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

REGION III

Report No. 50-155/77-06

Docket No. 50-155

License No. DPR-6

Licensee: Consumers Power Company 212 West Michigan Avenue

Jackson, MI 49201

Facility Name: Big Rock Point Nuclear Plant

Inspection at: Big Rock Point Site, Charlevoix, MI

Inspection conducted: May 27, 1977 WB Smart for

Inspector: A. G. Januska

WB Great fo

Approved by:

J. A. Pagliaro, Chief Environmental and Special Projects Section

date signed

Inspection Summary

Inspection on May 27, 1977 (Report No. 50-155/77-06)
Areas Inspected: Routine, observation of the response by the licensee's organization during a scheduled drill conducted by the licensee; collection of effluent samples for future comparative analyses. The inspection involved 8 inspector-hours on site by one NRC inspector. Results: For the two areas inspected, no items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

8101270978

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Principal Licensee Employees

*C. Axtell, Plant Health Physicist
C. For, Sopior Chemistry and Radiation Protection Technician

*denotes those present at the exit interview.

2. Drill

The inspector observed the response by the licensee organization and an offsite support agency during one of the scheduled drills conducted by the licensee on May 27, 1977. Observations were given in detail to the licensee representative which generally fell into the categories of Radiation Protection, room preparation and area restoration. The inspector noted that the Plant Health Physicist, also an observer, verified the impleme tation of Appendix C Section III of the Big Rock Point Plant Site Emergency Plan.

a. Radiation Protection

The inspector noted that minor deficiencies noted during the drill were due to the fact that the Emergency Room of the hospital was very busy and also that the ambulance used was the only one available and could not be detained to simulate a survey of the attendants.

b. Room Preparation

The Plant Health Physicist noted that a receptacle for waste was not provided in preparing the room.

c. Area Restoration

The inspector noted that blotting paper, removed from the route from the emergency patient entrance to the Treatment Room, was carried to the Treatment Room in a manner that would have allowed contamination to be deposited on the corridor floor.

A critique was scheduled for licensee management during the week of May 30 - June 3, 1977.

3. Effluent Sampling

Samples of liquid and gaseous waste, and particulate and charcoal desorber filters were obtained for future comparative analysis.

4. Exit Interview

The inspector summarized his findings with the licensee representative (paragraph 1) at the conclusion of the drill on May 27, 1977.