



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

Report No.: 50-413/84-35

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

Docket No.: 50-413

License No.: CPPR-116

Facility Name: Catawba

Inspection at Catawba site near Rock Hill, South Carolina

Inspector: Frank Jape
for S. P. Burris

4/16/84
Date Signed

Approved by: Frank Jape
F. Jape, Section Chief
Engineering Branch
Division of Reactor Safety

4/16/84
Date Signed

SUMMARY

Inspection on March 26 - 30, 1984

Areas Inspected

This routine, unannounced inspection involved 48 inspector-hours on site in the areas of witness of ESF testing, witness of diesel generator testing, review and inspection of standby shutdown facility, and plant tour.

Results

Of the four areas inspected, no violations or deviations were identified in three areas; one apparent violation was found in one area while witnessing diesel generator testing in that maintenance was performed without a work request, paragraph 6a.

REPORT DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Licensee Employees

- *J. W. Cox, Superintendent of Technical Services
- *G. Smith, Superintendent of Maintenance
- *C. W. Graves, Superintendent of Operations
- *P. G. Leroy, Licensing Engineer
- A. Bhatnagar, Test Director
- R. Jones, Test Director
- C. Dover, I&E Supervisor

Other licensee employees contacted included two technicians, four operators, and two office personnel.

NRC Resident Inspectors

- *P. Skinner, Senior Resident Inspector
- *P. K. VanDoorn, Senior Construction Resident Inspector

*Attended exit interview

2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on March 30, 1984, with those persons indicated in paragraph 1 above. The licensee acknowledged the findings without significant comment. The licensee was informed of a violation identified during this inspection for failure to follow the procedures for maintenance work request. Also an inspector followup item was identified related to documentation of test discrepancies.

Violation, Failure to Follow Procedure 50-413/84-35-01, paragraph 6a.

IFI, 50-413/84-05-02 Clarification of Statement Intent in SD 4.2.1, 6a.

3. Licensee Action on Previous Enforcement Matters

Not inspected.

4. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items were not identified during this inspection.

5. Independent Inspection Effort - Unit (92706)

The inspector toured portions of the Unit 1 reactor building, auxiliary building, control room, diesel generator rooms 1A and 1B, and the standby shutdown facility to observe ongoing activities for compliance with NRC requirements and licensee commitments.

No violations or deviations were identified in the areas inspected.

6. Preoperational Test Witnessing - Unit 1 (70315, 70316, 70312)

The following preoperational tests were witnessed:

a. Engineered Safeguard Feature Function Test - TP/1/A/1200/03A (ESF)

The inspector witnessed the ESF test to observe overall test personnel performance, verify that an approved procedure was available and in use, test equipment being used was properly calibrated, test data were collected, deficiencies identified during testing and changes to the test procedure were conducted in accordance with the approved procedure.

Those portions of the ESF test reviewed and witnessed included:

- TP/1/A/1200/03A section 12.3, "Train B B/O and LOCA ESF Actuation"
- TP/1/A/1200/03A, section 12.4, "Train A and Train B Full Flow Normal Power ESF Actuation"

While ESF testing was in progress, the control room meter indicators for Bus Voltage for EDA, EDB, EDC and EDD did not show the actual status which existed during the test. These items were brought to the attention of test personnel, who stated that these discrepancies were not to be included as test discrepancies. The inspector questioned this action. Station Directive, 4.2.1 states that all discrepancies are to be identified for resolution. Following these discussions the items were noted and documented as discrepancies.

Licensee stated that a procedural change would be issued to Station Directive 4.2.1 to clarify and expand on the handling of discrepancies and subsequent corrective action. The inspector identified this item as inspector followup item, IFI 50-413/84-35-02, "Clarification of Statement Intent in Station Directive 4.2.1."

Maintenance Activities during ESF testing:

- 1) During ESF testing the diesel generator 1A failed to remain running as required due to a signal air control problem. This condition required that I&E support personnel troubleshoot the

problem under Nuclear Station Work Request #0236 PRF. As stated in Section III of this document, I&E personnel were to "perform no maintenance". However, the I&E technician removed, cleaned, inspected and reinstalled the low, low lube oil trip line shuttle valve on March 21, 1984, for the diesel generator control panel without issuing appropriate work request to identify and accomplish the above maintenance. This is a violation of Station Directive 3.3.2 and Maintenance Management Procedure 1.0 which required preparation and use of maintenance work request.

- 2) In addition to the above example, the inspector identified that QA/QC personnel were not present before, during, or after the work was performed. This component, low low tube oil trip line shuttle valve, is identified on the vendors' drawing No. 52216, approved by Duke Power Company, and identifies the system to be "QA Condition 1, Nuclear Safety-Related." The failure to have QA/QC personnel in attendance for this maintenance is a violation of Catawba Nuclear Station Maintenance Procedure 1.0, section 4.2, this should have been identified as requiring QA/QC personnel involvement.
- 3) Another problem was identified with the administrative controls for maintenance controls regarding proper approval of work requests. As identified on Nuclear Station Work Request #0236 PRF, the originator who requested the manpower support, from I&E personnel, also approved this work request. Station Directive 3.3.7, section 5, step 5.1.3, states that manpower support work request require the approval of one of the following:
 - a) Section Head requesting support
 - b) Applicable Superintendent
 - c) Station Manager

The failure to obtain proper approval of the work request is a violation of Station Directive 3.3.7.

The three items listed above are identified as examples of failure to follow procedures and is a violation of 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion V. This item was discussed with the licensee and will be identified as violation 50-413/84-35-01.

b. Blackout/Load Rejection Diesel Generator 1A TP/1/A/1350/25A

The inspector witnessed the blackout/load rejection test to observe overall test personnel performance, verify that an approved procedure was available and in use, test equipment being used was properly calibrated, test data were properly collected, deficiencies identified during testing and changes to the procedure were documented in accordance with administrative procedures, and the test was being conducted in accordance with the approved procedure.

No violations or deviations were identified in the areas inspected.

7. Review and Inspection of the Standby Shutdown Facility (SSF) (70320, 70329, 42450, 42451)

With the assistance of licensee personnel, the inspector obtained copies of system descriptions (CN 1471-81, CN 1223-10 and CN SD 0144-02) and test data packages for the standby shutdown facility for review. The inspector identified that deviations and discrepancies were properly identified and resolved, and evaluated the adequacy of the licensee's administrative policies with respect to the test execution and data evaluation. The following test data packages were partially reviewed for accuracy, completeness, procedural changes and discrepancies identification:

- a. Standby Shutdown Facility Functional Test TP/1/A/1400/13
- b. Standby Shutdown Diesel System Functional Test TP/1/A/1350/07

A tour of the facility, which included the diesel generator room, switchgear room, battery room and the SSF control panel room was conducted. Construction and testing of the standby shutdown facility appeared to be complete. The inspector talked to several staff personnel to determine their understanding and purpose of the facility. During the discussion, the subject of Technical Specification for the facility was raised. It was pointed out that Technical Specifications are being prepared and would become a part of the Technical Specifications at the time of OL issuance.

No violations or deviations were identified in the areas inspected.