

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Region I

Report No. 50-443/84-10
50-444/84-04

Docket No. 50-443
50-444

License No. CPPR-135
CPPR-136

Priority --

Category A

Licensee: Public Service Company of New Hampshire

1000 Elm Street

Manchester, New Hampshire 03105

Facility Name: Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2

Inspection at: Seabrook, New Hampshire

Inspection conducted: June 26 - August 24, 1984

Inspectors: A.C. Cerne, Sr. Resident Inspector

8-30-84
date signed

H.M. Wescott, Resident Inspector

8-30-84
date signed

_____ date signed

Approved by: R.M. Gallo
R.M. Gallo, Chief, Projects Section 2A,
Division of Project and Resident Programs

9/12/84
date signed

Inspection Summary:

Inspection on June 26-August 24, 1984 (Combined Report No. 50-443/84-10 and 50-444/84-04)

Areas Inspected: Routine inspection by the resident inspectors of work activities, procedures and records relative to reactor vessel fabrication, reactor vessel flange seal ring groove repairs, observation of welder recertification, review of reactor vessel records of nozzle repairs, review of radwaste piping, review of steam generator nozzle repairs. The inspection involved 137 inspection hours (including 2 hours off-shift) of Unit 1 activities and 12 inspection hours of Unit 2 activities.

Results: No violations were identified.

8410150377 840920
PDR ADCK 05000443
Q PDR

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

J. O. Azzopardi, QA Engineer, Public Service Company of New Hampshire (PSNH)
F. W. Bean, QA Engineer, Yankee Atomic Electric Company (YAEC)
P. B. Bohan, Turnover Manager (PSNH)
J. A. Grusetskie, Site Engineering, United Engineers and Construction Inc. (UE&C)
G. A. Kann, Startup Testing Department (PSNH)
D. C. Lambert, Project Field QC Manager (UE&C)
J. C. March, Startup QC Manager, (UE&C)
G. F. McDonald, QA Manager (YAEC)
W. Middleton, QA Supervisor (YAEC)
B. Mizzau, QA Engineer (YAEC)
J. Tefft, QA Engineer (PSNH)
B. Temple, QA Engineer (YAEC)
J. W. Singleton, Special Projects Manager (YAEC)

The above personnel were in attendance at the final exit meeting held on August 27, 1984 for this report period. Other persons were also contacted and discussions held during this inspection period.

2. Licensee Action on Previously Identified Items

(Closed) Unresolved Item (443/83-19-01): Questionable interpretation of radiographs concerning the reactor vessel safe end welding involving stag inclusions. The inspector reviewed YAEC DR. No.498, dated 11/02/83, with attached Westinghouse letter (S.O. No.NAH-105) and Westinghouse Field Deficiency Report No.NAHM-10093. The inspector further reviewed the radiographs and radiograph reports for the subject repair welds and found them acceptable.

This unresolved item is considered to be resolved.

(Closed) Unresolved Item (443/83-19-02): Questionable radiograph film quality concerning steam generator safe end nozzle. The inspector reviewed the original radiograph inspection report dated 8/4/83 and the reshot report that was taken on 12/1/83 to verify film quality of steam generator safe end nozzle ISO-1-RC-7-0, FW-F0101, station 5-6. The original film had an elongated indication that did not appear in the reshot. The indication/artifact was apparently caused by film processing.

The inspector further reviewed radiograph inspection report for ISO-1-RC-11-01, FW-F0101, film station 1-2, dated 12/3/82, and 100% reshot on 10/11/83. Film station 1-2 was reshot a second time on 3/9/84. The film quality and indications appeared acceptable. All film is being kept for historical purposes. This unresolved item is considered resolved.

(Closed) Unresolved Item (443/444/84-01-01): Question concerning the applicability of certain subsections of the ASME Code (W77 addenda) in regard to structural attachments concerning fillet welds. Also, a licensee evaluation of ECA 19/2247A concerning the modified function of a component standard support welded to a pipe pressure boundary without apparent consideration of material requirements specified in NC-2190.

The inspector reviewed the response to B.S. No.063 which states in part that code interpretation III-1-79-214 specifically states that a fillet weld is an acceptable type of attachment weld and may be used for structural attachments to components under NC/ND-4433. Code CASE N-318 specified that fillet welds are acceptable. The shim material used in the Standard Component Supports was furnished under UE&C P.O. No. 9763.006-248-8 dated 6/30/75. The use of this material meets the requirements of ASME Section 3, Division 1 (S-74). NC-2190 states that nonpressure-retaining material attached to a pressure-retaining material need conform only to the requirements of the specifications for material listed in Tables I-7.0. Temporary and minor attachments as specified.

Specification 246-1 will be modified to reflect the correct information through ECA No.08/2245A. This unresolved item is considered to be resolved.

(Closed) Violation 50-443/84-04-02: Inadequate design and lack of inspection of the train 'A' EDG exhaust silencer mounting joint and concrete pedestal. The inspector is closing this violation as the licensee has subsequently reported this issue in accordance with 10CFR50.55(e) requirements. This item will be tracked as CDR No. 84-00-12.

(Closed) Unresolved Item (443/84-04-03): Question concerning timeliness of weld inspection when tack/roof welds are performed and when completion of weld is performed at a later date.

The inspector reviewed B.S. No.69 with response (File No.11.2) dated 5/24/84 (SM-9703A), stating that P-H procedure JS-IX-6 would be changed to reflect welder's responsibilities identified above.

The inspector reviewed P-H Seabrook Project Procedure JS-IX-6, issued 4/10/84, paragraph 8.2.2 stating, "If the root pass of any fit-up and tack weld has not been completed within a four day period, the welder shall verify that cleanliness requirements have been maintained and the remaining tacks are acceptable. Deoxaluminat may be applied to any P1 joints to aide in maintaining cleanliness." This unresolved item is considered to be resolved.

3. Plant Inspection-Tours (Units 1 and 2)

The inspectors observed work activities in-progress, completed work and plant status in several areas of the plant during general inspections of the plant. The inspectors examined work for any obvious defects or noncompliance with regulatory requirements or license conditions. Particular note was taken of the presence of quality control inspectors and quality control evidence such as inspection records, material identification, nonconforming material identification, housekeeping and equipment preservation. The inspectors interviewed craft personnel, supervision, and quality inspection personnel as such personnel were available in the work areas.

The inspectors noted that the remainder of the welding (approximately 8 feet) to seal the Unit 2 steel containment liner from the atmosphere had been completed.

Discussion with QC personnel established that the wooden construction platform above the Unit 2 reactor vessel had been removed and that further inspection of the flange area and stud holes had been performed. Several additional stud holes were found to contain water. These were cleaned and no deterioration of the threaded areas was observed (see violation 50/444/84-03-01). Current planning is to remove the dehumidifier systems from the steam generators and to return to a nitrogen blanket for long term preservation. No violations were identified.

4. Observation of Welder Certification

The inspector observed the certification of UE&C welders for AWS, B31 and ASME welding. The method of certification used is guided bend and visual examination of each completed test coupon. The completed test coupon is etched with the welder's symbol, date of test and weld procedures used. The inspector further reviewed the welder qualification logs for UE&C and Pullman-Higgins (P-H). No violations were identified.

5. Review of Records and Observation of Repairs to the Reactor Vessel Flange Seal Ring Groove (Unit 1)

The inspector reviewed NCR 2643 dated 3/19/84 concerning a minor blemish in the reactor vessel flange seal ring groove caused by a falling pipe. The high spots were removed by stoning. A PT examination was performed with satisfactory results. The inspector visually examined the completed repair.

Further visual examination of the reactor vessel I.D. was performed to assure that no damage had occurred as a result of the falling pipe.

No violations were identified.

6. Review of the Reactor Pressure Vessel Safe End Nozzle Repair Records

The inspector reviewed the Westinghouse data package for grinding repairs to the reactor vessel nozzle cladding. The package included:

1. Traveller
2. Procedures
3. Reports (LP & UT)
4. Material & Equipment Certs
5. Personnel Certs
6. Correspondence

The above package was transmitted to the licensee by Westinghouse Transmittal letter dtd. 5/8/84 S.O. No. NATL-105, NAH2.2.282, NAH-5740. No violations were identified.

7. Review of the Reactor Pressure Vessel (RPV) Records

The inspector reviewed equipment specification 676413, for the (RPV) dated 10/28/66 with revision No.4 dated 5/10/72, which was notarized by the responsible design engineer.

The inspector further verified that Certified Material Test Reports (CMTR's) were on file for the materials used in reactor vessel fabrication as required by the equipment specification. The encapsulated impact test specimens for analyzing radiation effects on reactor vessel material could not be located during this inspection. Also, documentation cannot be located to enable traceability of the impact specimens to vessel material.

This item is unresolved pending location of the impact specimens and retrieval of documentation to establish traceability to the reactor vessel material. (Unresolved Item 50-443/84-10-01).

8. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items are matters about which more information is required in order to ascertain whether they are acceptable items, violations or deviations. Unresolved items disclosed during the inspection are discussed in Paragraph 7.

9. Management Meetings

At periodic intervals during the course of this inspection, meetings were held with senior plant management to discuss the scope and findings of this inspection.