UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INSPECTION AND ENFORCEMENT

REGION III

Report of Operations Inspection

IE Inspection Report No. 050-263/76-11

Licensee: Northern States Power Company
414 Nicollet Mall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401

Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant
Monticello, Minnesota

License No. DPR-22
Category: C

Type of Licensee: BWR GE 1670 MWt

Type of Inspection: Routine, Unannounced

Dates of Inspection: August 9-13, 1976

Principal Inspector: W. D. Shafer (W.D. Shafer) 8-19-76 (Date)

Accompanying Inspectors: None

Other Accompanying Personnel: None

Reviewed By: D. C. Boyd, Acting Chief (D.C. Boyd) 8-19-76 (Date)
Reactor Projects Section 2

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Inspection Summary

Inspection on August 9-13, 1976, (76-11): Review of fire protection, review and audit function, and records. No items of noncompliance were identified.

Enforcement Items

None.

Licensee Action on Previously Identified Enforcement Items

Not reviewed.

Other Significant Items

A. Systems and Components

None.

B. Facility Items (Plans and Procedures)

None.

C. Managerial Items

None.

D. Noncompliance Identified and Corrected by Licensee

None.

E. Deviations

None.

F. Status of Previously Reported Unresolved Items

None.

Management Interview

At the conclusion of the inspection, a management interview was conducted with Messrs. Eliason, Plant Manager; Clarity, Superintendent of Plant Engineering and Radiation Protection; and other staff members. The inspector stated the following:

A. The fire protection program appears adequate, however, the quality assurance surveillance of work in progress must be accomplished in order to determine that safety measures are being practiced by plant personnel. (Paragraph 2.b, Report Details)

B. A weakness in the audit functions of the SAC exists in that recommendations made in SAC audits are not acknowledged. A management representative stated that this weakness will be corrected. (Paragraph 3.b, Report Details)

C. The licensee has an excellent records management program. No concerns were identified.

REPORT DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

L. R. Eliason, Plant Manager
M. H. Clarity, Superintendent, Plant Engineering and Radiation Protection
W. E. Anderson, Superintendent, Operations and Maintenance
D. D. Antony, Plant Engineer, Operations
W. H. Sparrow, Operations Supervisor
H. E. Nimmo, Maintenance Supervisor
H. M. Kendall, Plant Office Supervisor
J. R. Pasch, Training Supervisor
R. L. Scheinost, Quality Engineer
D. Pederson, Systems Engineer
M. F. Hammer, Engineer
J. D. Weyhrauch, Clerk

2. Fire Protection

A review of the licensee's fire protection program was conducted to determine whether special work controls over modification and maintenance activities have been implemented. The following observations were made:

a. Administrative Control Directives (ACDs) for activities involving maintenance and modifications appear to be effectively controlling all work involving open flame and other ignition sources.

b. Quality assurance surveillance of work involving fire hazards is not clearly identified through an ACD; however, a licensee representative stated that spot checks are unofficially conducted by all management representatives to determine that safe working conditions are maintained. Control of flammable materials with respect to seal penetrations is maintained at the time of purchase of the material requiring vendor certification of the material's resistance to fire.

The inspector informed the licensee that quality assurance audits must be more than review of the documentation generated from a particular modification or maintenance activity, and that on-the-job audits to determine how the work is actually being accomplished must be an integral part of the audit function.

A licensee representative stated that the onsite engineering staff has too many responsibilities to include them on independent audits; however, management is looking at the possibility of using corporate office personnel to perform the QA audits during the next refueling outage.

c. The inspector noted that fire drills are conducted periodically during the licensee's semiannual emergency procedure test. The last fire drill conducted occurred on July 2, 1975. In discussions with the licensee about drill frequency, a management representative stated that all future emergency procedure tests will include a fire drill for the fire fighting team. No concerns were identified.

d. The inspector conducted a tour of the facility and noted that no unnecessary fire hazards were present. Also, during a tour of the cable spreading room and control room, the inspector noted that all penetrations are properly sealed with fire resistant material. During the tour, the inspector noted that all the observed portable extinguishers located throughout the facility had not been inspected since June 1976. The licensee's test procedure No. 1123 identifies this inspection as a monthly requirement. In discussing this discrepancy with a licensee representative, the inspector determined that manpower shortages was the reason for the missed inspections. The purpose for the monthly inspection is to identify any portable extinguishers that might have been used during a work outage. The inspector noted that the fire codes recommend, as a minimum, a yearly inspection of these extinguishers. The inspector encouraged the licensee to continue the accelerated inspections and noted that prior to the conclusion of this inspection all observed portable extinguishers had been inspected. No further concerns were identified.

3. Reviews and Audits

a. Review of the minutes of the licensee's onsite and offsite Review Committees from July 1975 through July 1976 verified that both committees are meeting the licensee's Technical Specification requirements for the following:

(1) Meeting frequency for onsite and offsite Review Committees.

(2) Meeting membership and quorum requirements for both committees.

(3) Committee reviews of proposed tests and experiments are in accordance with 10 CFR 50.59.

(4) Technical Specification violations and proposed changes are reviewed as required.

No areas of concern were identified.

b. The inspector reviewed the audit program conducted under the cognizance of the Safety Audit Committee (SAC) and determined that audit frequency and audit independence is being conducted as required in the Technical Specifications. A weakness in the area of audit followup was identified by the inspector. Reports from audits conducted by the SAC are distributed to the person responsible for the area audited via a routing slip, however, there is no record indicating response to the recommendations made in the audit report. The inspector discussed this weakness with several licensee representatives and established that many of the recommendations made in an audit report are followed up, but no record is maintained to identify those recommendations acted upon or rejected, including a basis for the rejection.

The inspector noted that no safety related deficiencies or recommendations were made in the last 12 months by the Audit Committee; however, the weakness in the area of audit closeout does not preclude the possibility of not responding to a safety related deficiency. A licensee representative informed the inspector that an Administrative Work Instruction addressing this weakness will be generated and should resolve the problem. The inspector informed the licensee that audit repsonses will be reviewed in subsequent inspections.

4. Review of Records Management

The inspector reviewed the licensee's program for the control, storage, retention and retrieval of records and documents, and noted that the licensee's program exceeds the Technical

Specification requirement. Record keeping is maintained in accordance with Administrative Control Directive No. 4.ACD-3.8. No significant concerns were identified.

5. General

a. At the time of this inspection, the licensee informed the inspector that the requirement for inerting the drywell and torus within 24 hours from the time the mode switch is placed in run position could not be met due to a low supply of nitrogen. All available N_2 had been used to reduce the containment O_2 level to within the Technical Specification requirement. It was later determined that the O_2 analyzer sample pump was leaking, causing the analyzer to read incorrectly. The N_2 supply was replenished and containment inerted within 30 hours after entering the run mode. The licensee will follow up with a 30-day report.

b. The inspector was informed that during the last outage the three diaphragms (IE Bulletin No. 76-06) identified as having exceeded the vendor's recommended service life were replaced.