UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION I
631 PARK AVENUE
KING OF PRUSSIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19406

RFB

JAN 16 1976

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation
Attention: Mr. R. R. Schneider
Vice President
Electric Production
300 Erie Boulevard West
Syracuse, New York 13202

License No. DPR-17
Inspection No. 75-34
Docket No. 50-220

Gentlemen:

This refers to the inspection conducted by Mr. R. Hurd of this office on December 30-31, 1975 at Nine Mile Point Station, Oswego, New York of activities authorized by NRC License No. DPR-17 and to the discussions of our findings held by Mr. R. Hurd with Mr. T. Perkins of your staff at the conclusion of the inspection.

Areas examined during this inspection are described in the Office of Inspection and Enforcement Inspection Report which is enclosed with this letter. Within these areas, the inspection consisted of selective examinations of procedures and representative records, interviews with personnel, and observations by the inspector.

Within the scope of this inspection, no items of noncompliance were observed.

In accordance with Section 2.790 of the NRC's "Rules of Practice", Part 2, Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, a copy of this letter and the enclosed inspection report will be placed in the NRC's Public Document Room. If this report contains any information that you (or your contractor) believe to be proprietary, it is necessary that you make a written application within 20 days to this office to withhold such information from public disclosure. Any such application must include a full statement of the reasons on the basis of which it is claimed that the information is proprietary, and should be prepared so that proprietary information identified in the application is contained in a separate part of the document. If we do not hear from you in this regard within the specified period, the report will be placed in the Public Document Room.

1/16

No reply to this letter is required; however, if you should have any questions concerning this inspection, we will be pleased to discuss them with you.

Sincerely,

Elson J. Brunner, Chief
Reactor Operations and Nuclear
Support Branch

Enclosure:
IE:I Inspection Report No. 50-220/75-34

cc: T. E. Lempges, General Superintendent, Nuclear Generation
T. J. Perkins, Station Superintendent
C. L. Stuart, Operations Supervisor
E. B. Thomas, Jr., Esquire
A. Z. Roisman, Counsel for Citizens Committee for Protection of the Environment (Without Report)

bcc:
IE Mail & Files (For Appropriate Distribution)
PDR
Local PDR
NSIC
TIC
REG:I Reading Room
Region Directors (II, III, IV) (Report Only)
State of New York
A. Z. Roisman, Counsel for Citizens Committee for Protection of the Environment

IE:I Form 12
(Jan.75) (Rev)

NOTICE
AS OF JAN 19 1976
REGION 1 HAS NOT OBTAINED PRE
CLEARANCE IN ACCORDANCE WITH 10 [illegible]

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

OFFICE OF INSPECTION AND ENFORCEMENT

REGION I

IE Inspection Report No: 50-220/75-34 Docket No: 50-220

Licensee: Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation License No: DPR-17

300 Erie Boulevard, West Priority:

Syracuse, New York 13202 Category: C

Safeguards Group:

Location: Nine Mile Point 1, Oswego, New York

Type of Licensee: 1850 MWt - bwr (GE)

Type of Inspection: Routine, Unannounced

Dates of Inspection: December 30-31, 1975

Dates of Previous Inspection: December 17-18, 1975

Reporting Inspector: R. O. Hurd 1/14/76
R. Hurd, Reactor Inspector DATE

Accompanying Inspectors: T. Stetka 1/15/76
T. Stetka, Reactor Inspector DATE

DATE

DATE

Other Accompanying Personnel: None

DATE

Reviewed By: E C McCabe, Jr 1/15/76
E. C. McCabe, Nuclear Support Section Leader DATE
Reactor Operations Branch

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Enforcement Action

None

Design Changes

None identified.

Unusual Occurrences

Not inspected.

Other Significant Findings

A. Current Findings

1. Acceptable Areas
(These are areas which were inspected on a sampling basis and findings did not involve an Item of Noncompliance, Deviation or Unresolved Item.)

a. Systems returned to service after refueling. (Detail 3)
b. Verification of startup authorization. (Detail 4)
c. Surveillance requirements during refueling. (Details 5.a, b)
d. Startup testing following refueling outage. (Detail 6)

2. Unresolved Item
(This is an item for which more information is required in order to determine whether the item is acceptable or an Item of Noncompliance.)

a. Instrument Surveillance Procedure RE-04. (Detail 5.c)

B. Status of Previously Unresolved Items

Not inspected.

Management Interview

An exit interview was held at the site on December 31, 1975.

Persons Present

Mr. T. Dente, Reactor Analyst Supervisor
Mr. T. Perkins, Station Superintendent
Mr. C. Stuart, Operations Supervisor

Items Discussed

A. Startup Testing (Detail 6)
B. Facility System Records (Detail 3 and 4)
C. Surveillance Requirements (Detail 5.a, and b)
D. New Unresolved Item (Detail 5.c)

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Mr. D. Balduzzi, Operating Clerk
Mr. T. Dente, Reactor Analyst Supervisor
Mr. M. Helvey, I&C Technician
Mr. T. Perkins, Station Superintendent
Mr. M. Silliman, Site Results Supervisor
Mr. C. Stuart, Operations Supervisor
Mr. B. Taylor, Assistant I&C Supervisor

2. Purpose of Inspection

The inspectors stated that the purpose of this inspection was to cover the licensee's post-refueling activities to ascertain whether activities such as startup testing, system return to service, and surveillance were being conducted as required by Technical Specifications and approved procedures. This information was acknowledged by a licensee representative at the beginning of the inspection.

3. Systems Returned to Service

The inspector reviewed selected facility records on a sampling basis and the Master Refueling Outage Checkoff List to verify that systems disturbed during the refueling outage were returned to service in accordance with approved procedures.

The following items were included in the review. No discrepancies were noted.

a. Removal and installation of the reactor vessel head safety valves.

b. LPRM replacement.

c. Control rod drive housing support steel replacement.

d. Test results on Refueling Outage Test #9-R-9 which tested the operation of the emergency core cooling system. This test included testing of the following items.

(1) Auto actuation and timing of reactor vessel isolation valves.

(2) Auto actuation and timing of containment isolation valves.

(3) Auto actuation and timing of the emergency core cooling system.

(4) Automatic startup of core spray.

(5) Automatic startup of containment spray.

(6) Proper operation of the emergency power system.

4. Verification of Startup Authorization

The inspector reviewed the Master Startup Checkoff Sheet and results of the Rod Worth Minimizer tests to verify that the control rod withdrawal sequence and rod withdrawal authorization were available and in effect prior to the startup. No discrepancies were noted.

5. Surveillance Requirements During Refueling

The inspector reviewed selected facility records on a sampling basis and held discussions with licensee personnel to determine whether surveillance tests required by the Technical Specifications were performed during the refueling outage.

a. The "Monthly Test Checkoff List," "Weekly Test Requirements" sheets, and selected instrument procedures were reviewed in the following areas. No discrepancies were noted.

(1) Liquid Poison System Functional Test.

(2) Emergency Power Sources

(a) Starting and loading of diesel generator

(b) Measurement of cell voltage and specific gravity of station batteries

(3) Instrument channel tests for low-low reactor water level.

b. During review of the "Weekly Test Requirements" sheets, it was noted that an entry for checking access control of the core and containment spray pump compartments was missing for the week of 10/11/75. The inspector expressed concern for the missing data entry to the licensee. The inspector further stated that if this check was not required, due to maintenance performed during the outage period, that a suitable entry be made (e.g., N/A) to indicate review of this requirement.

The licensee responded that during this period in the refueling outage the core and containment spray were inoperable because the torus was de-watered for maintenance. It was shown that these operations were in compliance with the Technical Specifications.

The inspector had no further questions.

c. During review of the instrument channel test for high drywell pressure (Instrument Surveillance Procedure RE-04), the inspector noted that data for the month of September 1975 was missing.

When the licensee was questioned about the missing data he stated that his schedule showed that the test had been performed and that he would search for the missing data.

This item is unresolved until the missing data is reviewed during subsequent inspections.

6. Post Refueling Startup Testing

a. Control Rod Drive Scram Testing

The inspector reviewed the "Master Refueling Outage Checkoff List." Item 1 of this list is "Control Rod Drive Scram Testing Completed," the signoff is dated 11/29/75. The inspector reviewed "Results of Scram Timing" dated 11/29/75. The results were a tabulation of the 5%, 20%, 50%, and 90% scram insertion times for all control rods with reactor coolant temperature at 553°F and pressure at 990 psig. The inspector also reviewed a Scram Timing Evaluation Memo dated 12/3/75 prepared by the reactor analyst.

The above documents indicated that for the testing performed on 11/27/75 the scram insertion times for the 5% and 20% insertion points of control rod 10-31 were 0.42 sec. and 0.98 sec. versus the T.S. 3.1.1.c(2) maximum allowable times of 0.398 sec. and 0.954 sec. The inspector reviewed data from the retest performed 12/4/75 with reactor coolant temperature of 524°F and pressure of 942 psig. The scram insertion times for control rod 10-31 were within the T.S. 3.1.1.c(2) requirements.

Review of the above also indicated that scram insertion time recorded on 11/29/75 for Control Rod 34-35 at the 50% point was 2.14 sec. versus the T.S. 3.1.1.c(2) maximum allowable of 2.12 sec. The 90% insertion time for this rod was 3.61 sec. versus a 90% insertion time range of 1.9 sec. to 3.6 sec. in T.S. 4.1.1.c.

The evaluation memo referenced above documented the evaluation required by T.S. 4.1.1.c stated in part "Its drive performance is acceptable." This control rod drive was re-tested on 12/4/75 at a reactor pressure of 992 psig. The inspector reviewed the data from this test which indicated that Technical Specification requirements were met.

The inspector had no further questions in this area.

b. Control Rod Drive Normal Insertion and Withdrawal Times

The inspector reviewed the operator's data sheet of normal insertion and withdrawal times for the individual control rods in the continuous motion mode. The data sheet indicated that all control rods were timed to within the 44 to 52 second stroke time. The inspector's review of the Station Shift Supervisor's Log indicated this work was completed on 11/23/75, prior to the Shutdown Margin Demonstration and the criticality.

The inspector had no further questions in this area.

c. Shutdown Margin Demonstration

The Shutdown Margin was demonstrated on the core at completion of refueling to satisfy T.S. 4.1.1.a. The specification states in part "...demonstrate with a margin of 0.25 percent Δk that the core can be made subcritical at any time in the subsequent fuel cycle with the strongest operable control rod fully withdrawn." The procedure to verify this requires the rod 10-27 be fully withdrawn and the diagonally adjacent rod 14-31 be withdrawn to position 10. The withdrawal of 14-31 to position 10 inserts 0.75 percent Δk. The inspector reviewed the data sheets for the Shutdown Procedure performed 11/24/75 which indicated that the core was subcritical with the 10-27 at position 48 and 14-31 at position 10. The licensee stated that the required SDM demonstration was 0.41 percent Δk based on an "R" value (Refer to T.S. Bases 3.1.1/4.11) of 0.16 percent Δk plus 0.25 percent Δk required by T.S. 4.1.1.a. The inspector reviewed Safety Evaluation By the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation Support Amendment No. 5 to facility Operating License No. DPR-63 (Change No. 5 to the Technical Specifications) Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation NMP #1 Docket No. 50-220 section 2.2.1.1 upon which the license based the determination of R. The inspector found no inadequacies in this determination.

The inspector had no further questions in this area.

d. Criticality (Initial BOC 4)

The inspector reviewed the predicted criticality for Sequence A-1, BOC4. The predicted critical rod was 22-19, second rod of group #2. The critical pattern recorded on 11/24/75 with a moderator temperature of 150°F was rod 30-19 at position 12, 17th rod of group #2. The licensee stated that the actual critical rod pattern was within the uncertainty of the predicted rod pattern. The inspector noted that due to the rod withdrawal sequence the actual reactivity worth of the second to seventeen control rods in group two was very small, i.e., less than 0.1 percent Δk.

The inspector had no further questions in this area.

e. Rod Worth Minimizer

Inspector reviewed data sheet NI-ST.V3 dated 11/13/75, the data sheet was completed and approved 11/24/75 verifying the RWM was operable per the requirements of T.S. 4.1.1. As part of this check the Rod Withdrawal sequence was verified by the Reactor Analyst.

The inspector found no inadequacies in this area.

f. Core Performance

At the time of the inspection the reactor was at 81% of rated power. The power level was being increased to rated power by flow control at an increase rate of 2 to 3 MWe/hr (approximately .5%/hr). The slow power increase rate is used to accomodate the fuel pre-conditioning program. The inspector reviewed with the reactor analyst the results of the latest core performance analysis by the onsite computer. The core peaking factor was 2.473 versus the Technical Specification maximum allowable of 3.02 for 8x8 fuel and 3.06 for 7x7 fuel (T.S. 2.1.1).

The inspector had no further questions in this area.

3B

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION I
631 PARK AVENUE
KING OF PRUSSIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19406

JAN 15 1976

Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company
Attention: Mr. Robert H. Groce
Licensing Engineer
20 Turnpike Road
Westborough, MA 01581

License No. DPR-36
Inspection No. 75-18
Docket No. 50-309

Reference: Your letter dated December 17, 1975
In response to our letter dated November 25, 1975

Gentlemen:

Thank you for informing us of the corrective and preventive actions you documented in response to our correspondence. These actions will be examined during a subsequent inspection of your licensed program.

Your cooperation with us is appreciated.

Sincerely,

E. J. Brunner, Chief
Reactor Operations
and Nuclear Support Branch

cc: D. Moody, Plant Superintendent
E. W. Thurlow, President

bcc:
IE Mail & Files (For Appropriate Distribution)
PDR
Local PDR
NSIC
TIC
REG:I Reading Room
State of Maine

MAINE YANKEE ATOMIC POWER COMPANY
ENGINEERING OFFICE
TURNPIKE ROAD (RT. 9)
WESTBORO, MASSACHUSETTS 01581
617-366-9011

WMY 75-138

December 17, 1975

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region I
Office of Inspection and Enforcement
631 Park Avenue
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406

Reference: License No. DPR-36 (Docket No. 50-309)

Dear Sir:

In reference to your letter of November 25, 1975, relative to IE Inspection No. 50-309/75-18, Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company herewith submits the following reply:

A. Apparent Violation

Contrary to Criterion XVII of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix B, Technical Specification 5.0, and Procedure 0.05-1, a lack of control exists for certain quality assurance records.

B. Reply

As stated in the inspector's report, this apparent deficiency relates to the control, storage and retrieval of selected plant records (recorder charts).

Recorder charts are currently stored within the plant warehouse. The plant warehouse is and always has been under the control of the plant Administrative Supervisor. Maine Yankee, therefore, does not agree that this aspect of their storage is in violation of plant procedures or applicable regulations. For clarification, Maine Yankee will document this area as being an extension of the technical file system.

In an effort to improve control and retrieval of plant records, Maine Yankee is currently planning a complete revamping of the technical file system. This effort shall include changes relative to recorder chart identification and storage. It is expected that this effort will be completed during the year 1976.

Very truly yours,

MAINE YANKEE ATOMIC POWER COMPANY

J. H. Heider for

J. L. French
Manager of Operations

DEM/kg

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION I
631 PARK AVENUE
KING OF PRUSSIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19406

JAN 22 1976

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation
Attention: Mr. R. Schneider
Vice President, Electric Operations
300 Erie Boulevard West
Syracuse, NY 13202

License No. DPR-63
Docket No. 50-220

Reference: Your letter dated December 26, 1975

Gentlemen:

Thank you for informing us of the status of completion and implementation of your revised facility procedures. We understand that the expected dates for completion are:

Operating Procedures	March 1, 1976,
Operator Suveillance Test Procedures	March 31, 1976,
Special Procedures	March 31, 1976,
Instrument and Control Surveillance Test and Calibration Procedures	March 31, 1976,
Test and Inspection Program Development	March 1, 1976,
Test and Inspection Program Completion	June 1, 1976,

Your prior commitment with respect to revision and implementation of facility procedures as well as the revised commitment as submitted by your letter dated December 26, 1975 has been discussed with the cognizant NRR project manager. The facility procedures program will be examined during subsequent inspections of your licensed program. Should there be any further slippage please inform this office.

Your cooperation with us is appreciated.

Sincerely,

for James P. O'Reilly
Director

cc: T. E. Lempges, General Superintendent, Nuclear Generation
T. J. Perkins, Station Superintendent
C. L. Stuart, Operations Supervisor
E. B. Thomas, Jr., Esquire
A. Z. Roisman, Counsel for Citizens Committee for Protection of the Environment

Bcc:
IE Mail & Files (For Appropriate Distribution)
PDR
Local PDR
NSIC
TIC
REG:I Reading Room
State of New York

NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION

NIAGARA MOHAWK

300 ERIE BOULEVARD, WEST
SYRACUSE, N. Y. 13202

December 26, 1975

Mr. James P. O'Reilly
Directorate of Regulatory Operations
Region I
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
631 Park Avenue
King of Prussia, Pa. 19406

Dear Mr. O'Reilly:

The purpose of this letter is to revise the estimated completion date for the implementation of station procedures. The initial estimated date of January 1, 1976 should be revised, as indicated.

HISTORY

In 1974, Niagara Mohawk was involved in the review of procedures for the James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant and together with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission recognized the need for improvement in the plant procedures of Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station. A massive effort was organized to not only improve the basic plant procedures, but to implement new procedures governing almost every phase of plant operation, testing and control. Several outside vendors were retained and several station and company employees assigned to this proliferous project.

In 1975, several areas of station control were redefined and the Administrative Procedures were revised to reflect the departmental procedures needed to implement that control. This had a pyramiding effect on the total number of procedures. Additionally, not intentionally forestalling the committments made in May 1975 (Inspection Report 75-07), an emphasis has been placed on those procedures that have a direct bearing on the health and safety of the general public. Obviously, Instrument and Control Surveillance and Operator Surveillance Procedures, Special Procedures, Radiation and Protection Procedures, fall within that category. As a result, the time spent for plant review of procedures, as well as the Site Operation Review Committee's (SORC) review, was directed to those procedures that have an effect on public and plant safety. The SORC has been meeting in excess of twice a week during 1975 with most meetings lasting 4-5 hours. The additional work load on members of the Site and Station staff for first hand reviews has also been time consuming, therefore, the extention of time for completion is requested.

CURRENT STATUS

Operating Procedures

The following table reflects the change in Operating Procedure status since May, 1975.

NOTE: Redefining physical addition of equipment to the station has expanded the total procedures to 50.

	May	Dec.
Total No. of Procedures	46	50
Total No. of SORC Approved	6(13%)	29(58%)
Total No. Written Awaiting Approval	10(22%)	15(30%)
Total No. Undergoing Revision - Not Complete	10(22%)	5(10%)
Total No. of Procedure Remaining to be Revised	20(43%)	1(2%)

It is expected that these procedures will be completely implemented by 1 March 1976.

Operator Surveillance Test Procedures

There are a total of 68 new and revised procedures, 21 currently in use. 36 procedures are in the review process (station review, typing, SORC review and SORC acceptance). Only 11 procedures (16%) have not started the review process. The main thrust has been in the area of Weekly, Monthly and Quarterly.

It is expected that these procedures will be completely implemented by 31 March 1976.

Special Procedures

Prior to 1975, only 13 Special Procedures were written and implemented. The number of defined Special Procedures has increased to 27. During 1975, 9 new procedures were developed, reviewed and implemented and 1 procedure revised. The remaining 5 procedures are starting the review process.

It is expected that these procedures will be completely implemented by 31 March 1976.

Chemical and Radiation Protection Procedures

This item is completed with exception of ongoing revisions.

In this area alone, over 130 procedures have been written, reviewed and implemented.

Instrument and Control Procedures

Approximately 80% of the 50 procedures have been written, reviewed and implemented in the surveillance test and calibration area. Several procedures in Instrument Maintenance and Test Calibration have been completed.

It is expected that these procedures will be completely implemented by 31 March 1976.

Maintenance and Preventive Maintenance

Concurrent with the effort to upgrade the Surveillance Test procedures has been the development of a comprehensive Test and Inspection (T&I) Program, which deals with the scheduling, conducting and documentation required by the various quality related tests and inspections at Nine Mile Point. This item has been assigned to an outside vendor, General Physics - 12/16/75, for completion. Preventative maintenance actions, as well as surveillance tests, calibrations, and inservice inspection activities will be re-organized and carried out in accordance with the T&I Program. It should be recognized, for example, that some sections of the 80 maintenance procedures actually deal with preventative maintenance actions, and therefore, the status of implementation of a "preventative maintenance" program is determined by the status of the T&I Program. It is anticipated that the development of this program will be completed by March 1, 1976. At that time, it is also expected that some additional preventative maintenance action procedures will be identified by the T&I Program and that an effort will be underway to prepare those procedures. Substantial completion of these will be by 6-1-76.

Several hundred procedures have been written, reviewed and implemented in 1975 with the major effort placed upon public and plant safety. The above effort is in addition to and ran concurrently with the writing and upgrading of many procedures required during the refueling outage and special plant operations.

Very truly yours,

R. R. Schneider
Vice President
Electric Operations

TJP/aih