

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF INSPECTION AND ENFORCEMENT

REGION V

Report No. 50-312/79-21  
Docket No. 50-312 License No. DPR-54 Safeguards Group \_\_\_\_\_  
Licensee: Sacramento Municipal Utility District  
P. O. Box 15830  
Sacramento, California 95813

Facility Name: Rancho Seco  
Inspection at: Herald, California 95638 (Rancho Seco Site)

Inspection conducted: September 4-28, 1979

Inspectors: for Gerald B. Zurety Oct. 17, 1979  
Harvey L. Canter, Resident Inspector Date Signed

\_\_\_\_\_ Date Signed

Approved By: B. H. Faulkenberry for Oct 17, 1979  
B. H. Faulkenberry, Chief, Reactor Projects Date Signed  
Section 2, Reactor Operations and Nuclear  
Support Branch

Summary:

Inspection between September 4-28, 1979 (Report 50-312/79-21)  
Areas Inspected: Routine inspections of plant operations, maintenance;  
physical security, surveillance testing; radiological and chemical operations;  
review and audits; and, independent inspection effort. The inspections  
involved 67 inspector-hours by the NRC Resident Inspector.

Results: One item of noncompliance was identified in one area (Physical Security).

1762 130

RV Form 219 (2)

8001170586

## DETAILS

### 1. Persons Contacted

R. Rodriguez, Manager, Nuclear Operations  
\*P. Oubre, Plant Superintendent  
\*D. Blachly, Mechanical Engineering Associate  
\*N. Brock, Supervisor, Nuclear Instruments  
G. Coward, Maintenance Supervisor  
\*R. Colombo, Technical Assistant  
\*W. Ford, Operations Supervisor  
\*G. Hammond, Special Agent  
\*H. Hechert, Engineering Technician  
\*R. Medina, Quality Assurance Assistant Engineer  
\*R. Miller, Chemistry and Radiological Supervisor  
J. Sullivan, Quality Assurance Supervisor  
D. Whitney, Senior Nuclear Engineer

The inspector also interviewed and talked with other licensee employees during the course of the inspection. These included shift supervisors, reactor operators, auxiliary operators, maintenance personnel, plant technicians and engineers, and quality assurance personnel.

\*Denotes those attending the exit interviews.

### 2. Plant Operations

#### a. Facility Operating Records

The inspector examined the log entries contained in the control room log, the shift supervisor's log, and various other logs for facility operations performed during September, 1979. The log entries were consistent with the requirements of facility standing and administrative orders and were found to accurately reflect the operational status of the facility. Station orders issued by the operations supervision were consistent with the intent of the facility technical specifications, license conditions, and I.E. Bulletin requirements. Sufficient information was contained in the control room log and shift supervisor's log to identify potential problems and to verify compliance with technical specification reporting requirements and limiting conditions for operation.

b. Facility Tours and Observation of Operations

Tours of the facility were made by the Resident Inspector in the auxiliary building, fuel building, turbine building and other accessible vital areas. During the tours, the following assessments of equipment and plant conditions were made.

- (1) A number of limiting conditions for operation and limiting safety system settings were reviewed by the inspector and determined to be in compliance with technical specification and license requirements.
- (2) The control room operators time may be monopolized by acting as phone operators during some shift changes. The licensee stated that a change in phone systems is being negotiated and as an interim measure, the possible hold-over of plant personnel who will answer the phone until the swing-shift turnover is complete will be pursued. The inspector will follow up on this item (79-21-1).
- (3) Routine plant effluent chemistry sampling was observed by the Resident Inspector. The liquid samples were analyzed consistent with facility procedures.
- (4) Control room observations indicated that the facility manning was proper. Shift turnovers were found to be in accordance with presently approved watchstanding practices. Two or more operators were noted to be in the control room at all times.
- (5) System alignment and operability of various engineered safeguards systems were verified by the Resident Inspector.
- (6) Piping systems which were observed, appeared to show normal vibration levels and leakage.
- (7) Plant housekeeping/cleanliness conditions in controlled areas were appropriate for the work occurring in the areas. There were no visible, loose items which could fall into the spent fuel pool.
- (8) Radiation controls appeared properly established.
- (9) Instrumentation for monitoring the status of the plant were in operation.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

1762 132

### 3. Physical Security

With one exception, based on discussions with various licensee representatives, observations, and examination of facility procedures, the inspector verified that the measures employed for the physical protection of the facility were consistent with the requirements of the physical security plan, applicable administrative orders, and regulatory requirements. Specific aspects of physical protection examined by the inspector included the following:

- a. Properly closed and locked protected area and vital area barriers.
- b. Properly conducted personnel, vehicle and package searches.
- c. Adequate security organization manning.
- d. Proper shift turnover, shift routines, and communications procedures.
- e. Proper weapons qualifications and agility testing performed.
- f. Properly authorized, identified and badged personnel being provided access to the protected area and vital areas.
- g. Proper escorts provided for personnel and vehicles when required inside the protected area.

One area was not conducted in compliance with the physical security plan (See Appendix A). (79-21-02)

### 4. Maintenance

Records of maintenance operations on the Integrated Control System Feed Pump speed controller, anchor bolt repair, fire protection modifications, and security modifications were examined by the inspector. Some of the work mentioned above was observed while in progress. All work observed or examined appeared to have been performed in accordance with established procedures and technical specification requirements. The Resident Inspector made the following observations in relation to the work performed on the above mentioned systems:

- a. Applicable limiting conditions for operation as specified in the technical specifications were apparently met during maintenance.
- b. System tagging operations and plant status controls properly indicated the performance of maintenance activities.
- c. The maintenance was performed by qualified members of the maintenance organization.

- 4-
- d. Work requests had been properly prepared to provide the required administrative approval prior to initiating the work.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

5. Radiological Protection Operations

During plant tours, the Resident Inspector verified that the posting requirements of 10 CFR 19 and 10 CFR 20 were met. Form NRC-3 (9-78) was supplied to the licensee for proper posting in frequented areas of the plant.

Radiation control barriers were examined and found to be properly posted and to have been maintained consistent with facility procedures and operating practices. Workers observed by the inspector were found to comply with the requirements of the radiation work permits. Work performed within radiologically-controlled areas was found to have been properly authorized in accordance with work requests.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

6. Surveillance Testing

Selected parts of Surveillance Test SP203.02I, monthly HPI Venting Surveillance on P-238B, and SP203.02B, Quarterly HPI Loop B Inspection and Surveillance Test were witnessed by the Resident Inspector. Operability of the High Pressure Injection Loop B system appeared to be verified by these tests. An approved copy of the procedures was used for test performance and discrepancies were handled in accordance with approved procedures.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

7. Review and Audit

The Resident Inspector witnessed the performance of an audit conducted by licensee personnel and verified conformance with technical specification requirements and Q. C. procedures.

It was noted that one work request written for the removal of the Safety Features signal from SFV 23616, Reactor Coolant Pump Seal Injection Isolation Valve, was serialized and another work request on the same Engineering Change Notice (ECN) was not serialized. The question remains as to the purpose of serializing work requests on Q.A. 1 work being performed and to the lack of consistency in assigning the serialized numbers. A licensee representative stated that he will look into this issue. This item will be followed up at a later date by the Resident Inspector. (79-21-3).

1762 134



The Resident inspector completed the examination of PRC/MSRC meetings by review of the minutes of the meetings he attended. At the time of this writing, the inspector has some questions on the propriety of removing a Safety Features signal from a valve without prior NRC approval as per 10 CFR 50.59a.

Pending further information, this item is unresolved.

8. Independent Inspection Effort

Plant drawings posted in the radwaste area of the auxiliary building and used for various system lineups by health physics and operations personnel were out of date. The Plant Superintendent had a set of applicable up-to-date Piping and Instrument Diagrams (PID's) installed in the area in response to the Resident Inspector's concerns.

Discussions were held with operations and security personnel in an attempt to better understand the problems they may have with their job or management which could affect plant nuclear safety. These discussions and observations will continue as a standard practice of the Resident Inspector at Rancho Seco.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

9. Followup on Regional Request

The response to IE Bulletin 79-13 was received but it did not address the specific case in point: Feedwater line breaks. The Resident Inspector discussed the response with licensee representatives and received a commitment to issue a revision to this response. This item will be followed up at a later date. (79-21-5)

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

10. Unresolved Item

Unresolved items are matters about which more information is required in order to ascertain whether they are acceptable items, items of noncompliance or deviations. An unresolved item disclosed during the inspection is discussed in Paragraph 7. (79-21-4)

11. Exit Interview

The NRC Resident Inspector met with licensee representatives (denoted in Paragraph 1) on September 7 and 28, 1979. During these meetings the inspector summarized the scope and findings of this September 1979 inspection effort.