



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION II
101 MARIETTA STREET, N.W.
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

Report Nos. 50-335/82-24 and 50-389/82-30

Licensee: Florida Power and Light Company
9250 West Flagler Street
Miami, FL 33103

Facility Name: St. Lucie

Docket Nos. 50-335 and 50-389

License Nos. DPR-67 and CPPR-144

Inspection at St. Lucie site near Ft. Pierce, Florida

Inspector:

J. J. Kenahan
J. J. Kenahan

7/21/82
Date Signed

Approved by:

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

7-21-82
Date Signed

SUMMARY

Inspection on June 28 - July 1, 1982

Areas Inspected

This routine, unannounced inspection involved 22 inspector-hours on site in the areas of licensee action on previous inspection findings, training and qualifications of contractor supplied temporary QC inspectors, and quality records relating to foundations.

Results

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

REPORT DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Licensee Employees

- *C. M. Wethy, Unit 1 Plant Manager
- *B. J. Escue, Unit 2 Site Manager
- *T. M. Lyons, QC Inspector, Unit 1
- *A. W. Baily, QA Operations Supervisor
- *R. A. Symes, Supervisory QA Engineer, Unit 2
- *R. D. Parks, Unit 1 Backfit Project Manager
- J. Krumins, Unit 1 Backfit Project Engineer
- *C. T. Hamilton, Unit 1 Backfit QC Supervisor
- K. Van Oeveren, Supervisor QA Vendor Surveillance (Telephone Conversator)
- W. Brannan, Civil Engineer, Power Plant Engineer (Telephone Conversator)

Other Organizations

- *V. J. Gerley, ESSE Civil Engineer, EBASCO
- C. Belcher, Field Engineer, EBASCO
- *G. Krauss, ESSE Project Engineer, EBASCO
- P. Braswell, Unit 1 QC Supervisor, U. S. Testing
- H. Aberback, Project Manager, U. S. Testing

NRC Resident Inspector

- *S. A. Elrod
- H. E. Bibb

*Attended exit interview

2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on July 1, 1982, with those persons indicated in paragraph 1 above. The licensee was informed of the inspection findings listed below. The licensee acknowledged the inspection findings with no dissenting comments. The licensee agreed to provide NRC Region II with a supplemental response to a previously identified violation as discussed in paragraph 3 by July 22, 1982.

Unresolved Item 335/82-24-01, Training and Examination of Contractor Supplied QC inspectors.

Inspector Followup Item 389/82-30-01, Category I structure survey settlement results.

3. Licensee Action on Previous Inspection Findings

(Open) Violation (335/82-01-01): Inadequate Inspection of Masonry Wall Modifications. The inspector reviewed the licensee's response to this item dated May 6, 1982. This violation involved four examples of failure to adequately inspect masonry wall modification in accordance with QC instructions and procedures. The licensee disagreed, in part, with example number 4 of the violation which involved installation of incorrect size of anchor bolts on one side of wall 82 in the auxiliary building. Further review by the licensee disclosed that 3/4 inch diameter expansion anchors were required to be installed on only one side of wall 82, and not on both sides as stated in the violation (Example 4). The inspector reviewed a memo from EBASCO to Unit 1 Backfit QC dated April 27, 1982, which stated that the 3/4 inch anchor bolts were required on only one side of wall 82. This item was not clear on the original construction drawing. The inspector concurs with the licensee that this part of example 4 of the violation was incorrect. The remaining portion of example 4 of the violation involved torque testing the 3/4 inch expansion anchors to an incorrect torque value (75 ft-lbs versus the required value of 200 ft-lbs). The licensee reinspected the 3/4 inch expansion anchors on wall 82 and verified that they had been torqued to 200 ft-lbs. The inspector reviewed licensee inspection report number 6138-086 which documented this reinspection effort. The discrepancies noted by the inspector as example 1, 2 and 3 of the violation have been corrected and documented on nonconformance reports and inspection reports. These reports were reviewed by the inspector. The licensee's corrective action to avoid further violations of this type was to reinstruct the Q.C. inspectors in accordance with inspection requirements. The inspector discussed the reinstruction program with licensee and contractor QC supervisors. The QC Supervisors were not able to provide the inspector with specific information concerning the reinstruction of the QC inspectors. The inspector reviewed the training records of the QC inspectors permanently assigned to backfit at the time the violation was identified. The reinstruction of the inspectors was not documented in their records. Since the inspector was unable to verify the licensee's corrective action, he requested that the licensee provide a supplemental response to NRC Region II clarifying the information provided in the May 6, 1982 response to the Notice of Violation concerning reinstruction of QC inspectors. The licensee agreed to provide the supplemental response by July 22, 1982. This item remains open.

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 5.

5. Independent Inspection Effort

The inspector reviewed Quality Instruction (QI) 2.1, Certification of Plant Construction QC Personnel, and Quality Instruction (QI) 2.4, Training of Construction QC Personnel. These procedures specify the requirements for training and certification of QC personnel who inspect the backfit construction work performed on Unit 1. The inspector discussed the applicability of the procedure requirements to contractor supplied temporary QC inspectors with the Unit 1 QC supervisor. These temporary inspectors normally work at the site only during outages and may or may not have been previously employed by the contractor (U. S. Testing Company). These discussions disclosed that the contractor performs a review of the temporary inspectors' prior employment and education records and provides the licensee with documentation of their qualification per the requirements of QI 2.1. The licensee provides site orientation training for the temporary inspector to familiarize them with FP&L QA and administrative requirements. Per the requirements of QI 2.1 and QI 2.4, the temporary inspectors are only required to review the site QC inspection procedures and sign a document attesting to the fact that they read them. The inspector noted that, with the exception of NDE inspectors, procedures QI 2.1 and 2.4 do not require temporary inspectors to be tested by the licensee or contractor to verify that the inspectors are cognizant of the inspection requirements and are capable of performing the inspections they are required to perform. This appears to be in conflict with the requirements of Criterion II of 10CFR50, Appendix B which requires the licensee's QA program to provide assurance that suitable proficiency is achieved by personnel in performing activities affecting quality. This was identified to the licensee as Unresolved Item 335/82-24-01, Training and examination contractor supplied of QC inspectors, pending further review by NRC.

In the areas inspected, no violation or deviations were identified.

6. Foundations - Review of Quality Records - Unit 2 (Module 46055B)

The inspector reviewed monthly settlement records for the period January 1981 to date for the reactor containment building, the auxiliary building, and the intake structure. Acceptance criteria examined by the inspector appear in FSAR Section 2.5.4.10.2 and the licensee's response to FSAR question 241.8.

The settlement survey data indicates that the auxiliary building and the containment building had settled approximately $\frac{1}{2}$ inch in the first nine months of 1981. The inspector reviewed the field survey notes. Review of the field survey notes disclosed that the indicated settlements may be due to survey errors. The inspector discussed the problem with EBASCO and responsible licensee engineers who indicated that a detailed review would be made of the settlement data. The inspector will re-examine the settlement data in a future inspection. This was identified to the licensee as Inspector Follow-up Item 389/82-30-01, Category I structure survey settlement results.

In the areas inspected, no violations or deviations were identified.