



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 9 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-29  
GRAND GULF NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT 1  
MISSISSIPPI POWER & LIGHT COMPANY  
MIDDLE SOUTH ENERGY, INC.  
SOUTH MISSISSIPPI ELECTRIC POWER ASSOCIATION

INTRODUCTION

By letter dated September 13, 1985, Mississippi Power & Light Company (the licensee) proposed to change the facility Technical Specifications to provide for a one-time exception to Technical Specification 6.3.1 which requires that the Chemistry/Radiation Control Superintendent meet qualifications of Regulatory Guide 1.8, "Personnel Selection and Training." Supplemental information and a revised proposal were submitted by letters dated October 24 and December 11, 1985. The proposed amendment to TS 6.3.1 provides for the appointment of a Technical Assistant to the Chemistry/Radiation Control Superintendent who meets the guidelines of Regulatory Guide 1.8. The proposed amendment also provides for a specific NRC approved training program for the Chemistry/Radiation Control Superintendent, so that he will be qualified in accordance with the guidelines of Regulatory Guide 1.8.

By a separate letter dated September 13, 1985, the licensee proposed to change the facility Technical Specifications Table 3.3.7.4-1 "Remote Shutdown System Controls" by deleting the control for a valve which isolates the residual heat removal system from the reactor head spray line. By letter dated October 30, 1985, the licensee committed to remove the existing handswitch control for this valve from the remote shutdown panel.

EVALUATION

One-time Exception to Regulatory Guide 1.8

The staff has evaluated the licensee's request for a one-time exception to the Technical Specification 6.3.1 requirement that the Chemistry/Radiation Control Superintendent meet the guidelines of Regulatory Guide 1.8 using the criteria stated in NUREG-0800, Standard Review Plan (SRP) Section 12. The purpose of including a minimum qualification requirement for the Chemistry/Radiation Control Superintendent within the Grand Gulf Technical Specifications is to ensure that the station has a radiation protection manager (RPM) with the following qualifications:

- (1) an experienced professional in applied radiation protection at nuclear facilities dealing with radiation protection problems and programs similar to those at nuclear power stations; and

B604010207 B60318  
PDR ADOCK 05000416  
P PDR

- (2) an experienced manager, capable of supervision and directing the work of professionals, technicians and journeymen associated with the station's radiation protection program.

The licensee has demonstrated in its letters dated September 13, October 24, and December 11, 1985, that the individual selected to hold the Chemistry/Radiation Control Superintendent position at Grand Gulf is an experienced manager with several years of experience in the U.S. Nuclear Navy nuclear program. However, it is the staff's position that the individual lacks experience in radiation protection problems similar to those associated with the operation of a nuclear power station. The licensee has included in its December 11, 1985, submittal the training program to qualify the Chemistry/Radiation Control Superintendent with respect to the Regulatory Guide 1.8 guidelines. The staff has reviewed the licensee's proposed training program and finds it acceptable.

The staff concludes that the proposed one time exception to the qualification guidelines in Regulatory Guide 1.8 for the Chemistry/Radiation Control Superintendent is acceptable because a Technical Assistant meeting guidelines of Regulatory Guide 1.8 will assist the Superintendent in radiation protection matters until he completes an adequate training program.

Deletion of the Control for the RHR to Head Spray Valve from the Remote Shutdown Panel

Technical Specifications (TS) Table 3.3.7.4-1 identifies controls for valves that are required to be operable from the remote shutdown panel (RSP). In the original Grand Gulf, Unit 1 design, the RHR to head spray isolation valves were used for RCIC coolant injection into the vessel head through the RHR head spray line. Design evolution later resulted in the injection path being changed to injection through the feedwater line. Licensee has stated that operability of valve E12-F023 is no longer required to effect safe shutdown of the reactor or mitigate the consequence of any event analyzed in the Grand Gulf, Unit 1, FSAR. Since the valve is no longer required to operate for any safe shutdown or analyzed accident condition, operability from the RSP is not required. The licensee has provided a commitment in its October 30, 1985, letter to delete the handswitch for E12-F023 from the RSP upon the NRC's issuance of the license amendment related to the deletion request associated with T.S. Table 3.3.7.4-1. Based on the above information, the staff concludes that deletion of the control from the TS table and RSP switch removal are acceptable. Physical removal of the handswitch alleviates the staff's concern related to possible inadvertent operation of the valve from the RSP which could lead to overpressurization of the low pressure system.

It should be noted that the licensee has committed to maintain the operability of valve E12-F023 for the containment and reactor coolant boundary isolation functions in accordance with the requirements of T.S. 4.6.4 and 4.4.3.2.2. Further, the staff has verified that references to valve E12-F023 will remain unchanged in T.S. Table 3.4.3.2-1 "Reactor Coolant System Pressure Isolation Valves" and TS Table 3.6.4-1 "Containment and Drywell Isolation Valves."

### ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

The amendment involves changes in administrative procedures or requirements in the license (a one-time exception to Regulatory Guide 1.8) and a change of requirements of facility components located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR 20 (deletion of a control from the remote shutdown panel). The Commission made a proposed determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, and there have been no comments on that proposal. Based on its evaluation, the staff concludes that there is no significant change in types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite. There is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure because the changes do not affect personnel exposure. Accordingly, the amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR Sections 51.22(c)(9) and 51.22(c)(10).

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of the amendment.

### CONCLUSION

The Commission made a proposed determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration which was published in the Federal Register on December 30, 1985, (50 FR 53232) and consulted with the state of Mississippi. No public comments were received, and the state of Mississippi did not have any comments.

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributors: M. Lamastra, Plant Systems Branch, DBL  
R. Stevens, Electrical Instrumentation and  
Control Systems Branch, DBL  
L. Kintner, BWR Project Directorate No. 4, DBL

Dated: March 18, 1986