

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

IE Inspection Report No: 50-289/75-19 Docket No: 50-289
Licensee: Metropolitan Edison Company License No: DPR-50
P. O. Box 542 Priority: _____
Reading, Pennsylvania 19603 Category: C
Safeguards Group: _____
Location: Three Mile Island 1, Middletown, Pennsylvania
Type of Licensee: PWR, 871 MWe (B&W)
Time of Inspection: Management Meeting
Date of Inspection: July 30, 1975
Dates of Previous Inspection: July 30-31, August 1, 1975
Reporting Inspector: R. L. Spessard 8/11/75
R. L. Spessard, Reactor Inspector DATE
Accompanying Inspectors: E. J. Brunner 8/13/75
E. J. Brunner, Chief, Reactor Operations Branch DATE
A. B. Davis 8/12/75
A. B. Davis, Senior Reactor Inspector DATE
R. J. Nolan For 8/11/75
F. J. Nolan, Senior Reactor Inspection Specialist DATE
Other Accompanying Personnel: A. C. Ellingson For 8/11/75
A. C. Ellingson, NRC Consultant DATE
Reviewed By: E. J. Brunner 8/11/75
E. J. Brunner, Chief, Reactor Operations Branch DATE

1451 526

7910190

543

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Enforcement Action

None

Other Significant Findings

A. Current Findings

Not applicable

B. Management Meeting

The management meeting requested by Region I was conducted at the corporate offices of Metropolitan Edison Company, Reading, Pennsylvania on July 30, 1975. The following personnel were in attendance:

Metropolitan Edison Company

Mr. R. C. Arnold, Vice President
Mr. R. M. Klingaman, Manager, Generation Engineering
Mr. L. L. Lawyer, Manager, Operational Quality Assurance
Mr. J. G. Herbein, Manager, Generation Operations - Nuclear

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Mr. E. J. Brunner, Chief, Reactor Operations Branch, Region I
Mr. A. B. Davis, Senior Reactor Inspector, Region I
Mr. R. L. Spessard, Reactor Inspector, Region I
Mr. F. J. Nolan, Senior Reactor Inspection Specialist, HQ
Mr. A. C. Ellingson, Consultant

Purpose and Scope

A meeting was held with Met Ed management to discuss a new inspection program to be implemented at TMI-1 on a trial basis for a one year period with the first inspection beginning in September 1975.

Discussion Items

Specific items discussed are summarized below:

1451 527

A. Purpose of the Statistical Sampling Inspection Program (SSIP)

1. Determine feasibility of a SSIP to support a numerical confidence level statement regarding the effectiveness of an inspection program to determine a degree of compliance by the licensee.

2. Specifically the confidence level statement is as follows:

Inspection of licensee compliance with NRC requirements is such that there is at least an X% probability of detecting if the licensee is less than Y% in compliance over a one year period.

B. Description of the One Year Inspection Program

1. Program is made up of the SSIP and a portion of the routine uniform inspection program (RUIP) applied to all operating facilities.

2. Special inspections will continue to be performed as needed.

3. The SSIP encompasses inspections in the areas of:

- a. License conditions.
- b. Technical Specification requirements.
- c. 10 CFR 19, 20, 50, 55, 71 and 73.
- d. Security plan.
- e. FSAR Chapter 12.
- f. QA for operations.

4. The portion of the RUIP encompasses:

- a. Nonroutine events.
- b. Bulletin follow-up.
- c. Noncompliance/Deviation follow-up.
- d. Independent inspection effort.
- e. Training.
- f. Plant operations.
- g. Logs and records.
- h. Review and audits.
- i. Committee activities.

C. Inspection Effort

1. Expected to be about the same as the complete RUIP.

1451 328

D. SSIP Discussion

1. About 2500 inspectable elements were identified from areas described in B.3 above and were stored in random sequence in computer.
2. A sufficient number of these elements was randomly selected by computer to provide a 95/96 confidence level statement.
3. Inspection procedures were developed for the elements to be inspected.

E. Method of Inspection

1. Same as now. Project and specialist inspectors will perform the SSIP and RUIP.
2. Audits performed on selected inspector findings.

F. Method of Documentation

1. Same as used for other facilities.

G. Enforcement

1. Same as now - reference 12/21/74 letter from Dr. Knuth to licensees.

H. Licensee Comment

1. Encouraged at any time during the year.
2. Meeting after six months to discuss program.

I. End Objective

1. Cost benefit analysis - is SSIP of sufficient merit to apply nationwide?

Specific comments and/or concerns expressed by Met Ed management included the following:

- A. Met Ed would like a copy of the 2500 element population.
- B. Met Ed would like to know under which program (SSIP or RUIP) an Item of Noncompliance, when identified, was detected.

1451 329

- C. Met Ed expressed concern that the program puts the same importance relative to noncompliance on an item required to be done daily and items required to be done at lesser frequencies (quarterly, semi-annually, and annually). Met Ed intends to evaluate this program further, and if warranted, may object to its implementation at TMI-1.
- D. Met Ed expressed a general concern that the NRC inspection program was not taking advantage of the Quality Assurance Program being implemented by licensees to meet NRC requirements.

The licensee was advised that his comments and/or concerns would be evaluated.

1451 530