

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION III

Report No. 50-155/82-14(DPRP)

Docket No. 50-155

License No. DPR-6

Licensee: Consumers Power Company
212 West Michigan Avenue
Jackson, MI 49201

Facility Name: Big Rock Point Station

Inspection At: Charlevoix, MI

Inspection Conducted: July 31 through September 10, 1982

Inspectors: *R. D. Walker for*
G. C. Wright

10-18-82

R. D. Walker for
M. E. Parker

10-18-82

Approved By: *R. D. Walker*
R. D. Walker, Chief
Projects Section 2A

10-18-82

Inspection Summary

Inspection on July 31 through September 10, 1982 (Report No. 50-155/82-14 (DPRP))

Areas Inspected: Routine safety resident inspection involving followup on Outstanding Inspection Items; Operational Safety Verification; Monthly Maintenance Observation; Monthly Surveillance Observation; IE Circular Followup; and Followup on Regional Requests. The inspection involved a total of 155 inspector-hours onsite by two NRC inspectors including seven inspector-hours onsite during off-shifts.

Results: No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

- *D. P. Hoffman, Plant Superintendent
- *D. E. DeMoor, Technical Engineer
- *A. C. Sevener, Operations Supervisor
- *J. R. Epperson, Associate Health Physicist
- *C. R. Abel, Operations and Maintenance Superintendent
- *G. Withrow, Maintenance Superintendent
- *T.R. Fisher, Senior QA Administrator

The inspectors also contacted other licensee personnel including: Shift Supervisors, Control Operators and Maintenance personnel.

*Denotes those present at the exit interview.

2. Followup on Outstanding Inspection Items

Through direct observations, discussions with licensee personnel, and review of records, the following inspection items were reviewed to determine that appropriate corrective actions have been accomplished.

(Closed) Unresolved (50-155/81-03-03): Leak Rate Testing. Due to the inspectors concerns on leak rate testing of test connections the licensee sent a letter stating their position to NRR. NRR's response indicated that leak rate testing need not be performed; however, the subject of containment isolation acceptability is being evaluated under SEP.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

3. Operational Safety Verification

The inspector observed control room operations, reviewed applicable logs and conducted discussions with control room operators during the month of August. The inspector verified the operability of selected emergency systems, reviewed tagout records and verified proper return to service of affected components. Tours of the reactor building and turbine building were conducted to observe plant equipment conditions, including potential fire hazards, fluid leaks, and excessive vibrations and to verify that maintenance requests had been initiated for equipment in need of maintenance. The inspector by observation and direct interview verified that the physical security plan was being implemented in accordance with the station security plan.

The inspector observed plant housekeeping/cleanliness conditions and verified implementation of radiation protection controls. During the month of August, the inspector walked down the accessible portions of

the Post Incident System to verify operability. The inspector also witnessed portions of the radioactive waste system controls associated with radwaste shipments and barreling.

These reviews and observations were conducted to verify that facility operations were in conformance with the requirements established under technical specifications, 10 CFR, and administrative procedures.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

4. Monthly Maintenance Observation

Station maintenance activities of safety related systems and components listed below were observed/reviewed to ascertain that they were conducted in accordance with approved procedures, regulatory guides and industry codes or standards and in conformance with technical specifications.

The following items were considered during this review: the limiting conditions for operation were met while components or systems were removed from service; approvals were obtained prior to initiating the work; activities were accomplished using approved procedures and were inspected as applicable; functional testing and/or calibrations were performed prior to returning components or systems to service; quality control records were maintained; activities were accomplished by qualified personnel; parts and materials used were properly certified; radiological controls were implemented; and, fire prevention controls were implemented. Work requests were reviewed to determine status of outstanding jobs and to assure that priority is assigned to safety related equipment maintenance which may affect system performance.

The following maintenance activities were observed/reviewed:

Preventive Maintenance Inspection of Control Rod Drive (CRD)
Selector Valves and Repair of Intermediate Pressure (IP) Extraction
Steamline.

Following completion of maintenance on the Selector Valves and the IP Extraction Steamline, the inspector verified that these systems had been properly returned to service.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

5. Monthly Surveillance Observation

The inspector observed technical specifications required surveillance testing on the Area and Emergency Condenser Vent Monitors and verified that testing was performed in accordance with adequate procedures, that test instrumentation was calibrated, that limiting conditions for operation were met, that removal and restoration of the affected components were accomplished, that test results conformed with technical specifications and procedure requirements and were reviewed by personnel

other than the individual directing the test, and that any deficiencies identified during the testing were properly reviewed and resolved by appropriate management personnel.

The inspector also witnessed portions of the following test activities:

Turbine Bypass Valve Controls and Reactor Protection System Testing.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

6. IE Circular Followup

For the IE Circular listed below, the inspector verified that the circular was received by the licensee management, that a review for applicability was performed, and that if the circular was applicable to the facility, appropriate corrective actions were taken or were scheduled to be taken.

IE Circular 79-22 (Closed): Stroke Times for Power Operated Relief Valves.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

7. Followup on Regional Requests

The Resident Inspector was requested by Region III to determine the manufacturer of installed bullet resistant fire doors and to determine if the licensee had documentation specifically confirming that the door had been tested and approved for fire resistance by a nationally recognized laboratory.

By review of the facility Final Hazard Summary Report (FHSR) and Fire Hazard Report the only bullet resistant fire doors installed are on the Control Room, the Central Alarm Station (CAS) and the Identification Station (IDS). Further review of the documents indicate that the doors are not rated as fire doors. This is based on statements from the licensee that the walls through which the doors pass are not rated fire walls. As such, no credit is taken in the Fire Hazard Report for either the walls or the doors. Inasmuch as the doors are not rated fire doors, no documentation is required for their certification.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

8. Other Inspector Activities

During the inspection period, the Senior Resident Inspector was temporarily assigned to the LaSalle County Station for a two week period as Senior Resident Inspector.

9. Exit Interview

The inspector met with licensee representatives (denoted in Paragraph 1) throughout the month and at the conclusion of the inspection and summarized the scope and findings of the inspection activities. The licensee acknowledged the inspector's comments.