

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION V

Report No. 50-508/84-03

Docket No. 50-508

Construction Permit No. CPPR-154

Licensee: Washington Public Power Supply System (WPPSS)
P. O. Box 1223
Elma, Washington 98541

Facility Name: Washington Nuclear Project 3

Inspection at: WNP-3 Site, Satsop, Washington

Inspection conducted: September 24-27, 1984

Inspectors: E. M. Garcia 10/25/84
E. M. Garcia, Radiation Specialist Date Signed

Approved by: G. P. Yuhas, Jr. 10/26/84
G. P. Yuhas, Chief, Reactor Radiation Date Signed
Protection Section

Summary:

Inspection on September 24-27, 1984 (Report No. 50-508/84-03)

Areas Inspected: Routine unannounced inspection by a regionally based inspector of the quality assurance program for extended construction delay including organization, audits, quality records, and a site tour. This inspection involved 26 hours on site by one inspector.

Results: Of the four areas inspected no violations or deviations were identified.

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

a. Washington Public Power Supply System

- A. D. Kohler, WNP-3 Program Director
- *C. E. Love, Manager Construction
- L. J. Garvin, Manager Construction Quality Assurance
- *E. J. Galbraith, Acting Plant Manager
- *D. I. Hulbert, Assistant Project Manager, Engineering
- *E. A. Stauffer, Manager, Plant Quality Assurance
- *J. A. Vanni, Manager, Plant Nuclear Safety Assurance
- *D. R. Coody, Supervisor Project Quality Assurance
- *C. Butros, Project Engineer
- *H. Barton, Project Engineer

b. Ebasco Services Inc.

- *L. A. Bast, Acting Manager Project Site Quality Assurance
- *R. Shetty, Project Engineer

c. Other Organizations

- *M. Mills, Contract Administrator, Washington State EFSEC
- *S. F. Swearngin, Program Analyst, Bonneville Power Authority

* Denotes those attending the exit interview on September 27, 1984.

In addition to the individuals noted above, the inspectors interviewed other members of the licensee's and contractor's staff.

2. Organization

Since the last inspection the licensee has submitted an amendment to Chapter 17 of their Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR). Tables 17.1-1 through 17.1-4 of this chapter describe the licensee's organizational structure, including the quality organizations. The position of WNP-3 Project Quality Assurance (Q. A.) Manager is currently held by the corporate Construction Quality Assurance Manager. Other changes in the organization previously described in Inspection Report number 84-01, include a reduction in the site full-time staff of Project Quality Assurance to a supervisor and two engineers. The Project Q. A. Manager spends only part of his time at the site, with the remainder in his capacity as corporate Construction Q. A. Manager at the corporate offices in Richland. The site operational Q. A. group consists of the WNP-3 Q. A. Manager and the WNP-3 Safety Assurance Manager. No additional engineers or other technical staff are assigned in this area.

The Ebasco Q. A. group consists of a supervisor (acting Q. A. manager), nine engineers, and eight Q. A. specialists (quality documentation clerks). Functional areas include: contractor audits and surveillances,

Q. A. engineering, training, civil engineering test laboratory, receiving inspection, vendor Q. A., and Q. A. records.

No violations or deviations were identified in this area.

3. Audits

The inspector examined the records of three audits performed by the Supply System staff. Audit number 84-290 of March 26-30, 1984 was a corporate audit of the Supply System's Q. A. program at the site. This audit identified six Quality Findings Reports (QFRs). At the time of the inspection all of the QFRs had been closed. Review of the corrective actions taken by the licensee appeared to be responsive and adequate.

Audit number 84-297, of May 14-17 was a corporate audit of the Ebasco site activities. One QFR and eight deficiencies were identified. At the time of the inspection all audit items were considered closed. The responses and corrective actions appeared acceptable.

Audit number WNP-3-256-1, conducted on August 14-20, 1984, was an audit of contractor 256, Robert McMullan and Son, Inc.. This audit was performed by the staff of the Project Q. A. organization to fulfill the internal audit commitment of the contractor. The audit identified two items of concern and nine QFRs. The response to the audit findings was received on September 20, 1984. At the time of the inspection the licensee had not completed the review of the response.

The licensee is fulfilling its commitment to conduct periodic internal audits of their organization.

No violations or deviations were identified in this area.

4. Records

a. Supply System Preventative Maintenance

Selected records of preventative maintenance on safety systems conducted in the previous twelve months were examined. These systems include: low pressure safety injection (LPSI) pump and motor, high pressure safety injection (HPSI) pump and motor, reactor coolant system pumps and motors, shutdown heat exchangers, and steam generators. The licensee generally conducted preventative maintenance within the scheduled intervals. No significant problems were noted in the records with the exception of the inability to successfully eliminate all the oxygen in the steam generators. A nitrogen purge had not excluded oxygen from the steam generators. The problem was receiving attention from the licensee, the architect engineer, and the equipment vendor. The licensee stated that with the low humidity in the steam generators failure to preclude oxygen will not result in a degradation of the equipment, but that they will continue working to resolve this problem.

The inspector stated that the notes in the "comments" section of the preventative maintenance records needed improvement. It was not

clear if the notes refer to the condition the components as they had been found or the actions taken by the maintenance crew. The licensee agreed and stated that this matter will be discussed with the individuals involved and their supervisors.

The matters of the steam generators and the notes in preventative maintenance records were discussed in the exit interview.

No violations or deviations were identified in this area.

b. Ebasco Preventative Maintenance

During the tour of the Ebasco warehouses the inspector examined the preventative maintenance records. Based on discussion with the responsible individuals it was determined that their practice was not to record any additional maintenance that they may have performed, beyond that required by their procedure. Thus the records will indicate the date that the quarterly surveillance on the humidity indicator for the HPSI internals was conducted, but not note that the desiccant and humidity indicator had been changed a week earlier. After this matter was discussed with the Plant Q. A. Manager, the need for this information was recognized and the contractor agreed to record all maintenance performed.

No violations or deviations were identified in this area.

c. Quality Records

Inspection Report 84-01 describes the use of Site Work Instructions (SWI), for controlling the review and acceptance of contractor's quality records submitted to Ebasco for maintenance and storage. Paragraph 5 of that report discussed an inconsistency in the specific wording of SWI number 3240-256-SWI-001 and what the licensee intended to do. The licensee had not understood the point made by the inspector and had not corrected the inconsistency. After discussing the matter with the inspector Ebasco revised the SWI. Further, the representative from Ebasco stated that prior to reviewing any additional documents from any contractor they will assure that the SWI wording clearly reflect the intent of the review, and that all reviews will be performed in accordance with the written SWIs.

This matter was discussed at the exit interview.

No violations or deviations were identified in this area.

5. Facility Tour

The inspector toured the containment and auxiliary buildings to observe the preservation of installed equipment, and the Ebasco warehouses to observe the preservation of stored equipment. It was noted that electrical and control panels were protected under plastic. Pumps and motors were covered and lamps or heaters installed to minimize condensation. Incomplete systems had openings sealed with plastic or wood

covers. Some systems had vapor phase inhibitors applied to minimize corrosion. The reactor opening was covered with a locked protective structure. The warehouses were clean and environmentally controlled, materials were properly segregated. When desiccators were used the containers were sealed and had humidity indicators. With the exceptions noted below it appeared to the inspector that the licensee was appropriately protecting the installed and stored equipment.

The inspector noted a considerable residue from sand blasting. The licensee stated that the painting contractor was still working in the containment building and that when this work was completed the sand blasting residue would be removed.

The inspector also noted that a cover on one end of the pipe to the component cooling water heat exchanger was not in place. The licensee arranged to have the cover installed.

A tag on the primary side of the shutdown heat exchanger indicated that a vapor phase inhibitor had been applied. Supply System procedure 10.100.19 prohibits the use of vapor phase inhibitor on primary system components. Subsequent to the inspection the licensee determined that the vapor phase inhibitor had not been applied on the primary side and that the tag had been placed on the wrong side of the heat exchanger.

The inspector's observations were discussed in the exit interview. The licensee's comments are as noted above.

No violations or deviations were identified in this area.

6. Exit Interview

At the conclusion of the inspection the inspector met with the individuals denoted in Paragraph 1. The scope and findings of the inspection were discussed. Specific areas discussed during the exit interview are identified in Paragraphs 4 and 5. The licensee was informed that no violations had been identified.