

SEP 1 1982

DCS-MS 016
Docket Shelf

MEMORANDUM FOR: Robert A. Clark, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #3, DL

FROM: Ed Tourigny, Lead PM
Plant Shielding Modifications

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF AUGUST 25, 1982 MEETING ON PLANT
SHIELDING MODIFICATIONS FOR VITAL AREA ACCESS

Introduction

A meeting was held in Bethesda, Md, on August 25, 1982 to discuss plant shielding modifications for vital area access (NUREG-0737, Item II.B.2.2, MPA # F-11). The purpose of the meeting was to discuss in detail Regional preparation of SERs in order that the reviews may be conducted by all the Regions on a common understanding basis. Enclosure 1 contains a list of attendees. Regional representatives were present as well as members from the Radiological Assessment Branch, NRR. I chaired the meeting. Enclosure 2 contains the agenda that was used. Before we discussed the agenda items in detail, we went over the viewgraphs on processing of licensing actions that Bob Purple used in his briefing to the Regional Division Directors (See Enclosure 3). I felt that this was worthwhile in order to assure that the working level regional personnel would have a good understanding on how we conduct reviews in NRR.

Summary

We went over in detail the "Informational Package to Regions on II.B.2, Plant Shielding Modifications," which was sent to the Regions in June 1982 (Enclosure 4). This informational package contained a status of licensee modification completions as of June 1982. Since some of the schedular information was out of date, I updated this listing and passed it out for informational purposes (Enclosure 5). We discussed in detail a sample SER (Enclosure 6), which was developed by RAB and ORB#3. We had to do this because no SER was ever written for II.B.2.2; the regions needed an example. A current listing of ORPMs was also given to the attendees (Enclosure 7).

The main points discussed in the meeting are contained below. The rationale for transferring the review to the regions was that the review that we were requesting was more along the lines of an inspection function than that of a review function. One regional representative stated why did one need to write a SER when an inspection report or two could do the job. I stated that we wanted a SER for two reasons. If there were open items in the SER, we wanted NRR and the NRR project manager involved in resolving the open items. In addition, whether there were open items or not, we also wanted NRR and the NRR project manager involved to complete the action by writing a closeout letter to the licensee which would include the SER. The closeout letter would be our documentation of the post implementation review. We did agree

that an inspection report or multiple reports could be appended to the SER if this was what a particular region wanted to do; however, we still wanted an SER.

OFFICE					
SURNAME					

8209210528 820901
PDR MISC

PDR

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

We discussed when the region should conduct the inspection and write the SER. I stated that a region could conduct the inspection at any time before the end of FY 83 provided that the modifications are complete. I also stated that for those licensees that didn't complete the modifications, it would be up to the region as to when it wants to conduct the inspection, and it would depend upon the nature of the modifications yet to be done. I said that for these licensees, the region should work with the NRR project manager to determine the current licensee schedule for completion and to determine the significance of the modifications yet to be completed. I also requested the regions to give me a plant-by-plant schedule for completion of the SERs; only Region I has provided this schedule as of the date of the meeting. As a minimum, I requested that the plant-by-plant completion schedule be on a FY 83 quarter basis. NRR felt that the SER should come in on a periodic basis throughout the year versus getting all the SERs in late FY 83.

A major part of the meeting was used to discuss the scope of the SER. I tried to make it clear that we did not want a review of II.B.2.2 as was originally intended. We wanted only a review along the lines that DSI recommended to DL as contained in the DSI March 18, 1982 letter on this subject. The review would consist of two basic steps: (1) inspect to ensure that the licensee has completed the modifications that the licensee's shielding design studies concluded should be made, and (2) walkdown at least post-accident emergency procedure, as a check, to determine if the areas an operator must go to are safely accessible. Accordingly, we did not want the regions to review the shielding design studies to verify calculations, assumptions, exposures, and times to perform emergency actions. NRR felt that the benefits would not be worth the costs for such a review.

We discussed in detail how the regions would know what modifications to inspect and what post accident emergency procedures they should use as a check. I stated that for the operating reactors under NUREG-0737, item II.B.2.2, the respective licensees were requested to have the studies available for review. The only submittal that they had to make for II.B.2.2 was to inform NRC of technical and schedular deviations. No licensees requested technical deviations and some licensees requested schedular deviations. I stated that we envisioned the regional personnel going to the licensee sites/offices to review the documentation that stated what modifications had been made, prior to the plant inspection. We did not plan on formally requesting this information from licensees because it could be construed as a new requirement. Regarding which post accident emergency procedure to check or audit, I stated that it would be up to the regions to decide this since they are the reviewers in this case. I felt that it would be inappropriate for NRR to tell the regions what procedure to check. One regional representative wanted to know if he had to attest in the SER to the fact that operators would receive less than 5 REMS. I said that I felt because of the ground rules we established (e.g the licensees did the job correctly was a given example), a reviewer could not state in the SER that operators would receive less than the 5 REM, and we are not requiring the reviewers to state this. The walkdown using a post-accident emergency procedure is just a check.

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶

We discussed who is responsible for approving schedular deviations. I stated that this is being handled by the NRR project manager and his branch chief. This is the typical practice within NRR. The regions need not be involved with this determination. However, we have no problem with regional personnel checking with the NRR project manager regarding current licensee schedules and scope of modifications yet to be completed.

In summary, as a result of the meeting I believe that the SERs will be prepared along a common format and understanding basis. I will be working with Regions II, III, IV, and V over the next few weeks to obtain plant-by-plant SER completion schedules. I will review in detail the first few SERs that come in and make an assessment to determine if we are proceeding correctly.

Original signed by

Ed Tourigny, Lead Project Manager
Plant Shielding Modifications

Enclosures:
As stated

DISTRIBUTION
ORB#3 Rdg
ORB#3 Memo
PMKreutzer
ETourigny
RAClark
GLAINAS
WHouston
FCongel
GMeyer
BPurple
Attendees of Mtg.

ORPM's

OFFICE	DL:ORB#3	DL:ORB#?	DL:ORB#3			
SURNAME	PKreutzer	ETourigny:dd	RAClark			
DATE	9/1/82	9/1/82	9/1/82			

MEETING SUMMARY DISTRIBUTION

Licensee: Omaha Public Power District

*Copies also sent to those people on service (cc) list for subject plant(s).

Docket File
NRC PDR
L PDR
NSIC
TERA
ORB#3 Rdg
JHeltemes
BGrimes
RAClark
Project Manager
PMKreutzer
OELD
I&E
ACRS-10
ORB#3 Summary File
NRC Participants

Omaha Public Power District

cc:

Marilyn T. Shaw, Esq.
LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby & MacRae
1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Mr. Jack Jensen
Chairman, Washington County
Board of Supervisors
Blair, Nebraska 68023

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region VII
ATTN: Regional Radiation
Representative
324 East 11th Street
Kansas City, Missouri 64106

Mr. Frank Gibson
W. Dale Clark Library
215 South 15th Street
Omaha, Nebraska 68102

Alan H. Kirshen, Esq.
Fellman, Ramsey & Kirshen
1166 Woodmen Tower
Omaha, Nebraska 68102

Mr. Larry Yandell
U.S.N.R.C. Resident Inspector
P. O. Box 309
Fort Calhoun, Nebraska 68023

Mr. Charles B. Brinkman
Manager - Washington Nuclear
Operations
C-E Power Systems
Combustion Engineering, Inc.
4853 Cordell Avenue, Suite A-1
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Regional Administrator
Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Region IV
Office of Executive Director for Operations
611 Ryan Plaza Drive Suite 1000
Arlington, Texas 76011

Attendance List

Meeting on Plant Shielding Modifications

for Vital Area Access

Wednesday, August 25, 1982

Name

Richard Redano, Region IV
Ken Barr, Region II
John Wray, Region II
Doug Collins, RAB, NRR
Frank Skopec, RAB, NRR
Jerry Zwetzig, Region V
Robert Clark, ORB#3, NRR
Ed Tourigny, ORB#3, NRR
Tom Tambling, Region III
Ken Ridway, Region III
Phil McKee, ORPB, IE
Don Haverkamp, Region I
P. K. Eapen, Region I



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

ENCLOSURE 2

MEMORANDUM FOR: Robert A. Clark, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #3, DL

FROM: Ed Tourigny, Lead PM, Plant Shielding Modifications
Operating Reactors Branch #3, DL

SUBJECT: FORTHCOMING MEETING WITH NRC REGIONAL PERSONNEL ON
PLANT SHIELDING MODIFICATIONS FOR VITAL AREA ACCESS
(NUREG-0737, Item II.B.2.2)

Date and Time: Wednesday, August 25, 1982
9:00 A.M. - 11: A. M.

Location: U.S.N.R.C.
Phillips Building
Room P-114
7920 Norfolk Avenue
Bethesda, Md.

PURPOSE: To discuss in detail Regional preparation of SER's
on Plant Shielding Modifications for Vital Areas
Access including:

- . SER Structure
- . Scope of Review
- . Licensee Documentation
- . Emergency Procedure(s)
to Audit
- . SER Completion Schedules
- . Licensee Completion Schedules
- . Relationship between SER and
Inspection Report (s)
- . Relationship between II.B.2.2
5 REM criterion and emergency
response actions 25 REM criterion

Requested Participants: Frank Skopec, NRR
Doug Collins, NRR
Robert Clark, NRR
Ed Tourigny, NRR

Don Haverkamp, Region I
Ken Barr, Region II
Tom Tambling, Region III
Tom Westerman, Region IV
Jerry Zwetzig, Region V

PROCESSING OF LICENSING ACTIONS

- MULTIPLANT ACTIONS
 - LEAD PROJECT MANAGER ASSIGNED
 - NRR INITIATES ACTION
 - LICENSEES RESPOND
 - STAFF EVALUATES RESPONSE
 - NRR TECHNICAL DIVISIONS
 - TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CONTRACT
 - CLOSEOUT - SER, MAYBE LICENSE AMENDMENT

- PLANT SPECIFIC ACTIONS
 - LICENSEE INITIATES ACTION
 - DL PROJECT MANAGER DEVELOPS REVIEW PLAN
 - TECHNICAL REVIEW PERFORMED
 - FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICE, IF AMENDMENT
 - ISSUE AMENDMENT, WITH SER

- COMMON CHARACTERISTICS
 - MEETINGS WITH LICENSEES
 - PM SCHEDULES
 - PUBLIC NOTICE, OPEN MEETINGS
 - INFORMATION MUST BE DOCKETED
 - POTENTIAL FOR BOARD NOTIFICATION
 - CONFLICT RESOLUTION - MANAGEMENT CHAIN

TECHNICAL REVIEW BY REGIONS

A. POINTS OF CONTACT

- SIGNATURE AUTHORITY FOR COMMUNICATIONS
 - NRR - ' D /DL
 - REGIONS - DIVISION DIRECTOR

- WORKING LEVEL
 - NRR - LEAD PM ON MULTIPLANT
PLANT PM ON PLANT SPECIFIC
 - REGION - TO BE DESIGNATED FOR EACH ACTION

- WITH LICENSEES
 - FORMAL REVIEW MEETINGS - PM
 - ARRANGES QUESTION LISTS - THROUGH PM
 - INFORMAL CONTACT BY REGIONS OK
 - ALL RELEVANT INFORMATION MUST BE DOCKETED
 - CONFLICT RESOLUTION - THROUGH PM AND
DL MANAGEMENT CHAIN, AS NEEDED

- WITH CONTRACTORS
 - THROUGH LEAD PM

TECHNICAL REVIEW BY REGIONS (CONT'D)

- B. TRAINING AND INDOCTRINATION
WILL BE PROVIDED, AS REQUESTED
NRR WILL COME TO REGIONS, IF DESIRED, TO
BRIEF REGION REVIEWERS
- C. REVIEW CRITERIA
WILL BE PROVIDED FOR EACH ITEM
MULTIPLANT ACTIONS DESCRIBED IN ORLAS - BUT
WILL BE AUGMENTED
- D. SCHEDULES FOR COMPLETION
AS GIVEN IN 5 APRIL LETTER
PLANT-BY-PLANT SCHEDULES TO BE WORKED OUT BY
PM'S AND REGION CONTACT
PROGRESS IS TRACKED IN ORLAS
- E. SER PREPARATION
FOR NRC-INITIATED ACTIONS - EVALUATE LICENSEE
COMPLIANCE WITH NRC POSITION
FOR LICENSEE-INITIATED ACTIONS - EVALUATE SAFETY
IMPACT OF PROPOSAL
COMPLETED SER'S FORWARDED BY REGIONAL DIRECTORS
TO D/DL

ENCLOSURE 4

Informational Package to Regions on
II.B.2, Plant Shielding Modifications

Lead PM: E. G. Tourigny

Branch: ORB #3

Telephone: 492-7110

Mail Stop: 428

June 1982

Background

NUREG-0737 Item II.B.2 addresses plant shielding. The genesis for this item was that during an accident, certain systems would contain highly radioactive materials. Because the radiation fields associated with the radioactive materials would be significant, there was a concern regarding the operability of these systems after the accident. In addition, spaces around these systems may require personnel access, and personnel access could be precluded due to high radiation fields. Thus the Commission's position was that each licensee shall provide for adequate access to vital areas and protection of safety equipment by design changes, increased permanent or temporary shielding, or postaccident procedural controls.

Item II.B.2 was divided into three parts: Review Designs, Plant Modifications, and Equipment Qualification. The implementation date for "Review Designs" was January 1, 1980. The staff performed a general review of licensee submittals and Safety Evaluation Reports were issued to licensees. This action completed the "Review Designs" part; no Regional work on this part is required.

Equipment Qualification is continuing. The implementation date for this part is June 30, 1982. The equipment qualification part of II.B.2 deals with equipment operating under high radiation fields. The Commission has another multi-plant action that overlaps this item entitled "Environmental Qualification of Electric Equipment for Nuclear Power Plants." Its multi-plant number is B-60. The equipment qualification part of II.B.2 has since been included under B-60. Therefore, the Regions do not have any equipment qualification review responsibility under II.B.2.

The Plant Modifications for Vital Area Access part is the only task under II.B.2 that is still to be completed. Licensees were requested to notify NRC if they desired technical deviation(s) on this. No licensee requested technical deviations to our knowledge. A vital area is any area which will or may require occupancy to permit an operator to aid in mitigation or recovery from an accident. The control room, technical support center, sampling station, and sample analysis area must be included among those areas where access is considered vital after an accident. Licensees were requested to identify vital areas including these. For each vital area, adequate radiation protection should be provided such that the dose to personnel should not be in excess of 5 rem whole body, or its equivalent to any part of the body for the duration of the accident (GDC 19). Licensees were not required to submit all the documentation on this, but they were required to have it available for review. The implementation date for this part was January 1, 1982. Some licensees concluded that modifications were needed and have completed them. Some licensees have requested scheduler deviations. Enclosure 1 contains a status of plant shielding modifications for vital area access. Modifications to forty-four plants are complete. The status is based upon licensee responses to Generic Letter 82-05 entitled "Post TMI Requirements." This Generic Letter was

sent to licensees in March 1982, and responses were requested within thirty days. This status is slightly different than the status presented to regional personnel by the lead PM on May 26, 1982.

Remaining Work on Plant Modifications for Vital Area Access

- Task 1. Regions to audit 1 or more emergency procedures that require personnel leaving control room and determine if the vital areas personnel must go are safely accessible. Safely accessible means that the dose to personnel should not be in excess of 5 rem whole body, or its equivalent to any part of the body for the duration of the accident.*
- Task 2. Regions to audit plants to determine if licensee identified modifications are complete. Licensee identified modifications should be an integral part of the licensee held documentation on this subject.*
- Task 3. Regions to write SER and forward to NRR. Regions should provide (1) SER completion schedules to lead PM, and (2) regional contacts responsible for the work so that the lead PM can monitor progress.
- Task 4. NRR to complete action by letter to licensees containing the SER.

*Although it is desirable for the regions to perform the audits after the modifications are complete, we have no objections to the regions performing the audits before modifications are complete.

II.B.2 Plant Shielding Modificationsfor Vital Area Access

Status Per Licensee Response to GL-82-05.

Post TMI Requirements

<u>Plant</u>	<u>Region</u>	<u>Status</u>
Arkansas 1/2	IV	Complete
Beaver Valley 1	I	Complete
Big Rock Point 1	III	Complete
Browns Ferry 1/2/3	II	Not Complete. To be completed by 12/1/83
Brunswick 1/2	II	Complete
Calvert Cliffs 1/2	I	Complete
Cook 1/2	III	Complete
Cooper	IV	Complete
Crystal River 3	II	Not Complete. To be completed by the end of September 1982
Davis Besse 1	III	Complete
Dresden 2/3	III	Complete
Duane Arnold	III	Not Complete. Licensee did not identify completion date
Farley 1/2	II	Unit 2 Complete. Unit 1 to be completed by the end of January 1983
FitzPatrick	I	Complete

<u>Plant</u>	<u>Region</u>	<u>Status</u>
Fort Calhoun	IV	Complete
Ginna	I	Complete
Haddam Neck	I	Complete
Hatch 1/2	II	Complete
Indian Point 2/3	I	Not Complete. Unit 2 to be completed by the end of September 1982. Unit 3 to be completed by the end of May 1985.
Kewaunee	III	Complete
LaCrosse	III	Not Complete. To be completed during 1982 outage
Maine Yankee	I	Not Complete. To be completed by 12/31/81
McGuire 1	II	Complete
Millstone 1/2	I	Unit 1 to be completed during 1984 outage. Unit 2 complete.
Monticello	III	Not Complete. To be completed by 8/1/82
Nine Mile Point 1	I	Complete
North Anna 1/2	II	Not Complete. To be completed by the end of January 1983.
Oconee 1/2/3	II	Complete
Oyster Creek	I	Not Complete. To be completed by the end of July 1982.
Palisades	III	Complete
Peach Bottom 2/3	I	Complete

//

<u>Plant</u>	<u>Region</u>	<u>Status</u>
Pilgrim 1	I	Complete
Point Beach 1/2	III	Not Complete. To be completed by the end of January, 1984.
Prairie Island 1/2	III	Not Complete. Unit 1 to be completed by the end of November, 1982. Unit 2 to be completed by the end of June, 1982.
Quad Cities 1/2	III	Complete
Rancho Seco	V	Not Complete. To be completed by the end of September 1982
Robinson 2	II	Complete
Salem 1/2	I	Complete
San Onofre 1	V	Complete
Sequoyah 1	II	Complete
St. Lucie 1	II	Complete
Surry 1/2	II	Not Complete. To be completed by the end of July, 1982.
Trojan	V	Complete
Turkey Point 3/4	II	Not Complete. To be completed by the end of June 1982
Vermont Yankee	I	Complete
Yankee Rowe	I	Not Complete. To be completed by the end of September 1982
Zion 1/2	III	Complete

SCHEDULAR SLIPPAGE ANALYSIS FOR PLANT SHIELDING MODIFICATIONS
F-11 - II.B.2

<u>Plant/Unit</u>	<u>Licensee Letter Date</u>	<u>Current Date</u>	<u>Reason for Scheduler Delay</u>
Browns Ferry 1/2/3	6/17/82 letter supplementing response to GL-82-05	Complete	Licensee states that as a result of the plant shielding review, no modifications were required
Crystal River 3	6/30/82 letter updates completion schedule for 0737 items	9/30/82	Manpower availability, design changes due to physical interferences and structural limitations, and equipment delay (open items left are changes to 7 valves)
Duane Arnold	6/14/82 letter supplementing 4/14/82 response to GL-82-05	As late as Spring 1984	No reason for delays given (shielding modifications program tied in with 3 other programs [environmental qualification, post-accident sampling for reactor building stack, and post-accident sampling for reactor coolant and containment atmosphere])
Millstone 2	4/16/82 letter in response to GL-8205	1983 refueling outage estimated to start in April 1983	Access reevaluation performed and it was determined that 4 more valves should be modified to allow remote operation (only items left are 2 valves associated with charging system and 2 valves associated with safety injection system)

8/20/82 BJT

ENCLOSURE 5

<u>Plant/Unit</u>	<u>Licensee Letter Date</u>	<u>Current Date</u>	<u>Reason for Scheduler Delay</u>
Farley 1/2	4/16 letter in response to GL 82-05	Unit 1 - Jan. 1983 Unit 2 - Nov. 1982	Equipment delivery delays (only items left are electrical disconnect devices on both units and a shielding door on Unit 2)
Indian Point 2	4/16/82 letter in response to GL 82-05	September 1982	One valve has bent stem which has to be replaced; another valve has to be test stroked
Indian Point 3	Per discussion with PM	Spring 1985	Manpower availability (30 manual valves must be changed over to motor operated valves)
LaCrosse	May 7 letter in response to GL-82-05	COMPLETE	-----
Maine Yankee	5/10/82 letter in response to GL-82-05	12/3/82	No reason for delay given (only open item: reach rods on 2 valves)
Millstone 1	4/16/82 letter in response to GL-82-05	1984 refueling outage	Two pages of reasons for delay given (items still to be modified are two motor operated valves and one manually operated valve)
Monticello	6/28/82 letter in response to GL-82-05	11/15/82	Because of delays in the installation of the post-accident sampling system, the sample station will not meet the accessibility requirements of II.B.2. This system is only open item.

<u>Plant/Unit</u>	<u>Licensee Letter Date</u>	<u>Current Date</u>	<u>Reason for Scheduling Delay</u>
North Anna 1/2	5/26/82	1/1/83	Equipment delivery delays (only open item is remotely operated valves and associated piping in the Atmosphere Cleanup System; portion of system is shared between both units)
Oyster Creek	6/15/82 update of 4/21/82 response to GL-82-05	Upcoming refueling outage (Jan. 1983)	Change in refueling date (Tie-in for the Standby Gas Treatment System is only open item)
Point Beach 1/2	Per discussion with PM	1/84	Manpower availability (open items include shielding for control rooms and motor control centers)
Prairie Island 1/2	4/16/82 letter in response to GL-82-05	Next refueling outage for unit 1 - (Nov. 1982); Unit 2 is	Equipment delivery problems (only open items are loop B sample valves in post-accident sampling system and equipment needed for the letdown and degassing function)
Rancho Seco	4/15/82 letter in response to GL-82-05	9/82	Hardware and manpower shortages
Surry 1/2	5/17/82 letter in response to GL-82-05	7/1/82	Material procurement and delivery problems (testing of control valves still to be done)

<u>Plant/Unit</u>	<u>Licensee Letter Date</u>	<u>Current Date</u>	<u>Reason for Scheduling Delay</u>
Turkey Point 3/4	4/27/82 response to GL-82-05	<i>NEXT OUTAGE</i>	Equipment delivery delay cited (only open items - 6 valve reach rods and a coupling)
Yankee Rowe	5/14/82 0737 status letter	Scheduled 1982 refueling outage	No reason for delay given in 5/14/82 letter
TMI-1	6/15/82 letter supplementing 5/21/82 response to GL-82-05	Cycle 6 refueling estimated for 1984	Material delivery and plant conditions problems (only open items are 6 remote operators on Decay Heat Removal System valves)

SAFETY EVALUATION REPORT *
NUREG-0737, ITEM II.B.2.2-DESIGN REVIEW OF PLANT SHIELDING -
ACCESS TO VITAL AREAS

INTRODUCTION

Following the accident at TMI-2, the NRC staff developed Action Plan NUREG-0660, and "Clarification of TMI Action Plant Requirements" NUREG-0737, to provide for improved safety at nuclear power plants.

NUREG-0737, Item II.B.2 directed all licensees to perform a design review of plant shielding and to provide for adequate access to vital areas. The licensee had not requested technical deviations from the criteria of Item II.B.2.

The following evaluation contains the results of the post implementation ^{review} regarding II.B.2.2 entitled Plant Shielding Modifications for Vital Area Access.

EVALUATION

The inspector examined the conclusions resulting from the licensee's shielding review, as contained in the Shielding Design Review Report dated ^{the (same)} Nuclear power Plant.

*Appending an inspection report is acceptable.

The inspector verified by actual observation that the plant modifications recommended by the shielding design review report were completed. In addition, the inspector verified by review of procedures that the modifications to the procedures recommended by the licensee's shielding design review report were completed.

[OR: The verification of implementation of plant modifications recommended by the shielding review report was examined by an inspector on _____ and the results were reported in inspector report no. 50-XXX/81-XX.]

[OR: The inspector observed that the _____ modification was not completed because _____ (i.e., material delivery problem, waiting for next outage to erect shielding, etc). The licensee representative stated that the modification was scheduled for completion on _____. The inspector reviewed the Plant Change Notification and verified the planned completion date.]

The inspector reviewed the procedure _____ (e.g., "Post-Accident Sample Acquisition") and traced the path from the main control room to (the post-accident sample station to the sample analysis laboratory) in order to determine if there were potential sources of radiation under post-accident conditions. During this walk down the inspector discussed potential post-accident

sources of radiation with the licensee representative. The inspector did not observe any potential sources of radiation that were not included in the licensee's evaluation.

[OR: The inspector observed an unshielded primary coolant sampling line running across the auxiliary building hall along the path to be taken in post-accident situations to the RHR valve alignment station. A licensee representative stated that this line had not been considered in the original shield design review because the line was installed in June of 1982 as part of the new post-accident sampling system. A licensee management representative stated that the dose to individuals from the line would be evaluated and the shielding necessary to maintain post-accident doses within 3 rems would be added to the line by . The management representative also stated that the Engineering Change Notice (ECNs) procedure would be revised by to include consideration of post-accident doses that might result from modifications. He also stated that a review of all ECNs from January 1, 1982 to the present would be made by to determine if other changes might have effected post-accident doses. The inspector informed the licensee that this would be considered an open item.]

CONCLUSION

The licensee has completed the modifications resulting from the plant shielding review for post-accident access to vital areas as outlined in NUREG-0737, Item II.B.2.

[OR: Add - except for the modification, which is scheduled for completion by]

Operating Reactor Project Managers

ENCLOSURE 7

August 1, 1982

<u>Project Manager</u>	<u>Mail Stop</u>	<u>RAMS Initials</u>	<u>Branch</u>	<u>Operating Reactor</u>	<u>Docket Nos.</u>
F. Apicilla	416	FLA	ORB2	Duane Arnold	50-331
R. Bevan	416	RBB	ORB2	Quad Cities 1/2	50-254/265
R. Birkel*	116	REB	LPB4	McGuire 1/2	50-369/370
A. Bournia*	330	ABB	LPB2	LaSalle 1	50-373
B. Buckley*	128	BCB	LPB3	Diablo Canyon 1	50-275
R. Caruso	308	RIC	ORB5	Yanke Rowe 1	50-029
R. Cilimberg	440	RNC	ORB3	DC Cook 1/2	50-315/316
R. Clark	416	RJC	ORB2	Browns Ferry 1/2/3	40-259/260/296
T. Colburn	428	TGC	ORB3	Point Beach 1/2	50-266/301
E. Conner	428	ELC	ORB3	Millstone 2	50-336
				St. Lucie 1	50-335
A. Deagazio	416	ABD	ORB4	Davis Besse 1	50-346
D. DiIanni	428	DCD	ORB3	Prairie Island 1/2	50-282/306
R. Dudley	308	RND	ORB5	LaCrosse	50-409
K. Eccleston	416	KTE	ORB2	Pilgrim 1	50-293
R. Emch	308	RLE	ORB5	Big Rock Pt. 1	50-155
L. Engle	428	LBE	ORB3	North Anna 1/2	50-338/339
M. Fairtile	416	MBF	ORB4	Hatch 1/2	50-321/366
				Peach Bottom 2/3	50-277/278
M. Grotenhuis	440	MYG	ORB1	Turkey Point 3/4	50-250/251
				Kewaunee	50-305
J. Hannon	440	JNH	ORB1	Indian Point 2	50-247
J. Hegner	416	JQH	ORB2	Dresden 3	50-249
K. Heitner	428	KLH	ORB3	Maine Yankee	50-309
D. Houston*	330	MDH	LPB2	Grand Gulf 1/2	50-416/417
R. Jacobs	416	RDJ	ORB4	TMI-1	50-289
D. Jaffe	428	DHJ	ORB3	Calvert Cliffs 1/2	50-317/318
G. Kuzmycz	428	GAK	ORB3	Fort St. Vrain	50-267
J. Lombardo	308	JFL	ORB5	Oyster Creek 1	50-219
J. Lyons	308	JPL	ORB5	Ginna	50-244
S. Miner	440	SAM	ORB1	Crystal River 3	50-302
D. Neighbors	440	JDN	ORB1	Surry 1/2	50-280/281

<u>Project Manager</u>	<u>Mail Stop</u>	<u>RAMS Initials</u>	<u>Branch</u>	<u>Operating Reactor</u>	<u>Docket Nos.</u>
H. Nicholaras	416	HBN	ORB2	Monticello	50-263
P. O'Connor	308	PWO	ORB5	Dresden 1/2	50-010/237
M. Padovan	416	MLP	ORB4	Rancho Seco 1	50-312
W. Paulson	308	WAP	ORB5	San Onofre 1	50-206
R. Perch*	330	RDP	LPB2	Susquehanna 1	50-387
P. Polk	416	PJP	ORB2	Fitzpatrick	50-333
				Nine Mile Point 1	50-220
E. Reeves	440	EAR	ORB1	Farley 1/2	50-348/364
G. Requa	440	GDR	ORB1	Robinson 2	50-261
H. Rood*		HAR	LPB3	San Onofre 2/3	50-361/362
V. Rooney	416	VLR	ORB2	Humboldt Bay	50-133
				Vermont Yankee 1	50-271
W. Ross	440	WJR	ORB1	Salem 1/2	50-272/311
J. Shea	308	JJS	ORB5	Millstone 1	50-245
B. Siegel	416	XBS	ORB2	Cooper Station	50-298
C. Stahle*	116	CRS	LPB4	Sequoyah 1/2	50-327/328
J. Stevens	428	JSP	ORB3	Arkansas 2	50-368
P. Tam	440	PST	ORB1	Beaver Valley 1	50-334
J. Thoma	440	JGT	ORB1	Indian Point 1/3	50-003/286
E. Tourigny	428	EGT	ORB3	Fort Calhoun 1	50-285
C. Trammell	428	CMT	ORB3	Trojan	50-344
C. Tropf	308	CHT	ORB5	Haddam Neck	50-213
J. VanVliet	416	JBV	ORB2	Brunswick 1/2	50-325/324
G. Vissing	416	GSV	ORB4	Arkansas 1	50-313
P. Wagner	416	PCW	ORB4	Oconee 1/2/3	50-269/270/287
T. Wamback	308	TVW	ORB5	Palisades	50-255
D. Wigginton	440	DXW	ORB1	Zion 1/2	50-295/304

* Also LPM