

USNRC REGION II  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA

82 MAY 11 11:10



May 6, 1982  
L-82-189

Mr. James P. O'Reilly  
Regional Administrator, Region II  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
101 Marietta Street, Suite 3100  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Dear Mr. O'Reilly:

Re: St. Lucie Unit 1  
Docket No. 50-335  
IE Inspection Report 82-01

Florida Power & Light Company has reviewed the subject inspection report and a response is attached.

There is no proprietary information in the report.

Very truly yours,

Robert E. Uhrig  
Vice President  
Advanced Systems and Technology

REU/PLP/mbd

Attachment

cc: Harold F. Reis, Esquire

8207010309 820622  
PDR ADOCK 05000335  
Q PDR

## ATTACHMENT

Re: St. Lucie Unit 1  
Docket No. 50-335  
IE Inspection Report 82-01

### FINDING:

10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion V, as implemented by FP&L Topical Quality Assurance Report Number 5.0, requires that activities affecting quality shall be prescribed by documented instructions, procedures or drawings and shall be accomplished in accordance with these instructions, procedures or drawings. Quality Control instructions were not being followed for inspection of modifications to concrete masonry walls in the auxiliary building as described below.

#### ITEM 1:

Quality Control Instruction QI 10.23 requires expansion anchors to be inspected to verify that the expansion anchor pattern is as shown on the design drawings. Drawing numbers BCS 128-4.319 and BCS 128-4.315 required clip angles for wall numbers 74 and 174 to be held in place by expansion anchors installed on a 2' - 0" center to center spacing.

Contrary to this requirement, inspection of the installation of the expansion anchors in the clip angles for wall numbers 74 and 174 failed to detect that the expansion anchors were installed at a spacing greater than 2'0" center to center.

#### Response to Item 1

1. FPL concurs with the finding as identified.
2. The inspector failed to verify the center to center spacing on anchor bolts in accordance with design drawings.
3. As corrective action, Non-conformance Report 6738-477C, dated November 14, 1981, was prepared, processed and dispositioned as an acceptable condition by the contractor's engineering group.
4. To avoid further problems of this nature, Quality Control inspectors have been reinstructed in the requirements of Quality Instruction 10.23.
5. Full compliance was achieved November 20, 1981.

#### Item 2:

Quality Control Instruction QI 10.5 requires structural steel to be inspected to verify that the steel members are assembled and erected in accordance with the design drawings.

Contrary to this requirement, inspection of the clip angle intallation for masonry wall numbers 81, 165, 200, 202, and 205 failed to disclose that the steel members (clip angles) were not assembled and erected in accordance with the details shown on the design drawings.

Response to Item 2

1. FPL concurs with the finding as identified.
2. The inspector failed to verify that the clip angles were erected in accordance with the details shown on the design drawings.
3. As corrective action, Non-conformance Reports 6138-492C and 6138-496C, dated November 14, 1981 were prepared, processed and dispositioned as acceptable. Drawings were revised by the contractor's engineering group to reflect acceptable alteration of the as-built condition.
4. To avoid further problems of this nature, Quality Control inspectors have been reinstructed in the requirements of Quality Instruction 10.5.
5. Full compliance was achieved November 20, 1981.

Item 3:

Quality Control Instruction QI 10.1 requires QC inspectors to perform a thorough inspection of completed work to verify that the work is completed in accordance with the design drawings and specifications. Drawing number BCS 128-4.312 required that the gap between the wall and the reinforced concrete beam at the top of wall number 160 be grouted.

Contrary to this requirement, inspection of the modifications to wall 160 failed to detect that the required grouting had not been completed.

Response to Item 3

1. FPL concurs with the finding as identified.
2. The inspector failed to verify that the grouting required on design drawing BCS-128-4.312 had not been completed.
3. As corrective action, Wall 160 was subsequently reinspected for grout and documented.
4. To avoid further problems of this nature, Quality Control inspectors have been reinstructed to ensure that all requirements of design drawings are implemented and documented.
5. Full compliance was achieved on November 14, 1981.

Item 4:

Quality Control Instruction QI 10.23 requires expansion anchors to be inspected to verify that the proper size anchors are installed and to verify that the anchors are torque tested to the minimum torque value specified in the design documents. Drawing number BCS 128-4.311 required clip angles on both sides of the wall number 82 to be held in place by 3/4 inch diameter expansion anchors. Specification FLO-9110-AS-13 requires 3/4 inch expansion anchors to be tested to a torque of 200 foot pounds.

Contrary to this requirement, inspection of the installation of expansion anchors failed to detect that 1/2 inch diameter expansion anchors were installed in the clip angle on one side of wall 82. The 3/4 inch expansion anchor in the other side of wall 82 were only tested to a torque of 75 foot pounds.

Response to Item 4

1. FPL takes exception, in part, to the finding as identified. Drawing BCS-128-4.311 specified 3/4 inch expansion anchors to be installed on only one side of Wall 82 instead of both sides as stated above. We concur that the wrong torque value was listed on Inspection Report number 6138-079.
2. The inspector failed to include the torque test of 200 ft. lbs. on the report.
3. As corrective action the 3/4 inch expansion anchors have been reinspected and torque tested to 200 ft. lbs. To avoid further problems of this nature, Quality Control inspectors have been reinstructed to ensure that all requirements of design drawings are implemented and documented.
5. Full compliance was achieved April 26, 1982.