

MEMO ROUTE SLIP

Form AEC-95 (Rev. May 14, 1947) AECM 0240

See me about this.
Note and return.For concurrence.
For signature.For action.
For information.

TO (Name and unit)	INITIALS	REMARKS
RO Chief, Field Support & Enf Br., HQ RO:HQ (5) RO Files Central Mail and Files GC		RO INSPECTION REPORT NO. 50-363/73-05 JERSEY CENTRAL POWER & LIGHT COMPANY FORKED RIVER 1
Regulatory Standards (3) Directorate of Licensing (13) RO Directors (4)		The attached report is being forwarded for information. Distribution to PDR, Local PDR, NSIC, DTIE, and state representatives will be made after proprietary review
TO (Name and unit)	INITIALS	REMARKS
		is completed by the licensee.
FR (Name and unit)		REMARKS
R. F. Heishman, Acting Chief, FO&ESB RO:I		
PHONE NO. 281	DATE 9/25/73	

USE OTHER SIDE FOR ADDITIONAL REMARKS

GPO: 1973 O-485-4

0/135

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

General Public Utilities

Mr. H. C. Eisnaugle, Project Administrative Assistant
Mr. K. M. Pastor, Project Manager
Mr. K. A. Walther, QC Specialist

Stearns-Roger Corporation

Mr. T. S. Frost, Project QA Manager
Mr. F. Krejci, Contract Administrator
Mr. M. A. Minahan, Construction Superintendent
Mr. J. M. Richards, Materials Storage Supervisor

2. Audit Planning

The inspector asked what audit planning was established for vendor audits. He was shown a 1973 audit schedule. No formal promulgation of that audit schedule by the licensee was available and the inspector questioned whether a minimum audit frequency had been established for vendor audits. A verbal indication that such audits are required every 6 months was elicited but documentation of a minimum audit frequency for vendors of specific components was not available. This item is unresolved.

3. Safety Guide Incorporation

PSAR Article 1.4 commits the licensee to meet the requirements of the AEC's Safety Guides. To spot check implementation of that commitment, measures to incorporate the provisions of two safety guides were reviewed. For Safety Guide 19, Nondestructive Examination of Containment Liner Welds, provision for incorporation of the NDT requirements of the Safety Guide was not found in the bid specification provided. After researching the item, the licensee stated that the bid specification for the liner was based upon conformance to a proposed ACI/ASME joint code for **Concrete** Reactor Vessels and Containments, that justification for use of such a code would be submitted when it was approved, and that the contract had not yet been awarded. The inspector stated that the PSAR commitment remained and that this item would be carried as unresolved.

4. Procurement Requirement Conformance Documentation

The inspector asked what measures were provided to assure that proper documentation of conformance to procurement requirements was available on site prior to installing or using items. Specifically, the inspector questioned the means by which site personnel are to determine that documentation provided is acceptable. NSSS supplier provided items were stated to be handled by submission to the licensee of a listing of proposed documentation early in the contract, modification of that listing about 75% of the way through the contract, and finalization of that listing just prior to shipment. Balance of plant items were stated to be handled through identification in the applicable specification and the referenced listing of required documentation in Section III.9 of the licensee's Quality Assurance Requirements for Licensee Contractors and Vendors. That listing was stated to be covered by the applicable specification.

It was also stated that vendor inspection prior to shipment would be the means by which documentation was evaluated as correct and sufficient. The inspector asked if release for installation was established at the vendor's plant and was informed that such was not the case but that part of the determination of acceptability was made there, with receipt inspection and verification that required, and acceptable, documentation is on site also being necessary. The inspector asked how, for example, site personnel would know they had all the authorized contract exception and deviation documentation, or all the radiographs required. The licensee acknowledged that more detailed means of assuring that procurement requirement documentation is complete and proper are required. He also stated that such details come under the cognizance of the Construction-Manager, that safety-related equipment would not be arriving at the site for a considerable time period, and that the Construction Manager's program would adequately cover conformance to procurement requirements. This item is unresolved.

5. Drawing Control

The inspector asked how drawings are controlled to assure that only current revisions are used. Examination of the licensee's procedure FR 1-3 dated February 25, 1971 identified the requirements for insuring that the latest revisions are available (Art. 2.1.3) and for preventing use of outdated revisions (Art. 2.1.4). The Project Files were identified as the only controlled file in the home office (Art. 2.5).

A master index of all project drawings is required to be produced monthly by the Architect-Engineer (Art. 2.2.3). But specific drawing handling measures to assure that effective drawings are promptly filed and superseded drawings handled so as to prevent their use were not evident. This item is unresolved.

6. Audit Followup

Licensee records for an NSSS supplier facility audit on September 27-28, 1971 were reviewed. An independent consultant assisted in the audit. Thirteen (13) findings and recommendations were established and forwarded to the NSSS supplier by the licensee's letter FR-1/1499 dated October 21, 1971. Reaudit documented by licensee letter FR-1/2263 of December 12, 1972 verified resolution of 10 of the 13 findings and recommendations. The independent consultant's agenda planning established by letter dated June 26, 1973 included the three remaining unresolved items in the proposed agenda for the next audit, scheduled for September 18-19, 1973.

Spot check of recorded details for audit item 1 showed that an indicated procedure revision had been accomplished and implementation of the revised procedure was found satisfactory by the auditors. Spot check of Audit item 5, contractual obligation to meet Appendix B, 10 CFR 50, showed it to be an outstanding item to be reinspected. Review of the NSSS supplier's QA Manual submitted to the licensee showed, however, that the indicated contractual area did not affect the practice of the supplier, in that his QA Manual (QR-70-90) commits compliance to the 18 Criteria of Appendix B, 10 CFR 50. The inspector had no further questions on audit followup.

7. Specification Review

The inspector asked how component design review was accomplished. He was informed that specifications were routed to cognizant organizations for review prior to their approval. One of the Architect-Engineer's equipment specifications, covering component cooling pumps, was spot checked to examine the procedural control applied. Review and comment forms were filled out on the specification by the licensee and the Construction Manager, with the Construction Manager's review appearing to be comprehensive. Intended incorporation of comments considered valid was noted, but the contract award had reportedly not been made and a valid cross-check of specification comments against the award specification was not made.

The inspector questioned the means used to resolve exceptions taken to bid specifications. The licensee stated that his practice consisted of issuance of a bid specification, selection of a bidder, negotiation of exceptions, and issuance of an award specification based upon the resolution of any exceptions identified. The inspector had no further questions concerning specification review.

8. Job Description

The inspector asked a QC specialist if the duties and authority of his position were described in writing, other than in project directives. He was shown, and examined, a written job description for the position. The inspector had no further questions on this item.

9. Site Visit

A tour of the powerplant site was made after inspection at the licensee's home office. About six trailers were located on site. Clearing, grading, and grubbing operations were in progress. Informal discussions with Construction Manager personnel were held. Site operations are still in a preliminary phase. Safety-related items were stated to be expected to begin to arrive during the latter half of calendar year 1974, with the possible exception on some rebar which may be received earlier. Warehouse construction was stated to be scheduled for the February-August 1974 period, compatible with the storage requirements for safety-related items.