



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

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

SEP 28 1984

Report No.: 50-416/84-31

Licensee: Mississippi Power and Light Company  
Jackson, MS 39205

Docket No.: 50-416

License No.: NPF-13

Facility Name: Grand Gulf 1

Inspection Conducted: August 12-14, 1984

Inspector:

*J.R. Dicken for*  
A. L. Cunningham

*9/28/84*  
Date Signed

Accompanying Personnel: W. E. Cline  
D. M. Collins  
R. E. Trojanowski

Approved by:

*J.R. Dicken for*  
W. E. Cline, Section Chief  
Division of Radiological Safeguards and Security

*9/28/84*  
Date Signed

SUMMARY

Scope: This routine, announced inspection involved 40 inspector-hours on site in the area of an emergency preparedness drill. The drill was limited to notification and communications with major emphasis directed toward development of adequate communication with state agencies throughout the course of the exercise.

Results: Of the two areas inspected, no violations were identified.

## REPORT DETAILS

### 1. Licensee Employees Contacted

- \*J. P. McGaughy, Vice President, Nuclear Support
- \*\*\*L. R. McKay, Manager, Radiological and Environmental Services
- \*\*\*P. Benedict, Emergency Planning Coordinator
- \*J. Hurley, Site Emergency Planning Coordinator
- \*J. E. Wallace, Jr., Supervisor, Radiological Services - Nuclear Support
- \*\*\*J. E. Cross, General Manager - Plant Staff
- \*R. Pogue, Communications Specialist
- \*T. Hayes, Public Information Officer
- \*G. M. Morrison, Radiological Protection Specialist
- \*\*L. F. Dale,
- \*D. B. Lowman, Radiation Protection Specialist, Nuclear Support
- \*D. G. Bost, Project Engineer

#### Other Organizations

- |                       |                                       |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| **G. Wilson, MSDH     | **J. Genesse, MEMA                    |
| **G. Dempsey, MSDH    | ***J. D. Richardson, TERA Corporation |
| **M. J. Smith, MSDH   | *D. Reeves, TENERA                    |
| **B. R. Redding, MSDH | *R. Carroll, TERA Corporation         |
| **E. S. Fuente, MSDH  | **S. G. Aucsmith, FEMA Region IV      |

\*Attended exit interview

\*\*Attended meeting convened in Jackson, Mississippi on August 14, 1984.

\*\*\*Attended exit and Jackson meeting

### 2. Exit Interview (30703)

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on August 13, 1984, with those persons indicated in paragraph 1 above. A meeting was convened in Jackson, Mississippi on August 14, 1984, between principal representatives of the licensee, State of Mississippi, NRC Region II staff, and FEMA.

### 3. Licensee Action on Previous Enforcement Matters

This subject was not addressed during this inspection.

### 4. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items were not identified during this inspection.

### 5. Exercise Scenario (82301)

The scenario for the emergency drill was reviewed to assure that provisions were made to test the integrated capability and a major portion of the basic elements existing within the licensee, state and local emergency plans and organizations as required by 10 CFR 50.47(b)(14), 10 CFR 50, Appendix E, paragraph IV.F, and specific criteria in NUREG-0654, Section II.N.

The scenario was reviewed in advance of the scheduled drill and was discussed in detail with licensee representatives on August 13, 1984. While no major problems with the scenario were identified during the review, several minor inconsistencies became apparent during the drill. These inconsistencies failed to detract from the overall performance of the licensee's emergency organization. Scenario problems were discussed by management representatives during the drill critique on August 13, 1984.

The scenario developed was consistent with the limited drill and its basic objectives, viz: (1) demonstration of the capability of the TSC/EOF to notify the Mississippi EOC every 30 minutes, or sooner if conditions changed regarding plant status; (2) demonstrate the ability of the Radiation Protection Manager/Radiation Emergency Manager to communicate with the Mississippi State Radiological Assessment Officer every hour, or sooner, if radiological conditions affecting protective action recommendations changed. The scenario fully exercised the above emergency organizations, and provided sufficient information to the state consistent with the limited participation of the state in the drill.

6. Assignment of Responsibility (82301)

This area was observed to assure that primary responsibilities for emergency response by the licensee were specifically established, and that adequate staff was available to respond to an emergency as required by 10 CFR 50.47(b)(1), 10 CFR 50, Appendix E, paragraph IV.A, and specific criteria defined in NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1, Rev. 1, Section II.A.

The inspectors observed that specific emergency assignments were made for the licensee's emergency response organization, and there was adequate staff available to respond to the simulated emergency. Assignment of responsibility was consistent with the limited scope of the drill.

7. Onsite Emergency Organization (82301)

The licensee's onsite emergency organization was observed to determine the following, viz: (1) that the responsibilities for emergency response were unambiguously defined; (2) adequate staffing was provided to assure initial facility accident response in key functional areas at all times; (3) organizational interfaces were specified as required by 10 CFR 50.47(b)(2), 10 CFR 50, Appendix E, paragraph IV.A, and specific criteria in NUREG-0654, Section II.B.

The inspectors determined that the licensee's onsite emergency organization was effective in dealing with the simulated emergency. Adequate staffing of the emergency response facilities was provided for the initial accident response, and the interfaces between the onsite organizations and state agencies appeared to be adequate and consistent with the limited scope of the drill.

8. Emergency Classification System (82301)

This area was observed to assure that a standard emergency classification and action level matrix was used by the licensee as required by 10 CFR 50.47(b)(4), 10 CFR 50, Appendix E, paragraph IV.C, and specific criteria defined in NUREG-0654, Section II.D.

An emergency action level matrix was used to promptly identify and properly classify the emergency and escalate to more severe emergency classifications as the simulated emergency progressed. Licensee actions in this area were considered adequate.

9. Notification Methods and Procedures (82301)

This area was observed to assure that methods and procedures were established for notification of state response organizations and emergency personnel by the licensee, and that the content of initial and followup messages to response organizations were established; and means to provide early notification to the populace within the plume exposure pathway were established as required by 10 CFR 50.47(b)(5), 10 CFR 50, Appendix E, paragraph IV.D, and specific criteria defined in NUREG-0654, Section II.E. (Rev. 1).

An inspector observed that notification methods and procedures were established and available for use in providing information concerning the simulated emergency conditions to state response organizations, and to alert the licensee's augmented emergency response organizations. All notifications appeared to be timely and adequate, and were implemented in accordance with the procedures.

10. Emergency Communications (82301)

This area was observed to assure that provisions existed for prompt communications among principal response organizations and emergency personnel as required by 10 CFR 50.47(b)(6), 10 CFR 50, Appendix E, paragraph IV.E, and specific criteria in NUREG-0654, Section II.F.

Communications among the licensee's emergency response facilities and emergency organization, and between the licensee's emergency response organization and state authorities were adequate and consistent with the scope of the drill. It was noted, however, that the required frequency of the Radiation Protection Manager's communication with the State Radiological Assessment Officer appeared to be excessive, and conceivably could interfere with the Manager's discharge of other routinely assigned responsibilities. This finding was discussed at the drill critique and the licensee-State meeting convened in Jackson, Mississippi on August 14, 1984. The subject findings is further discussed in paragraphs 12 and 13 below.



11. Emergency Facilities and Equipment (82301)

This area was observed to assure that adequate emergency facilities and equipment required to support an emergency response were provided and maintained as required by 10 CFR 50.47(b)(8), 10 CFR 50, Appendix E, paragraph IV.E, and specific criteria in NUREG-0654, Section II.H.

Consistent with the scope and objectives of the drill, inspector observations were confined to the TSC and EOF. Emphasis was directed toward allocation of staff and equipment required for adequately implementing notification and communications within the emergency organizations and with offsite State agencies. Inspection disclosed that the above referenced emergency facilities, equipment, and staff allocations were provided and maintained as required and were consistent with the scope and objectives of the drill.

12. Exercise Critique (82301/30703)

Critique of the drill was conducted on August 13, 1984. Licensee management, key exercise participants, and NRC representatives were present. The licensee discussed areas of the drill in which minor problems and items for possible improvement were identified. The most significant of these are detailed below.

- a. Although the major responsibilities of the Radiological Protection Manager (RPM) were implemented, the added requirement of informing State agencies in accordance with the drill objectives can adversely impact the primary functions normally assigned to the RPM.
- b. In view of the additional responsibility imposed upon the RPM regarding periodic routine updating of State agencies, it was determined that a lesser functionary could readily assume this responsibility. Reporting of major changes in plant conditions/emergency status however would be delegated to the RPM.
- c. Additional reporting requirements were reflected in the burden on the telefax unit (required to effect hard copy dispatch) assigned to the TSC. It was noted, however, that the licensee plans to allocate two rapidfax units for use in this facility.

The inspector determined that the critique was comprehensive, and adequately addressed the apparent weaknesses identified in the licensee's Emergency Response Program during the drill.

13. Post-Critique Meeting of Licensee/State Principals (92706)

A meeting was convened at the Radiation Protection Division (State of Mississippi Department of Health) in Jackson, Mississippi on August 14, 1984, between the licensee and State of Mississippi. Representatives of the NRC Region II and FEMA-Region IV were also in attendance. The purpose of the meeting is defined below:

- a. Review of the drill, with major emphasis directed toward development and refinement of licensee communications with State emergency response agencies during simulated emergencies.
- b. Licensee assurance that state emergency response agencies will be periodically and adequately updated on a timely basis regarding the status of plant conditions and any changes therein, and the projected offsite radiological impact of such changes.
- c. Mutual exploration and agreement on methods and techniques of improvement and refinement of licensee/State communications during emergencies to assure that protection of public health and safety is implemented as required.

Licensee and State representatives agreed to work out details on the types and frequency of technical information to be transmitted to the State by the licensee.