

October 11, 2002

Mr. J. William Lessig
Plant Manager
Honeywell International, Inc.
P.O. Box 430
Metropolis, IL 62690

SUBJECT: NRC INSPECTION REPORT 04003392/2002-006(DNMS) - HONEYWELL

Dear Mr. Lessig:

On September 12 and 13, 2002, the NRC conducted a routine inspection at your Metropolis, Illinois facility. The purpose of the inspection was to determine whether activities authorized by the license were conducted safely and in accordance with NRC requirements. An NRC inspector discussed the findings with you on September 27, 2002.

Areas examined during the inspection are identified in the enclosed report. Within these areas, the inspection included a selective examination of procedures and representative records, interviews with personnel, and observations of activities in progress.

Licensed activities involving source materials at your plant were performed in accordance with approved procedures and license requirements and were effective in ensuring safe operations.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.790 of the NRC's "Rules of Practice," a copy of this letter and its enclosure will be available electronically for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room or from the *Publicly Available Records (PARS) component of NRC's document system (ADAMS)*. ADAMS is accessible from the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html> (the Public Electronic Reading Room).

We will gladly discuss any questions you have concerning this inspection.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Patrick L. Hiland, Chief
Fuel Cycle Branch

Docket No. 04003392
License No. SUB-526

Enclosure: Inspection Report No. 04003392/2002-006(DNMS)

cc w/encl: T. Ortziger, Illinois Department
of Nuclear Safety

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\SEC\HONEY2002006.WPD

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without enclosure "E"= Copy with enclosure "N"= No copy

OFFICE	RIII	<input type="checkbox"/>	RIII	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
NAME	Berg:js		Hiland				
DATE	10/11/02		10/11/02				

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Distribution w/encl

Docket File

PUBLIC IE-07

M. Raddatz, NMSS

M. Leach, NMSS

W. Schwink, NMSS

L. Fields, NMSS

J. L. Caldwell, RIII

M. L. Dapas, RIII

RIII Enf. Coordinator

R. Bellamy, RI

D. Ayres, RII

D. B. Spitzberg, RIV

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION III

Docket No. 04003392

License No. SUB-526

Report No. 04003392/2002-006(DNMS)

Licensee: Honeywell International, Inc.

Facility: Metropolis Works

Location: P.O. Box 430
Metropolis, Illinois

Dates: September 12 - 13, 2002

Inspector: Mary L. Thomas, Resident Inspector
Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant

David Hartland, Senior Resident Inspector
Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant

Richard Berg, Regional Fuel Cycle Inspector Trainee

Approved by: Patrick L. Hiland, Chief
Fuel Cycle Branch
Division of Nuclear Materials Safety

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Honeywell International, Incorporated
Metropolis Works
NRC Inspection Report 04003392/2002-006(DNMS)

This inspection included aspects of the licensee's emergency preparedness, maintenance, and management controls programs.

Emergency Preparedness

- The licensee maintained an up-to-date agreement with offsite support agencies to coordinate emergency actions and a system was in place to resolve issues with these agencies. The inspectors verified that emergency responder training was adequate and controls were in place to ensure minimum required emergency responder staffing at all times.

Maintenance and Surveillance Testing

- The inspectors verified that routine maintenance procedures met license requirements for safety. There were no significant issues observed during random tours of selected buildings. Housekeeping in the Feed Materials Building (FMB) was adequate and a significant improvement over previous inspection observations.

Management Organization and Controls

- Safety meetings were conducted at the license-required frequencies and open items were logged and tracked adequately. An audit system was in place to internally evaluate the quality of licensee programs.

Report Details

II. Maintenance

M1 Conduct of Maintenance and Operations

a. Inspection Scope (88025)

The inspectors observed a maintenance evolution and reviewed the associated work control procedure to ensure conformity with regulations. The inspectors also toured two buildings at random to determine whether process monitoring instrumentation was being maintained and calibrated as required.

b. Observations and Findings

The inspectors observed maintenance performed on the Hydrogen Fluoride (HF) vaporizer flanges. A maintenance foreman checked the system prior to maintenance work to ensure that appropriate tagouts were applied and that the system was isolated. The maintenance workers donned adequate personnel protective equipment (PPE) and stationed a watchman nearby with appropriate safety equipment in case of an HF release. The inspectors also reviewed the associated work permit, GRNSLT-0062, which contained appropriate information, including required PPE and tagouts.

The inspectors toured the cylinder wash station. A pressure gage used to verify hydrostatic test pressure had a calibration that was up to date. Another gage, without a gage number or calibration sticker, was determined to have no pressure recording function and was acceptable. The inspectors observed adequate attention to housekeeping when touring the Feed Materials Building (FMB). The housekeeping attention was an improvement over previous inspection observations. Signs were posted within certain rooms of the FMB alerting personnel to a high airborne area if warning lights were illuminated. The airborne radiation levels were checked at least daily. If the airborne concentrations reach 30 percent of 10 CFR Part 20 high airborne levels, the lights were illuminated. Later, the inspectors verified that the placement of warning signs within, rather than outside of, the potential high airborne area was in accordance with 10 CFR Part 20 requirements.

c. Conclusions

The inspectors verified that routine maintenance procedures met license requirements for safety. There were no significant issues observed during random tours of selected buildings. Housekeeping in the FMB was adequate and a significant improvement over previous observations. The current practice of placing required high airborne postings within potentially high airborne areas was acceptable.

IV. Plant Support

R8 Miscellaneous Radiological Protection Issues

a. Inspection Scope (88005)

The inspectors reviewed safety meeting minutes to ensure conformity to license conditions. The inspectors also reviewed the Quality Assurance (QA) audit checklist to verify that the audit system was being implemented.

b. Observations and Findings

The inspectors reviewed minutes of license-required safety meetings, for conformance with license-frequency requirements and to determine how open items were tracked. Frequency requirements were met for calendar year 2002 for all license required meetings, which included the "A" safety committee (primarily management), the "B" safety committee (for all plant personnel), an ALARA committee, and a Hazards Review committee. All open items from these meetings were tracked on one spreadsheet, with discussion and resolution of open items being a main agenda item.

The inspectors reviewed the QA audit checklist. Audits covered a wide range of plant activities including Production, Maintenance, Health Physics, Administration, and Process Safety Management. There is no required frequency interval for these management audits specified in the license.

c. Conclusions

Safety meetings were conducted at the license-required frequencies and open items were logged and tracked adequately. An audit system was in place to internally evaluate the quality of licensee programs.

P5 Staff Training and Qualification in Emergency Preparedness

a. Inspection Scope (88050)

The inspectors reviewed the Emergency Preparedness (EP) training program to ensure that appropriate training is provided to plant personnel. The inspectors also verified proper coordination of the EP program with offsite support agencies by interviews with licensee staff and offsite agents.

b. Observations and Findings

An informal agreement between Honeywell and the county sheriff's office exists whereby all emergency calls go to the county sheriff, who then dispatches police, ambulance, and/or fire fighters as appropriate. This agreement was verified during an interview with county sheriff's office staff. The dispatching plan was not unique to Honeywell; all emergency 911 calls in the county go first to the sheriff's office for dispatch. Offsite support agencies were invited to, and usually attended, non-license required Community Awareness Group meetings to discuss emergency drills and resolve issues.

The inspectors reviewed documentation from recent training classes and interviewed the Safety Officer concerning Emergency Preparedness training. Instead of relying on a volunteer pool of emergency responders, the licensee requires that certain job positions, known as "red hats," include emergency responder qualifications. Additionally, the weekly staffing plan, which shows the number of emergency responders during each shift, was issued several days in advance so any difficulties with meeting required minimum responder staff can be resolved.

Emergency responder training included three modules (Confined Space and Rescue; First Aid and CPR; and OSHA 8-Hour Hazardous Materials Training) spread out through the year. The curriculum and trainers for these modules generally changed from time to time to minimize repetition. The inspectors reviewed the records of the training rosters for the training classes in 2002 and verified that required personnel received training.

c. Conclusions

The licensee maintained an up-to-date agreement with offsite support agencies to coordinate emergency actions, and a system was in place to resolve issues with these agencies. Emergency responder training was adequate and controls were in place to ensure minimum required emergency responder staffing at all times.

V. Management Meeting

X Exit Meeting Summary

An inspector presented the inspection results to management, who acknowledged the findings presented, on September 27, 2002. The inspector asked management whether any materials examined during the inspection should be considered proprietary. No proprietary information was identified.

PARTIAL LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED

Honeywell Specialty Chemicals

D. Mays, Safety Manager
H. Roberts, Health Physics Manager

Other members of the licensees' staff were also contacted during the inspection.

INSPECTION PROCEDURES USED

IP 88005: Management Organization and Controls
IP 88025: Maintenance and Surveillance Testing
IP 88050: Emergency Preparedness

ITEMS OPENED, CLOSED, AND DISCUSSED

None

ACRONYMS and INITIALISMS

ADAMS	Agencywide Document Access and Management System
ALARA	As Low As Reasonably Achievable
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
FMB	Feed Materials Building
HF	Hydrogen Fluoride
IP	Inspection Procedure
NRC	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
PPE	Personal Protective Equipment
PARS	Publicly Available Records
QA	Quality Assurance