request (C.A.R.) System which provides for and requires the corrective action taken by the audited organization to be documented. This program is delineated in Chapter 18 of Southern California Edison's Quality Assurance Manual which is approved by the Vice President of Southern California Edison and the Manager of Quality Assurance.

e. The Manager, Quality Assurance is responsible for ensuring the communication of audit results to the management of the areas audited and to provide appropriate management involvement in the resolution of associated corrective action.

f. The Manager, Quality Assurance is responsible for approving audit schedules submitted by the Project Quality Assurance Supervisors.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were noted,

3. Implementation, Audit Program

The inspector reviewed the following Audit Reports:

#SOI-11-81	Audit of Technical Specification 6.8
#SOI-38-80	Emergency Operating Procedures
#SOI-23-80	Non licensed Personnel Performance, Training, and Qualification
#SOI-53-80	Design Control

The inspector also reviewed Corrective Action Request (CAR SOI-P-300). This C.A.R. dealt with the need for proper documentation of Plant Manager approval of design changes.

Based on this review and discussions with licensee personnel the inspector noted the following:

a. The audit reports clearly defined the scope and results of the audits.

b. The audits appeared to be conducted by trained personnel not having direct responsibility in the area being audited.

c. The frequency of the audits were in agreement with the Technical Specifications requirements.

d. Appropriate action to correct conditions noted by audits results appeared to be accomplished in a timely fashion.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were noted.

4. Design, Design Changes and Modifications

The inspector reviewed portions of the following design changes:

80-03	Feedwater Flow Straightener
80-07	Addition of Mechanical Penetrations
80-08	Modification of the R.H.R. Pump Motor Seal
80-10	Boric Acid System and Heat Tracing Modification
80-11	Generator Anti-Motoring Relay Modification

The last four modifications listed above were incomplete and test data was therefore not included. In addition, revision of the as-built drawings for these design changes was not yet complete.

Design Change 80-03, however, was complete and the as-built drawings had been revised. The test results were evaluated against the established acceptance criteria.

Based on his review, the inspector concluded that, to the extent they had been completed, all of the above design changes appeared to have been performed in accordance with Station Order S-E-116, Revision 7, dated February 20, 1980, and Technical Specification requirements.

The inspector determined that the licensee had just completed revising two procedures and originating another dealing with design changes. These new procedures are as follows:

SO1-E-116	Revision 8, dated March 31, 1981, Design Control
SO1-V-2.38	Revision 0, dated March 31, 1981, Proposed Facility Change
SO1-V-2.26	Revision 3, dated March 31, 1981, Structure and Equipment System Turn-over

These new procedures appear to provide more detailed guidance on the control of design changes and modifications.

The inspector also noted that there were approximately eighty-one design changes ordered but incomplete. Most of these appeared to be safety-related. The licensee acknowledged this large backlog and assured the inspector that the changes were being pursued as expeditiously as possible.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

5. Implementation of TMI Task Action Item II.B.4

The inspector reviewed the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Nuclear Training Division, Training Memorandum, 8-80/Revision 1, dated February 23, 1981, and a Westinghouse Electric Corporation document describing a "Mitigating Core Damage" training course offered by Westinghouse. Based on this review and discussions with the licensee the inspector determined the following:

a. The licensee has contracted with Westinghouse to provide a "Mitigating Core Damage" training course. This course will be given during June 1981 to applicable Unit-1 personnel.

b. The course offered by Westinghouse is described as meeting all N.R.C. requirements.

c. This course will consist of approximately forty contact hours per applicable individual at Unit-1.

d. Retraining in this area will consist of approximately eight contact hours. Retraining will be accomplished as part of the Operator Requalification Program.

The completion of this initial training will be examined during a subsequent inspection.

6. Seismic Event Monitoring Equipment

The inspector reviewed the following: Design Change 73-24, Modification to Stong-Motion Accelerograph System dated June 1, 1973; Design Change 76-40, Pressurizer Mounting of Strong Motion Recording System; Design Change 80-20, Remove South Offsite Trigger for Strong Motion Accelerograph; Volume II of Southern California Edison Final Safety Analyses, Section 1.54, pages 1-87a, 1-87b, revision 1; and Volume VI of Southern California Edison Final Safety Analysis, pages 2-3, 2-4, 2-6, revision 1.

Based on his review and discussions with licensee personnel, the inspector determined that the licensee's seismic event monitoring equipment consists of:

(1) One kinemetrics SMA-3 Strong Motion Accelerograph consisting of:

1) Main recording panel (located in 4KV room).

2) Six remote triaxial electromagnetic accelerometer units located as follows: Grade-10, Refueling Deck, Reactor Coolant Pump B, Steam Generator B, Pressurizer, and Top of Sphere (outside containment).

3) System triggers to initiate recording equipment.

i) one horizontal inverted pendulum and two vertical electromagnetic triggers located onsite.

ii) one vertical electromagnetic trigger located northeast of plant.

(2) One Kinemetrics SMA-2 Accelerograph (Free Field Unit).

1) Located in Units 2 & 3 First Aid Room.

2) Internal triggers consisting of:

i) one vertical electromagnetic trigger.

ii) one triaxial force-balance accelerometer unit.

3) Sensitivity of trigger levels for all kinemetrics equipment is .01g.

(3) Five peak Recording Accelerometers (PRA-100) located as follows:

1) on top of sphere (outside containment)

2) steam generator A.

3) steam generator B.

4) loop "C" reactor coolant pipe.

5) foundation of containment sphere.

The inspector concluded that the equipment described above appears to be in accordance with the licensee commitments.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were noted.

7. Exit Interview

The inspector met with the licensee representatives denoted in paragraph 1 on April 17, 1981, to summarize the scope and findings of the inspection.