

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

Report Nos. 50-498/79-07; 50-499/79-07

Docket Nos. 50-498
50-499

Licensee: Houston Lighting and Power Company (HLP)
Post Office Box 1700
Houston, Texas 77001

Facility Name: South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2

Inspection at: South Texas Project, Matagorda County and
HLP offices, Houston, Texas

Inspection conducted: May 7-9, 1979

Inspector: R. J. Everett 6/13/79
R. J. Everett, Radiation Specialist Date

Approved by: G. D. Brown 6/14/79
G. D. Brown, Chief, Fuel Facility and Material Safety Branch Date

Summary:

Inspection on May 7-9, 1979 (Report Nos. 50-498/79-07; 50-499/79-07)

Areas Inspected: Routine, unannounced inspection of construction phase environmental protection programs, including organization and administration; site environmental control program; audits; transmission line work; special studies and monitoring programs and a tour of the site and surrounding area. The inspection involved twenty (20) inspector-hours by one (1) NRC inspector.

Results: No items of noncompliance or deviations were disclosed.

567 003

7907310574

Details1. Persons ContactedHouston Lighting and Power Company (HLP)

D. R. Betterton, Manager, Environmental Protection
 W. F. McGuire, Principal Engineer, Environmental Planning
 and Assessment
 R. W. Lawhn, Lead Engineer, Nuclear Section
 S. S. Davis, Engineer, Nuclear Section
 J. A. Campbell, Principal Engineer, Transmission Engineering
 T. R. Alford, Site Project Manager

Brown and Root, Inc. (B&R)

M. J. Psujek Site Environmental Coordinator

*Denotes those present at the exit interview at HCP offices on May 9, 1979.

2. Licensee Action on Previous Inspection Findings

(Closed) Unresolved item (50-498/78-02/1): This item is concerned with the placement of crushed rock in the barge slip area as required by section 4.5 of the FES. The requirement was deleted by Amendment No. 1 to the construction permit, dated May 15, 1978.

(Closed) Unresolved item (50-498/78-02/2): This item is concerned with the site terrestrial ecological monitoring program as required by section 6.1.4.3.8 of the ER. The applicant's studies and monitoring programs are described in paragraph 6 of this report. This item considered closed.

3. Organization and Administration

The inspector reviewed the organizational structures of HLP and B&R as related to environmental matters at the site. No significant changes were noted. Mr. T. R. Alford replaces Mr. F. D. Asbeck as HLP's site project manager. The inspector had no further questions in this area at this time.

4. Internal Audits

The inspector discussed audits and audit findings with HLP and B&R representatives. The B&R environmental services organization conducts semi-annual audits of the site Environmental Protection Control Program (EPCP) and the HLP Environmental Planning and Assessment Division audits

567 004

the site program on the quarterly basis. In addition, a QA audit was conducted on July 20, 1978 of HLP's Environmental Assessment Division. The inspector reviewed these audits as to scope and findings and determined that corrective action was completed for each identified discrepancy. The inspector had no further questions in this area at this time.

5. Site Environmental Protection Control Program

A Site Environmental Control Program (ECP) has been defined and implemented. The program is carried out by the Site Environmental Coordinator (B&R). The inspector reviewed changes to the program since the last inspection and has no further questions. The inspector reviewed the log books and monthly reports which document activities of the ECP. The inspector noted no open items at the time of inspection and previous open items had been satisfactorily closed out.

The inspector noted a continuation of violation of permit requirements with respect to release limits on sanitary sewer effluent. The inspector noted additional sewage treatment capacity being installed. Since there are no NRC requirements in this area, the inspector had no further questions in this area.

6. Special Studies and Monitoring Programs

Studies and monitoring requirements during the construction phase are described in section 6.1 of the Environmental Report (ER) and section 6.1 of the Final Environmental Statement (FES). The hydrological and meteorological studies described in sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 of the FES have been completed. Required ecological studies are described in section 6.1.3 of the FES. In the aquatic ecological area, baseline studies on Little Robbins Slough have been completed. Continuing studies in this area consist of annual aerial mapping and ground truthing. Completion of entrainment and impingement studies await the filling of the cooling lake and the use of the intake structure. In the terrestrial ecological area, a site survey of wildlife populations was made in 1978 in compliance with section 6.1.4.3.8 of the ER. The inspector had no further questions in this area at this time.

The applicant described the initiation of a Pre-operational Radiological Monitoring Program. Controls for Environmental Pollution (CEP) has been selected as the analytical contractor and an audit was conducted by HLP in May, 1978. The audit covered CEP's analytical QA program and other requirements of the contract. The inspector noted that written procedures have not been finalized and implemented to cover the scope of the work, assignment of responsibility, sampling procedures, acceptance criteria and analytical QC activities. The inspector stated that this area would remain unresolved (79-07/1) pending completion and implementation of these procedures.

567 005

7. Transmission Line Environmental Protection

A discussion of transmission line routings with the applicant revealed several significant changes. The HLP corridor from the site eastward to Velasco has not changed. The corridor from Danevang to Glidden will be extended 19.5 miles northwest to the Holman substation. The proposed line from Danevang to the hill country substation remains unchanged. The southern corridor to Lon Hill is no longer being considered and will terminate at Blessing substation, about 10 miles northwest of the site. The applicant asked a consultant to review and assess the environmental impact of these changes. The inspector reviewed the consultant's report of March 9, 1978, which concluded that no environmental impact would take place greater than that previously evaluated. The inspector concurred in the evaluation. The ownership and construction of each corridor by various participating companies has been previously described (50-499/78-02). Construction work is now restricted to the Velasco line. The inspector reviewed weekly environmental status reports from the field which showed that environmental protection requirements have been met.

The inspector had no further questions in this area at this time.

8. Site Tour

A tour of the site and surrounding area was conducted on May 7-8, 1979. The inspector noted the burial of chemical and nonsalvageable waste at a designated location on-site. The applicant stated that burial of these wastes has been discussed with and approved by the Texas Department of Water Resources. The inspector stated that section 4.5.2 of the FES requires that nonsalvageable items be hauled from the site and disposed of in accordance with local regulations. The inspector stated further that this item would remain unresolved (79-07/2) pending discussions with the NRC staff.

The inspector toured the railroad spur right of way north from the site to a point about 9 miles away. The applicant stated that the spur had to be moved about 200 feet west of the originally planned location. The inspector reviewed the railroad spur description in section 2.1.2.2 of the FSAR and concluded that the movement in question was not significant. The inspector had no further questions in this area at this time.

After a tour of the site and surrounding area and a review of the applicant's EPCP and documented evidence of compliance, the inspector concluded that construction permit requirements and controls set forth in section 4.5 of the FES had been met.

9. 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 6 and 8.

10. Exit Interview

The inspector met with HLP representatives (denoted in paragraph 1) at the HLP general offices in Houston, Texas, following the conclusion of the inspection of May 9, 1979. The inspector summarized the purpose and scope of the inspection, and discussed the inspection findings.

567 007