



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

Report Nos.: 50-424/86-134

Licensee: Georgia Power Company
P. O. Box 4545
Atlanta, GA 30302

Docket No.: 50-424

License No.: CPPR-108

Facility Name: Vogtle 1

Inspection Conducted: December 16-19, 1986

Inspector: *P. T. Burnett* 1-7-87
P. T. Burnett Date Signed

Approved by: *Frank Jape* 1/14/87
F. Jape, Section Chief Date Signed
Engineering Branch
Division of Reactor Safety

SUMMARY

Scope: This routine, unannounced inspection addressed the review of proposed startup tests.

Results: No violations or deviations were identified.

8702090483 870115
PDR ADOCK 05000424
Q PDR

REPORT DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Licensee Employees

- *C. E. Belflower, Quality Assurance Site Manager
- *R. M. Bellamy, Plant Service Manager
- W. L. Burmeister, Operations Supervisor
- *E. M. Dannemiller, Technical Assistant to General Manager
- *W. C. Gabbard, Regulatory Specialist
- *Z. Hartka, Senior Nuclear Engineer, Licensing
- *W. F. Kitchens, Manager Operations
- *A. L. Mossbaugh, Assistant Plant Support Manager
- *R. E. Spinrad, Independent Safety Engineering Group Supervisor

Other licensee employees contacted included engineers, security force members, and office personnel.

NRC Resident Inspectors

- H. H. Livermore, Senior Resident Inspector, Construction
- J. F. Rogge, Senior Resident Inspector, Operations
- P. J. Schepens, Resident Inspector

*Attended exit interview

2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on December 19, 1986, with those persons indicated in paragraph 1 above. The inspector described the areas inspected and discussed in detail the inspection findings, including the observation that the Loss of Offsite Power Test, as described in Amendment 29 to the FSAR, did not meet the requirements of Regulatory Guide 1.68 and that the issue of blockage of the safety injection signal to components controlled from the remote panels had not been resolved. No dissenting comments were received from the licensee. The licensee did not identify as proprietary any of the materials provided to or reviewed by the inspector during this inspection.

3. Licensee Action on Previous Enforcement Matters

This subject was not addressed in the inspection.

4. Unresolved Items

No unresolved items were identified during this inspection.

5. Review of Proposed Startup Tests (72564, 72572, 72576, 72580, 72582, 72583, 72584)

The following procedures were reviewed for conformance to FSAR Chapter 14 test descriptions, Regulatory Guide 1.68, and the proposed Technical Specifications:

- a. 1-5SF-04 (Revision 1), Rod Drop Time Test
- b. 1-600-03 (Revision 1), Isothermal Temperature Coefficient Measurement, in step 6.1.3 recommends a 7 degrees F temperature change but does not specify a minimum, which should be at least 4 - 5 degrees. The moderator temperature coefficient (MTC) is calculated from this measurement, but no guidance is provided on further action should the Technical Specification limit of MTC ≤ 0 be exceeded.
- c. 1-6SF-09 (Revision 1), Boron Endpoint Measurement, reflects poor practice in data analysis on Data Sheet 7.1. Each endpoint measurement should be analyzed and the results averaged rather than averaging the observations of temperature and reactivity and calculating a single endpoint.
- d. 1-6SC-01 (Revision 0), Power Coefficient Determination, will require revision to insert data now represented by LATTER, but is otherwise acceptable.
- e. 1-6SF-04 (Revision 0), Pseudo Rod Ejection Test
- f. 1-700-02 (Revision 1), Plant Trip from 100% Power
- g. 1-600-08 (Revision 0), Remote Shutdown Test, includes specific test termination criteria, which is a strong point. In step 6.2.3, the test crew, CREW 1, should be dispatched from the control room to simulate the abandonment of the control room rather than prestationed at the remote locations. From that point on, any further action by CREW 2, other than silencing alarms should be logged and evaluated for impact on the test. Since the safety injection signal is blocked to components controlled from the remote shutdown panels, some further modification of the procedure to simulate manual safety injection may be required.

Chapter 14 of the FSAR was reviewed to assess the impact of proposed Amendment 29. The change to paragraph 14.2.8.2.46, Loss of Offsite Power at Greater than 10% Power Test, resulted in a test description that did meet the requirements of Regulatory Guide 1.68 Appendix A, paragraph 5.jj to initiate a station blackout. This issue was referred to NRR by telephone on December 18, 1986, and oral agreement with the inspector's finding obtained.

Following discussions with licensee personnel, the inspector had no further questions.

No violations or deviations were identified.

6. Followup on Previously Identified Items (9)

(Closed) Inspector Followup Item 424/86-73-03: Delete use of makeup to VCT during RCS leakage measurements. In Revision 5 to OP 14905-1, RCS Leakage Calculation, the licensee defined any makeup from any source as invalidating the test.