



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

Report No.: 50-416/84-50

Licensee: Mississippi Power and Light Company
Jackson, MS 39205

Docket No.: 50-416

License No.: NPF-29

Facility Name: Grand Gulf 1

Inspection Conducted: November 26-30, 1984

Inspector: *P. T. Burnett* *11 Dec 84*
P. T. Burnett Date Signed

Approved by: *Frank Jape* *12/11/84*
F. Jape, Section Chief Date Signed
Engineering Branch
Division of Reactor Safety

SUMMARY

Scope: This routine, unannounced inspection entailed 34 inspector-hours on site for the review of completed startup tests and witnessing a startup test.

Results: No violations or deviations were identified.

8501180468 841213
PDR ADOCK 05000416
PDR
Q

REPORT DETAILS

1. Licensee Employees Contacted

- J. E. Cross, General Manager
- *R. F. Rogers, Technical Assistant to General Manager
- *C. R. Hutchinson, Manager of Plant Maintenance
- M. J. Wright, Acting Plant Manager - Nuclear Operations
- *J. C. Roberts, Technical Superintendent
- D. Cupstid, Startup Supervisor
- *G. H. Davant, Startup Engineer
- *J. D. Bailey, Compliance Coordinator

Other licensee employees contacted included two senior reactor operators, two reactor operators, four test engineers, and four office personnel.

Other Organization

T. Enright, General Electric

NRC Resident Inspectors

- *R. J. Crlenjak, Acting Senior Resident Inspector
- *J. L. Caldwell, Resident Inspector

*Attended exit int. view

2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on November 30, 1984, with those persons indicated in paragraph 1 above. The licensee acknowledged that a submission on a test program change (paragraph 5.b) was due to the NRC. A need to revise FSAR Chapter 14 (paragraph 5.d) was also acknowledged. The licensee made one commitment:

Inspector followup item (416/84-50-01): Revise calculations of average vessel water level by December 31, 1984, paragraph 5.a(2).

3. Licensee Action on Previous Enforcement Matters

This subject was not addressed in the inspection.

4. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items were not identified during this inspection.

5. Startup Test Reviews (72532)

a. Completed Tests at Test Condition 2

The following completed, but not fully-reviewed startup tests, were reviewed for content, procedure adherence, and conformance to the test descriptions in the FSAR:

- (1) 1-C51-SU-12-2 (Revision 2), APRM Calibration
- (2) 1-B21-SU-16-2 (Revision 2), Selected Process Temperatures and Water Level Measurements. The inspection revealed that the procedure required a method of obtaining average water level measurement that did not give equal weight to all instrument channels. At the exit interview the licensee agreed with the finding and made a commitment to revise past, present, and future water level tests by December 31, 1984 (Inspector followup item 416/84-50-01).
- (3) 1-000-SU-19-2 (Revision 1), Core Performance. An OD-1 (LPRM calibration) was performed on November 18, 1984. At that time, core exposure was 240 MWD/Tn (9.2 EFPD). All thermal limits were satisfied.
- (4) 1-B33-SU-30-2 (Revision 2), Reactor Recirculation System Performance Measurement.

b. Plateau Procedure

1-000-SU-99-LP (Revision 2), Plateau Procedure - Low Power, was reviewed and the open exceptions discussed with plant personnel. Exception HU-97 addressed the inability to analyze vibration data for small-bore piping. In a letter (AECM-84/0420) dated August 8, 1984, the licensee committed to either analyzing existing data for acceptability or submitting and implementing an alternative program prior to leaving test condition 2 (TC-2). The discussions revealed that analyses of existing data had been abandoned, and a new test program implemented by a new contractor. At the exit interview licensee management acknowledged that submittal of the new program to the NRC was required.

c. Test Witnessing

The first reactor core isolation cooling (RCIC) system cold, quick start at rated conditions was witnessed from the control room. The procedure used was Section 3/4.4 of SU-14-2. Level 1 acceptance criteria, maximum turbine speed and time to full pump output, were satisfied. One level 2 acceptance criterion was that there be no steam leakage. A small leak was observed and a maintenance work order issued. The leak in no way affected system operability.

d. Other Startup Test Issues

- (1) Licensee letters on July 21, 1983 and August 23, 1983 proposed changes to the startup test program. The changes were approved in a letter by NRR on September 23, 1983. The licensee has not issued revisions to the FSAR covering the test program changes, although other FSAR revisions have been issued in the interim.
- (2) The power-flow map in the FSAR (Chapter 14) should be revised because there no longer is flow overlap between low speed and high speed recirculation pump operation.

6. Followup of Inspector Identified Items (92701)

(Closed) Inspector followup item 416/83-11-01: Failure of drywell suppression pool bypass leakage rate test. Procedural improvements were addressed in inspection report 416/84-33. The licensee performed an acceptable test on June 16, 1984.