

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INSPECTION AND ENFORCEMENT
REGION I

Inspection Report No: 50-219/75-20

Docket No: 50-219

Licensee: Jersey Central Power and Light Company (JCP&L)

License No: DPR-16

Madison Avenue at Punch Bowl Road

Priority: _____

Morristown, New Jersey 07960

Category: C

Location: Oyster Creek Nuclear Station (OC), Forked River, New Jersey

Safeguards
Group: _____

Type of Licensee: 640 MWe, BWR (GE)

Type of Inspection: Routine, Unannounced (Emergency Planning)

Dates of Inspection: August 4 and 5, 1975

Dates of Previous Inspection: June 18-20, 1975

Reporting Inspector: *Charles O. Gallina*
C. O. Gallina, Ph.D., Radiation Specialist

9-2-75
DATE

75-20
8/75

Accompanying Inspectors: None

DATE

DATE

DATE

Other Accompanying Personnel: None

DATE

Reviewed By: *J.P. Stohr*
J. P. Stohr, Chief, Environmental Protection and
Special Programs Section

9/9/75
DATE

9758

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Enforcement Action (Emergency Planning)

A. Items of Noncompliance

1. Violations

None

2. Infractions

None

3. Deficiencies

None

B. Deviations

One deviation was identified in that the licensee had not obtained a written letter of agreement from the non-licensee physician responsible for providing onsite medical treatment. (Report Details, Paragraph 6)

Licensee Action on Previously Identified Enforcement Items
(Emergency Planning)

Not applicable.

Design Changes

None

Unusual Occurrences

None

Other Significant Findings

A. Current Findings

1. General

The inspection was a review of the licensee's program status relative to the area of emergency planning. Emergency implementation procedures and tests of various stages of the licensee's

emergency preparedness program were reviewed. (Report Details, Paragraph 2)

2. Acceptable Areas (No items of non-compliance were identified)

- a. Communications. (Report Details, Paragraph 2)
- b. Emergency Vehicles. (Report Details, Paragraph 2)
- c. Alternate Emergency Control Center. (Report Details, Paragraph 2)
- d. Area Maps and Overlays. (Report Details, Paragraph 2)
- e. Medical Emergency Procedures. (Report Details, Paragraph 6)
- f. Search and Rescue Procedures. (Report Details, Paragraph 2)
- g. Recovery and Reentry Procedures. (Report Details, Paragraph 2)
- h. Natural Disasters and Toxic Releases. (Report Details, Paragraph 2)
- i. Area Monitoring. (Report Details, Paragraph 2)
- j. Personnel Call List. (Report Details, Paragraph 2)
- k. Accounting Procedures. (Report Details, Paragraph 2)
- l. Emergency Documentation. (Report Details, Paragraph 2)
- m. TLD Monitoring. (Report Details, Paragraph 2)
- n. Emergency Security Force Procedures. (Report Details, Paragraph 2)
- o. Emergency Call Board. (Report Details, Paragraph 2)

3. Open Items (Emergency Planning)

The items noted below remain open in that the procedures or decisional aids listed have not been prepared and/or approved. (Report Details, Paragraph 9)

- a. Emergency Environmental Sampling.
- b. Onsite Release Rate.
- c. Facility Plot Plan.

4. Unresolved Items (Emergency Planning)

The items noted below remain unresolved in that supporting documentation could not be provided at the time of the inspection in order to verify compliance. (Report Details, Paragraph 3)

- a. Agreements with Offsite Firefighting Groups.
- b. Agreements with Offsite Ambulance Service.

5. Infractions and Deficiencies Identified by the Licensee
(Emergency Planning)

a. Infractions

Contrary to emergency procedure 905.14.7.1 emergency equipment inventories were not conducted every two weeks. This item was identified and corrected by the licensee. There are no further questions on this matter at this time. (Report Details, Paragraph 4)

b. Deficiencies

None

B. Status of Previously Reported Unresolved Items (Emergency Planning)

Not applicable.

Management Interview

A management meeting was conducted at the Oyster Creek Nuclear Station on August 5, 1975 at the conclusion of the inspection at the site. The following individuals were in attendance:

Dr. C. O. Gallina, Radiation Specialist, USNRC, Region I
Mr. D. A. Ross, Manager, Nuclear Generating Stations, JCPL
Mr. J. T. Carroll, Station Superintendent, OC
Mr. E. D. Scalsky, Radiation Protection Supervisor, OC

At the above referenced meeting the following items were discussed:

A. Agreements and Coordination With Offsite Agencies

The inspector stated that the status of coordination between the licensee and both the offsite firefighting and ambulance services could not be evaluated due to the absence of supporting documentation. The licensee stated that the agencies involved had responded when needed in the past but that written documentation was unavailable due to the belief by these agencies that legal implications were involved. The licensee stated further that this matter would be evaluated by JCPL corporate attorneys and assistance provided to the offsite agencies. (Report Details, Paragraph 3)

B. Medical Arrangements

The inspector stated that a deviation had been identified relative to the failure on the part of the licensee to obtain a written

agreement from the physician utilized to provide onsite medical treatment. The inspector stated further that the agreement would have to be in writing due to the fact that the individual was a private citizen and not part of an overall community service such as those reviewed earlier relative to fire and ambulance services. The licensee stated that a letter would be requested immediately. (Report Details, Paragraph 6)

C. Facilities and Equipment

The licensee stated that the cause of the Infraction was an oversight on the part of licensee personnel and that the new procedures covering this area would ensure that emergency equipment was inventoried and checked as required. (Report Details, Paragraph 4)

D. Tests and Drills

The inspector stated that the full-scale emergency drill scheduled by the licensee in accordance with revised emergency procedures would be observed by NRC personnel. The inspector requested that the licensee inform the NRC Regional office prior to the conduct of the drill so that inspectors could be assigned accordingly. The licensee stated that he would comply with this request. (Report Details, Paragraph 8)

DETAILS

1. Personnel Contacted

Mr. D. A. Ross, Manager, Nuclear Generating Station, JCPL
Mr. J. T. Carroll, Station Superintendent, OC
Mr. E. D. Scalsky, Radiation Protection Supervisor, OC
Mr. D. E. Kaulback, Radiation Protection Foreman, OC
Mr. D. A. Arbach, Radiation Protection Foreman, OC
Mr. R. L. Stoudnour, Staff Engineer, OC
Mr. J. Schuessler, Assistant Administrator, Community Memorial
Hospital
Mr. J. Russo, Chief, Bureau of Radiation Protection, Department
of Environmental Protection, State of New Jersey
Mr. V. Saynisk, Director, Division of Civil Defense and Disaster
Control, State of New Jersey
Chief T. R. Darmody, Lacey Township Police Department

2. General

The inspection was a review of emergency preparedness program instituted by the Jersey Central Power and Light Company (JCPL) for its Oyster Creek Nuclear Station (OC). The inspector reviewed the emergency plan implementation procedures (Section 905 of the plant operating procedures, Revision No. 3, Effective Date: May 30, 1975) and the status of compliance was determined.

This report also updates the status of emergency planning as originally documented in AEC-RO Inspection Report No. 50-219/73-21. The inspector noted that satisfactory action had been taken in the following areas:

- Communications
- Emergency Vehicles
- Alternate Emergency Control Center
- Area Maps and Overlays
- Medical Emergency Procedures
- Search and Rescue Procedures
- Recovery and Reentry Procedures
- Natural Disasters and Toxic Releases
- Emergency Area Monitoring
- Personnel Call List
- Emergency Equipment
- Accounting Procedures
- Emergency Documentation

TLD Monitoring
Emergency Security Force Procedures
Emergency Call Board

Additional areas examined during this inspection included agreements and coordination with offsite agencies, facilities and equipment, means of monitoring the release of radioactivity, medical arrangements, and training. Within these areas the inspection consisted of a selective examination of procedures and related documentation, interviews with plant personnel, telephone contacts with offsite agencies and observations by the inspector.

3. Agreements and Coordination with Offsite Agencies

The inspector reviewed the status of the licensee's emergency planning program relative to coordination with offsite support groups. This review was conducted by personnel interviews and/or telephone conversations with representatives of these groups (see Paragraph 1 for personnel contacted). Although no specific items of noncompliance were identified in this area the inspector did note that written documentation was not available confirming the status of agreement between the licensee and the offsite firefighting and ambulance services. The licensee stated that a high degree of cooperation did exist between the utility and these agencies and although written letters had been promised, some difficulty had been experienced due to the belief on the part of these agencies that there were legal implications preventing such agreements. The licensee stated that this matter would be turned over to the corporate legal section for further review and evaluation and that the results of this evaluation would be forwarded to the offsite agencies in order to clarify their difficulties. The licensee stated that he believed that written agreements could be obtained in this manner.

The inspector stated that during an interview with the local police authorities, a potential problem was identified in that the representative of this authority felt that the agency should be notified directly of any problems at the site and not through the corporate offices located in Morristown, New Jersey. The representative stated that on several occasions in the past, the New Jersey State Police had been notified immediately but that a considerable time delay was experienced in local notification. The licensee stated that he was not aware of any difficulties in this area but that the matter would be evaluated and further action taken as appropriate to improve coordination in communications for this phase of the licensee's emergency planning.

4. Facilities and Equipment

The inspector verified by visual inspection that the licensee's emergency equipment, facilities, and systems were complete and as described in the emergency plan and implementation procedures. The inspector also reviewed the adequacy of the emergency equipment inventory and verified that all emergency equipment had been checked for operability and calibration as required by the emergency implementation procedures. The inspector did note however that prior to the implementation of the latest procedural provision dated May 30, 1975, emergency equipment had been inventoried on a very infrequent basis and not on the two week interval as specified in the earlier procedure (905.14.7.1). The licensee stated that this matter had recently been identified and that the corrective action was in fact the implementation of the revised emergency procedures. The inspector emphasized the importance of ensuring the availability of adequate and operable emergency equipment. The licensee stated that increased attention would be placed on this area in the future.

5. Means for Monitoring the release of Radioactivity

The inspector reviewed systems and equipment used by the licensee for the monitoring of the release of radioactivity. The systems included the stack/ventilation monitors, liquid effluent monitors, and survey team instrumentation. The inspector noted that all systems and equipment were complete, operable, and as described in the emergency plan and that calibrations were performed as required. The inspector did note however, that the upgraded meteorology equipment was not in service and that the licensee was relying on the old backup method. The licensee stated that problems had been experienced with the new meteorological tower being struck by lightning on several occasions, damaging sensitive meteorology equipment. The licensee stated further that an evaluation was being conducted in order to protect the meteorology tower from further damage and that until such time as this evaluation and corrective action was complete, the older meteorology equipment would be utilized. The inspector emphasized the fact that a meteorology readout in the control room would be required and that the old meteorology tower should not be dismantled until the problems with the new tower had been corrected. The licensee stated that this matter was clear and that they would act accordingly.

6. Medical Arrangements

The inspector verified by direct inspection and discussion with the licensee that arrangements for medical support and treatment were complete. The inspector did note, however, that a letter of agree-

ment was not available from the physician utilized by the licensee for all onsite medical treatment. The inspector stated that since this physician was a private individual and consequently had no predetermined responsibility to enter the plant under emergency conditions, that a written letter of agreement would be required. The inspector stated that this item constituted a deviation from standard emergency planning practices and the USAEC "Guide to the Preparation of Emergency Plans for Production and Utilization Facilities." The licensee stated that this matter would be attended to immediately and that a letter of agreement would be requested from the physician in question.

Telephone contact was also established by the inspector with the Assistant Administrator of the licensee's offsite medical treatment facility and the inspector confirmed that adequate coordination and planning had been established with this facility. First Aid training and other associated medical services were also reviewed and no problem areas were identified. The inspector was also able to verify that adequate first aid coverage was being provided by the licensee for all operational work shifts.

7. Training

The inspector reviewed the status of the licensee's emergency training program and determined by discussions with the licensee and a review of records that the aforementioned training program was adequate and that training was being performed as described. The inspector did note, however, that due to the recent revisions of the emergency procedures, additional training was being provided and that this phase of the upgrading program had not been completed as of the time of the inspection. The licensee stated that training schedules were being revised and that emergency training for supervisory personnel was scheduled to be completed within two weeks. The inspector stated that this matter would be reviewed again during subsequent inspections of this area and that particular attention would be paid to those areas involving the training of potential emergency coordinators.

8. Tests and Drills

The inspector reviewed records and reports of periodic tests and drills conducted at the OC site and noted no items of noncompliance in this area, primarily due to the fact that the outdated procedures called for a minimum number of drills with limited scope. The inspector did note, however, that the revised procedures effective May 30, 1975, provided for drills on a more frequent basis with an annual "full-scale" drill. The licensee stated that the first,

full-scale drill would be conducted in early autumn following the completion of the licensee's training programs in this area. The inspector requested that the licensee inform the NRC Regional Office prior to the conduct of this drill so that NRC inspectors could observe the training exercise at that time. The licensee stated that he would comply with the inspectors request for prior notification.

9. Emergency Implementation Procedures

The inspector noted in his review of the upgraded implementation procedures that certain procedures while written, had still not received final approval for implementation. The licensee stated that the aforementioned procedures were being reviewed at present and that approval was expected shortly. The inspector also noted that due to a misconception on the part of the licensee one procedure, namely "Onsite Release Rate Procedures" had not been provided to date. The licensee stated that this matter would be pursued immediately and that the aforementioned procedure would be provided as soon as possible, pending the evaluation of control room systems and other related areas. The licensee also stated that facility plot plans and upgraded meteorological overlays and maps would be fully operational prior to the conduct of the emergency training exercise scheduled for early autumn.