

DmB

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION III

Report No. 50-456/85031(DRP); 50-457/85030(DRP)

Docket Nos. 50-456; 50-457

Licenses No. CPPR-132; CPPR-133

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

Facility Name: Braidwood Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2

Inspection At: Braidwood Site, Braidwood, Illinois

Inspection Conducted: June 17 through June 21, 1985

Inspector: *P. R. Pelke*
P. R. Pelke

7/9/85
Date

Approved By: *W. S. Little*
W. S. Little, Director
Braidwood Project

7/10/85
Date

Inspection Summary

Inspection on June 17 through June 21, 1985 (Report No. 50-456/85031(DRP); 50-457/85030(DRP))

Areas Inspected: Routine, unannounced safety inspection of licensee actions on previous inspection findings, IE Circulars, and allegations. The inspection involved a total of 37 inspector-hours onsite by one inspector.

Results: No violations or deviations were identified.

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Commonwealth Edison Company (CECo)

- *M. Wallace, Project Manager
- *C. Schroeder, Licensing and Compliance Superintendent
- *D. Shamblin, Construction Superintendent
- *L. Kline, Licensing and Compliance Supervisor
- *D. Boone, Construction Engineer
- *T. Quaka, Quality Assurance Superintendent
- *W. Vahle, Project Field Engineering Manager
- *D. Cecchett, Project Licensing and Compliance
- *C. Tomashek, Startup Superintendent
- *G. Marcus, Project Management
- *E. Wendorf, Project Field Engineer
- *J. Geiseker, Project Construction Department
- *J. Phelan, Project Field Engineer
- *H. Zimmerman, Testing Supervisor
- T. Ronkoske, Field Engineer
- I. Rivera, OAD

L. K. Comstock (LKC)

- *R. Seltmann, Quality Assurance Manager
- *I. Dewald, Quality Control Manager
- *J. Klena, Project Engineer
- *F. Rolan, Project Manager

G. K. Newberg (GKN)

- *R. Donica, Quality Assurance Manager
- *D. Craven, Project Manager
- L. Tinker, Area Superintendent

Phillips Getschow Company (PGCo)

- *T. O'Connor, Project Manager
- *J. Stewart, Project Engineer
- *K. Kranz, Quality Assurance Site Manager

Sargent and Lundy (S&L)

- *K. Fus

Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)

*L. McGregor, Senior Resident Inspector
*R. Schulz, Senior Resident Inspector
*W. Little, Director, Braidwood Project

*Denotes those attending the June 21, 1985 exit meeting.

Additional licensee and contractor personnel were contacted during the course of the inspection.

2. Licensee Action on Previously Identified Items

(Closed) Noncompliance (456/82-01-04; 457/82-01-03): Nine out of 25 post tensioning vendor drawings on the rack in the Braidwood site construction office for Unit 1 were superseded and not identified as such, six out of 22 similar drawings for Unit 2 were also superseded and not identified as such, and the latest revisions of the superseded drawings were not distributed and used at this prescribed location.

The drawing files were updated the day after the discrepancies were identified. The vendor drawings in the Project Construction Office have all been stamped "For Information Only" and are not controlled. The site contractors' files were used whenever controlled construction vendor prints were needed. This item is considered to be closed.

(Closed) Open Item (456/83-18-07): During a review of MCC 1AP26E, the inspectors observed that the field welds between the equipment channels and the embedded sills had not been painted.

The inspector verified, by visual inspection, that the welds on MCC 1AP26E have been painted. L. K. Comstock Procedure 4.8.3, "Weld Inspection", Revision H, dated February 5, 1985, was revised to state in Paragraph 3.25 that, "LKC QC shall perform an inspection of released areas to assure that painting of field welds has been completed. The inspection shall take place when the walkdown inspection takes place. Results of the inspection shall be documented on a General Inspection Report." This item is considered to be closed.

(Closed) Open Item (456/84-23-03): During a review of the terminations in junction box 1JB428R-K1R, it appeared that the copper conductor was not inserted far enough into the lug barrel to provide a good mechanical and electrical connection on three terminations. Also, it appeared that the copper conductor extended too far beyond the lug barrel on one termination so as to cause interference when installing the termination screw. The licensee was requested to reinspect these terminations and determine their acceptability.

An LKC Inspection Correction Report (ICR) was written and work was completed to correct the termination deficiencies. The inspector verified that the terminations were acceptable. This item is considered to be closed.

The inspector noted that the drain wire for circuit 1RC226 was terminated on TBI at Point 9. The applicable drawing, 20E-1-4105M, Revision J, does not show this termination. LKC Procedure 4.3.9, "Cable Termination Installation", Revision C, dated March 7, 1984, Paragraph 3.10.1.2, states, "when no termination of the drain wire is indicated on the construction drawing, the drain wire shall be bent back and insulated with tape or heat shrinkable tubing."

The inspector reviewed LKC ICR No. 7000 which controlled this installation. The ICR referenced the wrong drawing and the work was QC accepted. Additionally, the cable de-termination and re-termination cards, dated June 1, 1985, for this activity referenced the wrong drawing and the re-termination card has a QC inprocess inspection signature. LKC wrote a nonconformance report to address these concerns. This is an unresolved item pending the inspectors' review of the licensee's corrective actions (456/85031-01).

(Closed) Open Item (456/84-23-04; 457/84-22-02): Review the revised LKC NCR procedure, as approved, and personnel training records.

The inspector reviewed LKC Procedure 4.11.1, "Nonconforming Items," Revision F, dated June 18, 1984 (Effective December 7, 1984). The disposition category "reject" has been removed from the procedure. The disposition categories "use-as-is, rework, repair, scrap, and other", have been defined. The inspector reviewed LKC records which documented a December 10, 1984 training session on this revised procedure. This item is considered to be closed.

No violations or deviations were identified.

3. IE Circulars

For the IE Circular listed below, the inspector verified that the circular was received by the licensee's management, that a review for applicability was performed, and that if the circular was applicable to the facility, appropriate corrective actions were taken or were scheduled to be taken.

(Closed) IE Circular 76-06: Stress Corrosion Cracks in Stagnant, Low Pressure Stainless Piping Containing Boric Acid Solution at PWR's. This circular relates to several occurrences of through-wall cracking in low pressure stainless steel piping containing boric acid solution. The failure mechanism was intergranular stress corrosion cracking in all observed instances. Once Braidwood is operational, inservice inspections will provide for a VT-2 examination every period (40 months) of the Class 2 and 3 portions of systems containing boric acid. This circular is considered to be closed.

No violations or deviations were identified.

4. Review of Allegations

(Closed) Allegation (RIII-85-A-0022): On February 5, 1985, Region III received an anonymous allegation that during winter months, salt was being used for ice control in the Braidwood parking lots. The alleger was concerned with the potential for salt being tracked into the building areas, being transferred to safety-related equipment and causing corrosion. This allegation was forwarded to the licensee for their review in a letter dated March 27, 1985.

The inspector reviewed the results of the licensee's review. Since the start of construction at Braidwood, no salt has been purchased, brought onsite or used to control ice and snow. Commonwealth Edison has only used sand on the main roads and paved areas to ease sliding conditions.

This sand is applied by two dump trucks with spreader boxes similar to those used by highway department vehicles. The sand used is from the batch plant stockpile. This was done to prevent having two sand stockpiles, thus eliminating the possibility of using the wrong sand in Category I concrete. In areas that have been stoned (rather than paved), CA-6 (Road Mix), a graded aggregate, is hand spread to provide better footing. The inspector interviewed the Newberg Area Superintendent responsible for these activities and he confirmed that no salt was used for ice control.

Additionally, during 1983 and 1984, a liquid ice preventer was used on side walks and around buildings. A total of 275 gallons of this product has been used at the site. A sample of this product was submitted to the CECO Systems Materials Analysis Department for an analysis for halogens, sulfur, and heavy metals. The sample was analyzed using ion chromatography and atomic absorption spectroscopy. The results of the analysis indicated that this product is not corrosive.

This allegation was not substantiated and is considered to be closed.

(Closed) Allegation (RIII-85-A-0009): Region III received an unsigned letter on January 24, 1985, alleging that a former Daniel International Corporation Level II civil Quality Inspector at Fermi 2 had not been properly trained or certified as a Level II Civil Quality Inspector. The alleger expressed specific concerns that he felt the individual was unable to correctly perform calculations relative to sand cone tests, cross sectional area of concrete cylinders, minimum distance between two concrete wedge anchors of differing diameters, or the revised torque value of anchor bolts using a torque wrench adaptor. This allegation was not substantiated and was closed for Fermi 2 in Report No. 50-341/85019(DRS). However, the alleger requested Region III to ensure that the individual and other Daniel inspectors who were transferred to Braidwood have the proper training before they can sign QC documents.

The inspector determined that the individual is currently certified at Braidwood as a BCAP Civil/Structural Level II inspector. The inspector reviewed the individual's certification package which contained the following information:

- ° The individual arrived onsite during December 1984.
- ° The individual had six years and two months of previous experience.
- ° The individual had passed both written and oral examinations, and the Vision Acuity Test. The individual had completed all required reading.
- ° A letter of recommendation for certification as a Level II from his supervisor was in the certification package.
- ° The individual was certified on May 7, 1985.
- ° The certification package was approved by BCAP QA.

The inspector determined that the individual was properly certified in accordance with BCAP Procedure BCAP-08, "Qualification and Certification of Reinspection Personnel," and ANSI N45.2.6 (1978).

Additionally, the inspector determined that other inspectors previously employed by Daniel Construction Company at the Fermi 2 plant were assigned to the Braidwood BCAP Program. During a previous inspection (Report No. 50-456/84-25; 50-457/84-24), an unresolved item was identified by the NRC BCAP inspector that a number of the BCAP inspectors were previously certified by Daniel Construction Company under a certification process which was not, on the surface, compatible with Braidwood site requirements. The affected inspectors had been performing inspections, at facilities under construction by Daniel Construction Company, for at least six months. The NRC BCAP inspector requested the licensee to review the affected inspectors' experience, education, and prior certifications to ensure that their certification at Braidwood would satisfy the requirements of ANSI N45.2.6. This unresolved item was closed in Report No. 50-456/85025; 50-457/85026. In followup to the unresolved item, the NRC BCAP inspector reviewed the education and experience data for 18 BCAP taskforce inspectors. In each case, the documented data exceeded the requirements delineated in ANSI N45.2.6.

Based on these reviews, this allegation is considered to be closed.

No violations or deviations were identified.

5. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items are matters about which more information is required in order to ascertain whether they are acceptable items, items of noncompliance, or deviations. An unresolved item disclosed during the inspection is discussed in Paragraph 2.

6. Exit Interview

The inspector met with licensee and contractor representatives denoted in Paragraph 1 during and at the conclusion of the inspection on June 21, 1985. The inspector summarized the scope and results of the inspection and discussed the likely content of this inspection report. The licensee acknowledged the information and did not indicate that any of the information disclosed during the inspection could be considered proprietary in nature.