U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

DIRECTORATE OF RECULATORY OPERATIONS

REGION I

-

RO Inspection Report No: 50-289/74-30	Docket No:	50-289
Licensee: Metropolitan Edison Company	License No:	DPR-50
Three Mile Island - Unit 1	Priority:	
	Category:	с
Location: Middletown, Pennsylvania		•
Type of Licensee: PWR, 871 MWe (B&W)		
Type of Inspection: Routine, Unannounced		
Dates of Inspection: September 10 thru 12, 1974		
Dates of Previous Inspection: August 13 thru 16, 1974		•
Reporting Inspector: D. M. Humberg, Reactor Inspector		9/23/74 Date
Accompanying Inspectors: None		'w
		Date
		Date
		Date
		Date
Other Accompanying Personnel:		
	70	Date
Reviewed By: E.C. mcCale, Ju		1/23/74
E. C. McCabe, Jr., Senior Reactor Inspector Reactor Operations Branch 7910180	728	Date

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Enforcement Action

- A. Violations
 - Contrary to the requirements of the industrial Security Plan's Administrative Procedure 1011.1, a gate in the security area fence was unlocked and uncontrolled, in that the inspector, unescorted, entered through the gate and gained access to the Service Building without licensee verification of the propriety of such entrance. (Details, Paragraph 6)

Licensee Action on Previously Identified Enforcement Items

A. Not inspected

Unusual Occurrences

None identified

Other Significant Findings

- A. Current
 - Review of Abnormal Occurrences was conducted. (Details, Paragraph 2)
 - Review of Safety Related Maintenance was conducted. (Details, Paragraph 3)
 - Review of Reporting Requirements (Semi-annual Report Primary Coolant Chemistry) was conducted. (Details, Paragraph 4)
 - Radiation Monitoring Systems (RMS) status was questioned. (Details, Paragraph 5)
- B. Status of Previously Reported Unresolved Items

Not inspected

Management Interview

An exit interview was held on September 12, 1974 at the conclusion of the inspection with the following attendees.

1445 071

Metropolitan Edison Company

Mr. J. Floyd, Supervisor of Operations Mr. J. Herbein, Station Superintendent

The following summarizes items discussed:

- 1. Review of Abnormal Occurrences. (Details, Paragraph 2)
- 2. Review of Safety Related Maintenance. (Details, Paragraph 3)

-2-

- 3. Review of Reporting Requirements. (Details, Paragraph 4)
- Radiation Monitoring System (RMS) Calibration Status. (Details, Paragraph 5)
- 5. Security Area violation. (Details, Paragraph 6)

1445)72

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Metropolitan Edison Company (Met Ed)

Dr. T. Baer, Station Engineer Mr. D. Barry, Instrument Supervisor Mr. E. Bulmer, Mechanical Engineer Mr. J. Colitz, Unit 1, Superintendent Mr. W. Cotter, Mechanical Engineer Mr. N. Derks, Shift Foreman, Unit 2 Mr. J. Floyd, Supervisor of Operations - Unit 1 Mr. K. Frederick, Staff Chemist Mr. C. Gilbert, Supervisor of Operations - Unit 2 Mr. D. Good, Test Coordinator Mr. C. Hartman, Electrical Engineer Mr. J. Herbein, Station Superintendent Mr. G. Miller, Unit 2, Superintendent Mr. W. Potts, Supervisor - Quality Control Mr. P. Valez, Radiation Chemistry Technician

2. Review of Abnormal Occurrences (A.O.'s)

Abnormal occurrence review included inspection of plant records and logs, Technical Specifications, Work Requests, Plant Operations and Review Committee minutes and correspondence to the AEC.

The below listed AO's were reviewed to verify that:

the cause was identified and details clearly reported; a.

the corrective action described was taken to prevent recurrences; b.

- each event was reviewed and evaluated by the licensee; and C.
- d. safety limits, limiting safety settings, and limiting conditions for operation were not exceeded.

A.O. System 74-7 Reactor Coolant System 74-8 Reactivity and Power Control 74-10

Auxiliary System 74-11 Containment System

1445 .)73

System

74-13*	Emergency Po		
74-14	Engineered S	Safety	Feature

* Final corrective action involves procuring new pressure switch

Abnormal Occurrence 74-13 remains open pending completion of corrective action. All others are complete and the inspector has no further questions.

3. Review of Safety Related Maintenance

A.0.

Maintenance evolutions on safety related systems were reviewed to verify that:

- a. limiting conditions for operation were met while the system or component was removed from service;
- administrative approval was obtained prior to initiating the work;
- c. maintenance was accomplished with approved procedures;
- d. required inspection or hold points were included;
- e. necessary functional testing and calibration was performed;
- f. quality control records are available for three of the items reviewed; and
- g. maintenance was performed by qualified personnel.

The maintenance review included inspection of the Work Request Log. appropriate Work Request packages, Technical Specifications and Quality Control Surveillance Reports. Discussions with the Supervisor of Maintenance and the Unit 1 Mechanical Engineer were held to obtain other required information. Maintenance work reviewed is tabulated below.

System	Component	Licensee Work Package Number			
Reactor Coolant	RC-V-2	569*			
Reactor Coolant	RC-RV-1A & B	549*.**			
Reactivity & Power Control	NI-7	2127			

1445)74

System	Component	Licensee Work Package Number
Reactivity & Power Control	CRDM 10	2274
Power Conversion System	MS V29A	1769
Auxiliary System	DH-V-13A/B	550/555*
Auxiliary System	MU-P-1B	267*
Electrical System	DH-V4A & B	3737
Electrical System	RC-VL 2	- 3245
Emergency Power	Diesel Generator 1A	2609
Emergency Power	Diesel Generator 1A	3254**
ECCS	Core Flood Pressure Switch	1700
ESF	MS-V-1D	1503**
ESF	RM-G1	1945

* Maintenance not performed by licensee personnel ** Quality Control Surveillance Reports reviewed

Within the inspection scope, no maintenance deficiencies were identified.

4. Review of Reporting Requirements

Since the licensee has not yet submitted his start-up report, this inspection was limited to the contents of the Semi-Annual Report submitted on August 29, 1974 and covered the period from June 5 through June 30, 1974. Within this report the area selected for verification was the "Primary Coolant Chemistry".

This inspection consisted of a random selection of five days during this period and comparison of the data from these days to the Technical Specifications and the data submitted in the Semi-Annual Report. Additionally, discussions were held with the Site Chemist and a Staff Chemist concerning the meaning of the data. The days selected for review were June 10, 21, 24, 27, and 30, 1974. No discrepancies were noted between the data in the Semi-Annual Report and the random sample nor was any data outside of the limits in the Technical Specifications. The inspector had no further questions in this area.

5. Radiation Monitoring Systems (RMS) Calibration Status

During a tour of the Control Room, the inspector observed calibration stickers on the meters associated with the RMS indicated all the instruments with calibration stickers (approximately 80%) had passed their required quarterly calibration date by one to two months.

1445 .)75

The licensee indicated that difficulties with the calibration procedure and certain instruments have been encountered. The licensee has also stated that his difficulties with the RMS have not resulted in noncompliance with his Technical Specification requirements. The inspector informed the licensee that it appeared that no effective calibration of the majority of the RMS had been accomplished since April, 1974.

In a subsequent phone call on September 17, 1974 between Mr. Herbein of the licensee's staff and Mr. Westerman of the AEC, the licensee stated an Abnormal Occurrence report would be submitted regarding the RMS. This item is unresolved and will be re-examined on a priority basis.

6. Violation of Security Plan

On September 12, 1974 the inspector observed that a gate in the security perimeter fence was opened to permit the unloading of a delivery truck. The inspector observed no guard at the opened gate and walked through without escort and unchallenged into the Service Building.

This is a violation of Section 2.3 of the Security Plans Administrative Procedure AP10.11.1 Revision 0, dated February 13, 1974 which states, "that the individual issued a key for a security area lock is responsible for the area under that key's control until the area is again secured and the key is returned."

Upon being informed, the licensee stated he took corrective action to place a guard at the open gate. Subsequent phone calls between the Station Superintendent and Mr. Davis of the AEC on September 13 and 16 and Mr. Arnold, Vice President of Generation, Metropolitan Edison Company and Mr. O'Reilly of the AEC on September 16, 1974, confirmed the licensee's intent to upgrade security to meet established requirements and emphasized the importance of adherence to security requirements.

Stock Form 11 -October 100 Tike 7, GAO M - 111+-106	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	CTION) On C	turp All No.			
	U. S. Atomic Energy Commissi (Department or Establishment and Bureau or Office)	<u>on</u>	r	Date	12-23-74		
PAYER:	Metropolitan Edison Company P. O. Box 542 Reading, Pennsylvania 19603 50-289 Thure Mile O		payer i	with his r	ld be returned emittance. CTIONS BEL		
			Unit Price				
Date	DESCRIPTION	Quantity	Cost	Per	- Amou	nt	
2	Civil Penalty imposed by letter dated September 23, 1974 and Order dated November 20, 1974 (Gyg kraters)				\$3,500	0	
		AMOUNT			\$3.500	00	

This is not a receipt

INSTRUCTIONS

Tender of payment of the above bill may be made in cash, United States postal money order, express money order, bank draft, or check, to the office indicated. Such tender, when in any other form than cash, should be drawn to the order of the Department or Establishment and Bureau or Office indicated above.

Receipts will be issued in all cases where "cash" is received, and only upon request when remittance is in any other form. If tender of payment of this bill is other than cash or United States postal money order, the receipt shall not become an acquittance until such tender has been cleared and the amount received by the Department or Establishment and Bureau or Office indicated above.

Failure to receive a receipt for a cash payment should be promptly reported by the payer to the chief administrative officer of the ureau or agency mentioned above.

1445 377

. U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 1969 OF-190-457 (21-4)

POOR ORIGINAL

