U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION III

Reports No. 50-254/84-16(DRP); 50-265/84-14(DRP)

Dockets No. 50-254; 50-265

License Nos. DPR-29; DPR-30

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

Facility Name: Quad-Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2

Inspection At: Quad-Cities Site, Cordova, IL

Inspection Conducted: September 6 through October 6, 1984

Inspectors: A. L. Madison

A. D. Morrongiello

J. C. Bjorgen

C. D. Anderson Approved by: N. J. Charlesotimos, Chief Projects Section 2C

10-17-84 Date

Inspection S mmary

Inspection on September 6 through October 6, 1984 (Reports No. 50-254/84-16(DRP); 50-265/84-14(DRP))

Areas Inspected: Routine, unannounced inspection by the resident inspectors of operations; radiological controls; maintenance/modifications; surveillance; fire protection; emergency preparedness; security, quality assurance; quality control; administration; procedures; routine and non-routine reports; and independent inspection. The inspection involved a total of 210 inspector-hours onsite by four NRC inspectors including 42 inspector-hours onsite during offshifts. Results: No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

- *N. Kalivianakis, Superintendent
- T. Tamlyn, Assistant Superintendent for Operations
- D. Bax, Assistant Superintendent for Maintenance
- *L. Gerner, Assistant Superintendent for Administration
- *D. Gibson, Quality Assurance Supervisor
- G. Spedl, Technical Staff Supervisor R. Roby, Senior Operating Engineer

The inspector also interviewed several other licensee employees, including shift engineers and foremen, reactor operators, technical staff personnel and quality control personnel.

*Denotes those present at the exit interview on October 5, 1984.

Routine Inspection 2.

The resident inspectors, through direct observation, discussions with licensee personnel, and review of applicable records and logs, examined the areas stated in the inspection summary. The items contained in the enclosure were considered during this review.

Further, additional observations were made in the following areas:

Plant Operations a.

Units 1 and 2 were in operation at the beginning of the report period and, except for minor reductions in power to accommodate testing and load dispatcher requests, remained at full power the duration of the report period.

During plant tours of Units 1 and 2, the inspectors walked down the accessible portions of the residual heat removal systems to verify operability.

Radiological Controls b.

The Radiation/Chemistry Department has instituted a new policy regarding people who repeatedly become contaminated. These people will be watched by health physics personnel to determine why they get contaminated and to provide instruction to prevent further occurrences. The policy became effective September 1, 1984.

Maintenance C.

Portions of the following maintenance activities were observed/reviewed:

Unit 1

Repairs to 1B reactor feed pump

Unit 2

Repairs to condensate/condensate booster pumps Repairs to 2B Reactor Protection System Motor Generator set Repairs to 2 Emergency diesel generator air compressor

d. Surveillance

Portions of the following surveillance activities were observed/reviewed:

Monthly surveillance on Unit 1, Unit 2, and the 1/2 emergency diesel generators Determination and setting of recirculation pump limits

e. Licensee Event Reports Followup

Unit 1

- (i) (Closed) RO 84-02, dated March 7, 1984, leak rate from all valves and penetrations in excess of Technical Specifications.
- (ii) (Closed) RO 84-13, dated August 8, 1984, reactor scram and ECCS initiation from false signal (details in Reports 50-254/84-14(DRP); 50-265/84-16(DRP).
- (iv) (Closed) RO 84-16, dated August 28, 1984, reactor scram due to spurious main steam line high flow signal (details in Reports 50-254/84-14(DRP); 50-265/84-16(DRP).
- (v) RO 84-17, dated August 16, 1984, steam jet air ejector valves incorrectly installed. This incident has been referred to the Division of Reactor Safety for inclusion in their review of design changes/modifications and as such, will remain open pending completion of this review.

Unit 2

 R0 84-07, dated June 10, 1984, Unit scram caused by No. 4 turbine control valve fast closure. This revision confirms the suppositions of the first report and updates the equipment status. This item will remain open pending completion of the planned modification.

3. Independent Inspection

- a. Failure of anti-cavitation devices in residual heat removal service water heat exchanger cutlet valves was reported by the Office for Analysis and Evaluation of Operational Data. A review of equipment determined that these devices were not in use at Quad Cities Station. Appropriate site personnel were notified of this potential problem.
- b. On August 31, 1984, Robinson Unit 2 reported problems experienced with test switches purchased from REES, Inc. A review of parts and equipment determined that these switches are not in use at Quad Cities. Appropriate site personnel were notified of this potential problem.

4. Exit Interview

The inspector met with licensee representatives (denoted in Paragraph 1) throughout the month and at the conclusion of the inspection on October 5, 1984, and summarized the scope and findings of the inspection activities. The licensee acknowledged the inspectors' concerns.

ENCLOSURE

The following items were considered during the review:

Activities were accomplished in a timely manner using approved procedures and drawings and were inspected/reviewed as applicable; procedures, procedure revisions and routine reports were in accordance with Technical Specifications, regulatory guides and industry codes or standards; approvals were obtained prior to initiating any work; activities were accomplished by qualified personnel; the limiting conditions for operation were met during normal operation and while components or systems were removed from service; functional testing and/or calibrations were performed prior to returning components or systems to service; independent verification of equipment lineups and review of test results were accomplished; quality control records and logs were properly maintained/and reviewed; parts, materials, and equipment were properly certified, calibrated, stored and/or maintained as applicable, adverse plant conditions including equipment malfunctions, potential fire hazards, radiological hazards, fluid leaks, excessive vibrations, and personnel errors were addressed in a timely manner with sufficient and proper corrective actions and reviewed by appropriate management personnel.