



March 14, 1977
L-77-78

Central File
50-389

Norman C. Moseley, Director
Office of Inspection and Enforcement, Region II
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
230 Peachtree Street, N. W., Suite 818
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Dear Mr. Moseley:

Re: IE:II:DHD
50-389/76-3

Florida Power & Light Company has examined the above-referenced inspection report and has determined that it contains no proprietary information.

Very truly yours,

for Robert E. Uhrig
Vice President

REU/LLL/hlc

cc: Robert Lowenstein, Esq.



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION II
230 PEACHTREE STREET, N.W. SUITE 818
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303
JAN 12 1977

In Reply Refer To:
IE:II:DHD
50-389/76-3

Florida Power and Light Company
Attn: Dr. R. E. Uhrig, Vice President
of Nuclear and General
Engineering
P. O. Box 013100
9250 West Flagler Street
Miami, Florida 33101

Gentlemen:

This refers to the inspection conducted by Mr. D. H. Danielson of this office on November 18-19, 1976, of activities associated with your application for an NRC Construction Permit for St. Lucie Plant, Unit 2, and to the discussion of our findings held with Mr. J. E. Vessely at the conclusion of the inspection.

Areas examined during the inspection and our findings are discussed in the enclosed inspection report. Within these areas, the inspection consisted of selective examination of procedures and representative records, interviews with personnel, and observations by the inspector.

Within the scope of this inspection we identified no significant deviations from the requirements of 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, "Quality Assurance Criteria for Nuclear Power Plants," of the NRC regulations.

In accordance with Section 2.790 of the NRC's "Rules of Practice," Part 2, Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, a copy of this letter and the enclosed inspection report will be placed in the NRC's Public Document Room. If this report contains any information that you believe to be proprietary, it is necessary that you submit a written application to this office requesting that such information be withheld from public disclosure. If no proprietary information is identified, a written statement to that effect should be submitted. If an application is submitted, it must fully identify the bases for which information is claimed to be proprietary. The application should be prepared so that information sought to be withheld is incorporated in a separate paper and referenced in the application since the application will be placed in the Public Document Room. Your application, or written statement, should be submitted to us within 20 days. If we are not contacted as specified, the enclosed report and this letter may then be placed in the Public Document Room.

JAN 12 1977

Florida Power and Light
Company

-2-

Should you have any questions concerning this letter, we will be glad to discuss them with you.

Very truly yours,



C. E. Murphy, Chief
Reactor Construction and Engineering
Support Branch

Enclosure:
IE Inspection Report No.
50-389/76-3



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION II
230 PEACHTREE STREET, N.W. SUITE 818
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

IE Inspection Report No. 50-389/76-3

Licensee: Florida Power and Light Company
P. O. Box 013100
Miami, Florida 33101

Facility Name: St. Lucie Unit 2
Docket No.: 50-389
License No.: Pending
Category: A1

Location: Hutchinson Island, Florida

Type of License: 800 Mwe (CE)

Type of Inspection: Routine, Unannounced, Construction

Dates of Inspection: November 18-19, 1976

Dates of Previous Inspection: September 22-24, 1976

Principal Inspector: D. H. Danielson, Reactor Inspector
Projects Section
Reactor Construction and Engineering
Support Branch

Accompanying Inspector: R. W. Wright, Reactor Inspector
Engineering Support Section No. 1
Reactor Construction and Engineering
Support Branch

Other Accompanying Personnel: R. W. Compton, Reactor Inspector (Training)
Engineering Support Section No. 1
Reactor Construction and Engineering
Support Branch

Principal Inspector: *D. H. Danielson*
D. H. Danielson, Reactor Inspector
Projects Section
Reactor Construction and Engineering
Support Branch

11/12/77
Date

Reviewed by: *J. C. Bryant*
J. C. Bryant, Chief
Projects Section
Reactor Construction and Engineering Support Branch

11/12/77
Date

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

I. Deviations

None

II. Licensee Action on Previously Identified Deviations

None

III. New Unresolved Items

None

IV. Status of Previously Reported Unresolved Items

None

V. Design Changes

None

VI. Unusual Occurrences

None

VII. Other Significant Findings

None

VIII. Management Interview

On September 24, 1976, the inspectors met with Mr. J. E. Vessely, Manager of Quality Assurance, and members of the plant staff to review the scope and findings of the inspection. It was noted that within the scope of the inspection we identified no significant deviations from the requirements of 10 CFR 50, Appendix B.

DETAILS I

Prepared by:

R. W. Wright
R. W. Wright, Reactor Inspector
Engineering Support Section No. 1
Reactor Construction and Engineering
Support Branch

12/14/76
Date

D. H. Danielson
D. H. Danielson, Reactor Inspector
Projects Section
Reactor Construction and Engineering
Support Branch

12/14/76
Date

Dates of Inspection: November 18-19, 1976

Reviewed by:

T. E. Conlon
T. E. Conlon, Chief
Engineering Support Section No. 1
Reactor Construction and Engineering
Support Branch

12/14/76
Date

1. Persons Contacteda. Florida Power and Light Company (FP&L)

B. J. Escue - Projects Construction Superintendent
N. T. Weems - Assistant QA Manager, Construction
A. M. Anderson - QA Engineer, Electrical
L. T. Page - QA Engineer, Civil
O. J. Karch - QA Engineer, Civil
D. R. Stone - Project QC Supervisor
R. G. Reesby - Area QC Supervisor, Civil
J. E. Vessely - Manager of QA

b. Contractor OrganizationsEbasco Services, Inc. (Ebasco)

J. E. Ramondo - Project Superintendent
J. C. Murphy - Sr. Resident Engineer

2. Scope

This inspection was conducted to review the licensee's plans and preparations for the construction delay resulting from the suspension

of their LWA-2 activities, to observe the status of completed site preparation work, and continue with the review of associated quality records.

3. Construction Delay

a. Personnel Layoff

Seventy-five percent of the working force, including supervision, are expected to be laid off by the end of November 1976. U. S. Testing and FP&L have begun relocating some of their QC personnel to other sites. The St. Lucie site QC Section is expected to be depleted to fifty percent of its original personnel by January 1, 1977.

b. Construction Status

The contractor completed the pouring of the 5-inch containment working slab prior to the suspension of work. The dished working slab has been weighted down with approximately 10 feet of water and the excavation's dewatering system is being maintained. Piezometric readings are continuing to be taken and recorded on a daily basis. Raymond International (RI) has completed the pile driving for the east wing wall and the intake cofferdam structure. RI has demobilized and removed its equipment from the job site due to the suspension of work. The interior PVC well casings for the intake cofferdam dewatering structure have been driven to their required depths; however, the wells have not been developed nor have the submersible pumps been installed.

c. Construction Delay Preparations

In accordance with "Recommendations for Implementation of Revised Delivery Requirements for Existing Purchase Orders" Rev 0 dated September 19, 1976, the contractor is in the process of reviewing all outstanding purchase orders and delaying the arrival of whatever equipment and materials he can and arranging for storage of these items at the vendors' premises where possible. Studies are being conducted of all available storage areas on site and for nearby off site facilities to assure space is available for storage of equipment and material for which delivery cannot be stopped. Long term storage and maintenance requirements are being requested from all equipment vendors. In addition, the contractor is conducting

studies on protection of stainless steel and carbon steel pipe, cathodic protection of sheet piling, protection of rebar, and protection of CB&I plate material.

The contractor is implementing existing administrative site procedure ASP-17 entitled, "Preventative Maintenance" on all pertinent equipment received to date. An acidifying and well cleaning program has just been performed on the existing dewatering system. The effluent from this system is monitored in accordance with ASP-9, "Environmental Protection Control." The concrete batch plant (Maule Concrete) has been shut down and one man will probably be retained on site on a standby basis. Existing requirements relating to shelf life, temperature, and protection of concrete ingredients such as cement and admixtures will be adhered to and may eventually require removal of some of these stored materials from the job site.

4. Site Preparation - Subsurface Preparation Acceptability
(Containment Location)

The activities associated with the subject foundation compaction were found in conformance with the following acceptance criteria: PSAR commitments, Ebasco specification FLO 2998.471 Rev. 4, construction site procedure CSP-25 Rev 0, and quality instruction QI 10.10 Rev 1.

Although no work was observed, extensive IE review of the records pertinent to the final preparation and recompaction of the in-place foundation soils at the bottom of the reactor building excavation verified that the completed work was accomplished in accordance with licensee procedures. Maps depicting soil sample and field density testing locations, laboratory test results for moisture-density relationships (modified proctor tests), particle sieve analysis data and in-place Troxler moisture-density test results were examined in inspection report numbers C-76-235, 236, 249, 250, 263 and 277.

The character of material compacted, frequency of soils testing and the percent of compaction achieved were found in accordance with specification FLO-2998.471, Rev. 4.

5. Independent Inspection Effort

a. Audits Reviewed

The following FP&L site QA audits were examined for deficiencies found, completeness and recommendations presented:

- | | | |
|-----|--|--|
| (1) | Audit No. QAC 76-38,
(September 30, 1976) | "Soils Compaction and Evaluation
Before Placement of 2-inch Mudmat" |
| (2) | Audit No. QAC 76-39
(October 20, 1976) | "Inspection of Concrete Mudmat
Placement and Waterproof Membrane" |
| (3) | Audit No. QAC 76-40,
(October 26, 1976) | "Inspection of Concrete Mudmat
Placement and Waterproof Membrane" |

b. Procedure Review

The following Ebasco construction site procedure and Maule contractor operating procedure were examined for conformance to SAR commitments, applicable codes and standards:

- (1) CSP-2 (Rev 0), "Concrete Placement"
- (2) COP-3-1 (Rev 0), "Batch Plant"

Within the scope of this inspection, no significant deviations from the licensee's LWA-2 authorization were identified.