



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

Report No.: 50-413/84-51

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

Docket No.: 50-413

License No.: CPPR-116

Facility Name: Catawba Unit 1

Inspection at Catawba site near Rock Hill, South Carolina

Inspector: P. A. Taylor
P. A. Taylor

5/25/84
Date Signed

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

5/25/84
Date Signed

SUMMARY

Inspection on May 7-11, 1984

Areas inspected

This routine unannounced inspection involved 32 inspector-hours on site in the areas of licensee action on previous enforcement matters; preoperational test results evaluation and plant tour.

Results

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

REPORT DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Licensee Employees

- *J. W. Cox, Superintendent of Technical Services
- *G. Smith, Superintendent of Maintenance
- *W. F. Beaver, Performance Engineer
- A. Bhatanagar, Test Engineer
- *P. G. LeRoy, Licensing Engineer
- *C. L. Hartzell, Licensing and Project Engineer
- *S. W. Dressler, Project Engineer
- D. M. Robinson, Reactor Engineer
- C. Gregory, I&E Support Engineer
- J. Wallace, I&E Support Engineer

NRC Resident Inspector

- *P. H. Skinner

*Attended exit interview

2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on May 11, 1984, with those persons indicated in paragraph 1 above. The licensee acknowledged the inspection results without significant comment.

3. Licensee Action on Previous Enforcement Matters (92702)

(Closed) Violation 413/84-48-01, Failure to provide appropriate quantitative or qualitative acceptance criteria in preoperational test procedures for determining that activities have been satisfactorily accomplished.

The inspector examined the licensee's response to the violation which was sent to the NRC Region II in a letter dated January 27, 1984. The corrective actions specified that a review of acceptance criteria statements in all preoperational test procedures which had previously been conducted would be done. The licensee also required that action be taken to provide guidelines which clearly indicate the basis for test acceptance to ensure that test procedures used for future testing activities contained specific acceptance criteria statements. The inspector reviewed the acceptance criteria guidelines provided by the licensee in a memorandum (CN-178.10) date January 17, 1984. Examples given in the memorandum required that quantitative acceptance criteria incorporate numerical bounds or ranges of acceptability and that qualitative acceptance criteria clearly and specifically indicate the basis for acceptable test performance. To further accentuate the new acceptance criteria guidelines the licensee provide

several examples of improperly stated acceptance criteria. The results of these reviews indicated that 59 preoperational test procedures contained acceptance criteria statements which did not meet the new guidelines. Additional analyses were conducted for these tests to ensure that the restated acceptance criteria were met. The inspector reviewed several completed preoperational tests to verify that the actions specified had been taken and were appropriate. The inspector also noted that the new acceptance criteria guidelines are being incorporated into the training program for test directors.

4. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items were not identified during this inspection.

5. Preoperational Test Results Evaluation (70320B, 70322B, 70324B, 70326B)

The inspector reviewed completed preoperational test TP 1/A/1100/01, Control Procedure for Hot Functional Testing to verify that:

- test steps and data sheets were initialed and dated as required.
- Test results met acceptance criteria.
- Deficiencies identified during the test were evaluated and corrective action identified as required.
- Management had evaluated the test results as required by administrative controls.

The inspector also examined the Engineered Safety Features Functional Test, TP 1/A/1200/03A to determine its state of completeness. The inspector noted that all sections of the test had been completed with the test results under review by the licensee. Several valves and components were identified as not meeting the required response times when actuated by a safeguards signal. The licensee is evaluating the corrective action necessary to resolve the discrepancies and to establish appropriate retest. The inspector will continue to monitor the progress in this area during future inspections.

The inspector initiated a review of all completed preoperational tests that are identified in the FSAR Chapter 14, table 14.2.12-1 in order to obtain a representative sample in determining the completion status of the preoperational test program. The inspector informed the licensee management that any preoperational test that will be outstanding for fuel loading needs to be identified to the NRC, with appropriate reason for not being completed, justification for remaining outstanding and by what plant mode the test will be completed.

The licensee indicated that preoperational tests identified for safety-related systems would be handled in this manner but no plans were being made to list preoperational test for non safety-related systems that may be outstanding. The inspector expressed a concern that the total status of the preoperational test program needs to be presented to the NRC for consideration regarding the issuance of an operating licensee as delineated in Regulatory Guide 1.68, Revision 2. These issues were further discussed between licensee management and Region II management during a meeting with Duke Power Company in the NRC Region II office on May 24, 1984. It's the NRC's understanding that all preoperational tests not completed will be listed as outstanding for fuel loading and formally presented to the NRC for review and evaluation.

Within the areas inspected no deviations or violations were identified.

6. Plant Tours (71302B)

The inspector toured the control room, auxiliary building, containment, reactor building, and diesel generator rooms to observe work activities in progress, housekeeping and tag controls on equipment.

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