

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION III

Reports No. 50-329/84-03(OSC); 50-330/84-03(OSC)

Docket Nos. 50-329; 50-330

Licenses No. CPPR-81; CPPR-82

Licensee: Consumers Power Company
1945 West Parnall Road
Jackson, MI 49201

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

Inspection At: Midland Site, Midland, MI

Inspection Conducted: January 1 through January 31, 1984

Inspectors: *R. N. Gardner*
R. N. Gardner

2/15/84
Date

R. B. Landsman
R. B. Landsman

2/15/84
Date

J. J. Hanis for
B. L. Burgess

02/15/84
Date

J. J. Hanis for
R. J. Cook

02/15/84
Date

Approved By: *J. J. Hanis*
J. J. Harrison, Chief
Section 2, Midland

02/15/84
Date

Inspection Summary

Inspection on January 1 through January 31, 1984 (Report No. 50-329/84-03(OSC); 50-330/84-03(OSC))

Areas Inspected: Licensee actions on previously identified items, lessons learned from Auxiliary Building underpinning, concrete crack surveys, remedial soils work activities, licensee's inspection evaluation program, allegations, snubber protection, document control stop work orders, alignment of vessel sample holders, and site tours. This inspection involved a total of 246 inspector-hours onsite by four NRC inspectors, including 36 inspector-hours during off-shifts.

8402290221 840215
PDR ADOCK 05000329
Q PDR

Results: Of the ten areas inspected, no items of noncompliance or deviations were identified in nine areas, one item of noncompliance was identified in the remaining area (snubber protection - Paragraph 8).

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Consumers Power Company (CPCo)

S. Howell, Executive Vice President
J. Cook, Vice President
R. Wells, MPQAD, Executive Manager
D. Quamme, Site Manager
J. Mooney, Executive Manager
B. Peck, Construction Superintendent
R. Wheeler, Technical Section Head
B. Ageter, Quality Advisor
L. Howell, Inspection Evaluation Group Supervisor

Bechtel Power Corporation

W. Henry, Vice President
M. Dietrich, PQAE
J. Rutgers, Project Manager

2. Licensee Actions on Previously Identified Items

- a. (Closed) Noncompliance Item (329/82-18-03; 330/82-18-02): The failure to construct the access shaft layback slope in accordance with design drawings. The licensee generated NCR No. M01-4-2-109 on this item. During this inspection the inspector reviewed the associated corrective actions for this NCR and concluded that appropriate measures have been affected by Consumers Power relative to this issue.
- b. (Closed) Noncompliance Item (329/82-18-02; 330/82-18-01): The failure to have adequate procedural requirements for dewatering well fines monitoring. The licensee generated SCNi2004 to Specification C-197 requiring the sampling petcocks to be located on a horizontal run of pipe below the center line. Since the original sampling points were located on vertical portions of pipe, the inspector also reviewed the effect that the wrong sampling point had on the previous fines monitoring data and determined it to be insignificant.
- c. (Closed) Open Item (329/82-20-01; 330/82-20-01): Concerns were identified with several aspects of the training program for remedial soils activities. These concerns were initially followed-up during the inspection documented in Report 82-26. During this inspection the inspector reviewed the actions taken by the licensee in resolving the one remaining concern on "tool box" meetings. The scope of meetings has been increased to include items peculiar and important to the remedial soils work. The inspector also reviewed Mergentime's "Craft Quality Training Program" records that document the "tool box" training sessions and found them acceptable.

- d. (Closed) Open Item (329/83-03-02; 330/83-03-02): The inspector during the ASLB hearing the week of February 14, 1983, determined that the scope of the excavation permit system did not cover all remedial soils work. The inspector reviewed "Excavation Permit System", FIC-5.100, Revision 4, Section 2.0, Scope, which currently requires this system to be used for all excavations onsite and found it to be acceptable.

3. Lessons Learned

The licensee during the performance of underpinning work beneath the Auxiliary Building identified numerous examples of problems and the subsequent resolution to those problems. The inspectors requested that the licensee document all such problems and resolutions so as to ensure that these problems were not repeated during the underpinning of the Service Water Pump Structure (SWPS). The licensee complied with this request by developing a document entitled, "Lessons Learned List for SWPS".

The inspectors reviewed the licensee's "Summarization of Lessons Learned List for Service Water Pump Structure". This list contains 36 items derived from the auxiliary building underpinning work. Of these 36 items, 6 were not applicable, 19 did apply and have been incorporated, an additional 11, although applicable, required further action to complete. The NRC concurs with this summarization and resolution of the items listed.

4. Concrete Crack Survey

During a tour of the main auxiliary building the inspectors observed a crack in the east outside foundation wall of the Laundry Drain Tank Room at elevation 568. Water appeared to be leaking through this crack for some time as the wall was highly stained below the crack. The licensee indicated that they will evaluate leaking areas and determine what corrective action is required, if any. The inspectors also requested that the licensee address the effect that the water has on the reinforcing steel in the wall. This item remains open pending their response (329/84-03-01; 330/84-03-01).

5. Remedial Soils Work Activities

The inspectors reviewed and authorized the following work activities during the report period:

- a. Piers E13 and W13.
- b. Piers CT1 and CT12.
- c. Crack Survey of Auxiliary Building roof slab.
- d. Piers KC4 and KC9.

- e. Piers E16 and W16.
- f. Piers E17 and W17.
- g. Saw concrete slab at El. 685 in Control Tower.
- h. Maintenance and monitoring of jacking loads.
- i. SWPS soil stabilization.
- j. Replacement of instrument cables for EX2 and EX3.
- k. Replacement of instrument cables for DMD5-E.

6. Meeting to Discuss the Licensee's Inspection Evaluation Program

On January 26, 1984, the inspectors met with Bill Ageter and Lee Howell of CPCo to discuss the licensee's inspection evaluation program. The purpose of the program is to establish the requirements, responsibilities, and methods for providing continuing assurance that documented inspection results are accurate and complete. The program applies to primary inspections performed by MPQAD Quality Control Division personnel in accordance with the Construction Completion Program (CCP). This program serves as a tool by which the licensee's QA department can evaluate the performance of QC inspectors during performance of the CCP. This function was previously performed by the MPQAD overinspection program.

7. Allegations

A review was performed of allegations concerning the Midland Plant as follows:

Allegation: Statements were overheard between NRC personnel and CPCo attorneys while in the lobby of the Midland County Courthouse during the October 15, 1981, ASLB hearings.

Review: This issue was reviewed by the Office of Inspector and Auditor (OIA) as documented in the January 30, 1984, memorandum from C. Messenger (OIA) to J. Harrison of the Office of Special Cases.

Conclusion: Based on the its review, OIA concluded: "...unable to find any evidence of misconduct..." Therefore, this issue is closed. (Closed 329/82#02-01; 330/82#02-01)

Allegation: Poorly trained, demoralized, family oriented, and uncommitted to duty contract security force.

Conclusion: Consumers Power Company has submitted its security plan to the NRC staff and the plan is currently being reviewed. Once the plan is reviewed and approved by the NRC, and put into effect by the utility, the NRC will conduct a thorough inspection to determine if the approved plan has been properly implemented. Any significant deficiencies must be corrected before an Operating License is issued. However, the NRC does not have specific requirements for security activities at a nuclear plant while it is under construction. Therefore, this issue is closed. (Closed 329/83#07-01; 330/83#07-01)

Allegation: Geotechnical drawing control concerns.

Review: An inspection was conducted on September 26-30, 1983, by members of the Region IV Division of Vendor and Technical Programs, to determine the adequacy of Geotechnical drawing controls. The inspection Findings are documented in RIV Inspection Report 99900501/83-03. The allegations concerning drawing control by the Geotechnical Services Group were substantiated but appear to relate only to nonsafety applications.

Conclusion: Based on the Region IV inspection report this issue is closed. (Closed 329/83#06-01; 330/83#06-01)

Allegation: There is no traceability for 7018 Lincoln electrode to the location of consumption.

Conclusion: Several attempts were made on nine separate days to contact the allegor so as to obtain sufficient information to pursue this issue. None of the attempts to contact the allegor were successful. Since the NRC has been unable to contact the allegor and obtain any specific information regarding this issue, the NRC does not intend to pursue this issue any further. (Closed 329/83#11-01; 330/83#11-01)

Allegation: Mistakes in Project Quality Control Instructions (PQCI's).

Conclusion: Several attempts were made on nine separate days to contact the allegor so as to obtain sufficient information to pursue this issue. None of the attempts to contact the allegor were successful. Since the NRC has been unable to contact the allegor and obtain any specific information regarding this issue, the NRC does not intend to pursue this issue any further. (Closed 329/83#11-02; 330/83#11-02)

8. Snubber Protection

On January 22 and January 23, 1984, the inspectors conducted an inspection of Unit 2 Containment south D ring and adjacent areas. The inspection was conducted to determine the effectiveness of the licensee's corrective action addressing a previous item of noncompliance identified in Inspection Report No. 50-329/83-05(OSC); 50-330/83-05(OSC). The inspectors noted four mechanical snubbers installed in Unit 2 Containment south D ring and adjacent areas which were not covered or protected from physical damage due to normal construction activities as required by Bechtel Specification 7220-M-326(Q), Rev. 12. The specification requires the use of heavy cloth, wooden, or other similar suitable protective covers to protect mechanical snubbers.

The licensee had implemented a maintenance program to inspect mechanical snubbers for the required protective covers. However, the number of mechanical snubbers found in the small area inspected indicated a need for more stringent corrective measures to assure the required protective covers are installed and maintained.

Failure to protect installed mechanical snubbers from physical damage during construction is considered an item of noncompliance with 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion V as delineated in the appendix of this report. This is a repeat item of noncompliance (330/84-03-02).

9. Document Control Stop Work Orders

During the reporting period, the licensee partially lifted some of the Stop Work Orders imposed because of irregularities encountered in the handling of Field Change Requests (FCRs) and Field Change Notices (FCNs). The original nine Stop Work Orders and their current status are as follows:

- a. FSW-33, Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning System Installation - not lifted
- b. FSW-34, MPQAD quality control piping hanger reinspections - not lifted
- c. FSW-35, Plant and System Testing - partially lifted
- d. FSW-36, Procurement Activities - partially lifted
- e. FSW-37, Nuclear Steam Supply System Installation (B&W work) - not lifted
- f. FSW-38, Remedial Soils Work - lifted 01/19/84
- g. FSW-39, Piping and Piping Support Fabrication (Standish) - not lifted
- h. FSW-40, Post System Turnover Activities - partially lifted
- i. FSW-41, Balance of Plant Activities (CCP) partially lifted

Note:

- (1) The partially released Stop Work Orders were released for activities/disciplines as follows:
 - (a) Procurement - 11/03/83 - partial lifting of the Stop Work Order on Bechtel Ann Arbor activities
 - (b) Architectural - 12/12 - 13/83 - partial lifting of Stop Work Order for coatings, CCP activities only
 - (c) Civil/Architectural - 01/20/84 - Stop Work Order lifted
 - (d) Instrumentation and Control - 01/24/84 - Stop Work Order lifted
 - (e) Electrical - 01/26/84 - Stop Work Order lifted
- (2) The only discipline area not released:

Mechanical - Stop Work Order remains in place - activity remains to be completed and results audited in order to resolve this issue, target completion by February 15, 1984.

The Resident Inspector reviews indicate that the licensee has adhered to the provisions of Field Instruction FID 2.400, FCR/FCN Review and Resolution Program for the release of the Stop Works referenced above.

10. Alignment of Vessel Sample Holders

During the reporting period, the Resident Inspector witnessed efforts to optically align the Unit 2 vessel sample holders. A satisfactory alignment was not accomplished because of equipment malfunctions which would not permit a reduplication of alignment readings.

11. Site Tours

At periodic intervals during the report period, tours of selected areas of the site were performed. These tours were intended to assess the cleanliness of the site; storage conditions of equipment and piping being used in site construction; the potential for fire or other hazards which might have a deleterious effect on personnel and equipment, and to witness construction activities in progress. These tours resulted in no NRC inspection findings.

12. Meetings

On January 12, 1984, members of the Region III staff met with key management personnel from Consumers Power Company (CPCo) and Bechtel to discuss various issues related to the Midland project.

Attendees:

NRC

A. P. Davis, Deputy Regional Administrator
E. F. Warnick, Director, Office of Special Cases
J. J. Harrison, Chief, Section 2, Midland

CPCo

S. H. Howell, Executive Vice President
J. Cook, Vice President

Bechtel

W. Henry, Vice President
J. Rutgers, Project Manager

Topics of discussion included:

- . Midland Project Status
- . Monthly Meeting Evaluation
- . FCR/FCN Design Change Issue
- . Communication Problem Resolution
- . Allegation Impact
- . Attitude

13. Open Items

Open Items are matters, not otherwise categorized in the report, that require followup during a future inspection. Open items identified during this inspection are discussed in Section 4.

14. Exit Interview

The inspectors met with licensee representatives at the conclusion of the inspection. The inspectors summarized the scope and findings of the inspection. The licensee acknowledged the information.

The Resident Inspectors met separately with the licensee on January 26, 1984, to discuss those items which specifically involved the Resident Inspector Office.