

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION III

Reports No. 50-456/84-16(DRS); 50-457/84-16(DRS)

Docket Nos. 50-456; 50-457

Licenses No. CPPR-132; CPPR-133

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

Facility Name: Braidwood Station, Units 1 and 2

Inspection At: Braidwood Site, Braidwood, Illinois

Inspection Conducted: June 25, 1984 through August 24, 1984

Inspectors: *D. L. Williams*
D. L. Williams

8/27/84
Date

M. A. Ring
M. A. Ring

8/27/84
Date

B. A. Schneider
B. A. Schneider
(Inspector Intern)

8/27/84
Date

Approved By: *L. A. Reyes*
L. A. Reyes, Chief
Test Programs Section

8/27/84
Date

Inspection Summary

Inspection on June 27-28, and August 7-10, 1984 (Reports No. 50-456/84-16(DRS); 50-457/84-16(DRS))

Areas Inspected: Routine, announced inspection to review preoperational test procedures and to witness preoperational test performance. The inspection involved a total of 51 inspector-hours onsite including seven inspector-hours onsite during off-shifts.

Results: Of the two areas inspected no items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

*C. Tomashek, Project Startup Superintendent
J. Galligan, Project Startup Test Supervisor
*P. Barnes, Project Licensing and Compliance
F. Brinker, Project Startup Test Coordinator

Additional station technical and administrative personnel were contacted by the inspectors during the course of the inspection.

*Denotes those personnel present at the exit meeting on August 20, 1984.

2. Preoperational Test Procedure Review

The inspectors reviewed portions of the following preoperational test procedures against the FSAR, SER, proposed Technical Specifications and Regulatory Guide 1.68, Revision 2.

- CS-10, Containment Spray System
- RH-10, Residual Heat Removal System
- SX-10, Essential Service Water System
- SI-10, Safety Injection (Motor Operated Valves)

The completed review of the procedure listed above will be documented in subsequent inspection reports. The inspector identified the following concern with development of pump performance curves to meet acceptance criteria.

During review of several procedures and in discussion with various startup test engineers (STE) it became apparent that common terminology for various parameters should be defined by the licensee to avoid confusion. The STE's were using Total Developed Head and Discharge Head as similar terms. Also, the ambiguous term Pump Head was used without definition of how to determine its value.

The potential for confusion and the impact on test results was discussed with the licensee. To avoid possible problems the licensee committed to initiate a Startup Work Instruction (SWI) to define terms and ensure that all STEs are using the same parameters to develop pump performance curves. This is considered an open item (456/84-16-01) pending issuance of the SWI.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

3. Preoperational Test Performance

The inspectors witnessed the performance of portions of the below listed preoperational test procedures in order to verify that testing is conducted in accordance with approved procedures, independently verify the acceptability of test results and evaluate the performance of licensee personnel conducting the tests.

SI-10, Safety Injection
SX-10, Essential Service Water

During the conduct of SX-10, the inspector questioned the STE's use of Discharge Pressure for meeting acceptance criteria when the procedure stated that Total Developed Head would be used. This concern is further discussed in paragraph 2.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

4. Preoperational Test Procedure Verification

The inspectors reviewed the following preoperational test procedures against Regulatory Guide 1.68 and applicable portions of the FSAR to verify the procedure adequately addresses NRC requirements and licensee commitments.

DO-12, Diesel Jil

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

5. Open Items

Open items are matters which have been discussed with the licensee which will be reviewed further by the inspector, and which involve some action on the part of the NRC or licensee or both. An open item disclosed during the inspection is discussed in Paragraph 2.

6. Exit Interview

The inspectors met with licensee representatives (denoted in Paragraph 1) at the conclusion of the inspection on August 20, 1984. The inspectors summarized the scope of the inspection and the open item identified in Paragraph 2. The licensee committed to corrective action which will be reviewed when issued and implemented.