

## UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

#### **REGION II** 101 MARIETTA ST., N.W., SUITE 3100 ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30363

Report Nos. 50-400/82-22 and 50-401/82-22

Licensee: Carolina Power and Light Company

411 Fayetteville Street

Raleigh, NC 27602

Facility Name: Shearon Harris Units 1 and 2

Docket Nos. 50-400 and 50-401

License Nos. CPPR-158 and CPPR-159

Inspection at Shearon Harris site\_near Raleigh, NC

Inspector: U

7-28-82

Date Signed

7-23-82

Approved by: 4

Engineering Inspection Blanch

Division of Engineering and Technical Programs

Date Signed

SUMMARY

Inspection on July 13-15, 1982

Areas Inspected

This routine, unannounced inspection involved 20 inspector-hours on site in the areas of safety-related pipe supports and restraint systems, soils laboratory, and QC procedure for inspection of masonry walls.

Results

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

### REPORT DETAILS

## 1. Persons Contacted

Licensee Employees

\*R. M. Parsons, Project General Manager,

\*A. M. Lucas, Senior Resident Engineer

\*G. L. Forehand, Site Director - QA/QC

\*G. M. Simpson, Principal Construction Specialist

W. Pridgen, Civil Engineer

D. C. Whitehead, QA Supervisor

J. F. Nevill, Senior Civil Engineer, Nuclear Engineering Department

E. M. Harris, Senior Mechanical Engineer, Nuclear Engineering Department

Other licensee employees contacted included three civil construction inspectors and two field engineers.

Other Organizations

\*W. D. Goodman, Project Manager, Daniel Construction Company

NRC Resident Inspector

\*G. F. Maxwell

\*Attended exit interview

#### 2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on July 15, 1982, with those persons indicated in paragraph 1 above. The licensee acknowledged the inspection findings.

3. Licensee Action on Previous Inspection Findings

Not inspected.

4. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items were not identified during this inspection.

5. Independent Juspection Effort

The inspector examined the following areas:

- a. Soils laboratory and currentness of calibration of laboratory equipment
- b. CP&L Procedure TP-44, Inspection of Concrete Masonry Walls

c. Results of inspection and tension testing of drilled in concrete expansion anchors for seismic electrical boxes in the auxiliary building - expansion anchor units 1AC-261-001, 1AC-286-002, and 1RA-190-001.

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

- Safety Related Pipe Supports and Restraint Systems (Module 50090 B) -Unit 1
  - a. The inspector reviewed the following procedures which control installation and inspection of pipe supports and restraints.
    - (1) EBASCO Specification CAR-SH-CH-19, Drilled in Expansion Type Anchors, Seismic Category I
    - (2) CP&L Technical Procedure 34, Inspection of the Installation of Safety Related (Seismic Class I) Pipe Hangers
    - (3) CP&L Work Procedure 39, Inspection of Drilled in Expansion Anchors
    - (4) CP&L Work Procedure 33, Installation of Wedge Expansion Bolt Anchors
    - (5) CP&L Work Procedure 110, Installation of Safety Related (Seismic Class I) Pipe Hangers
    - (6) Drawing Number CAR 2168-G-6091, Standard Details Steel Structural Tolerances
    - (7) Drawing Number CAR 2165-G-107S01, Field Installation Tolerances for Hangers

Acceptance criteria examined by the inspector appear in Appendix 1B of the PSAR.

- b. The inspector reviewed the following procedures which control the design review of as-built conditions for location and geometry of supports and restraints:
  - (1) EBASCO Manual of Procedures
  - (2) CP&L Nuclear Plant Engineering Department Procedure numbers listed in the table below.

# TABLE

Procedure Number	Title
3.1	Design Control
3.2	Design Change Control
3.3	Design Verification
3.4	Review of Externally Generated Design Documents
3.7	Preparation and Control of Interface Documents

Acceptance criteria examined by the inspector appear in PSAR Section 1.8 and Section 3 of the CP&L Corporate QA Program.

c. The inspector examined support number A-3-216-2 PD-H-3715 and observed a licensee construction inspector and a field engineer perform an inspection of this hanger to verify that the geometry and location of the support were in accordance with the design drawings. The inspector discussed the inspector requirements with the construction inspector and the field engineer.

Acceptance criteria examined by the inspector are those procedures listed in paragraph 6.a above.

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