



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
REGION II  
101 MARIETTA ST., N.W., SUITE 3  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

Report No. 50-413/80-19 and 50-414/80-19

Licensee: Duke Power Company  
422 South Church Street  
Charlotte, NC 28242

Facility Name: Catawba

License Nos. CPPR-116 and CPPR-117

Inspection at Catawba site near Rock Hill, SC

Inspector: *M. D. Hunt*  
M. D. Hunt

9/8/80  
Date Signed

Approved by: *J. C. Bryant*  
J. C. Bryant, Section Chief, RC&ES Branch

9/9/80  
Date Signed

SUMMARY

Inspection on July 28 - August 1, 1980

Areas Inspected

This routine, announced inspection involved 38 resident inspector-hours onsite in the areas of concrete placement, nonconforming reports, diesel generator clean up, storage of equipment and an employee's concerns.

Results

Of the five areas inspected, no items of noncompliance or deviations were identified in four areas; 2 items of noncompliance were found in one area (Paragraph 6, 414/80-19-01, Stainless steel piping on ground and 413/80-19-01, Scaffolding on piping and cable on floor).

8010240173

## DETAILS

### 1. Persons Contacted

#### Licensee Employees

- \*D. G. Beam, Construction Project Manager
- \*D. L. Freeze, Construction Project Engineer
- \*R. A. Morgan, Senior QA Engineer (QAE)
- \*J. C. Shropshire, QAE, Mechanical
- \*H. D. Mason, QAE, Civil-Electrical
- D. Morgan, Electrical QC Inspector
- C. Mathews, Mechanical QC Inspector
- R. David, Safety Supervisor

Other licensee employees contacted included 4 construction craftsmen, 6 technicians, and 5 office personnel.

#### Other Organizations

Hartford Steam Boiler Inspection & Insurance Company

- \*J. W. Kosko, Authorized Nuclear Inspector (ANI)
- \*C. E. Toegel, ANI

\*Attended exit interview

### 2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on August 1, 1980 with those persons indicated in Paragraph 1 above. The inspector outlined the two deficiencies discussed in paragraph 6. The licensee had taken the necessary actions to correct these items and was informed that no reply would be required.

### 3. Licensee Action on Previous Inspection Findings

Not inspected.

### 4. Unresolved items

Unresolved items were not identified during this inspection.

### 5. Independent Inspection Effort

#### a. Concrete Placement

The inspector observed the placement of concrete in the doghouse area at the north side of Unit 2 reactor building identified as Pour No. W 206. This pour consisted of approximately 270 yards of concrete.

Slump tests, air content measurements and concrete temperature readings were taken as required at the trucks, since the placement was by the crane and bucket method. The placement was monitored by QC inspectors. Vibrators were used properly to insure consolidation of the concrete.

b. Nonconforming reports (QIA)

The inspector selected six closed QIA's which required training of personnel as part of the resolution. The training sessions are now documented on Form No. VIA which identifies the type of training given, references the QIA, lists the instructor, crew number, and the names of those attending the training. This record of training is also entered in each of the attendees personnel files.

c. Diesel Generator Engine 1A Cleanup

As a result of heavy rains September 29-30, 1979, the licensee experienced flooding of diesel generator rooms 1A and 1B. (See RII Report No. 413/414/79-18). The licensee had issued Nonconforming Item (NCI) Report No. 6697 in which the resolution required the development of a cleanup procedure. The procedure, identified as Serial No. CP392, Cleanup of Diesel Engine 1-A, contains fifteen steps which must be completed before the NCI can be signed off. Several of the steps have been completed but there is no record to indicate when steps were completed or those remaining to be completed. During discussions with the licensee representatives, the inspector brought out the fact that the status of CP 392 was difficult to determine. The licensee agreed to develop a method for sign off of each step. RII will review the documentation method during a future inspection. This will be identified as Inspector Followup Item 50-413/80-19-03, Diesel Generator Engine 1A Cleanup Documentation.

d. Corrective Action Procedure R-2

The inspector discussed with the licensee the method for documenting minor discrepancies and the corrective actions taken. Minor discrepancies are reported on attachment form (R2-A) to procedure R-2A, Corrective Action.

Once the discrepancy is listed on the R-2A, the form is forwarded to the technical support or construction supervisor for corrective action. However, there are no provisions for acknowledgement by the receiving discipline and no time limit on the corrective action. There are provisions for reinspection after the corrective action has been taken. Discussions with licensee personnel revealed that in several instances a second R-2A form has been submitted for the same item, and after the second form has been submitted and the corrective action is not complete, a nonconforming item report is submitted. There appears to be no problems with this system of reporting discrepancies except that items may not be corrected in a timely manner. The inspector discussed this matter with the licensee who agreed to review the method for handling

discrepancies reported on R-2A forms. This will be identified as Inspector Followup Item, 413/414/80-19-02, Followup of corrective actions reported on R-2A forms.

Within the areas examined, no items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

6. Employee Concerns

On July 29, 1980 an employee gave the inspector a letter addressed to the NRC Inspector, Catawba project. The letter stated in summary that the employee had been harrassed and discriminated against by DPC management for bringing safety hazards and violations to DPC and NRC's attention. The allegor's letter stated that DPC is in violation according to 10CFR 19.16 (c).

The allegor gave the inspector a copy of a June 24, 1980 letter from the State of South Carolina Department of Labor which evaluated ten items brought to their attention by the allegor. No violations were cited. The inspector advised the allegor that he should present a list of the persons who have witnessed his harrassment. Arrangements were made to tour the site with the allegor and a DPC safety representative. The allegor, the DPC representative and the inspector toured the site on two different occasions. The allegor pointed out the following items:

- a. Rebar touching the ground in the rebar storage area
- b. Three sections of stainless steel piping touching the ground at the piping field fab shop.
- c. Manholes open on the condensate and the reactor water storage tanks.
- d. Scaffold boards on piping and electrical cable lying on the floor.
- e. Sections of piping lying on the concrete floor in the auxiliary building.
- f. Numerous sections of scaffolding that in the allegor's opinion were unsafe.
- g. Ladders improperly secured.

The inspector investigated the details surrounding certain of these items. The results are as follows:

- a. The rebar was determined to be material that was stored at the site but destined for use at other sites. The licensee detailed a crew to make the necessary corrections.
- b. The three sections of fabricated piping touching the ground were identified as sections 2NV 147-BB, 2ND1-9 and 2 NI 7, which are components of safety-related systems. Duke Power Company's Topical Report commits to the requirements of ANSI 45.2.2, which requires

equipment to be placed on cribbing to avoid flooding. This piping will be flushed and cleaned before the system is placed in service, therefore this noncompliance will be identified as a deficiency 414/80-19-01, Stainless steel piping on the ground at the pipe fab shop.

- c. Investigation revealed that the tanks with open manholes were still in the erection stage with work being performed inside. Once the tanks are completed the storage requirements will be in affect.
- d. The scaffold boards found on piping in the Unit 1 auxiliary feedwater pump room and pit, and the mechanical penetration room were found to conflict with the requirements of construction procedure Serial Number 371, Protection and Preservation of Installed Equipment. Also one cable (1\*CA529) found touching the floor was determined to be safety related. These items are identified as a deficiency 413/80-19-01, Scaffolding on piping and cable on floor.
- e. The piping found lying on the concrete floor in Auxiliary Building 1 was determined to be stored within the scope of the storage procedures in that the areas were dry and the floor drains were operational.
- f&g. The inspector referred the allegers concerns regarding the safety of scaffolding and ladders to DPC safety personnel.

The licensee was informed of the findings and took prompt action to correct the conditions noted in items a, b, and d. The corrective actions were:

- a. A crew was moved into the rebar storage area to help the crew already assigned in properly storing the rebar.
- b. Nonconforming item report No. 9097 was issued July 31, 1980 requiring the piping to be stored properly and the personnel retrained in storage requirements. The NCI was closed August 1, 1980.
- d. Corrective Action Notice R-2A, Serial No. M 543, was issued to require the removal of the scaffold boards from the piping and proper storage of the cable.

The alleger was informed of certain of these actions prior to the inspectors departure from the site. The inspector advised the alleger that 10 CFR 19.16 which refers to the handling of radioactive materials, does not apply in this instance. The inspector further requested that the alleger present a list of safety related concerns to the NRC so that they may be examined. This request was made in a effort to obtain guidance as to the concerns of this employee. To date no list has been presented.