



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

Report No. 50-261/82-36

Licensee: Carolina Power and Light Company
411 Fayetteville Street
Raleigh, NC 27602

Facility Name: H. B. Robinson Nuclear Plant

Docket No. 50-261

License No. DPR-23

Inspection at Robinson site near Hartsville, SC

Inspector: J. J. Lenahan *J. J. Lenahan* for 10/20/82
J. J. Lenahan Date Signed

Approved by: T. E. Conlon *T. E. Conlon* 10/20/82
T. E. Conlon, Section Chief Date Signed
Engineering Inspection Branch
Division of Engineering and Technical Programs

SUMMARY

Inspection on September 23-24, 1982

Areas Inspected

This routine, unannounced inspection involved seven inspector-hours on site in the areas of IE Bulletin 80-11 and licensee actions on previous inspection findings.

Results

In the two areas inspected, one violation was found in one area (Deficiencies in IE Bulletin 80-11 Program - paragraph 3). No deviations were identified.

REPORT DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Licensee Employees

- *J. M. Curley, Manager of Technical Services
- W. Farmer, Mechanical Engineer
- *M. Page, Engineering Supervisor
- *R. B. Starkey, Plant General Manager
- *C. Wright, Specialist, Regulatory Compliance

NRC Resident Inspector

- *S. Weise

*Attended exit interview

2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on September 24, 1982, with those persons indicated in paragraph 1 above. The licensee was informed of the inspection finding listed below. The licensee acknowledged the inspection finding with no dissenting comments.

Violation 261/82-36-01, Deficiencies in the IE Bulletin 80-11 Program.

3. Licensee Action on Previous Enforcement Matters

(Closed) Unresolved Item (261/82-18-01), IEB 80-11 Program. During the inspection (inspection number 82-18, May 4-6, 1982) when this unresolved item was identified, the inspector identified three concerns which indicated the program implemented at the site to address IEB 80-11 may have been inadequate. These three concerns and their resolution are addressed below.

- a. During the inspection of the modification to wall 3.b in the auxiliary building, the inspector noted that a lower horizontal steel member (a 6-inch channel) appeared to have been installed approximately eight inches lower than shown on the design sketches. The inspector discussed this problem with licensee engineers and reviewed the design drawing (sketch number CAR 2762 - SK 404). These discussions and the drawing review disclosed that the dimensions shown on the design drawing were approximate and that it was permissible to move the lower horizontal member to suit field conditions. Therefore, this concern was resolved.
- b. During the review of the structural design and analysis report, it appeared that the designer, EBASCO, did not consider numerous penetrations in wall 4 in their design evaluation of this wall.

Further discussions with licensee engineers during this inspection disclosed that these penetrations were considered in the design evaluation. Therefore, this concern was resolved.

- c. During inspection 82-18, the inspector identified a group of masonry walls in the control room complex which apparently had not been identified by licensee engineers during preparation of their IEB No. 80-11 response. Subsequent to inspection 82-18, the licensee determined that safety-related equipment was located in the proximity of one of these walls. As a result of this problem, the licensee made a detailed review of other areas in the plant. During this review, the licensee identified some additional walls, including plugs consisting of stacks of masonry bricks in reinforced concrete walls used for piping penetrations, radiation shields, missing barriers, etc., that had not been previously identified and evaluated under the IEB No. 80-11 program. The inspector discussed the method used by plant personnel to resolve IEB No. 80-11. These discussions disclosed that the bulletin response was prepared by an offsite engineering group in accordance with a Task Assistance Request (TAR). The inspector reviewed the TAR and concluded that the instructions in the TAR were not of a type appropriate to assure that all masonry walls in the proximity of safety-related equipment would be identified and evaluated in accordance with IEB No. 80-11 requirements. The lack of appropriate instructions to accomplish the IEB No. 80-11 requirements was identified to the licensee as a violation.

Unresolved Item 261/82-18-01 is closed and upgraded to violation item 261/82-36-01, Deficiencies in IE Bulletin 80-11 Program.

4. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items were not identified during this inspection.

5. Open IE Bulletin 80-11, Masonry Wall Design

a. Summary of Licensee's Responses to IE Bulletin 80-11

Carolina Power and Light Company (CP&L) submitted its 60-day IE Bulletin 80-11 response to NRC Region II for Robinson Unit 2 in a letter dated July 7, 1980. CP&L submitted its 180-day IEB 80-11 response to NRC Region II in a letter dated November 5, 1980.

CP&L submitted a supplemental IEB No. 80-11 response to NRC Region II in a letter dated August 11, 1982. This supplemental response was prepared as a result of the licensee's actions to resolve unresolved item 261/82-18-01 which is discussed in paragraph 3 above. This supplemental response supercedes the previously submitted 60- and 180-day responses and provides an updated response to IEB No. 80-11.

b. Inspection of Masonry Wall Modification Program

As a result of unresolved item 261/82-18-01, discussed in paragraph 3. above, the licensee's detailed review of other areas of safety-related structures in the plant disclosed that additional walls were located in the proximity of safety-related equipment. Due to a lack of data verifying the quality of wall construction, the licensee elected to modify the walls by use of external steel supports in order to assure that the walls meet seismic design requirements. The inspector examined modification numbers 667 and 671, and design sketch showing the block wall support details for wall number 8 - the wall in the control room, and wall number 15 - a masonry plug in the north wall of the auxiliary building. The inspector examined wall numbers 8 and 15 and compared the completed modifications with the details shown in the design sketches. Based on this review, the inspector concluded that the wall modifications were completed in accordance with the design requirements.

IE Bulletin 80-11 remains open pending completion of review of the licensee's supplemental response by the NRC Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation Structural Engineering Branch.

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