

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

REGION III

Report No. 50-373/80-56

Docket No. 50-373

License No. CPPR-99

Licensee: Commonwealth Edison Company
Post Office Box 767
Chicago, IL 60690

Facility Name: LaSalle County Nuclear Station, Unit 1

Inspection At: LaSalle Site, Marseilles, IL

Inspection Conducted: October 21 through December 31, 1980

Inspectors: *R. D. Walker for*
R. D. Walker, Senior Resident Inspector 1/19/81

S. E. Shepley for
S. E. Shepley, Resident Inspector 1/19/81

Approved by: *R. L. Spessard*
R. L. Spessard, Chief, 1/19/81
Reactor Projects Section 1

Inspection Summary

Inspection on October 21 through December 31, 1980 (Report No. 50-373/80-56)

Areas Inspected: Routine, resident inspector, preoperational inspection consisting of a review of licensee action on previous inspection findings, clarification of the licensee's position with respect to onsite review committee requirements, IE Bulletins and Circulars received by the licensee since last inspection, followup on significant events which occur during the inspection period, participation in the regional office systematic assessment of licensee performance, operating procedures, response to headquarters and IE requests, inspection activities preparatory to license issuance, and a plant walkthrough/operational status review. The inspection involved a total of 150 inspector-hours onsite by two NRC inspectors including 50 inspector-hours onsite during off-shifts.

Results: No items of noncompliance were identified.

8103090627

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

B. B. Stephenson, LaSalle County Station Project Manager
*R. H. Holyoak, Station Superintendent
*R. D. Kyrouc, Quality Assurance Engineer
G. J. Diederich, Station Operating Assistant Superintendent
*R. D. Bishop, Administrative and Support Services Assist. Superintendent
C. W. Schroeder, Technical Staff Supervisor
R. Raguse, Senior Operating Engineer
J. M. Marshall, Operating Engineer
W. Huntington, Assistant Technical Staff Supervisor
H. J. Hentschel, Assistant Technical Staff Supervisor
F. Lawless, Rad-Chem Supervisor
E. E. Spitzner, Startup Coordinator
G. E. Groth, Construction Engineer

The inspector also interviewed other licensee employees including members of the technical, operating, and construction staff, as well as certain licensee contractor employees.

*Denotes persons present at management interview onsite.

2. License Action On Previous Inspection Findings

(Open) Unresolved Item (373/80-10-03): Review of response to IE Bulletin 80-11, "Masonry Wall Design." The inspector has received the following correspondence with respect to this item:

- a. Letter to D. G. Eisenhut from D. L. Peoples, dated July 8, 1980, responding to NRC request for additional information found in S. A. Varga (NRC) letter to all CP and OL applicants dated April 21, 1980.
- b. Letter to J. G. Keppler from D. L. Peoples, dated July 7, 1980, responding to IE Bulletin 80-11

Both of these documents refer to additional investigations in this area to be performed at LaSalle County Units 1 and 2 and state that such additional work will be completed prior to unit startup and will be available for NRC Review at the site upon completion. This item remains open pending completion of this work and review of the work and bulletin response by the NRC Region III Construction Branch.

(Open) Unresolved Item (373/80-24-01): Review of response to IE Bulletin 80-07, "BWR Jet Pump Assembly Failure." The licensee states that their response will be submitted to the Office of NRR as answers to questions

FSAR Q111.83 through 85. This submittal will be in Amendment 54 to the FSAR due in January of 1981. This item remains open pending NRC Region III Construction Branch review of this submittal.

(Open) Unresolved Item (373/80-16-02): Review of response to IE Bulletin 80-13, "Cracking In Core Spray Spargers." The licensee stated that their response was submitted to the Office of NRR as answers to questions FSAR Q121.5 and Q121.10 submitted in May, 1980 as amendment 49 to the FSAR. The inspector has been unable to review this response; however, the licensee has agreed to provide this response and the inspector will review it during a subsequent inspection.

(Closed) Unresolved Item (373/80-43-03): Review of response to IE Circular 80-21, "Regulation of Refueling Crews." The inspector stated the response to this circular was acceptable with the exception that one item would require further licensee review. With respect to the item of clarification, the inspector and the licensee through his Technical Staff Supervisor and Fuel Handling Foreman, agreed that step C.3 of procedure LFP 100-1, Rev. 0, dated May 2, 1978 is interpreted to require that direct communication will be maintained with a licensed individual in the control room when fuel movements over the core are being made. The statement in the procedure implies this via a required demonstration of the operability of the communications system, but does not state it specifically. With respect to the item requiring licensee review, the circular states at item B.3 that, "The unlicensed members of the crew shall participate in appropriate facility administered training programs and be facility certified to perform their duties." The inspector noted that the fuel handlers have received systems and component training via a Systems Description Course. The inspector also noted that the fuel handling foremen are administering an on the job training program, which involves use of the specific tools and components involved in the fuel handling process. The inspector stated that the licensee should certify the fuel handlers to capable of performing their duties on the basis of the above training. The inspector is closing his review of IE Circular 80-21 but will review certification of fuel handlers under Open Item Number (373/80-56-01).

(Closed) Unresolved Items (373/79-33-11 and (373/79-33-17): Final inspector review of IE Circulars 79-17 and 78-13 respectively. The inspector verified that the circulars were received by the licensee management, that a review for applicability was performed and that appropriate action was taken or scheduled.

No items of noncompliance were identified in this area.

3. Clarification of Licensee Position With Respect to Onsite Review Committee Requirements

Due to further clarification by the licensee, the following statements may be added to the inspectors findings as given in paragraph 7 of inspection report No. 50-373/80-43.

- a. The LaSalle County Station (LSCS) Onsite Review and Investigative function as currently constituted does not contain provisions for specific review group membership beyond the Technical Staff Supervisor, but rather membership is selected as dictated by each review function under the direction of the Plant Superintendent from a list of people who are qualified as described in ANSI N18.1-1971. No general controls over the size or composition other than this list are imposed on the Plant Superintendent and the present Superintendent intends no routine use of committees nor to require formal meetings.
- b. Only minutes of scheduled meetings are specified, and no meetings need ever be scheduled. Any minutes that are recorded are attached to the review report which has no storage requirement unless it is approved by the Plant Superintendent.
- c. The interface with the offsite review group is unclear, the Plant Superintendent may have wide discretion.
- d. Provisions for followup actions to resolve items identified by the review group are vague with the Plant Superintendent having wide discretion.

All parts of paragraph 7 which are not affected by this additional information remain unchanged. This additional information does not materially affect the inspectors conclusions as given in paragraph 7 of inspection report No. 50-373/80-43.

No items of noncompliance were identified in this area.

4. Review of IE Bulletins Received Since Last Inspection Report

The licensee received IE Bulletins 80-21, 80-23, 80-24, and 80-25 since the last inspection report written by the inspector. The inspector verified that IE Bulletin 80-24 was received by the licensee for information only. Portions of this bulletin may be applicable to the licensee when the construction phase of the plant is completed and the startup/operating phase is entered; therefore, the licensee should provide an answer to the bulletin for the inspector's review prior to license issuance. Final review of the licensee's response to IE Bulletin 80-24 is assigned Open Item Number (373/80-56-02).

The inspector verified that IE Bulletins 80-21, 80-23, and 80-25 were received by the licensee with a response required. The time periods for the licensee's required responses to IE Bulletins 80-21, 80-23, and 80-25 have not elapsed and the licensee is still formulating the required responses. The inspector will review the licensee's responses to these bulletins under Open Item Number (373/80-56-03), (373/80-56-04), and (373/80-56-05) respectively.

No items of noncompliance were identified in this area.

5. Review of IE Circulars Received Since Last Inspection Report

The licensee has received IE Circular 80-23 since the last inspection report written by the inspector. The licensee is still reviewing this circular at this time, and the inspector will review the licensee's response during a subsequent inspection under open item number 373/80-56-06. The NRC issued IE Circular 80-24 to teletherapy licensee's and IE Circular 80-25 to radiography licensee's during this period. No licensee action is needed on these circulars.

No items of noncompliance were identified in this area.

6. Followup on Significant Events That Occur During the Inspection Period

The inspector followed up on the following events that occurred during the inspection period.

- a. On October 22, 1980, the licensee discovered approximately two inches of water and oil standing on the Low Pressure Core Spray (LPCS)/Reactor Core Isolation Cooling (RCIC) corner room floor. It was subsequently determined that construction workers had removed hoses going to the LPCS pump lube oil cooler. These hoses had been installed via a quick disconnect fittings to provide cooling water to this component for pump runs prior to installation of the cooling water lines. The construction workers, while turning the quick disconnect fittings off, unthreaded the cooler outlet pipe from the cooler internal to the pump motor. Subsequently, when cooling water inlet flow was established, the water ran out the pipe into the lube oil sump and overflowed into the corner room. The LPCS pump was tagged out of service and never ran during this evolution. The LPCS pump motor was subsequently inspected and meggered out, and no damage occurred.
- b. On October 23, 1980, the licensee discovered water on both recirculation pump motors. Initially it was thought that the pumps had a cooler leak similar to those described above for the LPCS pump motor. Further evaluation disclosed that the water was coming from the Gland Seal Leak Off Reservoir via a drain line to this reservoir. The Gland Seal Leak Off Reservoir was backing up due to a flush being performed. The Recirculation System pump motors were subsequently inspected and meggered out, and no damage occurred.
- c. On December 23, 1980, the licensee was conducting a portion of pre-operational test PD-DG-101A, which called for simultaneous initiation of diesel generators 0, 1A, and 1B. Diesel generator 0 was forced to be shutdown before diesel generators 1A and 1B when a 1.5 inch Core Standby Cooling System (CSCS) Equipment Cooling System water line off of the diesel generator 0 cooling water pump discharge line began pouring water on to elevation 673' in the north end of the Reactor Building. The line which supplies the LPCS motor cooler was mistakenly cut upstream of MOV 1DG-035 instead of preliminary reports indicate that no

water damage was sustained in the area of the leak. The inspectors were unable to thoroughly review this event before the completion of this inspection because of the unavailability of various personnel involved due to holiday vacations. The inspectors believe that the possibility exists that temporary turnover procedures and/or out of service procedures were not adequately followed, thereby causing this event. The inspectors will review this Unresolved Item (373/80-56-07) during a subsequent inspection to ascertain if any noncompliance with NRC requirements occurred.

The inspector determined that no items of noncompliance with NRC requirements occurred in the events discussed in paragraph's a. and b. above, but cautioned that these events seem to indicate that personnel involved in the events were not showing appropriate attention to detail in the conduct of the function; however, one Unresolved Item involving the event discussed in paragraph c. above will receive additional inspection followup.

7. Participation In Regional Office Systematic Assessment Of Licensee Performance (SALP)

The inspector participated in the regional office SALP review for LaSalle County Nuclear Station during this inspection period. This review culminated in a management meeting at the Commonwealth Edison Company (CECo) headquarters on November 25, 1980. The results of that meeting are documented in IE Inspection Report No. 50-73/80-52 and 50-374/80-33.

8. Review of Operating Procedures

The inspector discussed his continuing review of station operating procedures with the operating engineer. The inspector expressed his desire to be updated whenever all changes to procedures that are the consequence of system walkdown have been implemented. The inspector and the operating engineer agreed that this evolution represents the final form of the licensee's operating procedures and that at this point, the inspector should than review the adequacy of such procedure to attempt to close any open items with respect to that procedure. The operating engineer agreed to provide such an update on a periodic basis.

No items of noncompliance were identified in this area.

9. Response To Headquarters Request

- a. The Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR), Division of Human Factors Safety (DHFS), Human Factors Engineering Branch (HFEB) met with the licensee on November 6, 1980 in Bethesda, Maryland. The Resident Inspector attended this meeting to clarify followup activities required by him on site as a consequence of the control room human factors review.

- b. On November 18, 1980, Mr. Robert L. Tedesco, Assistant Director for Licensing Branch No. 1, was given a tour of the site and a discussion of items of mutual interest.
- c. On November 20 and November 21, 1980, the inspector participated in a team review of the LaSalle County Station Symptomatic Emergency Procedures (LGA's). The team was headed by the Office of NRR, DHFS, Procedures and Test Branch.
- d. On December 17, 1980, the Office of NRR, met with the licensee in Bethesda, Maryland to discuss all open items with respect to the LaSalle County Nuclear Station Safety Evaluation Report (SER). The resident inspector attended this meeting to clarify followup activities required by him on site as a consequence of these open items.
- e. The inspector participated in several discussions between the Office of NRR, DHFS, Licensee Qualification Branch (LQB) and the licensee during this inspection period. The purpose of these discussions was to try to clarify what the licensee would be required to do to satisfy the criteria established in Item I.G.1 of NUREG 0694 for training during low-power testing. At this time LQB and the licensee have not resolved this issue.

No items of noncompliance were identified in this area.

10. Other Significant Events Involving the Resident Site Staff

- a. On October 29 and October 30, 1980 the inspectors attended the quarterly Resident Inspectors Seminar at the NRC, RIII, Office in Glen Ellyn, Illinois.
- b. The inspectors were not on site for the period of November 26 through December 14, 1980 because they were attending a Nuclear Engineering course at the NRC Training Center in Chattanooga, Tennessee.
- c. The inspectors traveled to the NRC, RIII, Office in Glen Ellyn, Illinois on December 19, 1980 to discuss programatic topics with their supervisor.

11. Inspection Activities Preparatory to License Issuance (Status of Licensee Procedures and Preoperational Testing Program)

- a. Operating, Maintenance, Surveillance, Abnormal and Emergency Procedure Status.

The licensee projects 4927 procedures to be required in these areas. Currently the licensee has approved 4457 procedures, 414 procedures have been drafted but not reviewed, and 56 procedures remain to be drafted.

b. The licensee projects a total of 125 Preoperational Tests/System Demonstrations required for Unit 1 operation, of which 115 of these are specific Unit 1 and the remaining 10 are specific to Unit 2. The licensee reported that 121 systems have been turned over for preoperational testing, that 112 Preoperational Tests and System Demonstrations have been started, that 50 Preoperational Tests and System Demonstrations have been completed, and the preoperational testing program is approximately 74% complete at this time. The licensee stated that final Preoperational Test or System Demonstration results for 12 tests are ready for NRC review, i.e., the entire test is complete and the results have been reviewed and accepted by the licensee. These twelve tests are PT-DO-101 "Diesel Oil," PT-VY-102 "LSCS Equipment Ventilation," PT-PV-101 "Reactor Vessel Internals Vibration," PT-DO-201 "Unit 2 Diesel Oil," PT-FC-101 "Fuel Pool Cooling and Cleanup," PT-NR-101A "Source Range Monitors," PT-SC-101 "Standby Liquid Control," PT-VJ-101 "Machine Shop Ventilation," PT-VO-101 "Off Gas Ventilation," SD-WR-101 "Reactor Building Closed Cooling Water System," SD-CW-01 "Circulating Water System," and SD-CX-102 "Rod Worth Minimizer."

c. Deficiency Status

The licensee is currently listing 1996 Station Operations deficiencies and 4329 Station Construction deficiencies as outstanding items. The licensee is still attempting to segregate these deficiencies into those that will impact fuel load and those that will not. The licensee has reviewed approximately 2880 of these deficiencies for segregation and preliminary assessment is that 1090 of those reviewed would need to be cleared prior to fuel load. The inspector will continue to review this matter.

No items of noncompliance were identified in this area.

12. Plant Walkthrough/Operational Status Review

The inspector conducted walkthroughs and reviewed the plant operations status including examinations of control room log books, routine patrol sheets, shift engineers log books, equipment outage logs, special operating orders, and jumper tagout logs for the period of October 21, 1980 through November 26, 1980. The inspector observed the operations status during three off shifts during the same period as above. The inspector also made visual observations of the routine surveillance, functional, and preoperational tests in progress during this period. This review was conducted to verify that facility operations were in conformance with the requirements established under 10 CFR and administrative procedures. The inspector conducted tours of Units 1 and 2 reactor, auxiliary, and turbine buildings throughout the period and noted the status of construction and plant housekeeping/cleanliness. With respect to housekeeping/cleanliness, conditions appear to be adequate. The inspector observed that fire hazards were being

minimized. The inspector observed shift turnovers to verify that plant component status and problems areas were being turned over to a relieving shift.

No items of noncompliance were identified in this area.

13. 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 this inspection is discussed in paragraph 6.c.

14. Management Interview

The inspector met with licensee representatives (denoted in Paragraph 1) at the conclusion of the inspection period. The inspector summarized the scope and findings of the inspection activities.