

U. S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

DIRECTORATE OF REGULATORY OPERATIONS

REGION I

RO Inspection Report No.: 50-29/74-09

Docket No.: 50-29

Licensee: Yankee Atomic Electric Company

License No.: DPR-3

20 Turnpike Road

Priority: _____

Westboro, Massachusetts 01581

Category: C

Location: Rowe, Massachusetts

Type of Licensee: PWR, 600 Mwt (W)

Type of Inspection: Routine, Announced

Dates of Inspection: August 14 & 15, 1974

Dates of Previous Inspection: July 16 - 18, 1974

Reporting Inspector: R. H. Bickley

8/23/74

W. A. Ruhlman, Reactor Inspector

Date

Accompanying Inspectors: E. C. McCabe, Jr.

8/23/74

E. C. McCabe, Jr., Senior Reactor Inspector

Date

Other Accompanying Personnel: None

Date

8011050715

Reviewed By: E. C. McCabe, Jr.

POOR ORIGINAL 8/23/74

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Enforcement Action

The pressurizer pressure channel low pressure scram setpoint was found to be less than the minimum allowed by Appendix A, Section D.2.d.1 of the Technical Specifications. (Details, Paragraph 8)

Licensee Action on Previously Identified Enforcement Items

Not inspected

Unusual Occurrences

Pressurizer Pressure channel, setpoint drift. (Details, Paragraph 8)

Other Significant Findings

A. Current Findings

The plant was made critical following the installation of a new incore instrumentation package (Report 50-29/74-06, Details, Paragraph 12) and the completion of refueling operation on August 13, 1974 and zero power physics testing was in progress.

B. Status of Previously Unresolved and Open Items

1. Resolved Items

In the below listed cases, the licensee had taken the action(s) required to resolve the item and RO:I has no further questions in these areas.

- a. Plant Security Training. (Details, Paragraph 2)
- b. Quality Assurance Training. (Details, Paragraph 3)
- c. OSHA and Plant Safety Standard Training. (Details, Paragraph 4)
- d. Maintenance Department Training. (Details, Paragraph 5)
- e. Safety Related Plant Changes. (Details, Paragraph 7.a)
- f. Material Handling, Shipping, Packaging, Cleaning, Storage and Preservation. (Details, Paragraph 7.b)

2. Unresolved and Open Items

The following items remain unresolved or open either because the appropriate actions have not been completed or because the item could not yet be inspected.

- a. Instrument and Control Personnel Training. Unresolved. (Details, Paragraph 6)
- b. Operator Requalification Program. Open. (Details, Paragraph 10)

Management Interview

An exit interview was conducted on August 15, 1974 at the conclusion of the inspection with the following licensee attendees.

Mr. H. Autio, Plant Superintendent
Mr. N. St. Laurent, Technical Assistant to the Plant Superintendent
Mr. R. Berry, Training Coordinator

The following summarizes the items discussed.

- A. Plant Security Training. (Details, Paragraph 2)
- B. Quality Assurance Training. (Details, Paragraph 3)
- C. OSHA and Plant Safety Standard Training. (Details, Paragraph 4)
- D. Maintenance Department Training. (Details, Paragraph 5)
- E. Instrument and Control Personnel Training. (Details, Paragraph 6)
- F. Previously Unresolved Items - Quality Assurance. (Details, Paragraph 7)
- G. Protective Instrumentation Setpoint Drift (AO 74-3). (Details, Paragraph 8)
- H. Conduct of Operations. (Details, Paragraph 9)
- I. Operator Requalification Program. (Details, Paragraph 10)

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted Onsite

Mr. H. A. Autio, Plant Superintendent
Mr. R. L. Berry, Training Coordinator
Mr. R. E. Durfey, Engineering Assistant
Mr. R. S. Emery, Public Relations Director
Mr. J. A. Flanigan, Plant Health Physicist
Mr. W. G. Jones, Jr., Assistant Plant Superintendent
Mr. P. E. Laird, Maintenance Supervisor
Mr. E. A. Miles, Technical Assistant
Mr. J. G. Parillo, Associate Engineer
Mr. J. H. Shippee, Instrument and Control Supervisor
Mr. J. L. Staub, Technical Assistant
Mr. N. N. St. Laurent, Technical Assistant to the Plant Superintendent
Mr. R. H. Streeter, Storekeeper

2. Plant Security Training

This item was identified as unresolved in 50-29/74-03, Details, Paragraph 2.a. At that time, the licensee stated that training program changes would be incorporated which would ensure that personnel from all departments would be made aware of the information disseminated at any lectures that they failed to attend and that a method of evaluating the effectiveness of the training would also be developed and incorporated. Both of these requirements have been incorporated and approved in Revision 1 to the GENERAL PLANT TRAINING PROGRAM procedure No. AP-0501.

This item is resolved and RO:I has no further questions in this area.

3. Quality Assurance Training

As documented in Details, Paragraph 2.c of 50-29/74-03, this area of training was also covered by the licensee's procedure No. AP-0501. The licensee's commitments in this area were essentially the same as for item 2 above and they were also met with the changes incorporated in Revision 1 to the GENERAL PLANT TRAINING PROGRAM procedure.

This item is resolved and RO:I has no further questions in this area.

4. OSHA and Plant Safety Standard Training

This section of the Industrial Safety Training program was documenting attendance during the inspection covered in report 50-29/74-03,

Details, Paragraph 2.e(2). However, the training given was not required to be evaluated to determine that the lecture attendees were understanding the instruction. This facet of training is also covered by the GENERAL PLANT TRAINING PROGRAM procedure, and the licensee's commitment to correct the noted concern was also met in Revision 1 of AP-0501.

This item is resolved and RO:I has no further questions in this area.

5. Maintenance Department Training

The only deficiency identified with the training given in this department was that the program was not defined to ensure continuity if the department supervisor should be transferred, promoted or in some other manner fail to personally require that the training be accomplished. This lack of a documented program was noted in Details, Paragraph 3.b(1) of report 50-29/74-03. This deficiency has been corrected with the approval of the TRAINING OF MAINTENANCE DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL INCLUDING INITIAL AND ANNUAL REVIEW TRAINING REQUIREMENTS procedure No. AP-5006.

This item is resolved and RO:I has no further questions in this area.

6. Instrument and Control Personnel Training

As documented in Details, Paragraph 3.a of report 50-29/74-03, the training in this department was being conducted in accordance with an approved training procedure. The licensee stated that the controlling procedure would be revised to include the new requirements delineated in ANSI N45.2.6 - 1973. During this inspection, the inspector was given copies of newly instituted certification requirements similar to those required by the ANSI standard, and he was shown new documentation procedures which met the intent of the standard. The inspector was informed that the INITIAL AND REVIEW QUALIFICATION TRAINING OF I&C PERSONNEL procedure had not yet been revised to reflect the new practices. The procedure revision, according to the licensee, has been delayed due to the heavy I&C workload during the recently completed refueling outage. The licensee discussed the revision planned with the inspector and stated that a copy of the revised procedure would be forwarded, when approved, for RO:I review.

This item remains unresolved pending receipt of the revised procedure incorporating the licensee's commitments.

7. Previously Unresolved Items - Quality Assurance

In a letter dated January 9, 1974 from Yankee Atomic Electric Company to RO:I, steps were defined to resolve the deficiencies noted in inspection report 50-29/73-05. During the inspection documented by report 50-29/74-03, the inspector checked the implementation of the steps defined in the letter which resulted in resolving eight (8) of the ten (10) items. The two (2) remaining items were reinspected with the following results.

a. Safety Related Plant Changes

As noted in Details, Paragraph 7.b(1) of report 50-29/74-03, this item was unresolved because the action defined in your response letter and the actions taken at the site were considered inappropriate. Action taken essentially resulted in two (2) different procedures covering safety related plant modification with no guidance to define which procedure should be used. This inspection determined that the procedures have been revised and guidance defined to make one procedure for safety related changes and the other procedure for non-safety related changes.

This item is resolved and RO:I has no further question in this area.

b. Material Handling, Shipping, Packaging, Cleaning, Storage and Preservation

As noted in Details, Paragraph 7.b(2) of report 50-29/74-03, this item was unresolved because the actions defined in your response letter had not yet been implemented at the site. The action described consisted of issuance of a procedure revision to incorporate changes to eliminate the noted deficiencies. During this inspection the inspector verified that a new procedure, MATERIAL HANDLING, PACKAGING, SHIPPING, CLEANING, STORAGE AND PRESERVATION had been written, typed, and designated AP-0224. This procedure was approved by the PORC on August 16, 1974.

This item is resolved and RO:I has no further questions in this area.

8. Protective Instrumentation Setpoint Drift (AO 74-3)

Reference: Licensee letter to RO:I dated July 5, 1974

During routine refueling interval surveillance testing of the pressurizer pressure channel, the low pressure scram setpoint was found

to be at 1780 psig. The licensee reported this as a violation of the Technical Specifications, Appendix A, Section D.2.d.1 and Table 1 which lists a minimum setpoint of 1800 psig. The problem was identified by the licensee as instrumentation setpoint drift.

AO 74-3 was reviewed by the PORC in meeting 74-35 on July 3, 1974. The PORC recommended that instruments with setpoints covered by Technical Specification limits be set more conservatively to allow for some setpoint drift without exceeding the Technical Specification value. The Committee also recommended that all Instrument Technicians be trained to set setpoints to a more conservative value rather than right on the Technical Specification limit.

A training lecture was held, according to licensee documentation, on July 25, 1974 at which time all I&C Technicians received the training recommended by the PORC.

In addition, the licensee was currently reviewing and revising the alignment/calibration procedures for the affected instrumentation to indicate that the setpoints should be set more conservatively and specifying the setpoint band to be allowed.

RO:I has no further questions in this area, and no additional response is required.

9. Conduct of Operations

The inspectors also observed operations in the control room associated with the licensee physics testing being conducted following the recent refueling outage.

A walk through tour, with proposed storage areas and techniques being explained, was taken through the recently completed warehouse facilities.

The inspectors identified no deficiencies in either of the areas where routine operations were observed.

10. Operator Requalification Program

Certain aspects of this training were not required until after the first annual requalification examination had been administered as noted in Details, Paragraph 5.a of report 50-29/74-03. At that time the licensee estimated that this examination would be administered during the latter part of July 1974. Due to the workload and delays in the refueling operations, this item was not completed and new dates have been selected during the month of September 1974. This item will remain open and be-reinspected after the examination.