



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
REGION II  
151 MARIETTA ST., N.W., SUITE 3100  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

Report No. 50-302/80-31

Licensee: Florida Power Corporation  
3201 34th Street, South  
St. Petersburg, FL 33733

Facility Name: Crystal River 3

License No. DPR-72

Inspection at Crystal River 3 site near Crystal River, Florida and Corporate offices  
in St. Petersburg, Florida

Inspector: *V. L. Brownlee* 9-26-80  
V. L. Brownlee Date Signed

Approved by: *T. E. Conlon* 9-26-80  
T. E. Conlon, Section Chief, RCES Branch Date Signed

SUMMARY

Inspection on August 25 - 26, 1980

Areas Inspected

This special, unannounced management inspection involved 13 inspector-hours on site and at the corporate offices in review of procedures controls and adopted by Florida Power Corporation to implement the evaluation and reporting requirements of 10 CFR Part 21.

Results

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

8011040537

## DETAILS

### 1. Persons Contacted

#### Licensee Employees

T. C. Lutkehaus, Nuclear Technical Services Superintendent  
(Acting Plant Manager)  
J. Colby, Assistant Manager Nuclear Engineering  
J. Cooper, Nuclear QA/QC Compliance Manager  
J. Smith, Quality Programs  
G. Anderson, Buyer  
T. D. Hagen, Technical Specification Coordinator  
\*H. M. Perry, Nuclear Support Services Department  
G. Brillli, Senior Nuclear Buyer  
R. M. Bright, Acting Manager, Nuclear Support Services  
\*E. E. Froats, Manager Quality Audits & Engineering  
S. Ulm, Project Engineering, Nuclear Engineering  
J. C. Clapp, Manager, Vendor QA  
G. A. Becher, Supervisor Mechanical/Structural Engineer  
D. C. Nusbicker, Jr., Site Supervisor, Quality Programs Department  
R. Widell, Nuclear Engineering, Project Engineer  
B. E. Crane, Planning Engineer, Plant Staff

\*Attended Exit Interview

### 2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on August 26, 1980 with those persons indicated in paragraph 1 above.

### 3. Licensee Action on Previous Inspection Findings

Not inspected.

### 4. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items were not identified during this inspection.

### 5. Compliance with 10 CFR 21

#### a. General

The purpose of this inspection was to ascertain whether FPC and appropriate responsible officers had established and implemented procedures and other instructions as required to ensure compliance with 10 CFR 21 requirements relative to the reporting of defects and noncompliances. Inspector determinations are based on the requirements of 10 CFR 21 as clarified by staff positions in NUREG-0302, Revision 1. The inspector examined and evaluated the Crystal River site procedures on August 25,

1980, at the site, and reviewed and evaluated Corporate Office procedures on August 26, 1980, in the Corporate Offices in St. Petersburg, Florida.

b. Documents Examined

- (1) Nuclear Support Services Department Procedure NSSD-15, Revision 2, December 31, 1979, "Compliance with 10 CFR Part 21, Reporting of Defects and Noncompliance".
- (2) Quality Program Procedure QP No. 15.55, Rev. 0), August 21, 1980 "Reporting of Defects and Noncompliances."
- (3) Engineering Procedure No. 10, March 13, 1978, "10 CFR Part 21".
- (4) Engineering Procedure No. 12, August 1, 1979, "Applicability of 10 CFR Part 21 to Procurement Documents".
- (5) Production Engineering 10 CFR 21 Review Form.

c. Program Review

The inspector reviewed the above controlling procedures and verified that procedures have been established to assure that the following requirements of 10 CFR 21 will be met; the posting (21.6), evaluating deviations (21.21(1)), informing the director (21.21(a) assure that the director will notify the Commission (21.21(b)), and to assure that procurement documents specify that provisions of 10 CFR Part 21 will apply when applicable (21.31), maintenance of records (21.51(c)), and disposition of records (21.51(b)).

d. Program Implementation

The inspector held discussions with the above noted responsible managers, engineers, QA and QC personnel and examined the above noted areas for posting, audits and audit findings, nonconformances and evaluations, vendor and other sources of input, notification documentation, and reports to verify procedure implementation.

Based on the above program review and implementation evaluation the inspector concludes:

- (1) Responsible personnel at the site and General Offices are quite knowledgeable of Part 21 requirements.
- (2) Responsible personnel understand the company Part 21 procedures.
- (3) The procedures are adequate.

The inspector has no further questions regarding this matter.