



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION II
101 MARIETTA STREET, N.W.
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

Report Nos.: 50-413/84-55 and 50-414/84-25

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

Docket Nos.: 50-413 and 50-414

License Nos.: CPPR-116 and CPPR-117

Facility Name: Catawba Nuclear Station Units 1 and 2

Inspection Dates: March 26 - May 11, 1984

Inspection at Catawba site near Rock Hill, South Carolina

Inspectors:	<u><i>A. J. Sgroat</i></u>	<u>6/5/84</u>
	for P. K. VanDoorn	Date Signed
	<u><i>A. J. Sgroat</i></u>	<u>6/5/84</u>
	for P. H. Skinner	Date Signed
Approved by:	<u><i>V. L. Brownlee</i></u>	<u>6/6/84</u>
	V. L. Brownlee, Section Chief	Date Signed
	Division of Reactor Projects	

SUMMARY

Scope: This routine unannounced inspection involved 225 inspector-hours on site in the areas of followup of NRC and licensee identified items (Units 1 and 2); site tours (Units 1 and 2); personnel interviews (Units 1 and 2); preoperational test program implementation (Unit 1); maintenance observation (Unit 1); fuel receipt and storage (Unit 1); operating staff training (Unit 1); and followup of IE Bulletin and Circulars (Units 1 and 2).

Results: No violations or deviations were identified.

REPORT DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

- *R. L. Dick, Vice President, Construction
- *J. W. Hampton, Station Manager
- *T. B. Bright, Engineering Manager
- *L. R. Davison, Project QA Manager
- *W. O. Henry, QA Manager, Technical Services
- *J. W. Cox, Superintendent, Technical Services
- *R. A. Morgan, Senior QA Engineer
- J. M. Curtis, QA Manager Vendors
- *L. E. Vincent, Officer Engineer
- C. W. Graves, Operations Superintendent
- C. L. Hartzell, Licensing and Projects
- R. D. Rogers, Mechanical Engineer
- T. E. Crawford, Operations Engineer
- W. R. McCollum, Performance Engineer
- P. C. McAnulty, Training and Safety Coordinator
- *P. G. Leroy, Licensing Engineer
- D. M. Robinson, Reactor Engineer
- *D. P. Hensley, QA Technician
- H. L. Atkins, QA Surveillance Supervisor
- J. C. Shropshire, QA Engineer Supervisor
- H. D. Mason, QA Engineer
- B. Via, Training Supervisor

Other licensee employees contacted included construction craftsmen, technicians, operators, mechanics and office personnel.

*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.

3. Licensee Action on Previous Enforcement Matters (92702)

- a. (Closed) Violation 413/83-50-01: Failure to Provide an Adequate Procedure. Duke Power Company (DPC) letter of response dated February 17, 1984, has been reviewed by Region II as discussed in USNRC correspondence dated May 2, 1984. The inspector has reviewed the revised tank calculation criteria provided by DPC design personnel and the revision of instrument calibration procedure 1P/O/A/3600/02. Based on this review the inspector considers the action taken to be adequate and this item is closed.

- b. (Closed) Violation 413/83-56-04: Failure to Adequately Evaluate Test Results. DPC letter of response dated April 6, 1984, has been reviewed and determined to be acceptable by Region II. The inspector reviewed the quality record changes associated with this problem. Based on this review the inspector considers the action taken to be adequate and this item is closed.
 - c. (Closed) Violation 413/83-56-06: Failure to Implement All Test Requirements of Materials License No. SNM-1920. DPC letter of response dated April 6, 1984, has been reviewed and determined to be acceptable by Region II. The test procedure associated with this item has now been rescheduled to be performed prior to fuel load. Since there is no technical basis to require this test to be completed prior to receipt of new fuel or storage of new fuel, the inspector considers this corrective action to be acceptable and this item is closed.
4. Licensee Identified Items 50.55(e) (Units 1 and 2) (99020)
- a. (Closed) CDR (413/78-11-02, 414/78-10-01): Containment Isolation Valve Deficiency. Responses for this item were submitted on September 22, 1978; August 20, 1981; and September 7, 1982. The inspector reviewed and verified implementation of corrective actions for this item and considers these actions to be satisfactory.
 - b. (Closed) CDR (413, 414/82-09): Potential Undersizing of Electrical Motor Operators for Westinghouse Valves. Responses for this item were submitted on April 9, 1982; June 21, 1982; July 22, 1983; August 24, 1983; October 21, 1983; February 1, 1984; and March 29, 1984. The inspector reviewed and verified implementation of the corrective actions for this item and considers these actions to be satisfactory.
 - c. (Closed) CDR (413/83-07): Vent Valve IND105 Not Installed Per Design. Responses for this item were submitted on May 13, 1983; July 29, 1983; September 21, 1983; and March 5, 1984. The inspector reviewed and verified implementation of corrective actions for this item and considers these actions to be satisfactory.
5. Independent Inspection Effort (71302, 92706) (Units 1 and 2)
- a. The inspector conducted tours of various plant areas. During these tours, various plant conditions and activities were observed to determine if they were being performed in accordance with applicable requirements and procedures. No significant problems were identified during these tours and the various evolutions observed were being performed in accordance with applicable procedures.
 - b. The inspector conducted interviews with craftsmen to assess whether there were any concerns about the quality of the plant, whether the quality assurance program was being followed or whether these employees had any other concerns which they wished to discuss. These interviews were conducted to assess concerns expressed by an individual to the

NRC. The individuals interviewed included six powerhouse mechanics (pipefitters) from Crew No. 275, their foreman and general foreman, and the foreman of the welder crew working in the same area. No significant problems were identified. One incident was identified where a craftsman felt that he was told to perform work before the paperwork arrived. The work, was in fact performed properly and the incident was an apparent misunderstanding between the foreman and craftsman which had occurred when the foreman first took over the crew. The misunderstanding had been corrected and discussions had been held with the remainder of the crew to prevent further misunderstandings. It was identified that some of the welders were not as skillful as others, but it appeared that these situations had been or were being properly addressed. Concerns were expressed relative to working conditions in the pipe chase area; e.g., congestion, dust, need for improved lighting, and the need for improved ventilation. The individuals stated that these problems had not affected the quality of the work. In addition, the pipefitter foreman indicated that a cleanup-day was already planned for the area and the general foreman indicated that the ventilation would be improved. The two foremen appeared to have a good working relationship. The craftsmen indicated they felt some normally expected pressure for production, but no pressure to circumvent quality requirements. All individuals indicated the quality of the plant was good and felt the plant would be safe.

No violations or deviations were identified.

6. Preoperational Test Program Implementation (Unit 1) (70302)

The inspector reviewed, in part, time implementation of the preoperational test program. Test program attributes inspected included review of administrative requirements, document control, documentation of major test events and deviations to procedures, operating practices, instrument calibrations, and correction of problems revealed by the test.

No violations or deviations were identified.

7. Maintenance Observation (Unit 1) (71302)

Station maintenance activities of selected systems and components were observed/reviewed to ascertain that they were being conducted in accordance with the requirements. The inspector verified licensee conformance to the requirements in the following areas of inspection: (1) that the activities were accomplished using approved procedures, and functional testing and/or calibrations were performed prior to returning components or systems to service; (2) quality control records were maintained; (3) that the activities were accomplished by qualified personnel; and, (4) parts and materials used were properly certified. Work requests were reviewed to determine status of outstanding jobs and to assure that priority is assigned to safety-related equipment maintenance which may affect system performance.

No violations or deviations were identified.

8. Fuel Receipt and Storage (60501) (Unit 1)

During the inspection period, the inspector observed the receipt, handling and storage of nuclear fuel. Attributes used for inspection included security procedures, access control, health physics procedures, physical damage protection and debris control, proper storage spacing to prevent inadvertent criticality, record keeping and license compliance.

No violations or deviations were identified.

9. Operating Staff Training (41301) (Unit 1)

The inspector reviewed operating staff training. The purpose of this review was to confirm that the licensee has trained the operating staff, a continuing program of training is being conducted, and replaced personnel receive training or have experience equivalent to that required for originally selected personnel.

No violations or deviations were identified.

10. IE Bulletins (92703) (Units 1 and 2)

The following IE Bulletin was reviewed to ensure receipt, evaluation, and appropriate implementation.

(Closed - Unit 1 and 2) IE Bulletin 81-02: Failure of Gate Type Valves to Close Against Differential Pressure. This item is the same as CDR 413, 414/82-09 (see paragraph 4.b). The licensee has taken appropriate corrective actions which included changeout of operators, changeout of operator motors, or gearset change as appropriate.

11. IE Circulars (92703) (Units 1 and 2)

The following IE Circulars were reviewed to ensure their receipt, review by appropriate management, and that appropriate action was taken.

- a. (Closed - Units 1 and 2) IE Circular 79-04: Loose Locking Nut on Limitorque Valve Operators. The licensee has staked locking nuts on the affected valves. The inspector verified this action and this action is considered satisfactory.
- b. (Closed - Units 1 and 2) IE Circular 79-10: Pipefittings Manufactured from Unacceptable Material. The licensee has verified that the affected fittings were not used at Catawba and has returned affected fittings from the Cherokee station to the vendor to prevent transfer to Catawba. The inspector reviewed these actions and considers them to be satisfactory.