

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION III

Reports No. 50-440/83-38(DPRP); 50-441/83-36(DPRP)

Docket Nos. 50-440; 50-441

Licenses No. CPPR-148; CPPR-149

Licensee: Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company
Post Office Box 5000
Cleveland, OH 44101

Facility Name: Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2

Inspection At: Perry Site, Perry, OH

Inspection Conducted: November 1 through December 31, 1983

Inspector: M. L. Gildner

RC Knopf

1/25/84

Approved By: J. E. Konklin, Chief
Reactor Projects Section 1A

RC Knopf

1/25/84

Inspection Summary

Inspection on November 1 through December 31, 1983 (Reports No. 50-440/83-38 (DPRP); 50-441/83-36(DPRP))

Areas Inspected: Routine inspection by the Resident Inspector of safety-related construction activities including observation of plant housekeeping practices, equipment maintenance, followup on previous inspection findings, followup on 10 CFR 50.55(e) items, review of progress on INPO Self-Evaluation items, and evaluation of the effectiveness of inclement weather procedures. The inspection involved a total of 109 inspector-hours onsite by one NRC inspector and includes 23 inspector-hours during off-shifts. The inspector also examined concerns reported by allegers which involved 37 additional inspector-hours including 6 inspector-hours during off-shifts.

Results: No items of noncompliance were identified in the areas inspected.

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

C. M. Shuster, Manager, Nuclear Quality Assurance Department
*E. Riley, General Supervising Engineer, Construction Quality Section
M. Kritzer, Civil/Structural Unit Supervisor, Construction Quality Section
V. K. Higaki, Electrical Unit Supervisor, Construction Quality Section
*K. Kaplan, Senior Engineering Technician, Training and Administration Section

The inspector also contacted and interviewed other licensee and contractor personnel during this inspection.

*Denotes those attending one or more of the exit meetings.

2. Licensee Action on Previously Identified Items

(Closed) Unresolved Item (440/81-16-04; 441/81-16-04): Gould Pumps Seismic Analysis Reports. Certain inconsistencies had been found in documentation relating to the installation of the Emergency Service Water pumps. These questions were resolved through meetings and correspondence between the vendor and the licensee.

The resident has reviewed this correspondence and the installation of the subject pumps, where accessible. The installation appears to be in accordance with the above correspondence. This item is closed.

(Open) Unresolved Item (440/83-34-01; 441/83-33-01): Equipment Maintenance. The efforts devoted to equipment maintenance on equipment turned over to the Nuclear Test Section have increased. The problems previously noted were corrected but additional examples have been identified. This aspect of the testing program will require continual attention as equipment is being phased in and out of testing. This item remains open for further observation.

3. Licensee Actions on 10 CFR 50.55(e) Items

(Closed) 10 CFR 50.55(e) Report "Seismic Clearance - Gould Pumps" (440/81-20; 441/81-20) (DAR-078). The installation drawings for the deep draft Gould Pumps in the Emergency Service Water System were unclear regarding the clearance tolerance between the pump column and the seismic support. The seismic analysis had assumed a nominal clearance which the actual installed clearance should not exceed in order to take credit for the seismic analysis in equipment qualification. The Gould Seismic analysis assumed a maximum gap of 3/16". The installation drawings were revised to indicate 3/16" +0-3/16" gap and the installations inspected to assure the maximum gap did not exceed 3/16". With the resolution of this concern, the licensee determined that this matter was not reportable per 10 CFR 50.55(e).

The resident inspected the installation of the subject Gould pumps and reviewed the installation records to verify measured seismic support gaps. This item is considered closed.

4. Review and Followup of Utility Self Evaluation

The licensee conducted a Self-Initiated Evaluation following guidelines of the Institute of Nuclear Power Operations in October 1982. The resident sat in on the inspection exit meeting and later reviewed the total report when it became available. Where the Self-Evaluation and the NRC inspection program examined the same areas, all the findings had been identified previously by the NRC or the licensee's own audit program. A review of the balance of the findings by the resident inspector yielded no areas which constituted a potentially significant safety problem or problem which should have been reported under 10 CFR 50.55(e). The inspector has periodically followed the progress on the corrective actions committed to in the report. At present, all corrective actions are complete except two organizational administrative tasks which are scheduled for completion in the first quarter of 1984.

5. Inclement Weather Effects

The resident inspector has looked at the effects of the recent winter weather on plant systems. Inclement winter weather has caused many plant problems at operating sites across the nation. The resident examined the cause of a reported event at another plant, then looked at similar situations at Perry and what actions were being taken to prevent such an occurrence. The areas that appear to be most vulnerable are small diameter instrument sensing lines that pass through loading dock or trackway areas; fire suppression wet pipe systems with sprinkler heads in exposed areas; and equipment in pump houses located remote from the main plant building with only a few control room alarms or infrequent personnel traffic through them.

The Perry site is addressing these concerns by means of heat tracing on some exposed lines and by administrative controls on other areas subject to possible freezing conditions. The effectiveness of these measures will continue to be monitored by the resident inspector.

6. Concerns on Quality Control Inspector Qualifications

On September 10, 1983, an allegor notified USNRC Headquarters and Region III of some concerns with certain Quality Control Inspectors at Perry. The allegor stated, in part, that two electrical inspectors were hired "off-the-streets" and were unqualified. The resident reviewed the qualifications of the two inspectors and found their records to be complete. The inspectors were in fact local hires with a background in quality control at an area production facility. They received the contractor's QC training program and passed the required testing to be certified as Level II inspectors. Their work has not indicated that they are unqualified for the areas of certification.

The other concern regarding theft of construction material has been turned over to the licensee for his investigation and disposition.

No items of noncompliance were identified in this area.

7. Concerns About Coating Activities

On April 21, 1983, Region III offices received a phone call from an individual who had been laid off by the coatings contractor at the Perry site. This person expressed concerns about some problems encountered with coatings and the qualifications of the painters applying the coatings. The resident reviewed NRC documentation of problems in the reported areas and in similar areas found by the resident. The nonconformances noted did not indicate personnel errors nor improper coating mixes. The corrective actions were to alter the surface preparation and the curing process for those areas which have been reworked. Effective results were achieved.

Draft training records and inspection personnel qualification records in this area were reviewed by the inspector.

No items of noncompliance were identified in this area.

8. Concerns About Worker Intoxication

On October 3, 1983, NRC Headquarters received an anonymous call expressing concerns about the drinking of beer on the several commuter buses bringing workers to the Perry job site. This was brought to the attention of the licensee who took the following actions: (1) Posted signs on property boundary prohibiting alcoholic beverages on site property, (2) imposed greater discretion on the guard force to determine whether personnel are intoxicated on the site, and 3) stricter enforcement of the penalties for coming to work intoxicated. The owner has also tightened the work rules, which will strictly controll access of the work force and ensure that employees are in a safe condition to work.

9. Plant Tours and Housekeeping

The inspector made numerous tours of the site, noting work progress and general housekeeping. Overall housekeeping is improving and is expected to continue improving as tightened work rules come into affect.

10. Exit Interviews

The inspector, singularly or in conjunction with region based inspectors, met with persons noted in Paragraph 1 on November 2, 18, December 2, and 22, 1983, to discuss the scope and results of the inspection.