

V10/5 RMB

Attachment

EMPLOYEE CONCERNS PROGRAMS

PLANT NAME: Rancho Seco LICENSEE: SMUD DOCKET #: 50-312

NOTE: Please circle yes or no if applicable and add comments in the space provided.

A. PROGRAM:

- 1. Does the licensee have an employee concerns program?  
(Yes or NO/Comments)  
Yes, called PDQ (Potential Deviation from Quality), Affirmative Action, Grievance Procedures, Idea Program
- 2. Has NRC inspected this program? Report #  
No

B. SCOPE: (Circle all that apply)

- 1. Is it for:
  - a. Technical? (Yes, No/Comments)  
Yes
  - b. Administrative? (Yes, No/Comments)  
Yes
  - c. Personnel issues? (Yes, No/Comments)  
Yes
- 2. Does it cover safety as well as non-safety issues?  
(Yes, No/Comments)  
Yes
- 3. Is it designed for:
  - a. Nuclear Safety? (Yes, No/Comments)  
Yes
  - b. Personal Safety? (Yes, No/Comments)  
Yes
  - c. Personnel issues - including union grievances?  
(Yes, No/Comments)  
Yes
- 4. Does the program apply to all licensee employees?  
(Yes, No/Comments)  
Yes
- 5. Contractors?  
(Yes, No/Comments)  
Yes

Handwritten signature and initials: JFO 0/11

Issue Date: 07/29/93

A-1

2500/028 Attachment

200077

9312290035 930729  
PDR ADOCK 05000312  
PDR  
G

6. Does the licensee require its contractors and their subs to have a similar program?  
(Yes or No/Comments)  
Affirmative Action and Safety
7. Does the licensee conduct an exit interview upon terminating employees asking if they have any safety concerns?  
(Yes or No/Comments)  
Yes

C. INDEPENDENCE:

1. What is the title of the person in charge?  
Good Idea Program: Asst. General Manager for Operations  
PDQ Program: Licensing/QA Manager  
Grievance/Affirmative Action Programs: Personnel Services
2. Who do they report to?  
Licensing/QA - Deputy ACM Operations  
AGM OPS - Deputy GM  
Personnel Services - AGM and Chief, Energy Supply
3. Are they independent of line management?  
Yes
4. Does the ECP use third party consultants?  
No
5. How is a concern about a manager or vice president followed up?  
Handled at highest level of the chain, at least higher than the individual involved.

D. RESOURCES:

1. What is the size of the staff devoted to this program?  
Programs at Rancho are collateral duties so no staff devoted to GCP.
2. What are ECP staff qualifications (technical training, interviewing training, investigator training, other)?  
Safety Training  
Personnel training for interviewer.

E. REFERRALS:

1. Who has followup on concerns (ECP staff, line management, other)?  
ECP staff

## F. CONFIDENTIALITY:

1. Are the reports confidential?  
(Yes or No/Comments)  
Can be confidential.
2. Who is the identity of the allegor made known to senior management  
ECP staff, line management, other)?
3. Can employees be:
  - a. Anonymous? (Yes), No/Comments)
  - b. Report by phone? (Yes), No/Comments)

## G. FEEDBACK:

1. Is feedback given to the allegor upon completion of the followup?  
(Yes or No - If so, how?)  
Yes, resolution report.
2. Does the program reward good ideas?  
Yes
3. Who, or at what level, makes the final decision of resolution?  
Manager or higher
4. Are the resolutions of anonymous concerns disseminated?  
Yes, as appropriate.
5. Are resolutions of valid concerns publicized (newsletter, bulletin board, all hands meeting, other)?  
Yes

## H. EFFECTIVENESS:

1. How does the licensee measure the effectiveness of the program?  
QA audits
2. Are concerns:
  - a. Trended? (Yes or No/Comments)  
PDQs are trended.
  - b. Used? (Yes) or No/Comments)
3. In the last three years how many concerns were raised? 5  
Of the concerns raised, how many were closed? 5 What  
percentage were substantiated? 2

4. How are followup techniques used to measure effectiveness (random survey, interviews, other)?  
All Hands Meeting  
Anonymous Surveys
5. How frequently are internal audits of the ECP conducted and by whom?  
QA, Biennial

I. ADMINISTRATION/TRAINING:

1. Is ECP prescribed by a procedure? (Yes or NO/Comments)  
Each separate program is prescribed by a procedure.
2. How are employees, as well as contractors, made aware of this program (training, newsletter, bulletin board, other)?  
Training (GET) NRC Form 3  
Newsletter  
PDQ Posters  
Good Idea Posters

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: (Including characteristics which make the program especially effective, if any.)

Due to the plant being in a defueled/decommissioning condition there is only a small number of long term, experienced employees resulting in an open culture and few concerns.

NAME:

TITLE:

PHONE #:

Phillip Qualls, Reactor Inspector, 510-975-0245



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
REGION V

JO MARIA LANE  
WALNUT CREEK, CALIFORNIA 94596-5368

SEP 2 - 1993

Docket No. 50-312

Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station  
Sacramento Municipal Utility District  
14440 Twin Cities Road  
Herald, California 95638-9799

Attention: Mr. J. Shetler, Deputy Assistant  
General Manager, Nuclear

SUBJECT: NRC INSPECTION

This letter refers to the inspection conducted by Mr. P. Qualls on August 19, 1993, of activities authorized by NRC license No. DPR-54 and to the discussion of our findings held with members of your staff at the conclusion of the inspection.

Areas examined during this inspection are described in the enclosed inspection report. Within these areas, the inspection consisted of selective examinations of procedures and representative records, interviews with personnel, and observations by the inspector.

No deviations or violations of NRC requirements were identified within the scope of this inspection.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.790(a), a copy of this letter and the enclosure will be placed in the NRC Public Document Room.

Should you have any questions concerning this inspection, we will be glad to discuss them with you.

Sincerely,

James H. Reese, Chief,  
Facilities Radiological Protection Branch

Enclosure:  
Inspection Report No. 50-312/93-06

0307290034

cc w/enclosure:

Mr. S. David Freeman, General Manager, SMUD

Thomas A. Baxter, Esq.

Mr. Jerry Delezinski, Licensing Supervisor, SMUD

Mr. Robert B. Borsum, Licensing Representative, B&W Nuclear Technologies  
Sacramento County Board of Supervisors

Mr. Leo Fassler, Assistant General Manager and Chief Operations Officer, SMUD

Mr. Charles Bechhoefer, Chairman, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel

Mr. Richard F. Cole, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel

Mr. Thomas D. Murphy, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel

Mr. John Bartus, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Ms. JoAnne Scott, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Ms. Helen Hubbard

Environmental Conservation Organization

Ms. Jan Schori, General Counsel, SMUD

James P. McGranery, Jr., Esq., Dow, Lohnes & Albertson

Mr. John Hickman, Senior Health Physicist, Environmental Radioactive  
Management Unit

bcc w/enclosure:  
Docket File  
G. Cook  
B. Faulkenberry

bcc w/o enclosure:  
M. Smith  
J. Zollicoffer

Region V/ear

REQUEST COPY

YES  NO

P Qualls

9/2/93

*[Signature]*

REQUEST COPY

YES  NO

J. Reese

9/2/93

~~SEND~~ TO DCS

YES  NO

~~SEND~~ TO PDR

YES  NO

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION V

Report No.: 50-312/93-06  
 License No.: DPR-54  
 Licensee: Sacramento Municipal Utility District  
 14440 Twin Cities Road  
 Herald, California 95638-9799  
 Facility Name: Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station  
 Inspection at: Rancho Seco Site, Herald, California  
 Inspection Dates: August 19, 1993

Inspectors: Phillip Challs 9/2/93  
 P. Challs, Reactor Inspector Date Signed  
 Approved by: James H. Reese 9/2/93  
 James H. Reese, Chief, Date Signed  
 Radiation Protection Branch

Summary:

Areas Inspected: Announced inspection to obtain information on the licensee's employee concerns program. During this inspection, Temporary Instruction 2500/028 was used.

Results: No violations or deviations were identified.

~~9309290038~~



DETAILS1. PERSONS CONTACTED

The below listed persons were contacted during the course of the inspection:

\*D. Gardiner, Manager, Radiation Protection, Chemistry, and Emergency planning

\*J. Delezinski, Manager, QA, Licensing, and Administration

W. Koepke, Supervisor, Quality Control

\* Attended Exit Meeting on January 20, 1993.

2. Employee Concerns Program

The inspector interviewed licensee managers concerning the scope and content of their employee concerns programs in order to complete the questionnaire which was required by Temporary Instruction 2500/028. The completed questionnaire is included as an attachment to this report.

3. Exit Interview

On August 19, 1993, at the conclusion of the site visit, the inspector met with the licensee representatives identified in Paragraph 1 to summarize the scope and the preliminary results of this inspection. The licensee did not identify as proprietary any of the materials provided to or reviewed by the inspectors during the inspection.