

APPENDIX

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION IV

NRC Inspection Report: 50-382/84-33

Construction Permit: CPPR-103

Docket: 50-382

Category: A2

Licensee: Louisiana Power and Light Company (LP&L)
142 Delaronde Street
New Orleans, Louisiana 70174

Inspection Name: Waterford 3 Steam Electric Station

Inspection At: Waterford 3 Steam Electric Station site near Killona, Louisiana

Inspection Conducted: June 18-19, 1984

Inspector: Charles A. Hackney 7-26-84
C. A. Hackney, Emergency Preparedness Analyst, Date
Emergency Preparedness Section (EPS)

Approved: J. B. Baird 7/26/84
J. B. Baird, Chief, EPS Date

W. A. Crossman 8/6/84
W. A. Crossman, Team Leader, Task Force Date

Inspection Summary

Followup Inspection Conducted June 18-19, 1984 (Report 50-382/84-33)

Areas Inspected: The special, announced followup inspection involved 16 inspector-hours onsite in the performance of an emergency preparedness implementation followup inspection including administration; training; emergency implementing procedures; coordination with offsite groups; and walk-throughs.

Results: Within the areas inspected, no violations or deviations were identified.

8409240195 840815
PDR ADOCK 05000382
Q PDR

DETAILS1. Persons ContactedLP&L

- *J. O'Hern, Training Superintendent
- *J. Sledger, Jr., Executive Assistant
- *M. Langan, General Training Supervisor
- *F. Drummond, Nuclear Services Manager
- *C. Toth, Operations Training Superintendent
- *D. Packer, Training Manager
- *J. Lewis, Emergency Planning
- *P. Backes, Emergency Planning
- *S. Lubinski, Emergency Planning
- *R. Barkhurst, Plant Manager
- *F. Englebracht, Manager Plant Administrative Services
- *J. Woods, Plant Quality Manager
- *R. Leddick, Sr. Vice President - Nuclear Operations
- *S. Alleman, Assistant Plant Manager, Plant Technical Supervisor

NRC

- *T. Flipppo, Resident Inspector

*Denotes those present at the exit interview.

2. Scope of Inspection

The purpose of the inspection was to evaluate the applicant's progress in correcting the three deviations noted during the emergency preparedness appraisal followup inspection conducted May 7-11, 1984 (50-382/84-23).

3. Entrance Interview

The entrance interview was conducted on June 18, 1984, with S. A. Alleman, Assistant Plant Manager, Plant Technical Supervisor, and members of his staff. Also present was the NRC resident inspector.

4. Actions on Previously Identified Deviationsa. Emergency Training of All Onsite and Offsite Support Personnel

The NRC inspector reviewed offsite training records for Little Gypsy and Waterford, Units 1 and 2. The personnel training records indicated that training course, catalog number J036-000-00, had been conducted for Little Gypsy personnel on June 12-14, 1984. Waterford, Units 1

and 2 personnel had training courses conducted on June 11-13, 1984, and June 15, 1984. Both Little Gypsy and Waterford, Units 1 and 2 personnel had approximately six persons at each station that had not completed their training. The applicant had committed to have offsite training completed by June 30, 1984.

The NRC inspector reviewed the onsite nonapplicant employee training, catalog number GET-007, and noted from the training records that 57 persons had been trained. Further, it was determined from reviewing the onsite training records that 42 of the persons trained were security personnel. The applicant had committed to complete the onsite nonapplicant personnel training prior to exceeding 5 percent power level. The applicant did not have a license to load fuel at the time of the NRC inspection on June 19, 1984. During the discussion concerning personnel access to the protected area, it was determined that one trained person may escort ten untrained persons into the protected area. Further, one trained person may escort five people into the vital areas. That policy did not appear to be consistent with Section 8.0 of the emergency plan. The NRC inspector discussed this with the training manager, the security supervisor, and the plant manager. The NRC inspector also reviewed three interoffice correspondence letters from R. P. Barkhurst to D. E. Dobson dated April 28, May 26, and June 2, 1984. In summarizing Mr. Barkhurst's letters, it was stated that escorting personnel was expensive and could create security problems; therefore, escorting personnel was to be reduced to zero by June 4, 1984. An applicant staff member further stated that it was the intent of LP&L to reduce the use of visitor badges to near zero.

The applicant's progress toward resolution of the deviation appeared adequate.

b. Training Records

The NRC inspector reviewed offsite training records, specifically, the training records for Little Gypsy and Waterford, Units 1 and 2. The NRC inspector determined that there were training records on file for both offsite stations for the years of 1983 and 1984.

The applicant's corrective action appeared adequate.

c. Public Information and Notification

The applicant submitted a public information distribution list for the transient population. The letter dated May 17, 1984, contained a public information distribution list for both St. Charles and St. John parishes. The applicant committed to include the distribution list in a future revision to the emergency plan.

The applicant's corrective action appeared adequate.

5. Exit Meeting

On June 19, 1984, at the conclusion of the onsite inspection, the NRC inspector along with Mr. R. Hall, Chief, Technical Programs Branch, NRC Region IV, and Mr. T. Flippo, NRC resident inspector, met with Mr. R. S. Leddick, Senior Vice President, Nuclear Operations and his staff as identified in paragraph 1. The NRC inspector discussed the status of progress toward correcting the previously identified deviations (NRC Inspection Report 50-382/84-23).

The applicant acknowledged the NRC inspector's findings and indicated that they were pursuing the remaining training schedule.

The applicant noted that NRC Inspection Report No. 50-382/84-23 stated that the onsite nonessential personnel were to be trained by June 30, 1984, which the applicant did not believe to be a correct statement of their commitment. The NRC inspector stated that he would review the previous inspection report and make any appropriate changes in future reports. The NRC inspector subsequently confirmed that the commitment was incorrectly stated in the inspection report and should have said that nonessential personnel would be trained prior to exceeding 5 percent full power.