

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION V

Report No. 50-361/83-12
50-362/83-11
50-361
Docket No. 50-362 License No. NPF-10, NPF-15 Safeguards Group

Licensee: Southern California Edison Company
P. O. Box 800, 2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Rosemead, California 91770

Facility Name: San Onofre Units 2 and 3

Inspection at: San Onofre Site, San Clemente, California

Inspection conducted: February 21 through March 25, 1983

Inspectors: *R. J. Pate for* *4/14/83*
R. J. Pate, Senior Resident Inspector Date Signed
Unit 3

M. M. Mendonca for *4/14/83*
M. M. Mendonca, Resident Inspector Date Signed

J. P. O'Brien for *4/14/83*
J. P. O'Brien, Resident Inspector Date Signed

Approved by: *D. F. Kirsch* *4/14/83*
D. F. Kirsch, Chief, Reactor Projects Section Date Signed
No. 3, Reactor Projects Branch No. 2

Summary:

Inspection on February 21 through March 25, 1983
(Report No. 50-361/83-12, 50-362/83-11)

Areas inspected: Routine, unannounced resident inspection of Units 2 and 3 including the following areas: Operational safety verification; Monthly surveillance; licensee events report review and independent inspection effort. This inspection involved 131 inspector-hours by three NRC inspectors.

Results: No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

+H. Ray, Station Manager
+E. Morgan, Operations Manager
+W. Moody, Deputy Station Manager
+P. Croy, Compliance and Configuration Control Manager
+P. King, Operations Quality Assurance Supervisor
+J. Iyer, Lead Compliance Engineer
+C. Kergis, Lead Quality Assurance Engineer
+M. Short, Project Support Manager
+E. Gulbrand, Assistant Manager, Maintenance

The inspectors also interviewed and talked with other licensee employees during the course of the inspection. These included shift supervisors, control room operators, startup engineers, and quality assurance personnel.

+Denotes those persons attending the exit interview on March 31, 1983.

2. Operational Safety Verification (Unit 3)

The inspector observed the Unit 3 control room operations, completed the unit check list for mode 5, reviewed applicable logs and conducted discussions with control room operators during the inspection period. Tours of the Unit 3 diesel generator building, safety equipment building and turbine building were conducted to observe plant equipment conditions. Particular attention was given to potential fire hazards, fluid leaks, excessive vibrations, and housekeeping.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

3. Licensee Event Report (LER) Followup (Units 2 and 3)

The inspectors reviewed portions of LER records, and evaluated, verified and discussed, with licensee personnel selected corrective actions. The inspectors determined that the licensee's organization acceptably disseminated and reviewed the information and that acceptable corrective action had been completed. Therefore, the LER's listed below are closed.

UNIT 2

82-019
82-021
82-025
82-034
82-039
82-045
82-046
82-047
82-052
82-054
82-055

82-058
82-059
82-060
82-061
82-062
82-063
82-065
82-066
82-073
82-081
82-090

UNIT 3

82-093
82-100
82-103
82-134
82-151
82-159
83-003
83-007
83-011
83-012

83-004
83-015
83-017

Also the inspector reviewed the following LER's with the licensee management personnel:

Unit 2	LER 83-002	Low Level Tank T-121
Unit 2	LER 83-016	Low Level Tank T-121
Unit 2	LER 83-001	Low Level Tank T-120
Unit 2	LER 82-145	Missed RCS Inventory Surveillance
Unit 2	LER 82-156	Missed RCS Inventory Surveillance
Unit 3	LER 83-002	Missed RCS Inventory Surveillance
Unit 3	LER 83-007	Excessive Reactor Heatup/Cooldown
Unit 2	LER 82-170	Excessive Reactor Heatup/Cooldown

These LER's were selected as examples of where licensed operators made errors that significantly contributed to the events reported. The inspector expressed concern that corrective action appeared ineffective, considering the repetitive nature of such events. The SCE management personnel present at the exit interview stated that they had already recognized that operator errors appeared excessive and were taking corrective measures. These measures include meetings between the reactor operators and the Vice President, Nuclear Engineering and Operations, and plans to extend the operators work day thirty minutes to allow for a formal shift turnover.

SCE management personnel stated that they believed the corrective action taken or planned would be effective in reducing the number of operator errors. This area will be examined further during a future inspection.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

4. Monthly Surveillances (Units 2 and 3)

The inspector reviewed the test data generated during the conduct of "Emergency Air Cleanup System Absorber Stage In-Place Leak Test," per procedure S023-I-6.100. The test data appeared acceptable. The inspector pointed out one area of inconsistency between the procedure and the data. The licensee revised the procedure by Temporary Change Notice (TCN) No. 3, dated March 12, 1983.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

5. Independent Inspection Effort (Units 2 and 3)

The inspector participated with the Region V and NRR staff in the review of the scram breaker failures identified on Units 2 and 3. The inspection findings are reported in NRC Inspection Report Nos. 50-361/83-13 and 50-362/83-12.

6. Exit Interview

The inspector met with the licensee representatives (denoted in paragraph 1) on March 31, 1983 and discussed the inspection scope and findings.