

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION REGION II 101 MARIETTA STREET, N.W. ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30323

JAN 0 9 1990

Report No.: 70-1201/89-09 Licensee: B&W Fuel Company Commercial Nuclear Fuel Plant Lynchburg, VA 24505 Docket No.: 70-1201 License No.: SNM-1168 Facility Name: Commercial Nuclear Fuel Plant (CNFP) Inspection Conducted: December 7, 1989 9 Jan, 1990 Inspector: mes Date Signed Kreh Approved by: UNuia 9 JAN 1990 W. H. Rankin, Chief Date Signed Emergency Preparedness Section Emergency Preparedness and Radiological Protection Branch Division of Radiation Safety and Safeguards

SUMMARY

Scone:

This routine, announced inspection was conducted to evaluate the adequacy of the licensee's emergency response capability through observation of the annual emergency drill.

Results:

In the area inspected, no violations or deviations were identified. The licensee's demonstrated response capability during the simulated emergency was fully adequate. All drill objectives were met, and the licensee's critique was thorough.

9001190163 900109 PDR ADOCK 07001201

REPORT DETAILS

1. Licensee Employees Contacted

- *R. Alto, Plant Manager
- *E. Coppola, Manager, Quality and Safety
- *W. Engelke, Manager, Quality Assurance
- *D. Ferree, Manager, Fuel Operations
- *K. Lester, License and Control Administrator

Other licensee employees contacted during this inspection included security force members, technicians, and administrative personnel.

*Attended exit interview

2. Emergency Response Drill (88050)

Section 7.3 of the Emergency Plan (12-12-86 revision) states that "Emergency Drills and exercises are conducted to test the adequacy of timing and content of implementing procedures, to test emergency equipment, and to ensure that emergency organization personnel are familiar with their duties... Emergency drills (or a combined drill) of plant medical emergency and radiological monitoring capabilities will be held at least annually."

The annual drill for 1989 was conducted on December 7, commencing at 9:00 a.m. and terminating at 9:25 a.m. The scenario involved a major fire in the equipment storage building in the southwest corner of the plant. Radioactive material of low specific activity was included in the postulated blaze, and three persons suffered simulated injuries. There was no onsite participation by any offsite support groups. Further information on the scenario is available in the attachment to this report.

The inspector observed most aspects of the drill, including activation of the emergency response organization, management of the simulated fire emergency by the on-scene emergency coordinator, fire-fighting efforts by the Emergency Team, rescue and treatment of the "victims," and radiological monitoring. Activities not observed by the inspector primarily involved the overall command and notification responsibilities executed by the Emergency Officer at his designated location (Guard House). Documentation of the required offsite notifications was received and reviewed by the inspector after the drill.

The emergency response organization responded capably to the conditions postulated by the scenario. The inspector especially noted the realism of the drill play on the part of Emergency Response Team members, as contrasted with the "walk-through" approach typically observed during such drills. Responders connected and charged fire hoses; a problem with low water pressure was quickly resolved. Several minor problems were noted by the inspector, including leaving the victims too close to the fire (probably a drill artificiality), and use of an alpha survey instrument where only beta-gamma contamination was expected.

The inspector attended the postdrill critique, which included observations and findings from controllers, evaluators, and players. The critique lasted 75 minutes and was very thorough, identifying all of the problems noted by the inspector. Corrective actions implemented in response to the substantive findings will be reviewed during future inspections.

No violations or deviations were identified.

3. Action or Previous Inspection Findings (92701)

(Closed) Program Weakness 70-1201/88-11-02: Failure to conduct annual drill in a manner that would adequately test implementation of the Emergency Plan.

The only drill player who participated in the development of the scenario was the License and Control Administrator, whose emergency response position was Evacuation Officer; however, this "player knowledge" was irrelevant because an "official" evacuation was not conducted as a component of the December 7 drill. The preparation and conduct of this drill demonstrated that the licensee had fully addressed the subject finding.

4. Exit Interview (30703)

The inspection scope and results were summarized on December 7, 1989, with those persons indicated in Paragraph 1. Dissenting comments were not received from the licensee.

Attachment:

Licensee Submittal (dated November 13, 1989), Describing Drill Scenario