

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION III

Report No. 50-456/85029(DRS)

Docket No. 50-456

License No. CPPR-132

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

Facility Name: Braidwood Station, Unit 1

Inspection At: Braidwood Site, Braidwood, Illinois

Inspection Conducted: June 25-28, July 2, and July 9-11, 1985

Inspector:

J. A. Malloy
J. A. Malloy

7/30/85
Date

Approved By:

F. C. Hawkins
F. C. Hawkins, Chief
Quality Assurance Programs Section

7/30/85
Date

Inspection Summary

Inspection on June 25-28, July 2, and July 9-11, 1985 (Report No. 50-456/85029(DRS))

Areas Inspected: Routine, announced inspection by one regional inspector of preoperational testing quality assurance, quality assurance operational staffing and status of selected preoperational functional areas. The inspection involved 44 inspector-hours onsite and 12 inspector-hours of in-office procedure review at Region III.

Results: No violations or deviations were identified.

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Commonwealth Edison Company (CECo)

*C. Tomashek, Startup Superintendent
*T. Quaka, Site QA Superintendent
C. Schroeder, Project Licensing Superintendent
*R. Kyroutac, Station QA Supervisor
*H. Zimmerman, Startup Test Supervisor
*E. Netzel, QA Supervisor
*S. Hunsader, QA Supervisor
L. Kline, Project Licensing Supervisor
B. Wood, Startup Coordinator
*D. Cecchetti, Project Licensing
*W. Betounne, QA Engineer
*L. Johnson, QA Engineer
*E. Mazur, QA Engineer
*T. Simpkin, Technical Staff

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)

L. McGregor, Senior Resident Inspector
*A. Dunlop, Reactor Inspector
*D. Williams, Reactor Inspector

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

*Indicates those attending the exit meeting on July 11, 1985.

2. Preoperational Testing Quality Assurance

A review was conducted of the quality assurance program established for the preoperational testing activities at the Braidwood Station. Preoperational testing activities included the testing categories identified as construction verification tests and preoperational tests. The objectives of this review were to verify that the QA program provided control over the conduct of testing, to verify that the QA program which covers preoperational testing activities had been developed consistent with regulatory requirements and commitments, and to verify that the QA program which covered preoperational testing activities had been implemented. This review was conducted at the beginning of preoperational testing activities.

a. Documents Reviewed

- (1) Byron/Braidwood Final Safety Analysis Report, Chapter 14, "Initial Test Program", January 1985.
- (2) Braidwood Project Startup Manual, Revision 13.
- (3) Commonwealth Edison Quality Assurance Program Manual, Revision 2.

- (4) Quality Assurance Procedures Manual
 - (a) QP 11-1, "Development, Performance, Documentation and Evaluation of Construction Tests", Revision 10.
 - (b) QP 11-2, "Development, Performance, Documentation and Evaluation of Preoperational and Startup Tests", Revision 1.
 - (c) QP 18-1, "Quality Program Audits", Revision 8.
- (5) Construction and Preoperational Audit and Surveillance Reports.
- (6) Qualification Binders for QA Inspectors and Engineers.
- (7) Quality Assurance Department Memorandums.

b. Results of Inspection

- (1) The inspector verified through the review of Quality Assurance Department Position Descriptions that minimum educational, experience and qualification requirements had been established for the positions of the station quality assurance supervisor, engineer, inspector, and operating inspector. The personnel records of the station QA supervisor, two QA engineers, and two QA inspectors were reviewed to verify that these minimum educational, experience and qualification requirements were being met. The personnel records of two newly hired inspectors were also examined to verify that position description requirements had been met.
- (2) The inspector verified that a training program had been established for QA auditors and inspectors which included company indoctrination and specific preoperational testing indoctrination. The inspector verified that responsibilities for the indoctrination training program had been identified in procedures. The personnel records of two quality assurance inspectors were examined to verify that the indoctrination training was performed.
- (3) The inspector reviewed various audits and surveillances that have covered both preoperational and construction testing activities. The inspector verified that the deficiencies that were identified were corrected.
- (4) Project Startup Procedure PSU-200, Revision 3, was in the process of being revised. The startup group will be required to inform site quality assurance when the Level III flushing inspector witnesses hold points for flushing tests. In discussions with site QA and startup testing personnel, site QA will have the option to accompany the flushing inspector. Pending further review of the frequency of site QA participation in flushing activities, this item is open (456/85029-01).

- (5) During the review of selected test deficiency reports, a number of reports appeared to be inadequately prepared, dispositioned, and closed (follow-up action). Because site quality assurance is responsible for the final approval of the test deficiency reports, the inspector is concerned whether quality assurance is appropriately involved in the test deficiency process. Pending further review of quality assurance involvement, this matter is considered to be an unresolved item (456/85029-02).

No violations or deviations were identified.

3. Operational Staffing

The inspector verified that the quality assurance organization had been designated as indicated in the FSAR and Quality Assurance Manual. The qualifications of the station quality assurance supervisor, two QA engineers and two QA inspectors were also reviewed.

No violations or deviations were identified.

4. Other Preoperational Functional Areas

The inspector reviewed the status of the following areas: QA/QC administration; audits; document control; maintenance; design changes and modifications; surveillance testing; procurement control; receipt, storage and handling; records; tests and experiments; and test and measurement equipment. Although programs for these areas were documented, implementation activities were minimal. These areas will be reviewed in future inspections.

No violations or deviations were identified.

5. Unresolved Item

Unresolved items are matters about which information is required in order to ascertain whether they are acceptable items, violations, or deviations. One unresolved item was disclosed during the inspection.

6. 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. One open item was disclosed during the inspection.

7. Exit Interview

The inspector met with licensee representatives (denoted in Paragraph 1) at Braidwood at the conclusion of the inspection on July 11, 1985, and summarized the purpose, scope, and findings of the inspection. The inspector discussed the likely informational content of the inspection report with regard to documents or processes reviewed by the inspector during the inspection. The licensee did not identify any such documents or processes as proprietary.