



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
REGION II  
101 MARIETTA STREET, N.W.  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30323

FEB 27 1985

Report No.: 50-400/85-05

Licensee: Carolina Power and Light Company  
411 Fayetteville Street  
Raleigh, NC 27602

Docket No.: 50-400

License No.: CPPR-158

Facility Name: Shearon Harris

Inspection Conducted: February 11 - 15, 1985

Inspector: T. R. Decker

2/27/85  
Date Signed

Accompanying Personnel: F. McManus

Approved by: W. E. Cline  
W. E. Cline, Section Chief  
Division of Radiation Safety and Safeguards

2/27/85  
Date Signed

SUMMARY

Scope: This special, announced inspection involved 50 inspector-hours on site in the area of emergency preparedness. The inspection was specifically to determine if the applicant had enough of the emergency preparedness program in place to warrant a full implementation appraisal.

Results: Of the areas inspected, no violations or deviations were identified. The inspector determined that the applicant's emergency preparedness program was advanced enough for the appraisal.

8503210023 850227  
PDR ADDCK 05000400  
Q PDR



REPORT DETAILS

## 1. Persons Contacted

## Licensee Employees

- \*J. Willis, Plant General Manager
- \*C. Gibson, Assistant to Plant General Manager
- \*E. Bean, Corporate Communications
- \*J. Sipp, Manager, Environmental & Radiation Controls
- \*R. Black, Director of Emergency Preparedness
- \*W. Powell, Director of Training
- \*C. Bohanan, Director of Regulatory Compliance
- \*A. Carroll, Senior Specialist-Emergency Preparedness
- \*W. Trolenberg, Emergency Preparedness Specialist
- \*A. Stanley, Project Specialist-Training

Other licensee employees contacted included construction craftsmen, technicians, operators, mechanics, security force members, and office personnel.

## Other Organizations

- \*J. O'Hara, Consultant-EBASCO

NRC Resident Inspector

- \*G. Maxwell

\*Attended exit interview

## 2. Exit interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on February 15, 1985, with those persons indicated in Paragraph 1 above. The licensee did not identify as proprietary any of the materials provided or reviewed by the inspector during the inspection.

## 3. Licensee Action on Previous Inspection Findings

The subject was not addressed in the inspection.

## 4. Emergency Organization (25555)

The applicant's emergency organization was evaluated. The evaluation involved the review of emergency plans and procedures, staffing charts and interviews with members of the emergency organization.

Flow charts as well as descriptive information in the plans and procedures indicated that key functional areas of emergency activity had been addressed and that personnel had been assigned to the functional areas. The inspector had no further questions.

No violations or deviations were identified.

5. Training (25555)

The inspector reviewed the applicant's Emergency Plan (EP) training program to determine if the program was in place and functional. The evaluation involved the review of lesson plans, training schedules, interviews with members of the training staff and included the observation of several training classes.

The review indicated that the EP training program is in place and functional. The majority of personnel assigned EP duties have completed the basic EP overview course. More specific courses have also been conducted: e.g., Technical Support Center Personnel, Emergency Communicators, Environmental Monitoring Team, Plant Monitoring Team, Damage Control Team, First Aid Team, Accident Assessment Team and Emergency Operations Facility Team.

Personnel training completion and scheduling is tracked by a computer system. This system appears to be effective in maintaining current training records as well as in highlighting due dates for retraining.

The applicant's current EP training schedule indicates an ambitious program with the goal of being well prepared and trained for the full scale exercise scheduled for May 17-18, 1985.

At present, the on site security force is not included in the EP training program. Security force members will be trained in the fall of 1985 after the permanent force is established.

Based on this review, the inspector determined that the EP training program is and will be in an auditable condition for the scheduled EP Appraisal. It was noted, however, that the training program will not have been completed at the time of the appraisal. Due to the incomplete training at the time of the Appraisal, the inspectors expressed concern to plant management that walkthroughs and interviews of key personnel conducted during the Appraisal will not reflect the level of knowledge that will be available at the conclusion of the training program. The inspectors had no further questions in this area.

No violations or deviations were identified.

6. Facilities and Equipment (25555)

a. Control Room

The inspector toured the control room and observed the locations of instruments and annunciator panels. As presently configured, it is doubtful that the NUREG-0696 goal of a two minute walking time from TSC to the control room can be met. As construction impediments are removed, the goal should be more achievable and will be tested during the Appraisal.

b. Technical Support Center (TSC)

With the exception of emergency stores, the TSC appears to be largely complete. Electrical service, telephones, status boards, furniture and procedures were available. The ENS has yet to be installed.

c. Operational Support Center (OSC)

The inspector toured the OSC and noted emergency equipment lockers and assembly area. The area appears large enough to accommodate the necessary OSC teams.

d. Emergency Operation Facility (EOF)

The applicant's EOF serves as the overall site near management facility for supporting accident response and recovery. The facility is located in the basement of the training center and appears to be well equipped and nearly operational. As with the TSC, no ENS telephone has been installed.

No violations or deviations were identified.

7. Plans and Procedures (25555)

A review of the Plant Emergency Procedures (PEP) was conducted to determine if the state of development was sufficient for appraisal purposes. Approximately twenty five of the Plant Emergency Procedures were being revised (draft revisions were not reviewed). The revisions resulted from modifications due to experience in classroom training and user comment. The target date for revision approval and incorporation into the PEP is March 4, 1985.

Based on this review, the Plant Emergency Procedures are sufficiently developed to be submitted for a more rigorous Appraisal review.

The current revision (Rev. 0) of the Abnormal and Emergency Operating (AOP & EOP) Procedures do not direct the user to the REP. Draft revisions of the AOP & EOP are in progress that will direct the user to the PEP for accident classification according to the Emergency Action Level (EAL) network. Subsequently, the draft revision is to be verified by simulator at the Seabrook facility. The "link" between the EOP/AOPs to the EALs does not now exist. The applicant has indicated that the links will not be established for the Emergency Preparedness Implementation Appraisal scheduled for March 1985.

No violations or deviations were identified.

8. Coordination with Offsite Groups (25555)

Letters of agreement with offsite support groups were reviewed. Adequate support appears to have been pledged. This area will be further investigated during the Appraisal.

No violations or deviations were identified.