



UNITED STATES  
 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
 REGION II  
 101 MARIETTA STREET, N.W.  
 ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30323

Report Nos.: 50-416/85-01

Licensee: Mississippi Power and Light Company  
 Jackson, MS 39205

Docket No.: 50-416

License No.: NPF-29

Facility Name: Grand Gulf 1

Inspection Conducted: January 2 -11, 1985

Inspector:	<u>Frank Jape</u>	<u>1/29/85</u>
<i>for</i> S. Burris		Date Signed
Approved by:	<u>Frank Jape</u>	<u>1/29/85</u>
F. Jape, Section Chief		Date Signed
Engineering Branch		
Division of Reactor Safety		

SUMMARY

Scope: This routine, unannounced inspection entailed 77 inspector-hours in the areas of startup test procedures review, startup test witnessing, followup on previously inspected items and independent inspection effort.

Results: No violations or deviations were identified.

8503050135 850204  
 PDR ADOCK 05000416  
 Q PDR

## REPORT DETAILS

### 1. Licensee Employees Contacted

- \*J. D. Bailey, Compliance Coordinator
- \*J. E. Cross, General Manager
- \*D. Cupstid, Startup Supervisor
- \*L. F. Daughtery, Compliance Superintendent
- \*J. Dozier, Quality Assurance Representative
- G. Duvant, Startup Engineer
- \*C. R. Hutchinson, Manager Plant Maintenance
- R. V. Moomaw, I&C Superintendent
- \*J. C. Roberts, Technical Support Superintendent
- M. Shelley, Simulator Supervisor
- V. Stairs, Instructor

Other licensee employees contacted included employees contacted included technicians, operators, and office personnel.

#### NRC Resident Inspectors

- \*R. C. Butcher, Senior Resident Inspection
- J. L. Caldwell, Resident Inspector

\*Attended exit interview

### 2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on January 11, 1985, with those persons indicated in paragraph 1 above. The licensee acknowledged the findings during the exit meeting with NRC personnel. The licensee agreed to review and revise, as necessary, the established procedures to include all test observations under a formal program of review. The licensee did not identify as proprietary any of the material provided to or reviewed by the inspector during this inspection. The inspector identified the following item as an unresolved item (URI):

URI 416/85-01-01, Identification and Resolution of Discrepancies During Testing - paragraph 7.

### 3. Licensee Action on Previous Enforcement Matters

This subject was not addressed in the inspection.

### 4. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items are matters about which more information is required to determine whether they are acceptable or may involve violations or deviations. New unresolved items identified during this inspection are discussed in paragraph 7.

## 5. Independent Inspection Effort (92706)

The inspector toured portions of the Unit 1 reactor building, turbine building, auxiliary building and specifically the Remote Shutdown Room to observe ongoing activities for compliance with NRC requirements and licensee commitments.

In addition to this tour, the inspector reviewed Grand Gulf Nuclear Station's adherence to proper housekeeping and formal behavior in the control room. The inspector noted that all personnel observed appeared to be attentive to their respective assigned duties and responsibilities. In general, the control room appeared to be maintained in a clean and orderly manner.

No violations or deviations were identified in the areas inspected.

## 6. Startup Test Procedure Review (72300)

The inspector reviewed current copies of the following test procedures: 1-000-SU-27-2, Generator Load Rejection Within Bypass Capacity; 1-000-SU-28-2, Shutdown From Outside the Main Control Room; 1-000-SU-31-2, Loss of T-G and Offsite Power. These procedures were reviewed to ensure that the requirements of the preparation, review, approval, revision, and use were accomplished in accordance with all applicable administrative controls.

In addition to the above listed criteria, the inspector verified that the official test copies were updated with the latest revisions and applicable Permanent Test Changes (PTC). All test procedures reviewed appeared to be adequate.

No violations or deviation were identified in the areas inspected.

## 7. Startup Test Witnessing - Unit 1 (61701)

The inspector witnessed the following startup tests: 1-000-SU-28-2, Shutdown From Outside the Main Control; 1-000-SU-27-2, Generator Load Rejection Within Bypass Capacity; and 1-000-SU-31-2, Loss of T-G and Offsite Power.

The witnessing was performed to observe overall test personnel performance, to verify that an approved procedure was available and in use, to verify that test equipment being used was properly calibrated and installed, and to determine that changes to the procedure were documented in accordance with administrative procedures. Operational phases of the tests were witnessed.

A concern was identified while witnessing 1-000-SU-28-2, Shutdown From Outside the Main Control Room. This test was to demonstrate that the reactor could be brought from a normal initial steady-state power level to

the point where cooldown was initiated and under control with the reactor vessel pressure and water level controlled from outside the main control room.

The inspector verified that the following test requirements were met:

- Observers stationed within the control room performed only those functions as identified in the test procedure.
- The test was initiated and controlled entirely from outside the main control room as required under Section 1 of the test.
- Prerequisites and initial conditions were established as required under Section 3 of the test.
- Test data were collected as required under Section 4 of the test.
- Plant quality witness hold points were observed and signed.
- The test was conducted in an orderly and professional manner.

During preliminary review of the raw test data, the inspector noted several items which were identified as test observations on Data Sheet 11. This data sheet was added to the procedure to allow test personnel to note observations during the conduct of the prescribed test. Although these test observations were included in the test procedure, on Data Sheet 11, the items in question were not officially identified under any approved deficiency program, such as the Test Exception Program defined in Grand Gulf Startup Manual (SUM), Section 4.2.4 or the Operational Quality Assurance Manual (OQAM), Section 16.0.

This concern was brought to the attention of licensee management during post testing discussions. Although the concern in question did not impact or alter the acceptance criteria as identified in the FSAR and test procedure, the licensee agreed to encompass the concern into a program which would ensure that they would be:

- a. identified
- b. documented and tracked
- d. evaluated or analyzed by the proper level of management
- c. resolved, and actions documented

Specifically for test 1-000-SU-28-2 the licensee committed to resolve the items listed on Data Sheet 11.

The inspector informed the licensee that the NRC would review and evaluate implementation of this concern during a future inspection. The licensee agreed to have these commitments in place by February 15, 1985. This item was identified as Unresolved Item 416/85-01-01, Identification and Resolution of Discrepancies During Testing.

No other items were identified during witnessing of the other tests listed above. Test data will be reviewed during a future inspection.

No violations or deviations were identified in the areas inspected.

8. Followup On Previously Identified Items (92701)

During this inspection, the inspector reviewed Grand Gulf Nuclear Station's (GGNS) evaluation 84/1791, December 18, 1984, evaluation to IE Information Notice 84-70, Reliance on Water Level Instrumentation with a Common Reference Leg.

The inspector verified that the GGNS Engineering Design analysis had considered the results of a failure in the protective channel of the redundant reference leg in the Final Safety Analysis Report Chapter 15.

Also, the inspector discussed this item with GGNS Training Staff to ensure that this problem was identified as a potential problem for operations personnel under certain abnormal conditions. Training records and outlines did include the potential problem and the simulator was used to analyze operations personnel's response to simulated failure of level instrumentation.

It appeared to the inspector that GGNS personnel and staff had addressed and resolved IEN 84-70, with respect to Unit 1 at GGNS.

No violations or deviations were identified in the areas inspected.