

SSER

Task: Allegation A-143, A-150, A-162, A-163

Ref. No.: 4-84-A-06/38; 45; 57 and 58

Characterization: The allegation is that LP&L, Ebasco, and contractors did not perform adequate reviews of QA records.

Assessment of Allegation: Inadequate review of documentation to assure completeness and technical adequacy of QA records could cause the quality of installation work to be in question.

The procedures delineating guidelines for the collection, handling, and review of construction-installation quality assurance (QA) records for NISCO, Mercury, Tompkins-Bechwith (T-B), Ebasco, and LP&L have been evaluated by the NRC staff for compliance with ANSI N45.2.9 and ASME requirements, and found acceptable.

To verify procedural implementation, the NRC staff reviewed a random sample of work packages for each company. The startup systems (SUS) sampled included 36-Component Cooling, 52-Reactor Cooling, and 60-Safety Injection. The hardware reviewed included large- and small-bore piping, and instrumentation and control lines.

The NRC staff reviewed the documentation packages to verify completeness, accuracy of content, proper form, traceability, legibility, authenticity, and pertinent changes/supplements. The Staff also conducted system walkdowns.

The NRC staff made the following observations:

- (1) QA records review acceptance and approval was adequately documented (stamping, signature, and dating).
- (2) Technical adequacy was acceptable.
- (3) Records were complete.
- (4) Corrections and supplements were performed in accordance with prescribed procedures.
- (5) Record retrievability was timely.
- (6) Auditability was adequate.

For additional information regarding QA record review by contractors, Ebasco and LP&L, see allegations A-35 and A-308. The details of the interview and problem resolution concerning the Ebasco records reviewer are denoted in A-186(b).

The NRC staff concludes that the contractors, Ebasco, and LP&L have implemented adequate documentation requirements, including reviews. Therefore, allegations A-143, A-150, A-162, and A-163 have no safety significance, nor generic implications.

FINAL SSER ROUTING

A-143

Revision :	0	1	2	3
Denny Crutchfield	<i>[Signature]</i>			
✓ Jim Gagliardo				

FINAL

Ok as is

FINAL SSER ROUTING * A-143

Revision :	0	1	2	3
Denny Crutchfield	<i>[Signature]</i>			
✓ Jim Gagliardo	<i>[Signature]</i>			

Potential Violations: None.]

Actions Required: None.

References:

1. Ebasco Procedures:
QAI-9, Rev. 2 - Review of Handling of Cont.-Install. Record.
QAI-23, Rev. 3 - Review of Ebasco Cont. Quality Record.
CP-793, Issue F - Work Package Processing for Ebasco Cont.
2. T-B Procedures:
TBP-20, QA Records Turnover
TBP-35, Preparation and Control of Process Piping Travelers
3. Mercury Procedures:
QCP-3010 (N49720-Suppl) Quality Assurance Records Control
Procedure
4. NISCO Procedures:
ES-3016-129, Rev. A - Final Review of QA Records
5. LP&L Procedures:
QA17.5, Rev. 0 - Quality Records Status Review
6. Staff review and documentation records for piping and instrumentation and control systems.

Statement Prepared By:

V. L. Wenczel

_____ Date

Reviewed By:

Team Leader

_____ Date

Reviewed By:

Site Team Leader (S)

_____ Date

Approved By:

Task Management

_____ Date

Document Name:
SSER A-143

Requestor's ID:
PATTYN

Author's Name:

Document Comments:

SSER

Task: Allegation A-143, A-150, A-162, A-163

Ref. No.: 4-84-A-06/38; 45; 57 and 58

Characterization: The allegation is that LP&L, Ebasco, and contractors did not perform adequate reviews of QA records.

Assessment of Allegation: Inadequate review of documentation to assure completeness and technical adequacy of QA records could cause the quality of installation work to be in question.

The procedures delineating guidelines for the collection, handling, and review of construction-installation quality assurance (QA) records for NISCO, Mercury, Tompkins-Bechwith (T-B), Ebasco, and LP&L have been evaluated by the NRC staff for compliance with ANSI N45.2.9 and ASME requirements, and found acceptable.

To verify procedural implementation, the NRC staff reviewed a random sample of work packages for each company. The startup systems (SUS) sampled included 36-Component Cooling, 52-Reactor Cooling, and 60-Safety Injection. The hardware reviewed included large- and small-bore piping, and instrumentation and control lines.

The NRC staff reviewed the documentation packages to verify completeness, accuracy of content, proper form, traceability, legibility, authenticity, and pertinent changes/supplements. The Staff also conducted system walkdowns.

The NRC staff made the following observations:

- (1) QA records review, acceptance and approval was adequately documented (stamping, signature, and dating).
- (2) Technical adequacy was acceptable.
- (3) Records were complete.
- (4) Corrections and supplements were performed in accordance with prescribed procedures.
- (5) Record retrievability was timely.
- (6) Auditability was adequate.

For additional information regarding QA record review by contractors, Ebasco and LP&L, see allegations A-35 and A-308. The details of the interview and problem resolution concerning the Ebasco records reviewer are denoted in A-186(b).

The NRC staff concludes that the contractors, Ebasco, and LP&L have implemented adequate documentation requirements, including reviews. Therefore, allegations A-143, A-150, A-162, and A-163 have no safety significance, nor generic implications.

Potential Violations: None.

Actions Required: None.

References:

1. Ebasco Procedures:
QAI-9, Rev. 2 - Review of Handling of Cont.-Install. Record.
QAI-23, Rev. 3 - Review of Ebasco Cont. Quality Record.
CP-793, Issue F - Work Package Processing for Ebasco Cont.
2. T-B Procedures:
TBP-20, QA Records Turnover
TBP-35, Preparation and Control of Process Piping Travelers
3. Mercury Procedures:
QCP-3010 (N49720-Suppl) Quality Assurance Records Control
Procedure
4. NISCO Procedures:
ES-3016-129, Rev. A - Final Review of QA Records
5. LP&L Procedures:
QA17.5, Rev. 0 - Quality Records Status Review
6. Staff review and documentation records for piping and instrumentation and control systems.

Statement Prepared By:

V. L. Wenczel

_____ Date

Reviewed By:

Team Leader

_____ Date

Reviewed By:

Site Team Leader(s)

_____ Date

Approved By:

Task Management

_____ Date