



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

Report Nos. 50-424/82-03 and 50-425/82-03

Licensee: Georgia Power Company
P. O. Box 4545
Atlanta, GA 30302

Facility Name: Vogtle

Docket Nos. 50-424 and 50-425

License No. CPPR-108 and CPPR-109

Inspection at Vogtle site near Waynesboro, GA

Inspector: J. R. Harris

3/4/82
Date Signed

Approved by: T. E. Conlon
T. E. Conlon, Section Chief
Engineering Inspection Branch
Division of Engineering and Technical Programs

3-4-82
Date Signed

SUMMARY

Inspection on February 9-12, 1982

Areas Inspected

This routine, unannounced inspection involved 28 inspector-hours on site in the areas of structural concrete, foundations and previous inspection findings.

Results

Of the three areas inspected, no violations or deviations were identified.

REPORT DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Licensee Employees

H. H. Gregory, III, Project Manager
*R. R. Allen, Assistant Construction Project Manager
*R. W. McManus, Manager of Quality Control
*J. E. Seagraves, Civil QC Supervisor
*E. D. Groover, QA Site Supervisor
*B. C. Harbin, Civil QC Section Supervisor
*M. H. Googe, Manager of Field Operations
*R. E. Folker, QA Engineer
W. E. Kent, Civil QC Technician
B. Fairley, Level III Soils Inspector
L. Hatcher, Soils and Concrete Lab. Supervisor

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

Other Organizations

*F. R. McCarty, Project Manager, Walsh Construction
*G. Ryan, QA/QC Coordinator, Walsh Construction

NRC Resident Inspector

*W. E. Sanders

*Attended exit interview

2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on February 12, 1982, with those persons indicated in paragraph 1 above.

3. Licensee Action on Previous Inspection Findings

(Open) Unresolved Item (424/81-09-02 and 425/81-09-02) Training Requirements of Contractor Furnished Civil QC Inspectors. The inspector examined contract furnished civil QC inspector training and qualification requirements identified in the contractor's QA program and licensee audit numbers TR01-81/62, Training Audit and Q C01-81/76, Qualification of Inspection Examination and Testing Personnel for Nuclear Facilities. Examination of the above showed that contract furnished civil QC inspector training and qualification requirements are in accordance with licensee commitments. However, this item remains open pending further examination by the NRC of contract furnished civil QC inspectors training and qualification records.

4. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items are matters about which more information is required to determine whether they are acceptable or may involve violations or deviations. New unresolved items identified during this inspection are discussed in paragraph 7.

5. Independent Inspection Effort

The inspector examined the following:

- a. Soils and concrete laboratory and currentness of calibration of laboratory equipment.
- b. Concrete batch plant.
- c. Results of concrete placements in the auxiliary and Unit one containment building.
- d. Installation of reinforcing steel in the power block.
- e. Drawing controls.
- f. Stop Work Notice numbers C-25 and C-35.

Observations indicated the above activities were being controlled in accordance with the licensees QA program.

No violations or deviations were identified.

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

The inspector observed partial placement of pour numbers A-11A-043 and 1-010-008. Acceptance criteria examined by the inspector appears in the following documents:

- a. Specification X21P01, Forming, Placing, Finishing, and Curing Concrete
- b. Procedure CD-T-02, Concrete Quality Control
- c. PSAR, Sections 3 and 17

Forms were tight and clean. Rebar was properly installed and clean. Preplacement inspection was indicated by the signed pre-inspection forms. Examination of the batch plant indicated proper mixes were being delivered to specified sites, materials were being controlled and that accurate batch plant records were being generated. Samples for temperature, slump, air content, unit weight and strength met frequency requirements. Post placement inspection showed required curing controls were being implemented.

No violations or deviations were identified.

7. Site Preparation and Foundations - Review of Quality Records, Unit 1 and Unit 2

The inspector examined compaction controls on backfill placed in the powerblock. Acceptance criteria examined by the inspector appears in the following documents:

- a. Section 2c of the PSAR
- b. Specification X2AB01, Site Preparation and Earthwork
- c. Procedure CD-T-01, Earthwork Quality Control

Records examined included the following documentation on backfill placement from August 1981 to February 1982.

- a. Fill failure and fill failure correction notices
- b. Proctor sheets
- c. Moisture density test data
- d. Wash sieve analysis
- e. Field density work sheet sand cone
- f. Moisture data
- g. Daily inspection reports

Examination of methods used in selection of representative proctors (compaction standards) disclosed the following unresolved item. Specification and procedure instructions allow the selected proctor to be the compaction standard for seven sand cone tests made in one day provided the sand cone dry densities are within 1.5 pounds of each other and the color and texture of the soil material are the same. The specified method to a large degree is dependent on the judgment and experience of the technician doing the proctor selection. The dry densities of the sand cone tests could be the same and the color of the material could be the same; but if the texture or grain size of the material varied significantly (a difficult variation to determine visually) the materials could have different compaction standards. Because difficulty in determining texture differences could result in the selection of the wrong proctor, the inspector requested the licensee to perform additional proctor tests on selected groups of sand cone tests (4 or more samples represented by a proctor) to verify that the judgement being used by soil technicians is adequate. Potential variation in proctor results was identified to the licensee as Unresolved item 50-424/82-03-01 and 50-425/82-03-01, Compaction Control.

No violations or deviations were identified.