

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION III

Reports No. 50-373/84-19(DRS); 50-374/84-25(DRS)

Docket Nos. 50-373; 50-374

Licenses No. NPF-11; NPF-18

Licensee: Commonwealth Edison Company
Post Office Box 767
Chicago, IL 60690

Facility Name: LaSalle County Station, Units 1 and 2

Inspection At: LaSalle Site, Marseilles, IL

Inspection Conducted: July 24-26, 1984

Inspector: *M.C. Choules*
N. C. Choules

8/6/84
Date

Approved By: *F.C. Hawkins*
F. C. Hawkins, Chief
Quality Assurance Programs Section

8/6/84
Date

Inspection Summary

Inspection on July 24-26, 1984 (Report No. 50-373/84-19(DRS); 50-374/84-25(DRS))

Areas Inspected: Routine unannounced inspection by one regional inspector of previous inspection findings and the startup testing audit program. The inspection involved 23 inspector-hours onsite.

Results: No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Commonwealth Edison Company

- *R. D. Bishop, Assistant Superintendent Administration
- *H. D. Studtman, QA Supervisor
- *W. R. Huntington, Technical Staff Supervisor
- *R. F. Jancek, Project Engineer
- *P. F. Manning, Assistant Technical Staff Supervisor
- *J. W. Giesecker, Assistant Technical Staff Supervisor
- *J. A. Ahlman, QA Engineer
- *M. Musser, QA Engineer

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

- *M. J. Jordan
- S. Guthrie

Other personnel were contacted as a matter of routine during the inspection.

*Denotes those attending the exit interview on July 26, 1984.

2. Action on Previous Inspection Findings

- a. (Closed) Unresolved Item (373/83-09-01): Adequacy of audits to verify adherence to the Technical Specifications provisions. A policy has been developed which addresses quality assurance audits of Technical Specification line items within prescribed time periods. The licensee had previously instituted a program that complies with this policy.
- b. (Open) Open Item (373/83-15-04, 374/83-13-03): There was no guidance which specified the types of documents which should be included in modification history packages. The licensee had not completed the development of this guidance.
- c. (Closed) Open Item (373/83-15-05, 374/83-13-04): There was no system to identify drawings changed by a modification in the history packages. The licensee had revised the plant modification procedure LAP 1300-2 to include an attachment C on which drawings changed by a modification or drawing change notice (DCNs) generated by a modification would be identified. Attachment C will be part of the modification history package.
- d. (Closed) Unresolved Item (373/83-35-01, 374/83-34-01): Marked up drawings were not provided to the control room when modifications were completed. The licensee has prepared a list of drawings and if a modification changes any of these drawings, the control room

copies are required to be marked with changes. The licensee has revised procedures LAP 810-9 ("Control of Drawing Modifications") and LAP 1300-2 ("Plant Modification") to require the above. Review of control room drawings indicated the requirements for marked up drawings had been implemented.

- e. (Closed) Noncompliance (373/83-41-01, 374/83-42-01): Failure to adequately review and evaluate the feedwater check valve disc modification and the change from molded to extruded/vulcanized seals. The licensee's corrective actions for this item are documented in their responses dated January 20 and February 9, 1984. The inspector verified that SNED procedure Q.6 had been revised to require revision of applicable stress reports and to identify environmental qualification requirements in the modification approval letter checklist. SNED procedure Q.28 had been revised to require documentation regarding stress report revisions from vendors. The extruded/vulcanized seals had been replaced on Unit 1 and Unit 2 as determined from review of the applicable purchase order and work requests as was stated in the licensee's response.
- f. (Open) Open Item (373/83-41-04, 374/83-42-04): The cause of the excessive leakage through the feedwater check valves had not been determined. During a Unit 1 shutdown in February, the licensee determined the leak rate for feedwater check valve 1B21-F010A was excessive as reported in LER 373-84-012. Leakage for check valve 1B21-F010B was acceptable. As stated in the LER, the licensee found an alignment problem with the check valves and believes this to be the cause of the excessive leakage problems. Corrective maintenance in the form of reducing the hinge pin shoulder to disc bushing clearances was performed on the four Unit 1 and 2 feedwater check valves. Until leak rate tests are performed during the refueling outage to confirm that the leakage was caused by misalignment, this item will remain open.

3. Quality Assurance for the Startup Test Program

The inspector reviewed the licensee's program for auditing and surveillance of startup testing. Audits and surveillances were reviewed to verify that they require the observation of testing, tracking of test deficiencies, review of test documentation and acceptance criteria, and review of the status of measuring and test equipment. Audits and surveillance reports were reviewed to verify that they documented the results of the above.

a. Documents Reviewed

- (1) Selected Audit Reports of Startup Testing
- (2) Selected Surveillance Reports of Startup Testing

b. Results of Inspection

The inspector's review revealed that the licensee was conducting audits and surveillances of startup testing. The licensee intends to perform audits or surveillances of all startup tests. A generic audit checklist had been developed which required the review of the items listed above. Audit reports documented the results of the reviews.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

4. Exit Interview

The inspector met with licensee representatives (denoted in Paragraph 1) on July 26, 1984, and summarized the purpose, scope, and findings of the inspection.