

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION I

Report No. 50-443/84-09

Docket No. 50-443

License No. CPPR-135

Priority --

Category B

Licensee: Public Service Company of New Hampshire
1000 Elm Street
Manchester, New Hampshire 03105

Facility Name: Seabrook Station, Unit 1

Inspection At: Seabrook, New Hampshire

Inspection Conducted: June 12-15, 1984

Inspectors:

L. Briggs
L. Briggs, Lead Reactor Engineer

7/2/84
date

Approved by:

L. Bettenhausen
L. Bettenhausen, Chief, Test Programs
Section

7/2/84
date

Inspection Summary: Inspection on June 12-15, 1984 (Report No. 50-443/84-09)

Areas Inspected: Routine, unannounced inspection by one region-based inspector (20 hours) of preoperational test procedure review and verification, QA interface with preoperational testing, and a facility tour.

Results: No violations were identified.

8407300340 840711
PDR ADOCK 05000443
Q PDR

50-443/84-09 - 0001.0.0
06/18/84

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

- * J. Azzopardi, Field Quality Assurance (QC) Engineer
- * F. Bean, QA Engineer
- D. Bodoh, QA Engineer
- * D. Covill, Construction Field QA Surveillance Supervisor
- * J. Grusetskie, Site Engineering
- * R. Guillette, Supervisor, Construction QA Engineering
- * D. Lambert, Field Supervisor, UE&C QA
- * J. Marchi, Startup QC
- * D. McLain, Startup Manager
- * W. Middleton, QA Specialist
- * J. Philbrick, Construction Engineer
- J. Singleton, Construction Field QA Manager
- A. Smith, System Test Engineer, Mechanical, STD
- * J. Tefft, STD Special Assistant
- * W. Temple, QA Engineer

Other NRC Personnel Present

- * A. Cerne, Senior Resident Inspector
- * H. Wescott, Resident Inspector

* denotes those present at the June 15, 1984 exit meeting

2. Preoperational Test Review and Verification

2.1 Scope of Review

The following procedures were reviewed in preparation for test witnessing, for technical and administrative adequacy and for verification that testing is planned to adequately satisfy regulatory guidance and licensee commitments. The procedures were reviewed to verify licensee review and approval, proper format, test objectives, prerequisites, initial conditions, test data recording requirements, technical adequacy and system return to normal.

- 1-PT-11, Containment Sump Recirculation Flow Test, Revision 1, JTG Approved June 6, 1984;
- 1-PT(I)-35, Reactor Coolant System Hydrostatic Test, Revision 0, JTG Approved April 19, 1984;
- 1-PT(I)-6.2, Boron Thermal Regeneration System Hot Functional Test, Revision 0, JTG Approved May 23, 1984;

- 1-PT(I)-6.1, CVCS - Boron Thermal Regeneration System, Revision 0, JTG Approved May 23, 1984;
- 1-PT-5.1, CVCS - Charging System Operational Test, Revision 0, JTG Approved May 23, 1984;
- 1-PT-5.2, CVCS - Boric Acid Transfer Subsystem, Revision 0, JTG Approved May 9, 1984;
- 1-PT-5.3, CVCS - Hot Functional Test, Revision 0, JTG Approved May 16, 1984;
- 1-PT-2.1, Pressurizer Relief Tank Test, Revision 0, JTG Approved May 16, 1984;
- 1-PT-29, Emergency Switchgear Ventilation, Revision 0, JTG Approved May 16, 1984; and,
- 1-PT(I)-24, Containment Enclosure Leak Rate Test, Revision 0, JTG Approved June 6, 1984.

2.2 Findings

During review of 1-PT(I)-35 the inspector noted that there did not appear to be any weld listing or isometric listing to keep track of welds that would be inspected during the hydrostatic test. During discussions with the licensee and the authorized Nuclear Inspector, it was found that Pullman-Higgins had NA stamp responsibility and that 1-PT(I)-35 only establishes the plant conditions for the hydro. The Pullman Power Products Master Integrity Test Procedure No. XI-1, Revision 13 (March 22, 1984) Paragraph 5.1.2.K. requires all as-built verified piping field drawings (isometrics) and change documents to be included in all hydro test packages. The drawing shall include the location of all shop and field welds and mechanical joints which are to be examined for leakage.

The inspector had no further questions regarding this item.

The inspector had several questions regarding clarification of 1-PT-11 and 1-PT-5.1 which were discussed with the licensee and resolved.

No unacceptable conditions were identified.

3. QA Interface With Preoperational Test Program

The inspector reviewed four (4) recent Startup Quality Assurance (SUQA) surveillances of different areas of the licensee's startup program. The surveillance results were also discussed with one of the licensee's QA engineers. The following surveillances were reviewed:

- SUQA Surveillance No. Q2.6.21.7150, Startup Test Department (STD) Limited Work Authorization (LWA), completed on June 13, 1984.

This surveillance resulted in Deficiency Report (DR) No. 651 being issued for STD failure to request LWA's (approximately 69) for contractor Nonconformance Reports (NCR) on two systems (Residual Heat Removal and Component Cooling) that had been turned over to STD.

- SUQA Surveillance Q2.6.21.7149, Preventive Maintenance (PM), completed on June 14, 1984. This surveillance identified several items concerning status tracking of PM's in progress which were corrected. It also resulted in DR 652 concerning training and qualification of PM personnel (mechanical) and their foreman. On notification of this finding, the STD manager suspended activities of the affected personnel until the matter is resolved.

The inspector had no further questions.

- SUQA Surveillance Q2.6.21.7141, Boundary Identification Package (BIP) Turnover 1-CS-E-2(B), completed on June 1, 1984. Several minor nameplate identification problems were identified and immediately corrected. No DR was issued.
- SUQA Surveillance Q2.6.21.7140, Residual Heat Removal Pump (RH-P-8A) Electrical Testing. High vibration of the pump was identified by this surveillance and the STD engineer. No DR was issued. This item is being tracked by STD NCR 82-260 which was issued on June 5, 1984. In addition, a LWA was issued to allow limited pump runs to take additional readings and corrective action.

No unacceptable conditions were identified.

4. Plant Tours

The inspector made several tours of various areas of the facility to observe work in progress, housekeeping, cleanliness controls, and status of construction and preoperational testing activities.

During this inspection limited activity was taking place. RHR system flushing was scheduled but did not occur due to a lack of craft personnel.

No unacceptable conditions were noted.

5. Exit Interview

A management meeting was held at the conclusion of the inspection on June 15, 1984 to discuss inspection scope and findings as detailed in this report (see Paragraph 1 for Attendees). No written information was provided to the licensee at any time during the inspection.