

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGIONIV

611 RYAN PLAZA DRIVE, SUITE 400 ARLINGTON, TEXAS 76011-8064

SEP 2 2 1992

Docket Nos.

50-498

50-499

License Nos. NPF-76

NPF-80

Houston Lighting & Power Company ATTN: Donald P. Hall, Group Vice President, Nuclear P.O. Box 1700

Houston, Texas 77251

Gentlemen:

SUBJECT:

LICENSEE RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF VIOLATION (NRC INSPECTION REPORT

NOS. 5:-498/92-07; 50-499/92-07)

Thank you for your letters dated May 1 and June 30, 1992. The May letter submitted information in response to the February 10, 1992, 10 CFR Part 2.206 petition and the June letter responded to our letter and the enc osed Notice of Violation dated June 1, 1992. We have reviewed the corrective actions that Houston Lighting & Power Company has taken, as outlined in the Attachment to the June 30, 1992, letter, and we find those corrective actions to be responsive to the specific issues cited in the Notice of Violation. As a result of our review, however, we found that clarification of certain issues was warranted, as discussed with Mr. W. Jump during a telephon; call on August 20, 1992.

Additional information about these issues is provided in the Attachment to this letter. No additional response is required for these issues, at this time.

Our routine inspection program will review the effectiveness of your corrective actions. Should you have further questions concerning this letter, we will be pleased to discuss them with you.

Sincerely,

Dames L. Milhoan Regional Administrator

Attachment: (as stated)

cc w/Attachment: (see next page)

209280119 920922 DR ADDCK 03000498

cc w/Attachment: Houston Lighting & Power Company ATT": William J. Jump, Manager Nuclear Licensing P.O. Box 289 Wadsworth, Texas 77483

City of Austin Electric Utility Department ATTN: J. C. Lanier/M. B. Lee P.O. Box 1088 Austin, Texas 78767

City Public Service Board ATTN: R. J. Costello/M. T. Hardt P.O. Box 1771 San Antonio, Texas 7829

Newman & Holtzinger, P. C. ATTN. Jack R. Newman, Esq. 1615 L Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20036

Central Power and Light Company ATTN: D. E. Ward/T. M. Puckett P.O. Box 2121 Corpus Christi, Texas 78403

INPO Records Center 1100 Circle 75 Parkway Atlanta, Georgia 30339-3064

Mr. Joseph M. Hendrie 50 Bellport Lane Bellport, New York 11713

Bureau of Radiation Control State of Texas 1101 West 49th Street Austin, Texas 78756

Judge, Matagorda County Matagorda County Courthouse 1700 Seventh Street Bay City, Texas 77414

Licensing Representative Houston Lighting & Power Company Suite 610 Three Metro Center Bethesda, Maryland 20814

Houston Lighting & Power Company ATTN: Rufus S. Scoti, Associate General Counsel P.O. Box 61867 Houston, Texas 77208

bcc to DMB: (IEO1)

bcc w/Attachment distrib. by RIV: J. L. Milhoan DRP Lisa Shea, RM/ALF, MS: MNBB 4503 DRSS-FIPS Project Engineer (DRP/D) Chief, Technical Support Section J. Gagliardo L. Williamson

Resident Inspector Section Chief (DRP/D) MIS System RSTS Operator RIY File R. Bachmann, OGC, MS: 15-B-18 D. Powers T. Cexter RIV Allegation Coordinator

RIV: OPS: SRI*	SPSS:FIPS*	C:TPS*	C:FIPS*	D:DRSS*
DAPcwers/1b	TWDexter	JEGagliardo	BMurray	LJCallan
08/07/92	08/07/92	08/07/92	08/10/92	08/18/92

D:DRP *	EOVE	D:DRS	DRA TA	1
ABBeach Chouse	Gsapborn	SUCOTTINS	Jamery Williams	Jitihoan
08/18/92 617	18/92	Q VR 125	9 12/192	5/44/92

*Previously concurred

bcc to DMB: (IEO1)

bcc w/Attachment distrib. by RIV:
J. L. Milhoan
DRP
Lisa Shea, RM/ALF, MS: MNBB 4503
DRSS-FIPS
Project Engineer (DRP/D)
DRS
Chief, Technical Support Section
J. Gagliardo
L. Williamson

Resident Inspector
Section Chief (DRP/D)
MIS System
RSTS Operator
RIV File
R. Bachmann, OGC, MS: 15-B-18
D. Powers
T. Dexter
RIV Allegation Coordinator

RIV:OPS:SRI*	SPSS:FIPS*	C:TPS*	C:FIPS*	D:DRSS*
DAPowers/1b	TWDexter	JEGagliardo	BMurray	LJCallan
08/07/92	08/07/92	08/07/92	08/10/92	08/18/92

D:DRP *	Egy	D:DRS	DRIVAMA	6
ABBeach Asses	Gsapborn	8JCollins/	JMNontgomery	JiMilhoan
08/18/92 4141	8/18/92	a 18/25	9 124/92	1/11/92

*Previously concurred

ATTACHMENT

The NRC letter dated June 1, 1992, transmitted NRC Inspection Report 50-498/92-07; 50-499/92-07 and an enclosed Notice of Violation. Houston Lighting & Power Company (HL&P) responded to 1 a Notice of Violation by letter dated June 30, 1992. This Attachment provides clarification of issues contained in the HL&P response letter and the NRC inspection report, which provided the results of a special followup team inspection at South Texas Project Electric Generating Station (STP) that gathered and assessed specific and programmatic information related to issues identified in a 10 CFR Part 2.206 Petition dated February 10, 1992.

Concern Related to Lax Attitude

The inspection report related the presence of a lax attitude that had been exhibited by certain maintenance workers and security officers at STP toward ensuring compliance with visitor escort procedures. The determination of the presence of a lax attitude was not only an NRC inspection team finding, but was also later confirmed by the security manager in his April 14, 1992, presentation of corrective actions to the NRC inspection team.

2. Concern Related to Timely Corrective Actions

The inspection report related the lack of timely corrective actions taken by HL&P in response to the notification of the apparent violations by the petitioner, the news media, and the NRC inspection team

On March 13. 12.2, at the NRC inspection team's request, a meeting was held with the security manager and other licensee representatives. At the meeting the team discussed that it had determined that visitor escort ching, had apparently been violated on occasion by several plant workers in the early portion of 1992. In particular, the NRC inspection team members stated that they had obtained admissions from workers, who had served as escorts, that they had left visitors unattended within the protected area for short periods. Also at that time, the NRC informed HL&P staff of other security problems (e.g., some escorts and security personnel had allowed visitors to notify security of their transfers to other escorts).

In a March 25, 1992, briefing with the NRC inspection team leader and HL&P representatives, the security manager stated that he was not convinced that an escort problem had occurred. Later, however, at a subsequent March 27, 1992, briefing and again at the management conference on April 14, 1999, the security manager acknowledged that a procedural noncompliance had occurred. The HL&P June 30, 1992, response to the Notice of Violation concurred that the violations occurred.

3. Clarifications Related to HL&P Response Letter

HL&P's June 30, 1992, letter warrants the followings clarifications:

- a. HL&P's letter stated, "The understanding from the March briefing from NRC inspectors was that an apparent violation of visitor escort requirements due to training deficiencies existed."
 - (1) Our inspectors did not know the root cause(s) of the apparent violation. In particular, with one exception, the NRC inspection team did not have any critical comments about the training given to security officers and this exception was not determined by the NRC inspection team until after the March briefing.
- b. HL&P's letter stated, "During the formal NRC exit meeting in April, our management became aware of information from NRC interviews with plant personnel wherein a number of significant actual visitor control deficiencies were evidently occurring."
 - (1) The meeting referred to in the statement given above was the management conference conducted on April 14, 1992, not the subsequent formal NRC exit meeting conducted on April 14, 1992.
 - (2) The security manager and other HL&P representatives were previously informed by the inspection team on March 13, 1992, that visitors had been left unattended. The NRC inspection team subsequently expected the licensee's representatives to evaluate this information and provide for notification to other HL&P managers, as appropriate, within the licensee's organization. Apparently, however, that information was not conveyed to senior management.
 - (3) The NRC inspection team did not identify any visitor escort violations that "were . . . occurring," but rather did identify that such violations had occurred based on interviews. The NRC inspection team had no evidence of continuing violations during its presence on site.