

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF INSPECTION AND ENFORCEMENT

REGION V

Report No. 50-508/86-03

License No. CPPR-154

Licensee: Washington Public Power Supply System

Facility Name: WNP-3

Inspection at: Construction Site

Inspection Conducted: March 17-18, 1986

Inspectors: W. G. Albert, Reactor Inspector

3/28/86  
Date Signed

Approved by: K. T. Dodds, Reactor Projects Section I

3/29/86  
Date Signed

Summary:

Inspection on March 17-18, 1986 (Report No. 50-508/86-03)

Areas Inspected: Unannounced inspection of selected open issues. This inspection involved 13 hours onsite by one NRC inspector. Inspection procedure 92702 was followed.

Results: In the areas inspected, no violations of NRC requirements were identified.

8604210277 860331  
PDR ADOCK C5000508  
G PDR

## DETAILS

### 1. Individuals Contacted

#### a. Washington Public Power Supply System (WPPSS)

J. R. Garvin, Quality Assurance Manager (Corporate Office)  
D. R. Coody, Project Quality Assurance Manager  
C. E. Love, Construction Manager  
A. G. Carlyle, Quality Assurance Engineer  
D. W. Coleman, Manager, Safety Assurance

#### b. Ebasco Services Inc. (Ebasco)

P. L. Pitman, Quality Program Site Manager  
W. K. Drinkard, Project Quality Engineer

### 2. Licensee Action on Previous Follow-Up and Enforcement Items

#### a. (Closed) Follow-Up (50-508/80-14/03) WPPSS/Ebasco - QA Program Surveillance and Audit Effectiveness

This issue was originally raised with regard to a finding that the licensee was tardy in identifying various problem areas with their HVAC contractor. The item was originally written as memo to the NRC itself for further follow-up.

The licensee nonetheless nearly doubled their surveillance of this contractor in the six months following the issue of Report No. 50-508/80-14.

The licensee's actions appear prudent in view of the NRC observation, although the suspension of construction and the termination of the HVAC contract no longer leaves this issue one of practical significance. This item is closed.

#### b. (Closed) Follow-Up (50-508/81-08-13) Ebasco - Inconsistent Definitions of NonConforming Conditions

This item originally arose when the NRC inspector observed that various definitions were being used in project documents of what constituted a nonconforming condition. In reviewing the issue during this inspection, the inspector compared the definitions in use with that of ANSI N45.2.10. The ANSI very clearly stated that questionable or indeterminate conditions constituted a nonconforming condition; this point appeared to be the issue in question. It was found that definitions in current site documents generally followed the ANSI guidance. The only exception was the Ebasco Corporate Manual (ETR1001). Ebasco personnel agreed to initiate action to provide conformance of the corporate manual to ANSI. Nonetheless, the inspector was satisfied that site documents now provided a clear understanding that any condition which rendered the quality of an item or service as indeterminate, would be treated as a nonconformance. This item is closed.

c. (Closed) Follow-Up Item (50-508/81-08-22) Licensee Evaluations to Assure Procedure Comment Resolution

This item was directed to the work of J. A. Jones. In a memo of April 13, 1983, the licensee's QA organization reported on a review conducted of all J. A. Jones procedures to assure that comments had been properly resolved. In a memo of April 19, 1983, the licensee's QA organization reported on a satisfactory review of other principal contractors. This item is closed.

d. (Closed) Follow-Up Item (50-508/81-08-24) Actions to Assure Proper J. A. Jones Concrete Placement

In the original item, the NRC inspector had observed what appeared to be a weakness in the way craft personnel of J. A. Jones worked with their quality verification personnel and also a weakness in the way quality verification personnel worked among themselves. The licensee had agreed to assure that appropriate corrective action was taken. As evidence of this corrective action, the licensee had records of craft training and quality verification (J. A. Jones term) training. In neither case could the NRC inspector establish that the training specifically addressed the original concern of the NRC. With the suspension of construction and the termination of the J. A. Jones contract, there is no practical way of directly determining licensee follow-up on this item. This issue is closed.

e. (Closed) Follow-Up Item (50-508/81-09-01) Ebasco - Review of Requirements for Concrete Expansion Anchors

The original item found that procedures based on Ebasco Specification WPPSS 3240-467 inadequately addressed angularity of installation and distance from discontinuities such as abandoned holes. During this inspection, it was verified that an appropriate PCP (35Q-05670) had been issued correcting the specification and that all affected contractors had been appraised of the changes. This item is closed.

d. (Open) Enforcement (50-508/82-16-03) Ebasco Failure to Properly Classify Masonary Block Walls

This item originally arose when the NRC questioned whether wall No. 41, a 23 ft. high structure in one of the diesel generator rooms, would meet seismic design criteria. A "sister" wall in the other diesel generator room was fabricated of placed concrete. In examining this issue a corollary question arose as to whether the wall had the proper quality classification since it was a seismic Class I structure which could collapse on critical, safety related equipment. In reviewing this issue, the NRC inspector determined that it was not resolved in a satisfactory manner. At issue are the following points:

- . Does Wall No. 41 meet seismic design criteria? Ebasco contends that design of the wall to UBC is satisfactory. However, a licensee design review questioned the assumption of "rigid structure" for a wall of this type. This point has not been resolved.
  - . Should the wall be a quality Class I structure? The licensee and Ebasco have stated that the wall is not Class I and cannot be Class I as a practical matter, when concrete blocks and mortar are used. Reinforcing steel is Class I. To address this point a revision to the FSAR has been made. However, the NRC is not currently reviewing this FSAR and thus this question remains open.
  - . Assuming the wall is satisfactory as a non Class I structure, (Quality Class G), has sufficient quality control been exercised during construction to provide adequate assurance of integrity during a seismic event? Some licensee and Ebasco personnel contend that controls were adequate but available records indicate that minimal controls were exercised. A compilation of records for Wall No. 41 shows only incidental mention of three visual surveillances by a field engineer and four concrete tracking records related to grout for block fill. The contractor for this wall (CDC) did not perform safety related work on site. In the judgement of the NRC inspector the quality of Wall No. 41 is still indeterminate.
- g. (Closed) Enforcement (50-508/82-19-01) Ebasco - Failure to Obtain QA Review and Approval for Deviation from Specifications

This item relates to the improper use of the project change procedure (PCP) in a single instance. A licensee review of twenty-two other PCP's has shown that the responsible individual correctly routed the document for review in each of the other instances. Retraining was conducted. This item is closed.

### 3. MANAGEMENT MEETING

The inspector met with the Corporate Quality Assurance Manager and the site Quality Assurance Manager to discuss the results of the inspection. The licensee agreed that additional action was required with regard to the open item on masonry block walls.