

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION III

Report No.: 50-440/85045

Docket No.: 50-440

License No.: CPPR-148

Licensee: The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company
Post Office Box 5000
Cleveland, Ohio 44101

Facility Name: Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1

Inspection At: Perry Site, Perry, Ohio

Inspector: J. H. Neisler *Candell C. Williams for.*

7/9/85
(DATE)

Approved By: C. C. Williams *Candell C. Williams*
Chief, Plant Systems Section

7/9/85
(DATE)

Inspection Summary

Inspection on June 26-28, 1985 (Report No. 50-440/85045(DRS))

Areas Inspected: Followup on allegations concerning electrical installation and terminations. The inspection involved a total of 10 inspector-hours onsite by one NRC inspector.

Results: No violations or deviations were identified during this inspection.

8507150401 850710
PDR ADOCK 05000440
Q PDR

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Principal Licensee Employees

*C. Shuster, Manager, Quality Assurance
*E. Riley, General Supervisor, CQS
*S. Tulk, Unit Supervisor, CQS
K. Cimorelli, Lead Quality Engineer, CQS
H. Spackman, Quality Inspector, OQC
W. Morris, Quality Inspector, CQS
*W. Boyd, Quality Engineer, CQS
R. Peters, Quality Inspector, CQS

*Denotes those persons attending the exit interview.

2. Followup On Allegations

The inspector performed followup activities relative to the following allegations pertaining to electrical activities at the Perry site. Results are as shown for the individual allegations.

Allegation RIII-83-A-0093

- (1) (Closed) Switchgear 5018, 5019 and 5020 were turned over to the Nuclear Test Section (NTS). NTS damaged the switchgear during the switchgear testing and turned it back to Comstock. The alleged identified the damage in inspections conducted during September 1982 however, his supervisor would not allow the findings to be documented.

NRC Review

Direct inspection of cabinets 1R24-5018, 1R24-5019 and 1R24-5020 and other switchgear in the area by the NRC inspector did not reveal any damage, neither internal nor external, to the switchgear. The inspector examined QC inspection reports issued subsequent to the September 1982 observations by the alleged. No incidence of damage was mentioned in these QC inspection reports. NCR-OQC-156 identified six overtightened bolts which were removed and replaced in May 1982. Through discussions with site personnel, the inspector determined that quality inspection of this switchgear, during the time of the alleged incident, was the responsibility of the Operations Quality Control (OQC) and not the responsibility of the alleged's organization. Therefore, OQC would have been responsible for documenting deficiencies, not the alleged. During interviews by the NRC inspector, the OQC inspector responsible for the switchgear stated that the switchgear had not been damaged.

Conclusions

Based on the NRC's direct inspections, review of quality assurance documentation, and interviews with cognizant site personnel that revealed that NCR initiation in this area was the responsibility of OQC and not the alleged nor his supervisor, this allegation was not substantiated.

- (2) (Closed) There is a problem with the identification of wiring on the outboard side of all safety related penetrations. Bare vendor wires (wires that came with the penetrations) are causing the problem. The L. K. Comstock Quality Control Manager was informed but the problem has not been resolved.

NRC Review

The NRC inspector examined the wiring on the outboard side of safety-related electrical penetrations. The inspector did not observe any conductors (wires), that were not identified, including both vendor and field wiring. Inspection personnel who had been involved in penetration inspections did not recall a problem with wiring identification in these penetrations. There were no "bare" wires in the penetrations examined by the inspector.

Conclusion

This allegation was not substantiated by direct inspection of penetrations or interviews with the quality inspectors remaining on site who were familiar with the penetration terminations.

- (3) (Closed) The licensee was reinspecting equipment in an attempt to identify any nonconforming conditions. Two motor control centers were mentioned by the alleged as possibly being involved, 1R23-5026 and 1R24-5028. The motor control centers are located flush against the wall. The Nuclear Test Section has to remove the internal buckets to get to the bus bars. The alleged had concerns about the bend radius of the determined cables.

NRC Review

The inspector examined randomly selected buckets in motor control centers including buckets in the two motor control centers mentioned in the allegation. No evidence that minimum bend radii was exceeded was observed by the inspector. Review of the bucket removal methods and discussions with personnel involved, including the QC inspectors who were providing 100 percent inspection coverage, revealed that cables were not determined to remove the buckets. The design of the bucket permits easy removal of modular terminal blocks without removing the cables from the blocks. Review of QC inspection reports did not reveal any problems identified with bend radius violations.

Conclusion

Based on the results of direct inspection of the motor control center buckets and cables, review of quality assurance records and interviews with cognizant site personnel, this allegation was not substantiated.

3. Exit Interview

The inspector met with licensee representatives (denoted in paragraph 1) at the conclusion of the inspection. The inspector summarized the scope and findings of the inspection. The licensee acknowledged the inspector's comments as reported herein. The inspector also 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/processes as proprietary.