



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION II
101 MARIETTA STREET, N.W.
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

Report No. 50-280/78-28, 50-281/78-28

Docket No. 50-280, 50-281

License No. DPR-32, DPR-37

Licensee: Virginia Electric and Power Company
P. O. Box 26666
Richmond, Virginia 23261

Facility Name: Surry 1 and 2

Inspection at: Surry Site
Surry, Virginia

Inspection conducted: October 2-6, 1978

Inspector-In-Charge: D. J. Perrotti

Accompanying Personnel: R. E. Trojanowski

Reviewed by: *J. W. Hufham*
J. W. Hufham, Chief
Environmental and Special Projects Section
Fuel Facility and Materials Safety Branch

11-16-78
Date

Inspection Summary

Inspection on October 2-6, 1978 (Report No. 50-280/78-28,
50-281/78-28)

Areas Inspected: A routine, unannounced inspection to determine the adequacy and effectiveness of the licensee's emergency organization; emergency facilities, equipment and procedures; emergency tests and drills; main control room environmental system; fire brigade organization and training, means for determining a radioactive release; coordination with off-site support agencies, and emergency training. The inspection involved 30 inspector-hours on site by one NRC inspector.

Results: Of the eight areas inspected, there were no items of noncompliance or deviations.

7812290088

DETAILS I

Prepared by:

Henry T. Gibson for
D. J. Perrotti, Radiation Specialist
Environmental and Special Projects Section
Fuel Facility and Materials Safety Branch

11-16-78
Date

Dates of Inspection: October 2-6, 1978

Reviewed by:

Henry T. Gibson for
J. W. Hufham, Chief
Environmental and Special Projects Section
Fuel Facility and Materials Safety Branch

11-16-78
Date

1. Persons Contacted

a. Surry Plant Personnel

- *T. L. Baucom, Plant Manager
- *J. Wilson, Operations Supervisor
- *R. M. Smith, Health Physics Supervisor
 - L. Lobo, Health Physicist
- *J. S. Fisher, Fire Marshall
- *J. Hanson, Nuclear Training Supervisor
 - O. Vogtsberger, Training Coordinator
- *R. E. Nicholls, Electrical Supervisor
- *E. DeWandel, Administrative Assistant
- *D. Kildoo, Senior Quality Control Inspector
 - D. Wagner, Health Physics Technician Trainee
 - G. Kane, Assistant Operations Supervisor
 - A. Lassley, Electrical Coordinator
 - M. Beckham, Health Physics Technician
- *L. A. Johnson, Engineering Services Supervisor
- *F. L. Rentz, Resident QC Supervisor
- *D. S. Taylor, Mechanical Maintenance Supervisor

b. Other VEPCO Personnel

- J. W. Martin, Jr., Supervisor, Quality Assurance -
Operations and Maintenance
- S. Baker, Supervisor, Air Monitoring
- T. Ware, Registered Nurse
- *W. Cameron, Corporate Superintendent, Technical Services
- *M. Tower, Corporate Staff Engineer

c. Other Personnel Contacted Through Meetings

N. McTague, Virginia State Office of Emergency Services
N. Chapin, Virginia State Office of Emergency Services
A. Smith, Surry County Administrator (Civil Defense Coordinator)

d. Other Personnel Contacted by Telephone

W. C. Andrews, Jr., Sheriff, Surry County
D. Broga, Director of Radiation Safety, Medical College
of Virginia
J. H. Holt, Chief, Surry Volunteer Fire Department
J. R. Stallings, Chief, Smithfield Volunteer Fire Department

*Denotes those present at the exit interview.

2. Licensee Action on Previous Inspection Findings

a. Noncompliance

No licensee action on previous inspection findings were reviewed during the inspection.

3. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items are matters about which more information is required in order to ascertain whether they are acceptable items, items of noncompliance, or deviations. Two unresolved items disclosed during the inspection are discussed in paragraphs 5.c and 6.c of this report.

4. Coordination With Off-Site Support Agencies

a. Appendix E to 10 CFR 50, Section IV.D specifies that the emergency plan shall contain procedures for notifying, and agreements reached with local, state, and federal officials and agencies for early warning of the public. Appendix E also specifies arrangements for the services of a physician and other medical personnel qualified to handle radiation emergencies; arrangements for transportation to, and treatment of injured or contaminated individuals at treatment facilities outside the site boundary. Appendices 8.1 and 8.2 of the Emergency Plan identify the off-site agencies and Appendix 3 to Emergency Plan Implementing Procedure 1 (EPIP-1) specifies that agreement letters will be renewed every three years.

- b. The inspector verified, through discussions with representatives from off-site agencies identified in paragraph 1, that the licensee has maintained contact with the off-site groups, and has invited the agencies to participate in training exercises conducted within the past year. The inspector met with representatives from the Virginia State Office of Emergency Services (OES), identified in paragraph 1, to discuss the Virginia Operations Plan Exercise (VOPEX) scheduled for November 4, 1978. VOPEX is a planned emergency exercise involving Surry County, James City County, Newport News and OES. While OES will not require activation of any local hospitals, local government bodies have been invited to take part in the exercise and perform their own drill exercises. The inspector asked about the renewal of agreement letters every three years. A licensee representative stated that the arrangements for renewing the letters would be handled through the corporate office in Richmond, Virginia. The inspector had no further comments.
- c. There were no items of noncompliance or deviations.

5. Facilities, Equipment and Procedures

a. Changes in Facilities, Equipment and Procedures

The inspector discussed changes to emergency facilities, equipment and procedures with a licensee representative. The inspector was informed that except for updating of the plan and procedures, there have been no changes to the emergency planning effort since the last emergency plan inspection in September 1977. The inspector reviewed changes to the Emergency Plan, up to, and including Revision 6, dated June 7, 1978. The changes did not alter the initial requirements of the Emergency Plan and did not constitute an unreviewed safety question nor a change in the Technical Specifications.

b. Emergency Kits

- (1) Appendix E to 10 CFR 50, Section IV.F specifies that the emergency plan includes provisions for emergency first aid and personal decontamination facilities, including equipment at the site for personnel monitoring and decontamination. EPIP-21, paragraph 2.4 specifies the locations of the emergency kits. HP procedure 3.12-1 specifies the contents of the kits to be inventoried quarterly and checked monthly. Technical Specification Table 4.1-1, Item 26 requires a calibration of the emergency plan radiation instruments at each refueling shutdown.

(2) The inspector verified, by record review, that the requirements of the emergency plan, HP procedure 3.12-1, and Technical Specification Table 4.1-1, Item 26 were being met. The inspector observed the two emergency kits at the HP Lab, and compared the contents of the kits against the inventory form HP 3.12-1.1. The inspector asked about the changes to the form, the substitution of equipment and the removal of emergency plan implementing procedures (EPIP) from the kits. The inspector was informed that the changes had been made previous to the present HP Supervisor taking over. The inspector discussed this matter with the HP Supervisor and the station manager at the exit interview, and stressed the importance of having all specified items, including the EPIP's, in the kits, and pointed out the problems involved in having an inventory list which could be changed without approval of the Safety Committee. The inspector was informed that the inventory form was being used as a guide only; however, the HP Supervisor agreed that the EPIP's should be part of the kits and assured the inspector that copies of the EPIP's would be placed appropriately. The station manager also committed to initiate a periodic test (PT) to accomplish the inventory of the emergency equipment. In this way, any changes to the inventory list will require approval by the safety committee. The inspector had no further comments.

(3) There were no items of noncompliance or deviations.

c. Main Control Room Environmental System

- (1) Section 9.13 of the FSAR describes the main control room environmental system. Section 9.13.4.3 states that equipment installed for emergency use is tested during installation and operated monthly thereafter to ensure proper functioning. Technical Specification Table 4.1-24, Item 15 requires a pressure test of the control room at each refueling shutdown.
- (2) The inspector verified through record review of PT-33 that the pressure test of the control room had been done on May 10, 1978. The inspector also reviewed PT-18.2, Safety System Injection Test, which verified that the auto-isolation test of the control room ventilation dampers had been performed on September 10, 1977, and April 24, 1978. The inspector asked about the malfunction of one of the dampers on the April 24 test. The inspector was informed that a licensee event report (LER) had been submitted on the failure of the damper to shut, and that corrective action had been taken.

The inspector reviewed LER No. 78-008/036-0 and had no further comments on this matter. At the exit interview, the inspector asked about the monthly operability testing of the system as committed by FSAR, Section 9.13.4.3. The inspector was informed by licensee management representatives that the FSAR is not kept up-to-date and that monthly testing of the system is not being done.

Subsequent to the inspection, on October 13, 1978, the inspector contacted the licensee. A licensee management representative committed to incorporating a monthly operability test (excluding the pressurization by air bottles) in an administrative procedure, Admin-29. The inspector stated that this matter would be followed during a subsequent inspection.

- (3) The inspector defined the monthly operability test of the main control room environmental system as an unresolved item (50-280, 281/78-28-01).

d. Emergency Lighting

- (1) Section 8.6 of the FSAR describes the emergency lighting system available in vital areas of the plant, such as control room, turbine areas and auxiliary building. PT-47, Emergency DC Lighting Test, requires a semi-annual test of the DC lighting system.
- (2) The inspector verified, by review of PT-47, that the emergency DC lighting system had been tested on January 6, 1978, and July 17, 1978.
- (3) The requirement for testing of the emergency DC lighting system has apparently been satisfactorily met.

e. Emergency Communications

- (1) Section 5.2 of the Emergency Plan defines the various communication systems that are available for use during emergencies, including PA system, portable radios, PBX telephones, microwave, station wire system and VHF radio.
- (2) The inspector discussed the various communication systems with a licensee representative. The inspector observed in the main control room the red telephone used for call backs (telephone verification), PA system, and the other telephone and radio systems specified in the emergency plan. The

inspector also reviewed the VEPCO Communication Check form used for daily testing of telephone and radio systems. The inspector verified, through record review of control room PT schedules, that the site evacuation alarm and the fire alarm had been tested weekly during the period June through August 1978.

- (3) The requirement for the various communication systems is apparently being satisfactorily met.

f. Respiratory Protection Equipment

- (1) Appendix 8.5 of the Emergency Plan specifies the respiratory protection equipment that is available on-site. Technical Specification 6.4-B.3.d.(4) requires written procedures for maintenance, inspection and storage of respiratory protection equipment.
- (2) The inspector discussed the respiratory protection equipment with a licensee representative, and reviewed the procedures for maintenance, storage and inspection of respirators. The inspector observed the self-contained breathing apparatus (SCBA) at the HP Laboratory area and the cascade system for charging the air tanks. The inspector verified, by review of form RPM 9-1, that the SCBA's had been inspected during the period January to September 1978.
- (3) The requirement for respiratory protection equipment is apparently being satisfactorily met.

g. Remote Shutdown Facility

- (1) Section 9.13.4.1.3 of the FSAR states that if the main control room becomes untenable, the units can be shut down to hot standby from their respective auxiliary control areas in the relay rooms.
- (2) The inspector discussed the relay room areas and procedures that should be available for safe shut down of the plant from outside the main control room with a licensee representative. The inspector observed the shut down panels for Units 1 and 2 in the emergency switch-gear room, and verified that procedure AP-20, Main Control Room Inaccessibility, was available for use by the operators.
- (3) The requirement for a remote shutdown facility is apparently being satisfactorily met.

h. First Aid and Decontamination Facilities

- (1) Sections 5.5.1 and 7.1.3 of the Emergency Plan describe the first aid and decontamination facilities, respectively, that are available for use during emergencies.
- (2) The inspector observed the first aid room at the entrance to the service building, the alternate first aid station and decontamination area in the HP Laboratory area. The inspector verified the facilities and equipment were available as described in the emergency plan. The inspector also observed the emergency vehicle and verified that it contained a full complement of emergency equipment. The inspector was informed that either an emergency medical technician or a person trained in advanced first aid would be available as an attendant. Training is discussed in paragraph 7.c.
- (3) The requirement for a first aid and decontamination facility is apparently being satisfactorily met.

i. Review of Licensee's Response to IE Bulletin 77-08, "Locking Systems"

- (1) IE Bulletin 77-08 required the licensee, in part, to survey the facility and facility plans as to whether or not prompt emergency ingress into electrically locked safety related areas by essential personnel could be assured during loss of power, and if unimpeded emergency egress from all parts of the facility could be assured with respect to hardware and security system installations. In addition, the licensee was required to review existing emergency plans and procedures to assure that prompt emergency ingress and unimpeded emergency egress was fully and effectively addressed for any postulated occurrence. A written report was required for any facility that did not meet the requirements of action item 1 and 2 of the bulletin.
- (2) The inspector reviewed the licensee's response which states that all locks fail in the unsecure mode except for two doors. The Station Security Department maintains keys under administrative control to be used in the event of loss of power. The two doors are included in a weekly performance test of the locking systems each Thursday. The inspector verified, by record review, the test done on October 5, 1978. The response to the bulletin also states that the appropriate emergency plans and procedures will be revised as required after the implementation of the security modifica-

tions described in the amended security plans. The inspector was informed by a licensee representative that the amended Security Plan had just been submitted to the NRC for review and approval. This matter was discussed during the exit interview. The inspector informed licensee management representatives that the revision to the emergency plans and procedures would be followed during a subsequent inspection.

6. Means For Determining a Release

Appendix E to 10 CFR 50, paragraph IV.C requires means for determining the magnitude of release of radioactive material, and criteria for determining when protective measure should be considered within and outside the site boundary.

a. Process and Area Radiation Monitors

- (1) Section 5.3.2 of the Emergency Plan states that the installed Radiation Monitoring System consists of process and area monitors which read out and record in the control room. Technical Specification Table 4.1-1, Item 19 requires a daily check, monthly test and calibration at each refueling shutdown for the process and area radiation monitoring systems.
- (2) The inspector observed the radiation monitoring panels in the control room and verified that the readouts for the area and process monitors were available as described in the emergency plan. The inspector verified, by record review of PT 26.1, Daily Check, PT 26.2, Monthly Test, and PT 26.3, Calibration of RMS During Refuel Shutdown, that the surveillance on the process and area monitors is being conducted in accordance with Technical Specifications.
- (3) There were no items of noncompliance or deviations.

b. Seismic Instrumentation

- (1) Section 5.3.1 states that the seismic instrumentation has a readily accessible readout in the control room. Technical Specification Table 4.1-1, Item 31 requires a monthly check and test, and a semi-annual calibration of the system.
- (2) The inspector verified, through observation in the main control room and discussion with a licensee representative, that the seismic instrumentation was operable and available as required by the emergency plan. The inspector also

verified, through review of PT 31.1, Seismic Instrument Test (Monthly), PT 31.2, Seismic Instrument Calibration (semi-annual), PT 31.3, Seismic Instrument Status Check Recording (monthly) and PT 31.3A, Seismic Instrument Status Check-Vendor Evaluation (monthly, in conjunction with PT 31.3), that the monthly checks and tests, and the semi-annual calibration had been performed during the period September 1977 to September 1978.

- (3) There were no items of noncompliance or deviations.

c. Meteorological Instrumentation

- (1) Section 5.3.1 of the Emergency Plan states that the control room readouts include wind speed, wind direction and temperatures.
- (2) The inspector discussed the meteorological systems with a licensee representative and verified, by observation, that a printout of wind speed, wind direction and temperature was available in the control room. The inspector also observed an alternate readout of wind speed and direction. In discussion with licensee representatives, the inspector was informed that the computer printout was the primary means of obtaining weather data, but that if it was inoperable, the alternate means (indicator/recorder) would be used. The inspector asked about testing and calibration of the meteorological instrumentation. The inspector was informed that surveillance was performed by the Environmental Services Division of the corporate office in Richmond, Virginia. The inspector reviewed calibration reports, Surry Meteorological Monitoring System Calibration Reports, which verified calibrations had been performed quarterly during the period November 1977 to June 1978. The inspector contacted the Environmental Services group on October 11, 1978, to discuss the testing and calibration requirements. The inspector was informed that since there were no Technical Specifications on the systems, a quarterly calibration frequency had been arbitrarily chosen. The inspector was also informed that only the new met system had been calibrated, and that this calibration included the recording station at the base of the met tower. The inspector then contacted the Surry Engineering Services Supervisor on October 11, 1978, to ask about the testing and/or calibration of the older meteorological system. The inspector was told that the wind direction synchro was checked when repaired or when it appeared to be malfunctioning, and that there was no

calibration being done on the wind speed sensor. The inspector pointed out the fact that the alternate system would be used in the event the primary meteorological system was inoperable.

- (3) The inspector defined the matter of calibration and testing of the older (alternate) meteorological system as an unresolved item (50-280, 281/78-28-02).

7. Emergency Plan Training

Appendix E to 10 CFR 50, paragraph IV.H requires that the emergency plan contain provisions for training of employees of the licensee who are assigned specific authority and responsibility in the event of an emergency, and other persons whose assistance may be needed in the event of a radiation emergency.

a. General Employee Training

- (1) Section 2.3 of EPIP-21 specifies annual retraining sessions for station personnel. Appendix 3 to EPIP-21 defines the training required for general personnel, security personnel, contractors and visitors.
- (2) The inspector verified, by examination of selected records from general employees, security and contractors that the annual refresher training had been held during the period August-September 1978. The inspector reviewed a memo sent September 18, 1978 to those personnel who had missed the training. The inspector was informed that contractors and visitors either receive the eight hour course in radiation safety, as do general employees, or that they have a continuous escort.
- (3) There were no items of noncompliance or deviations.

b. Emergency Committee

- (1) Section 3.2 of the Emergency Plan describes the on-site emergency organization and defines the line of succession for the Emergency Coordinator and Emergency Director. Appendix 3 to EPIP-21 specifies the training to be received.
- (2) The inspector discussed the training of the Emergency Committee with a licensee representative from the training section. The inspector was informed that the committee had a training session on the EPIP's prior to the last emergency

drill. This was verified by review of a training memo which indicated the Emergency Committee attended the session on August 8, 1978. The inspector was also informed that the station manager, as Chairman of the Station Nuclear Safety Operating Committee (SNSOC), approves all changes to the EPIP's and annually reviews the EPIP's.

- (3) The training for the emergency committee appeared to be adequately satisfied.

c. Operator Training

- (1) Section 1.1 of EPIP-21 states that training of licensed operators will consist of a detailed indoctrination in the use of EPIP-1, Emergency Classification and Organization-Formation, Notification and Communications. Section 2.3 of EPIP-21 specifies annual retraining for station personnel.
- (2) The inspector reviewed selected records of operations personnel which verified retraining in the Emergency Plan and EPIP's had been completed within the past twelve months.
- (3) The training requirement for operators appeared to be adequately satisfied.

d. Emergency Monitoring Team

- (1) EPIP-21, Section 2.3, requires annual training sessions and Appendix 3 defines the course content for the HP Technicians.
- (2) The inspector verified, by review of training records, that the annual refresher training for twenty-one members of the HP Department was conducted on June 21, 1978.
- (3) The training requirement for the emergency monitoring team appeared to be adequately satisfied.

e. First Aid Training

- (1) Section 7.1.3 of the Emergency Plan states that station personnel have received first aid training to ensure that at least one member of each shift holds a valid certificate.
- (2) The inspector reviewed selected training records from the shift personnel of the Security Department which indicated that each shift had at least one first aid trained personnel. Licensee representatives from the training department

informed the inspector that first aid trained personnel at Surry included personnel trained in advanced first aid, cardiopulmonary resuscitation and EMT's. The inspector was also informed that it was Surry's goal to have all personnel complete the basic first aid course.

- (3) The requirement for first aid trained personnel appeared to be adequately satisfied.

f. Off-Site Agency Training

- (1) Section 1.7 of EPIP-21 states that off-site fire and rescue personnel have received training and familiarization tours, and Section 2.6 of the procedure specifies that meetings will be held as deemed necessary, normally when significant changes to the Emergency Plan are made.
- (2) The inspector discussed the training provided the off-site fire and rescue personnel with a licensee representative. The inspector was informed that the training requirement had been changed from an annual familiarization tour to periodically as when required by significant changes to the emergency plan and/or procedures. The inspector pointed out the advantages in maintaining contact with off-site fire and rescue agencies on a routine basis. The inspector contacted the off-site fire agencies. Results of the contacts are discussed in paragraph 4.
- (3) The requirement for off-site training appeared to be adequately satisfied.

8. Review, Updating and Distribution of Emergency Plans and Procedures

Appendix E to 10 CFR 50, paragraph IV.E requires provisions for maintaining, up-to-date, the organization for coping with emergencies, the procedures for use in emergencies, and the lists of persons with special qualifications for coping with emergencies.

a. Review of Emergency Plan and EPIP's by the SNSOC

- (1) Section 2.5 of EPIP-21 requires an annual review of the Emergency Plan and EPIP's by the SNSOC.
- (2) The inspector verified, by review of the minutes of the SNSOC meeting #52-78, that the Emergency Plan had been reviewed on June 16, 1978. The inspector asked about the review of the EPIP's. The inspector was informed by a

licensee representative that the EPIP's had also been discussed on June 16, 1978, and that most of the procedures had been updated within the past twelve months. The verification was completed by a review of the approval dates of the procedures by the chairman of the SNSOC.

- (3) The requirement for the annual review of the Emergency Plan and EPIP's appeared to be adequately satisfied.

b. Audit of the Plan and Procedures

- (1) Technical Specification 6.1.C.2.i.5 requires an audit every two years of the Emergency Plan and implementing procedures under the cognizance of the System Safety Nuclear Operating Committee (Sy SNOC).
- (2) The inspector reviewed documentation which verified that an audit of the Emergency Plan and procedures had been performed on November 1, 1977, under the cognizance of Corporate Quality Assurance-Operations and Maintenance.
- (3) There were no items of noncompliance or deviations.

c. Distribution of the Emergency Plan and Procedures

- (1) Section 7.1.1 of the Emergency Plan specifies that appropriate off-site agencies have received a copy of the plan.
- (2) The inspector verified, by review of the Emergency Plan distribution list and by discussions with off-site support agency representatives, that the Emergency Plan and changes to the Plan have been distributed to appropriate off-site agencies.
- (3) The requirement for distribution of the Emergency Plan to off-site agencies appeared to be adequately satisfied.

d. Virginia State Interim Notification Procedure

The inspector discussed the procedure for notifying the State of Virginia when an event occurs that affects the off-site areas. The inspector commented that there was no mechanism for notifying the state for potential radiation exposure to the public below 0.5 Rem (defined as Condition Yellow by the Virginia State Radiological Emergency Plan). A licensee management representative stated that this was the case; however, it was the state's responsibility to furnish the licensee with the

notification procedure. The inspector stated that this matter was being looked into for another facility and would be followed during a subsequent inspection. The inspector had no further comments.

9. Fire Protection/Prevention

a. Fire Brigade Organization

- (1) Technical Specification 6.1.C.4 requires at least five members of the fire brigade on-site at all times, above minimum shift requirements as defined by Technical Specification 6.1.C.3. Section 3.3.6 of the Emergency Plan specifies that a list of fire team members is maintained by the Security Staff.
- (2) The inspector discussed the shift fire brigade members with the Fire Marshall. The inspector was informed that a shift fire brigade is composed of three security personnel and two operations personnel. The inspector reviewed shift schedules and fire brigade rosters which verified that at least five members of the fire brigade were on-site at all times. The schedules reviewed covered the period August 13 to September 9, 1978.
- (3) There were no items of noncompliance or deviations.

b. Fire Brigade Training

- (1) Technical Specification 6.1.C.5 requires a training program to be maintained that meets or exceeds the requirements of NFPA Code Section 27 (1976). Section 2.3 of EPIP-21 states that retraining sessions will be held annually. Sections 4.1 and 4.2 of the Fire Protection Plan specify the requirements for periodic drills and training.
- (2) The inspector reviewed selected training records which verified initial fire training for the fire brigade had been completed and that refresher training had been conducted in August 1978. The inspector discussed the fire training with the Fire Marshall. The inspector was informed that the refresher would probably be conducted on a monthly basis until the standardized technical specifications become effective. At that time, the Fire Protection Plan would be revised to reflect current requirements.

- (3) The requirement for the training of the fire brigade appeared to be adequately satisfied.

10. Emergency Drills

- a. 10 CFR 50, Appendix E, paragraph IV.I requires provisions for testing, by periodic drills, of radiation emergency plans to assure that employees of the licensee are familiar with their specific duties, and provisions for participation in the drills by other persons whose assistance may be needed in the event of a radiation emergency. Technical Specification 6.4.H requires an annual drill including a check of communication lines with off-site groups. Section 7.1.2 of the Emergency Plan states that appropriate off-site agencies will be asked to participate in or observe the drill.
- b. The inspector discussed the last emergency drill, held on August 10, 1978, with licensee representatives, and reviewed the drill scenario which included a fuel handling accident, uncontrolled release of radioactive material and a personnel injury. The inspector verified, through review of the drill critique memo, that drill monitors were designated to observe the response, and that no major problems were identified. The inspector also verified, by discussion with a licensee representative and review of the drill critique, that the recommendations made by the monitors were being acted upon.
- (c) The requirement for the annual emergency drill appeared to be satisfactorily met.

11. Exit Interview

The inspector met with licensee representatives (denoted in paragraph 1) at the conclusion of the inspection on October 6, 1978. The inspector summarized the purpose and scope of the inspections and the findings.