# U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION REGION I

eport No. 50-286/84-17
ocket No. <u>50-286</u>
icense No. DPR-64 Priority Category C
icensee: Power Authority of the State of New York
10 Columbus Circle
New York, New York 10019
acility Name: Indian Point 3
nspection At: Buchanan, New York
nspection Conducted: August 6-10, 1984
nspector: Hawee Zeleulsky 8-27-84 Hi Zibulsky, Genist date
pproved by: W. J. Pasciak, Chief, Effluent Radiation Protection Section  8/78/84

Inspection Summary: Inspection on August 6-10, 1984 (Report No. 50-286/84-17)

Areas Inspected: Routine, announced inspection of the licensee's nonradio-logical chemical program. Areas reviewed include: quality control of analytical measurements, analytical procedures, staffing, and training. The inspection involved 31 hours onsite by one region based inspector.

Results: The licensee was in compliance with NRC requirements examined during the inspection.

8409210272 840829 PDR ADOCK 05000286 G PDR

#### DETAILS

## 1. Individuals Contacted

\*J. Brons, Resident Manager

\*J. Russell, Superintendent of Power

\*J. Gillen, General Chemistry Supervisor

\*J. Kraft, Chemistry Supervisor

- \*R. Deschamps, General HP Supervisor
- \*W. Greenman, Rad Waste Supervisor

\*J. Cirilli, QA Superintendent

- \*W. Hamlin, Assitant to Resident Manager
- \*D. Quinn, Senior Radiological Engineer
- \*R. Allen, Training Superintendent
- \*A. Burger, Rad Waste Foreman
- M. Kerns, Chemistry Supervisor

\*Denotes those present at the exit interview.

The inspector also interviewed other licensee employees including members of the Chemistry staff.

#### 2. Laboratory Quality Control

The adequacy and effectiveness of the licensee's nonradiological chemistry quality control program was reviewed against the requirements of Amendment No. 19 to the license, Technical Specification 2.3 and 6.8, U.S. NRC Regulatory Guide 1.33, Revision 2, ANSI N18.7-1976, and standard industrial practices. The licensee's performance relative to these requirements and standards was determined by review of records, discussions with licensee personnel, and observations by the inspector.

For the analyses observed, calibration standards were used over the full range of operation.

Separate control standards were not used nor documented by the licensee for quality control. The inspector told the licensee that the utilization and documentation of control standards would add to the assurance that the measurement system and standards were correct. By plotting the control standards on charts with a  $\pm$  2 sigma acceptance criteria, the laboratory personnel will be able to identify whether analytical differences were significant and whether trends were developing. The control program will be reviewed at a subsequent inspection. Inspector Follow-up Item (84-17-01).

No violations were identified.

### 3. Analytical Procedures

The inspector reviewed the licensee's analytical procedures in the water chemistry area. The procedures are required under Amendment No. 19 to the license, Technical Specification 2.3 and U.S. NRC Regulatory Guide 1.33, Revision 2, referenced in Section 6.8 of the Technical Specifications.

The analytical procedures that were observed were titrimetric boron; lithium, chromium, iron, copper, and nickel by emission spectrometry; chloride and fluoride by specific ion electrode; silica and hydrazine by colorimetry. The calibration of the procedures were over the range of operation. The procedures and instruments used for the water chemistry analyses are adequate.

No violations were identified.

## 4. Staffing and Training

The inspector reviewed the licensee's organization with respect to the staffing in the chemistry area. The nonradiological chemistry department is responsible for implementing a reactor coolant and secondary water chemistry monitoring program to measure the values of critical parameters.

The chemistry department is headed by a Radiation and Environmental Service Superintendent. He has an H.P. General Supervisor, a Chemistry General Supervisor, and a Senior Radiological Engineer reporting to him. Two Chemistry Supervisors report to the Chemistry General Supervisor and the Chemistry Technicians report to the Chemistry Supervisors.

There is good communication amongst the chemistry personnel and an out of control analysis in the laboratory can be enacted upon without delay.

An indoctrination and training procedure (15-7(B)) for Radiological and Environmental Services Chemistry Technicians has been written. The training program isn't planned to be operational until 1987. The inspector told the licensee that the time span is too long to be without a formal training program and this will be reviewed at a subsequent inspection. Inspector Follow-up Item (84-17-02).

The laboratory personnel have an on-the-job training program that is documented on a sign-off sheet. Further laboratory training is performed utilizing inter and intra laboratory standards. The chemistry technicians analyze the standards and the results are documented and evaluated.

No violations were identified.

#### 5. Exit Interview

The inspector met with the licensee representatives (denoted in paragraph 1) at the conclusion of the inspection on August 10, 1984. The inspector summarized the purpose and scope of the inspection and the inspector findings. At no time during the inspection was any written material provided to the licensee by the inspector.