



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION II
131 MARIETTA STREET, N.W.
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

October 7, 1982

Report No. 50-369/82-35

Licensee: Duke Power Company
422 South Church Street
Charlotte, NC 28242

Facility Name: McGuire

Docket No. 50-369

License No. NPF-9

Inspection at McGuire site near Charlotte, North Carolina

Inspector: *X R. H. Albright* 10/1/82
Date Signed

Approved by: *X K. P. Barr* 10/1/82
Date Signed
K. P. Barr, Section Chief
Technical Inspection Branch
Division of Engineering and Technical Programs

SUMMARY

Inspection on September 13-17, 1982

Areas Inspected

This routine, unannounced inspection involved 32 inspector-hours on site in the areas of external exposure control, radiation protection procedures, instruments and equipment, radioactive effluents, and radiological posting of areas.

Results

Of the five areas inspected, no violations or deviations were identified in four areas; one apparent violation was found in one area.

REPORT DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Licensee Employees

- *M. D. McIntosh, Station Manager
- *T. J. Keane, Station Health Physicist
- *W. M. Sample, Projects and Licensing Engineer
- *D. Mendezoff, Licensing Engineer
- J. W. Foster, Health Physics Coordinator
- G. R. Terrell, Health Physics Coordinator
- D. C. Britton, Health Physics Supervisor
- M. B. Carswell, Health Physics Supervisor
- J. S. Mooneyhan, Health Physics Supervisor

NRC Resident Inspector

- *P. Bemis, Senior Resident Inspector

*Attended exit interview

2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on September 17, 1982, with those persons indicated in paragraph 1 above. The inspector discussed the violation of 10 CFR 20.102(c)(1) with plant management personnel. The station manager acknowledged the violation. The inspector also discussed the need for the route to the liquid and gaseous emergency sample panels to be described in the respective emergency procedure. The station manager stated that the route to the sample panels for the worst case accident would be added to the emergency sampling procedures.

3. Licensee Action on Previous Enforcement Matters

Not inspected.

4. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items were not identified during this inspection.

5. External Exposure Control

The inspector selectively reviewed personnel exposure records to ensure that these records contained the required documentation. The inspector found on NRC Form-4 where an individual indicated a period of exposure, from September 1977 to May 1978, while attending college. For this period of time the Form-4 indicated an exposure of 0.000 Rem. Licensee personnel made

this entry into the individual's record after receiving a letter from the college personnel officer. The letter stated that the nuclear engineering technology program, in which the individual was enrolled, had been discontinued and that faculty members involved in the program were no longer available. The letter also stated there was no information on file regarding occupational exposures to ionizing radiation. However, the personnel officer had been told that if there was any exposure to radiation, it would have been negligible.

Dosimetry personnel misinterpreted this letter as adequate for record purposes and assigned 0.000 Rems to the individual's record for the period September 1977 to May 1978. The inspector stated that this is a violation of 10 CFR 20.102(c)(1) which requires that, in any case where a licensee is unable to obtain reports of the individual's occupational dose for a previous complete quarter, it shall be assumed that the individual has received 1.25 Rems (82-35-01).

No individuals were found to have exceeded quarterly regulatory exposure limits.

6. Radiation Protection Procedures

The inspector selectively reviewed radiation protection procedures which had been revised since May 1982. The procedures were reviewed for good health physics practice, regulatory compliance, and to ensure that revisions were made in accordance with licensee procedure change requirements.

The inspector reviewed health physics procedure HP/O/B/1009/15, "Nuclear Post Accident Containment Air Sampling System Operating Procedure" and found that the procedure did not state the route to be taken to the panel during an accident. The inspector stated that the procedure should contain the route since a route to the panel was evaluated for radiation sources and a mock-up drill had been conducted to determine other problems such as how long the air in self-contained breathing air bottles would last. The route is needed due to potential for extremely high radiation sources along a path which had not been evaluated for radiation sources during an accident situation. During the exit interview the station manager stated that the path to the sample panel during the worst case accident would be added to the emergency sampling procedures. The addition of the route to the emergency sampling procedures will be reviewed during a future inspection (82-35-02).

7. Instruments and Equipment

The licensee repairs and calibrates health physics instruments at the plant. The licensee tracks calibration due dates for the instruments and uses an instrument check-out procedure which requires instruments to be returned to the check-out desk each shift or before another instrument can be checked out by an individual. Radiation detection instruments are response checked prior to check-out. The check-out of instruments is limited to health physics and operations personnel.

The inspector observed the calibration tags on portable instruments ready for check-out, friskers in use at various points in the plant, constant air monitors and various process detectors. All instruments were within calibration due dates.

The quantity of health physics instruments and respiratory protection equipment was determined by observation and by discussion with the health physics supervisor in charge of instrumentation. The health physics equipment available should be sufficient for the upcoming outage.

No violations or deficiencies were identified.

8. Radioactive Effluents

The inspector selectively reviewed data for liquid and gaseous releases during 1982. These records showed that the frequency of radioactive effluent analyses, radioactive concentrations, and total quantities for liquid and gaseous effluents were within plant technical specification limits.

The inspector also reviewed the procedures and data for the last calibration and functional test for the liquid effluent monitor.

No violations or deviations were identified.

9. Posting and Labeling

The inspector toured the auxiliary building in order to observe posting practices and to perform independent surveys to verify that posting met regulatory and license procedural requirements.

No violations or deviations were identified.