



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

Report Nos. 50-369/82-34 and 50-370/82-29

Licensee: Duke Power Company
422 South Church Street
Charlotte, NC 28242

Facility Name: McGuire 1 and 2

Docket Nos. 50-369, 50-370

License Nos. NPF-9, CPPR 84

Inspection at McGuire site near Charlotte, N. C.

Inspector: P. H. Skinner
P. H. Skinner

Oct. 18, 1982
Date Signed

Approved by: FOR R. W. Wright
C. M. Upright, Section Chief
Engineering Inspection Branch
Division of Engineering and Technical Programs

October 19, 1982
Date Signed

SUMMARY

Inspection on September 27 - October 1, 1982

Areas Inspected

This routine, unannounced inspection involved 32 inspector-hours on site and at the corporate offices in the areas of audit program implementation, maintenance program, general employee training, licensed operator requalification training, and licensee action on previously identified inspection findings.

Results

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

REPORT DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Licensee Employees

- D. Dycus, Area Coordinator, System Maintenance Support
- J. Effinger, Senior QA Specialist
- **J. Frye, Senior QA Supervisor-Audits
- *D. Harrington, Training and Safety Coordinator
- T. Parker, Training Supervisor
- D. Rains, Superintendent of Maintenance
- *M. McIntosh, Station Manager
- *M. Sample, Project Licensing Engineer
- J. Wolfmeyer, Senior Instructor

NRC Staff

- *P. Hopkins, NRC Resident Inspector
- *J. Bryant, Chief, Reactor Projects Section 2A

*Attended exit interview on September 30, 1982

**Attended exit interview on October 1, 1982

2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on September 30, 1982, with those persons indicated in paragraph 1 above for the site portion of the inspection and with J. Frye for the corporate office portion of the inspection on October 1, 1982. The licensee acknowledged the inspection findings. The following new issues were discussed:

Audited organizations are submitting responses to audit findings in excess of specified response time, paragraph 5.

Documentation does not indicate that licensed personnel are provided update information on activities that may affect operating practices or plant safety, paragraph 8.

3. Licensee Action on Previous Enforcement Matters

Not inspected.

4. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items were not identified during this inspection.

5. Audit Implementation (40704)

- References:
- (a) Duke Power Company Quality Assurance Program, Duke-1-A, Amendment 5 (Accepted QA Program), Section 17.2.18, Audits
 - (b) ANSI N 45-2.12-1977, Requirements for Auditing of Quality Assurance Programs for Nuclear Power Plants
 - (c) QA 160, Performance of Corporate Quality Assurance Audits, Revision 0

The inspector reviewed reference (c) and verified that it met the requirements of reference (a) and reference (b) as endorsed by the accepted QA Program. The inspector reviewed the following aspects of the audit program:

The content of audit reports clearly define the scope and results of the audit.

Audits were conducted by trained personnel not having direct responsibility in areas being audited.

Frequency of audits was in conformance with Technical Specifications and the QA program.

Appropriate followup actions (including reaudit, if necessary) had been taken, were in progress, or were being initiated.

The audited organization's response to audit findings was in writing, was timely, and adequately addressed findings and recommendations.

The inspector reviewed the results of two audits conducted during 1982 (SP-82-6(MC), and SP-82-1 (MC)), and reviewed the qualifications of two auditors.

Based on this review, one inspector followup item was identified. Section 4.5.1 of reference (b) requires that management of an audited organization or activity review and investigate any adverse audit findings to determine and schedule appropriate corrective action including action to prevent recurrence and shall respond as requested by the audit report. The audits reviewed indicated that a response was to be provided in 30 days. The audited organization has not responded to all findings of the above audits in the specified time. This item was discussed with the Senior Quality Assurance Supervisor-Audit Division. The Senior QA Supervisor stated this item has been identified to the Corporate QA Manager who is discussing action to correct this problem with corporate vice-presidents. In addition, a memo was drafted to the project licensing group on September 27, 1982, discussing this same subject. This item will be tracked as an inspector followup item (369/82-34-01, 370/82-29-01) pending subsequent review of this area.

6. Maintenance Program (62702)

- References: (a) Administrative Policy Manual (APM)
Section 3.3, Maintenance, Revision 20
- (b) APM Section 4.7, Administrative Instruction for Work Request, Revision 20
 - (c) Station Directive 4.7, Control of the Maintenance Program, Revision 1
 - (d) Maintenance Management Procedure 1.0, Definition of the Work Request, Revision 3
 - (e) Maintenance Management Procedure 1.1, Priority 1 Work Request-Emergency, Revision 2
 - (f) Maintenance Management Procedure 1.2, Priority 2 Work Request - Rush, Revision 2
 - (g) Maintenance Management Procedure 1.3, Priority 3 and 4 Work Request-Normal, Revision 2

The inspector reviewed the maintenance program in accordance with references 6(a) through 6(g). The following criteria were used during the review:

Written procedures were established for initiating requests for routine and emergency maintenance.

Criteria and responsibilities for review and approval of maintenance requests were established.

Criteria and responsibilities that form the basis for designating the activity as safety-related were established.

Provisions and responsibilities were established for identification of appropriate inspection hold points related to maintenance activities.

Methods and responsibilities were designated for performing functional testing of structures, systems, or components following maintenance work and/or prior to their being returned to service.

A written preventive maintenance program for safety-related structures, systems, and components has been established.

Administrative controls for special processes have been established.

Method and responsibilities for equipment control have been defined.

A corrective maintenance program has been established that includes written procedures, responsibilities for review and approval of work requests, inspection of work, hold point implementation, and administrative controls.

Based on this review, no violations or deviations were identified.

7. Training (41700)

References: (a) Technical Specification, Section 6.4, Training

(b) FSAR, Section 13.2, Conduct of Operations

(c) APM 2.5, Qualifications and Training of Personnel, Revision 20

(d) Station Directive 2.5, Qualifications and Training of Personnel, Revision 5

(e) Station Directive 2.7.1, Control of Non assigned Individuals and Organizations Performing Work or Directing Activities In the Station, Revision 4

The inspector reviewed the training and retraining program as identified in references (a) - (e) for all non-licensed personnel and general employee training for all employees to verify the following aspects of the program:

The program complies with regulatory requirements and licensee commitments.

The program covers training in the areas of administrative controls and procedures, radiological health and safety, industrial safety, security procedures, the emergency plan, quality assurance, firefighting, and prenatal radiation exposure.

Surveillances conducted by the licensee in the areas of general employee training and documentation that training records were adequate.

The inspector reviewed approximately 200 training records of unit operating personnel and contract personnel.

Based on this review, no violations or deviations were identified.

8. Requalification Training (41701)

References: (a) Technical Specification, Section 6.4, Training

- (b) Final Safety Analysis Report, Section 13.2, Conduct of Operations
- (c) 10 CFR 55, Appendix A, Requalification Programs for Licensed Operators of Production and Utilization Facilities
- (d) Station Directive 3.1.38, Operational Review Program Licensed Personnel Requalification, dated 12/7/81
- (e) Duke Power Company McGuire Nuclear Station Requalification Program for NRC Licensed Personnel dated July 2, 1982

The inspector reviewed the requalification program to determine conformance to references (a) through (e). The inspector reviewed the following areas: re-training conducted in 1981 and to date in 1982; annual written examinations and the individual's responses; documentation of required control manipulations; schedule for conducting lectures and prepared lesson plans; and participation in an accelerated training program when applicable. The training records of six licensed operators were reviewed.

Based on this review, one inspector followup item was identified. Reference (e), Section 7.6.1 requires that all licensed personnel shall be updated on important information that may affect operating practices or plant safety. The documentation (Requal Review Record) used to accomplish this effort indicates that all licensed personnel do not receive this information. Discussions with operations personnel indicate that this material is reviewed but personnel fail to sign the required documentation. This problem area was also identified by DPC QA audit SP-82-16(MC) conducted on 9/14/82. This item will be tracked as an inspector followup item (369/82-34-02, 370/82-29-02) pending review of the corrective action of the audit finding during a subsequent inspection.

9. Licensee Action on Previously Identified Inspection Findings (92701)

(Open) Inspector Followup Item (369/81-17-15, 370/81-05-15): Simulator Inaccurate Reflection of Heat Transfer, Fluid Flow and Thermodynamic Considerations. Duke Power Company is negotiating for a rewrite of the program for the pressurizer and reactor vessel models to accurately reflect these requirements. There will be no estimate of completion of this item until a contract is approved.