

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION V

Report Nos. 50-528/89-35, 50-529/89-35, 50-530/89-35

Licensee: Arizona Public Service Company
P. O. Box 21666
Phoenix, Arizona 85836

Facility Name: Palo Verde Site, Wintersburg, Arizona
Units 1, 2 and 3

Inspection at: Palo Verde Site, Wintersburg, Arizona

Inspection Dates: July 31 - August 3, 1989

Inspector: Kent M. Prendergast 8/25/89
Date Signed

Approved by: R. F. Fish 8/29/89
R. F. Fish, Chief, Emergency Preparedness
Section Date Signed

Summary:

Areas Inspected: Routine unannounced inspection of the operational status of the emergency preparedness program. Inspection procedure 82701 was covered.

Results: In the areas inspected the licensee's program appeared fully capable of accomplishing their safety objectives. No violations of NRC requirements were identified.



DETAILS1. Persons Contacted:

- *J. Haynes, Vice President
- *W. Marsh, Plant Director
- *H. Bieling, Manager, Emergency Planning and Fire Protection
T. Shriver, Compliance Manager
- *N. Willsey, Emergency Planning Supervisor
T. Barsuk, Lead Site Emergency Planner
- G. Eimar, Shift Supervisor
- L. Speight, Shift Supervisor

*Denotes those attending the exit interview.

2. Operational Status of Emergency Preparedness Program (82701)a. Training

The inspector conducted interviews with two Shift Supervisors to evaluate their knowledge of their responsibilities during an emergency and to assess their training in emergency response. During the interviews the individuals were given various hypothetical sets of emergency conditions and data and asked to respond as if an emergency actually existed. The Shift Supervisors demonstrated they were aware of their responsibilities as the Emergency Coordinator and were able to classify the numerous hypothetical scenarios and make protective action recommendations (PARs). The individuals were also aware of the necessary time frames for classification and notification to state and local governments of the emergency conditions and utility recommendations. During the interviews, one of the Shift Supervisors, who was currently enrolled in simulator training, commented that Nuclear Training now places more emphasis on the timeliness of classification and the use of the Emergency Plan implementing procedures (EPIPs) during simulator training. The increased emphasis on the timeliness of classification and the EPIPs are considered improvements to the program.

Records of emergency preparedness drills required by the Emergency Plan and the licensee's administrative training procedure (16AC-OEP05) were examined and considered satisfactory. The drill records documented that drills were conducted at the frequency specified in the documents mentioned above and that the licensee has appropriate records and systems for correcting deficiencies identified during emergency drills. The examination included radiation monitoring drills, post accident sampling system drills, health physics drills, and communication drills. During the review of the health physics drills it was noted that some clarification regarding environmental sampling was necessary. The Emergency Plan (EP) and administrative training procedure both infer that liquid environmental samples will be taken during the semiannual Health



Physics (HP) drills. Since this is a desert area and there are no nearby bodies of water, liquid environmental samples have not been routinely collected and analyzed during the HP drills. During discussions with the Manager of Emergency Planning, the licensee agreed to change the EP and the training procedure to provide clarification on the types of environmental sampling that will be performed during the HP drills. The licensee also stated that Arizona State University, a licensee contractor, will be asked to perform environmental sampling during HP drills. Further, the licensee intends to coordinate environmental sampling methodology with the Arizona Radiation Regulatory Agency (ARRA) to assure consistency in sample results.

During the inspection, staff augmentation times for Emergency Response Facilities (ERFs) were discussed with members of emergency planning. The discussions revealed it has been a considerable period of time (August 26, 1987) since the licensee has conducted a drill or study to verify the timeliness in activation of ERFs during off hours or on weekends. The inspector stated that a time study or off hours augmentation drill to determine manpower resources and availability times for key individuals may be beneficial. The time study could be performed in conjunction with a test of the automated call-out system. Thus providing a system test and determining if personnel residence relocations have affected the activation times for the ERFs.

b. Emergency Facilities, Equipment, Instrumentation, and Supplies

An inspection of the licensee's emergency response facilities was conducted to verify essential emergency facilities and equipment were maintained in a state of operational readiness. The inspection included verifying instrument calibration and operability, the availability of updated copies of the EP and EIPs, and the maintenance of emergency facilities. The inspection included 3 Operations Support Centers (OSCs), the Technical Support Center, the Emergency Operations Facility, and the kits used by the field monitoring teams. The inspection concluded that the licensee is doing a good job of maintaining their facilities and equipment. However, the configuration of the OSCs, especially Unit 1, were noted to have been altered by the installation of a large number of vending machines in the small rooms. This subject of whether the machines may interfere with the operations of the OSCs during an emergency by reducing the space for personnel and access to phones and drawings was brought up during the exit interview. After a brief discussion, the licensee committed to moving the machines to another area.

During this inspection, the Water Reclamation Facility (WRF), which lies adjacent to the site, was visited to determine if their Administrative Emergency Plan contains instructions for personnel sweeps. The personnel sweeps are necessary to inform personnel, in areas where siren or Public Address System are inaudible, of emergency events or instructions. Discussions with WRF personnel and



a review of their Administrative Emergency Plan, which is a separate document from the licensee's EP, determined that personnel sweeps are required at the site area or general emergency classification or upon a determination by the Emergency Coordinator that accountability is required. The discussions also revealed that WRF personnel are not routinely included in the emergency response training required for site personnel. Consequently, they may not be aware of the significance of the different emergency classifications or of the response capabilities of the plant. Because of the WRF proximity to the site, it is recommended that WRF personnel be provided with training to help them understand the different emergency classifications and the response capabilities of the Plant. In addition, it may be advisable to determine if there are any other organizations or groups who may benefit by a similar course in emergency response.

c. Emergency Plans

There have been no changes to the EP since the last inspection. The EP was reviewed by emergency planning and changes were submitted to the ANPP licensing organization in December 1988. At the time of this inspection the EP was still in licensing, awaiting final approval of all the necessary paper work prior to issuance. Since the EP is a document that is important to safety and because of the extraordinary time frame (eight months) to complete all the documentation necessary to issue Revision 9 of the EP, the licensee was requested to consider ways to expedite the issuance of the Emergency Plan.

Licensee management is supportive of the Emergency Preparedness Program and the program appears fully capable of maintaining their emergency response capabilities. No violations of NRC requirements were identified.

3. Exit Interview

The inspector met with the licensee representatives, denoted in paragraph 1, at the conclusion of the inspection on August 3, 1989. The scope and findings of the inspection were summarized.

The licensee was informed that no apparent violations were identified. The observations described in the report were acknowledged by the licensee.

