

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
Region I

Report No. 50-423/86-20  
Docket No. 50-423  
License No. NPF-49  
Licensee: Northeast Nuclear Energy Company  
Post Office Box 270  
Hartford, Connecticut 06141-0270  
Facility Name: Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 3  
Inspection At: Waterford, Connecticut  
Inspection Conducted: June 16-19, 1986  
Inspector: *James Prell* 7/16/86  
James Prell, Reactor Engineer date  
Approved By: *Jon R Johnson* 7/16/86  
Jon Johnson, Chief, Operational Programs date  
Section, OB, DRS

Inspection Summary: Routine unannounced inspection conducted on June 16-19, 1986  
(Report No. 50-423/86-20)

Areas Inspected: Startup test results review and review of licensee actions on previous inspection findings.

Results: No violations were identified.

8607240107 860717  
PDR ADOCK 05000423  
Q PDR

## DETAILS

### 1.0 Persons Contacted

#### Northeast Nuclear Energy Company

- R. Cikatz, Quality Control Inspector
- G. Closius, QA/QC Supervisor
- \* J. Crockett, MP-3 Unit Superintendent
- \* J. Harris, Engineering Supervisor
- T. Kulterman, Coordination Engineer
- J. LaWare, QA Senior Engineer Technician
- P. Priuizzini, Assistant Maintenance Supervisor
- S. Sudigala, Engineering Assistant Supervisor

#### U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

- \* F. Casella, Resident Inspector

\*Denotes those present at the exit meeting on June 19, 1986. The inspector also interviewed other personnel during this inspection period.

### 2.0 Licensee Action on Previous Inspection Findings

(Closed) UNR (85-36-02) - The following procedures did not accurately reflect MP-3 operational status: ACP-QA-3.03; ACP-QA-4.01; ACP-QA-4.02; ACP-QA-4.03; NEO-6.01; and NEO-6.02. NRC Report 85-69 reviewed: ACP-QA-3.03, Revision 28; ACP-QA-4.01, Revision 12; and ACP-QA-4.02B, Revision 0; and found them acceptable. At that time, the inspector found the remaining procedures unacceptable for the following reasons:

1. ACP-QA-4.03, Revision 14, was not approved or implemented by the licensee.
2. NEO-6.01, Revision 1, was not approved or implemented by the licensee.
3. NEO-6.02, Revision 2, had the wrong revision number.

The licensee has replaced ACP-QA-4.03 with ACP-QA-4.03A, Revision 1 and ACP-QA-4.03B, Revision 0. These procedures have been approved and implemented and they properly reference MP-3 operational status. NEO-6.01, Revision 1A has been approved and implemented as of May 10, 1986. It also properly reflects MP-3 operational status. NEO-6.02, Revision 2, properly indicated the correct revision number.

Based on the above, this item is closed.

(Closed) UNR (85-57-01) - Several startup testing procedures were awaiting final licensee review and approval, and subsequent NRC review to verify the startup test program is consistent with FSAR and Regulatory Guide requirements.

During the startup test program, all startup test procedures were reviewed by NRC against FSAR and RG 1.68 requirements and found acceptable. These reviews were documented in the following NRC reports; 50-423/86-57, 86-59, 86-01, 86-07, 86-09 and 86-14.

Based on these reviews, this item is closed.

(Closed) IFI (85-59-01) - In the review of the maintenance procedures against information in the vendors manual, it was noted that one of the procedures, MP3782CA "480 Volt Load Center Breaker", failed to incorporate specific vendor manual safety notes required prior to performing maintenance on the circuit breakers.

The specific vendor safety notes which were not incorporated in MP3782CA are included in the technicians training program for this type of equipment. A safety precautionary step as well as General Precautions steps are included in MP3782CA. The training and precautionary steps are adequate to meet the vendors safety concern.

This item is closed.

(Closed) IFI (86-01-01) - During the performance of startup test procedure 3-INT-5000, Appendix 5033, "RCS Loop Stop Valve Interlocks and Pump Interlocks", two UNSATS were identified - number 7378 and 7417. This was an inspector followup item awaiting resolution by the licensee.

The licensee's resolution of these two UNSATS were reviewed and found acceptable.

This item is closed.

(Closed) UNR (86-07-01) - A review of the test results for the RCS leak rate program performed during the post-core Hot Functional Test (3-INT-5000, Appendix 5006) identified some problems. Based on discussions with the licensee cognizant engineer and a subsequent document review, the inspector noted the following items have since been corrected and implemented:

- Average values at beginning and end of test have been used in lieu of instantaneous values for the RCS leak rate determination. The current RCS leak rate program uses the average value of 6 data points at 10 second intervals. This greatly reduces the instrument uncertainty associated with the calculation.

- The licensee intends to use computer program SP3J3 for RCS leak rate surveillance test. Although many sources other than RCS could enter the Primary Drains Transfer Tank (PDTT), any flow into the PDTT would automatically be classified as "identified" leak rate; this would yield a conservative value for the identified leak rate calculation.
- During the Appendix 5006 test, computer point GWS-F84 (VCT Divert Flow to BRS) was observed as having noise spikes which caused an erroneous computer entry of the VCT dump flow. The computer program SP3J3 was modified such that the value of GWS-F84 is integrated only when the upstream valve (CHS-Z112A) is in the DIVERT position. This change eliminated the need for operators to make manual corrections to the RCS leak rate calculation.

Based on this information, this item is closed.

(Open) UNR (86-07-02) - The licensee deleted two tests committed to in FSAR Table 14.2-2 item number 30, and RG 1.68; the ejected rod test at 30% power and the dropped rod test at 50% full power. The reason for deletion of these tests was that they would have placed the plant in an unstable state. Credit for these tests could be established based on MP-3 similarity to other plants who had performed their test satisfactorily. Westinghouse supported the licensee's position in a letter dated January 20, 1985. The licensee was to notify the NRC of the change to the FSAR deleting these tests.

In a letter dated March 12, 1986 from NNECO to the NRC Region I Regional Administrator, the licensee notified the NRC that the FSAR was changed to delete a reference to performing a pseudo ejected rod test at 30% power. The licensee still has to notify the NRC of the FSAR change taking an exception to the dropped rod requirement of R.G. 1.68 at 50% power.

This item remains open pending notification to the NRC of the exception to the R.G. 1.68, Appendix A, Paragraph 5.f, Revision 2, requirement for a dropped rod test from 50% power.

(Closed) UNR (86-09-01) - Plant behavior and lessons learned from the Natural Circulation Test (Appendix 7006) were to be evaluated by the licensee and incorporated in the licensee operator training program by May 1, 1986.

A memorandum dated April 28, 1986 from the MP-3 Training Supervisor to the Manager of Operator Training indicated that MP-3 operators had completed classroom and simulator training for natural circulation operation. This memorandum also indicated that data from MP-3 engineering files for this test was compared with the simulator response and that the results were acceptable.

This item is closed.

(Open) Violation (86-09-02) - The licensee received a level V violation for assigning a QC inspector to witness a startup test (Reactor Trip/Shutdown Outside the Control Room) for which the inspector was not trained or briefed on.

In response to this violation, the licensee has prepared two procedures related to QC inspectors performing surveillances. The first QA 1312A, Revision 0, "Guidelines for QA Surveillance Activities" specifically addresses the duties and responsibilities of management and QC inspectors related to surveillances. The second procedure ACP-QA-9.07, Revision 1, "Quality Assurance Surveillance Program" more clearly defines the individual responsibilities for performing and documenting surveillance activities. These two procedures adequately respond to the violation. At the time of this inspection, however, these procedures still were in draft form awaiting SORC approval.

This item will remain open awaiting SORC approval and NRC review of QA 1312A, Revision 0, and ACP-QA-9.07, Revision 1.

### 3.0 Startup Test Results Review

During previous inspections of the startup test program, the disposition of UNSATs generated during Phase 2 through 6 tests was reviewed on a sampling basis. No problems were identified. During Phase 7 tests, the following UNSATs were identified; UNS 7515, 7516 and 7535. The inspector reviewed the disposition of these UNSATs and identified no problems. The following Phase 8 UNSATs were reviewed; UNS 7596, UNS 7597, UNS 7595, UNS 7590, UNS 7588, UNS 7587, UNS 7587, UNS 7585, UNS 7584, UNS 7583, UNS 7582, UNS 7581, UNS 7579, UNS 7577, and UNS 7569. Although most of these UNSATs had not yet been reviewed by QC, the engineering disposition appeared acceptable. Based on these reviews, the licensee's program for dispositioning UNSATs has been found acceptable.

### 4.0 Plant Tours

The inspector made several tours of the facility during the course of the inspection. This included tours of the control building and control room, turbine building and auxiliary building. A review of the work in progress, security, cleanliness and housekeeping was made and found acceptable.

### 5.0 Exit Meeting

An exit meeting was held on June 19, 1986 to discuss the inspection scope and findings, as detailed in this report (see paragraph 1.0 for attendees).

At no time was written material given to the licensee. The inspector determined that no proprietary information was utilized during this inspection.