MISSISSIPPI POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
Helping Build Mississippi
P. O. BOX 1640, JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI 39205

NUCLEAR PRODUCTION DEPARTMENT

May 1, 1984

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Attention: Mr. Harold R. Denton, Director

Dear Mr. Denton:

SUBJECT: Grand Gulf Nuclear Station
Units 1 and 2
Docket Nos. 50-416 and 50-417
License No. NPF-13
File 0260/L-860.0
Transmittal of Outstanding Technical
Specification Problem Sheets
AECM-84/0251

In a meeting held between members of your staff and Mississippi Power & Light Company (MP&L) representatives on April 20, 1984, MP&L was requested to provide all outstanding Technical Specification Problem Sheets (TSPS). This request was formalized in an April 25, 1984, letter to MP&L from Elinor Adensam of your staff and was clarified during the followup meeting of April 27, 1984. In response to your request, MP&L is providing the attached TSPS for your review. This information is in the form of revisions to the TSPS and includes Revisions 23 through 28. These problem sheets along with those previously submitted in the April 9, 1984 MP&L letter AECM-84/0217 (which incorporated all changes through Revision 22) provide a complete and updated set of problem sheets.

At the April 27, 1984 meeting, the NRC requested and MP&L agreed to provide eleven new problem sheets. These new problem sheets (which are included in Revision 28) have been generated to provide a convenient tracking mechanism for certain NRC initiated items. MP&L is committed to work with the NRC to satisfactorily resolve these issues simultaneously with the problem sheets generated during the Technical Specification Review Program (TSRP). However, since these problem sheets were generated outside the TSRP, the matrix of TSRP results and the delineation of identified discrepancies which were provided in MP&L letters AECM-84/0217 and AECM-84/0229 of April 9, 1984 and April 29, 1984 will not be revised to reflect the content of these new problem sheets.

A001
1/40

Please advise if additional information is required.

Yours truly,

S H Hobbs

for L. F. Dale
Manager of Nuclear Services

SHH/mm

Attachment
cc: Mr. J. B. Richard, (w/a)
Mr. R. B. McGehee (w/o)
Mr. N. S. Reynolds (w/o)
Mr. G. B. Taylor (w/o)

Mr. Richard C. DeYoung, Director (w/a)
Office of Inspection and Enforcement
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Mr. J. P. O'Reilly, Regional Administrator (w/a)
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region II
101 Marietta Street, N.W., Suite 2900
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

MISSISSIPPI POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
Helping Build Mississippi
P. O. BOX 1640, JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI 39205

NUCLEAR PRODUCTION DEPARTMENT

May 1, 1984

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Attention: Mr. Harold R. Denton, Director

Dear Mr. Denton:

SUBJECT: Grand Gulf Nuclear Station
Units 1 and 2
Docket Nos. 50-416 and 50-417
License No. NPF-13
File 0260/L-860.0
Transmittal of Outstanding Technical Specification Problem Sheets
AECM-84/0251

In a meeting held between members of your staff and Mississippi Power & Light Company (MP&L) representatives on April 20, 1984, MP&L was requested to provide all outstanding Technical Specification Problem Sheets (TSPS). This request was formalized in an April 25, 1984, letter to MP&L from Elinor Adensam of your staff and was clarified during the followup meeting of April 27, 1984. In response to your request, MP&L is providing the attached TSPS for your review. This information is in the form of revisions to the TSPS and includes Revisions 23 through 28. These problem sheets along with those previously submitted in the April 9, 1984 MP&L letter AECM-84/0217 (which incorporated all changes through Revision 22) provide a complete and updated set of problem sheets.

At the April 27, 1984 meeting, the NRC requested and MP&L agreed to provide eleven new problem sheets. These new problem sheets (which are included in Revision 28) have been generated to provide a convenient tracking mechanism for certain NRC initiated items. MP&L is committed to work with the NRC to satisfactorily resolve these issues simultaneously with the problem sheets generated during the Technical Specification Review Program (TSRP). However, since these problem sheets were generated outside the TSRP, the matrix of TSRP results and the delineation of identified discrepancies which were provided in MP&L letters AECM-84/0217 and AECM-84/0229 of April 9, 1984 and April 29, 1984 will not be revised to reflect the content of these new problem sheets.

Please advise if additional information is required.

Yours truly,

S H Hobbs

for L. F. Dale
Manager of Nuclear Services

SHH/mm

Attachment
cc: Mr. J. B. Richard, (w/a)
Mr. R. B. McGehee (w/o)
Mr. N. S. Reynolds (w/o)
Mr. G. B. Taylor (w/o)

Mr. Richard C. DeYoung, Director (w/a)
Office of Inspection and Enforcement
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Mr. J. P. O'Reilly, Regional Administrator (w/a)
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region II
101 Marietta Street, N.W., Suite 2900
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

"TECH SPEC PRIORITY"

MEMO TO: Tech Spec Review Personnel

FROM: C. L. Tyrone

SUBJECT: Rev. 23 to Technical Specification Problem Sheet

TSRT: 84/0926

DATE: April 10, 1984

The following changes/additions are to be incorporated into the Tech Spec Problem Sheets:

ITEM NUMBER	CHANGES/ADDITION
346	Remove Rev 21, Insert Rev. 23
812	Remove Rev. 22, Insert Rev. 23
816	Remove Rev. —, Insert Rev. 23
817	Remove Rev. —, Insert Rev. 23
818	Remove Rev. —, Insert Rev. 23
819	Remove Rev —, Insert Rev. 23
820	Remove Rev —, Insert Rev. 23

C. L. Tyrone

CLT:sad
Attachment

cc: S. H. Hobbs (w/1)
File (Tech Spec Records) (w/1)
M2sd1

TSRT-84/0926

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING AS OF April 10, 1984
Date

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
001	X	1B	15, 3/29/84
002	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
003	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
004	X	2E	22, 4/09/84
005	X	1B	15, 3/29/84
006	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
007	X	2F	15, 3/29/84
008	X	2H	17, 4/01/84
009	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
010	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
011	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
012	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
013	X	3A	21, 4/08/84
014	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
015	X	1B	17, 4/01/84
016	X	1B	15, 3/29/84
017	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
018	X	3B	15, 3/29/84
019	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
020	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
021	X	1C	15, 3/29/84
022	X	2A	17, 4/01/84
023	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
024	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
025	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
026	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
027	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
028	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
029	X	3B	17, 4/01/84
030	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
031	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
032	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
033	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
034	X	1C	18, 4/02/84
035	X	2C	15, 3/29/84

L26sd1

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
036	X	2E --	20, 4/06/84
037	X	1C	15, 3/29/84
038	X	1C	15, 3/29/84
039	X	2G	17, 4/01/84
040	X	2F	17, 4/01/84
041	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
042	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
043	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
044	X	3B	17, 4/01/84
045	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
046	X	2F	15, 3/29/84
047	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
048	X	2H	15, 3/29/84
049	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
050	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
051	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
052	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
053	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
054	X	1B	21, 4/08/84
055	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
056	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
057	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
058	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
059	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
060	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
061	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
062	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
063	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
064	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
065	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
066	X	2D	22, 4/09/84
067	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
068	X	3B	15, 3/29/84
069	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
070	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
071	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
072	X	2D	17, 4/01/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
073	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
074	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
075	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
076	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
077	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
078	X	1B	15, 3/29/84
079	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
080	X	N/A (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
081	X	3A	15, 3/29/84
082	X	3A	15, 3/29/84
083	X	2B	22, 4/09/84
084	X	3A	15, 3/29/84
085	X	2D	20, 4/06/84
086	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
087	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
088	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
089	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
090	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
091	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
092	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
093	X	2E	22, 4/09/84
094	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
095	X	2E	22, 4/09/84
096	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
097	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
098	X	2G	15, 3/29/84
099	X	2G	21, 4/08/84
100	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
101	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
102	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
103	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
104	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
105	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
106	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
107	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
108	X	2C	15, 3/29/84
109	X	2D	15, 3/29/84

L26sd3

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
110	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
111	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
112	X	2A	15, 3/29/84
113	X	N/A (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
114	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
115	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
116	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
117	X	N/A (Resolved)	18, 4/02/84
118	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
119	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
120	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
121	X	N/A (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
122	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
123	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
124	X	2C	18, 4/02/84
125	X	N/A (Resolved)	18, 4/02/84
126	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
127	X	2G	17, 4/01/84
128	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
129	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
130	X	N/A (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
131	X	2G	15, 3/29/84
132	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
133	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
134	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
135	X	N/A (Resolved)	18, 4/02/84
136	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
137	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
138	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
139	X	1C	15, 3/29/84
140	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
141	X	2F	17, 4/01/84
142	X	2F	15, 3/29/84
143	X	2G	15, 3/29/84
144	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
145	X	2F	17, 4/01/84
146	X	2E	15, 3/29/84

L26sd4

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
147	X	3B	16, 3/31/84
148	X	3A	17, 4/01/84
149	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
150	X	2G	17, 4/01/84
151	X	3B	17, 4/01/84
152	X	2E	16, 3/31/84
153	X	2H	17, 4/01/84
154	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
155	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
156	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
157	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
158	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
159	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
160	X	2E	21, 4/08/84
161	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
162	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
163	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
164	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
165	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
166	X	3B	17, 4/01/84
167	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
168	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
169	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
170	X	2E	16, 3/31/84
171	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
172	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
173	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
174	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
175	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
176	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
177	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
178	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
179	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
180	X	2A	17, 4/01/84
181	X	2F	17, 4/01/84
182	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
183	X	2D	18, 4/02/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
184	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
185	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
186	X	N/A (Resolved)	18, 4/02/84
187	X	2G	18, 4/02/84
188	X	3B (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
189	X	2H	18, 4/02/84
190	X	2D	20, 4/06/84
191	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
192	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
193	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
194	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
195	X	3A	18, 4/02/84
196	X	2B	16, 3/31/84
197	X	3A	21, 4/08/84
198	X	1C	16, 3/31/84
199	X	3B	13, 4/02/84
200	X	2G	18, 4/02/84
201	X	2B	22, 4/09/84
202	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
203	X	2D	22, 4/09/84
204	X	2H	18, 4/02/84
205	X	2H	16, 3/31/84
206	X	2G	16, 3/31/84
207	X	2H	18, 4/02/84
208	X	2H	18, 4/02/84
209	X	2H	15, 3/29/84
210	X	2G	18, 4/02/84
211	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
212	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
213	X	1C	16, 3/31/84
214	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
215	X	3B	16, 3/31/84
216	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
217	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
218	X	3A	21, 4/08/84
219	X	2I	16, 3/31/84
220	X	3A	18, 4/02/84

L26sd6

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
221	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
222	X	3B	16, 3/31/84
223	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
224	X	3B	16, 3/31/84
225	X	2D	20, 4/06/84
226	X	3A	18, 4/02/84
227	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
228	X	3B	17, 4/01/84
229	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
230	X	2B (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
231	X	3B	17, 4/01/84
232	X	3B	17, 4/01/84
233	X	1B	20, 4/06/84
234	X	3A	18, 4/02/84
235	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
236	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
237	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
238	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
239	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
240	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
241	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
242	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
243	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
244	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
245	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
246	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
247	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
248	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
249	X	2D	22, 4/09/84
250	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
251	X	2F	18, 4/02/84
252	X	*3B	18, 4/02/84
253	X	2C	18, 4/02/84
254	X	3B	18, 4/02/84

* Priority changed from 1A per J. C. Roberts 3/27/84.

L26sd7

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
255	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
256	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
256-1	X	Sub, 2E	18, 4/02/84
257	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
258	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
259	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
260	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
261	X	3A	18, 4/02/84
262	X	1C	16, 3/31/84
263	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
264	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
265	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
266	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
267	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
268	X	2F	18, 4/02/84
269	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
270	X	2E	22, 4/09/84
271	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
272	X	2D	22, 4/09/84
273	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
274	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
275	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
276	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
277	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
278	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
279	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
280	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
281	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
282	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
283	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
284	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
285	X	1C	18, 4/02/84
286	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
287	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
288	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
289	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
290	X	2E	18, 4/02/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
291	X	*3B	18, 4/02/84
292	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
293	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
294	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
295	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
296	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
297	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
298	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
299	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
300	X	3A	18, 4/02/84
301	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
302	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
303	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
304	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
305	X	2I	18, 4/02/84
306	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
307	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
308	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
309	X	2A	18, 4/02/84
310	X	2A	18, 4/02/84
311	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
312	X	2B	22, 4/09/84
313	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
314	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
315	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
316	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
317	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
318	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
319	X	2E	21, 4/08/84
320	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
321	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
322	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
323	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
324	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
325	X	2I	18, 4/02/84

* Priority changed from 1A per J. C. Roberts 3/27/84.

L26ed9

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
326	X	2I	18, 4/02/84
327	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
328	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
329	X	1C	18, 4/02/84
330	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
331	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
332	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
333	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
334	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
335	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
336	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
337	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
338	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
339	X	2I	18, 4/02/84
340	X	2I	18, 4/02/84
341	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
342	X	2B	19, 4/05/84
343	X	2D	19, 4/05/84
344	X	1B	19, 4/05/84
345	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
346	X	2B	23, 4/10/84
347	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
348	X	2E	21, 4/08/84
349	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
350	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
351	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
352	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
353	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
354	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
355	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
356	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
357	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
358	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
359	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
360	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
361	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
362	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
363	X	2D	21, 4/08/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
364	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
800	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
801	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
802	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
803	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
804	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
805	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
806	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
807	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
808	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
809	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
810	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
811	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
812	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
813	X	3B	22, 4/09/84
814	X	3B	22, 4/09/84
815	X	3B	22, 4/09/84
816	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
817	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
818	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
819	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
820	X	3B	23, 4/10/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 346 Priority: 2B

Loeper /4/5/84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.3.7.8

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-75

Problem Title: Chlorine Detection System

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
Technical Specification 3.3.7.8 requires two independent chlorine detection systems to be operable in all Operational Conditions. The GGNS design for the chlorine detection system includes a sensor with output contacts providing signals to the control room emergency filtration system isolation logic. The specification should be revised to replace "chlorine detection systems" with "chlorine detection channels" for consistency with the GGNS instrumentation definitions.

Action Statements (a) and (b) require at least one control room emergency filtration system subsystem to be operating in the isolation mode when there are inoperable chlorine detection channel(s). The Action Statements should require that the control room emergency filtration subsystem which is associated with the Control Room HVAC subsystem that is in operation be initiated and maintained in the isolation mode of operation.

2. Safety Significance:
None. Replacing "systems" with "channels" for the chlorine detection instrumentation is for clarification of terminology and does not affect compliance with the intent of the Technical Specification.

None. This is an enhancement item for operations. As presently worded, Action Statements (a) and (b) would permit initiating and maintaining the control room emergency filtration subsystem which is associated with the control room HVAC subsystem that is not in operation in the isolation mode. The operating control room HVAC subsystem in this event would only be recirculating air through its normal filter and would not be circulating air

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 346 Priority: 2B

through the filters of the emergency filtration subsystem. This is not a concern for an outside accidental chlorine release since the common intake for both control room HVAC subsystems would be isolated.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate the necessity of changing Technical Specification 3.3.7.8 to provide the proper terminology and provide consistency with the GGNS instrumentation channel definitions.

Evaluate Action Statements (a) and (b) with respect to the design intent of the control room emergency filtration subsystems and their associated chlorine detection channels. Propose appropriate Technical Specification changes as necessary.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 812 Priority: 3B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Table 3.3.2-1, Item 5.h; FSAR Figure 7.6-17, FSAR Section 7.3.1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-12; FSAR Page 7.3-29

Problem Title: FSAR/Main Steam Tunnel Temperature Timer

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
Technical Specification Table 3.3.2-1 Item 5.h identifies a "Main Steam Line Tunnel Temperature Timer", whose function is to delay RCIC isolation for 30 minutes (to allow the operator time to establish an alternate means of Reactor Vessel Level Control.) A timer is identified in FSAR Figure 7.6-17 for the Leak Detection System, but is not included in the discussion on Main Steam Line Leak Detection presented in FSAR Section 7.3.1.1.2.4.1.3.

2. Safety Significance:
Not Applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:
Evaluate the need to revise FSAR Section 7.3.1 to include a discussion of the Main Steam Line Tunnel Temperature Timer and if necessary, include appropriate changes in the next annual FSAR update per 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4).

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ /

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 23, 4/10/84

P1sd292

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 812 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: INTEL, item 3B

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 816 Priority: 3B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Table 3.3.2-2; FSAR Table 7.3-10

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-15; FSAR Table 7.3-10

Problem Title: FSAR/Main Steam Line Flow-High Instrumentation

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

FSAR Table 7.3-10 contains specifications for the containment and reactor vessel isolation control instrumentation. The maximum allowable setpoint for the main steam line flow-high instrumentation is given as 133.5 psid. The trip setpoint for this instrumentation in Technical Specification Table 3.3.2-2 is 169 psid. A 169 psid signal corresponds to a main steam line flow of 140% which is the value used in the FSAR analysis for a main steam line break.

The range for the main steam line flow-high instrument given in FSAR Table 7.3-10 is -15/0/150 psid. As discussed above, a trip setpoint of 169 psid would necessitate revising this instrument range to accomodate the setpoint.

FSAR Table 7.3-10 should be revised to correct the main steam line flow-high instrumentation valves.

2. Safety Significance:

Not Applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Revise FSAR Table 7.3-10 to correct the main steam line flow-high instrumentation valves in the next annual FSAR update per 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4).

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____/_____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 23, 4/10/84

P1sd298

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 816 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 817 Priority: 3B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: N/A; FSAR Section 6.2.3.2

Tech Spec Page: N/A; FSAR Pages 6.2-52, 6.2-52a

Problem Title: FSAR/Standby Gas Treatment System Design Criteria

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

FSAR Section 6.2.3.2 needs to be revised to indicate that the Standby Gas Treatment System (SGTS) has sufficient capacity to overcome the additional inleakage (i.e., maintain secondary containment negative pressure) from a single 4 inch line penetration or failure of all non-Q lines 2 inches and smaller.

2. Safety Significance:

Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate FSAR Section 6.2.3.2 with respect to the need for indicating the capacity criterion of the SGTS and, if necessary, include appropriate changes in the next annual FSAR update per 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4).

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____/_____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____/_____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 23, 4/10/84

P1sd300

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 818 Priority: 3B

_____ / _____ _____

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: N/A; FSAR Section 6.2.3.2

Tech Spec Page: N/A; FSAR 6.2-50 through 53a

Problem Title: FSAR/Secondary Containment Isolation

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

FSAR Section 6.2.3.2 needs to be revised to indicate that blind flanges and rupture discs are also used to isolate secondary containment.

2. Safety Significance:

Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate FSAR Section 6.2.3.2 with respect to the need for indicating that blind flanges and rupture discs are also used to isolate secondary containment and, if necessary, include appropriate changes in the next annual FSAR update per 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4).

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 23, 4/10/84

P1sd301

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 819 Priority: 3B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: N/A; FSAR Table 3.7-17

Tech Spec Page: N/A; FSAR Table 3.7-17

Problem Title: FSAR/Seismic Instrumentation Nomenclaure

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

FSAR Section 3.7 describes the seismic design and seismic monitoring for GGNS. Section 3.7.4.2 discusses the location and description of seismic monitoring instrumentation, which is consolidated in Table 3.7-17. The response spectrum analyzer identified in Section 3.7.4.2.5 is incorrectly labeled in Table 3.7-17 as a "Triaxial Response Spectrum Recorder."

2. Safety Significance:

Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate the need to relabel the response spectrum analyzer in Table 3.7-17 and, if necessary, include the appropriate changes in the next annual FSAR update per 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4).

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____/_____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____/_____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 23, 4/10/84

P1sd302

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 820 Priority: 3B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Table 3.3.2-2, Table 3.3.5-2; FSAR Table 7.4-1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-17, 3/4 3-47; FSAR Table 7.4-1

Problem Title: FSAR/RCIC Instrument Specifications

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

FSAR Table 7.4-1 lists the Reactor Core Isolation Cooling instrument specifications. The values provided in this FSAR table are not consistent with the associated instrument specifications in the GGNS Technical Specifications.

The following inconsistencies have been identified between the FSAR Table 7.4-1 and Technical Specification Table 3.3.2-2:

Function	FSAR Value	GGNS-TS Value
a) RCIC system steam supply low pressure	65 psig	greater than or equal to 60 psig
b) RCIC turbine exhaust high pressure	25 psig	less than or equal to 10 psig

The following inconsistencies have been identified between the FSAR Table 7.4-1 and Technical Specification Table 3.3.5-2:

Function	FSAR Value	GGNS-TS Value
a) reactor vessel low water level	less than or equal to -41.8"	greater than or equal to -41.6"
b) reactor vessel high water level	greater than or equal to 54.9"	less than or equal to 53.5"
c) condensate storage tank level	1'2"	greater than or equal to 0"
d) suppression pool level	5"	less than or equal to 5.9"

Rev. 23, 4/10/84

P1sd303

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 820 Priority: 3B

2. Safety Significance:

Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate the RCIC instrument specifications in FSAR Table 7.4-1 to determine the correct values. Revise the table as necessary following this review and include the appropriate changes in the next annual FSAR update per 10 CFR 50.17(e)(4).

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

"TECH SPEC PRIORITY"

MEMO TO: Tech Spec Review Personnel

FROM: C. L. Tyrone

SUBJECT: Rev. 24 to Technical Specification Problem Sheet

TSRT: 84/0930

DATE: April 13, 1984

The following changes/additions are tc be incorporated into the Tech Spec Problem Sheets:

ITEM NUMBER	CHANGES/ADDITION
365 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. —, Insert Rev. 24
366 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. —, Insert Rev. 24
367	Remove Rev. —, Insert Rev. 24
368	Remove Rev. —, Insert Rev. 24
369 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. —, Insert Rev. 24
370	Remove Rev. —, Insert Rev. 24
371 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. —, Insert Rev. 24
805 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 24
821 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. —, Insert Rev. 24
822 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. —, Insert Rev. 24
823 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. —, Insert Rev. 24
824	Remove Rev. —, Insert Rev. 24
825 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. —, Insert Rev. 24

C. L. Tyrone

CLT:sad
Attachment

cc: S. H. Hobbs (w/1)
File (Tech Spec Records) (w/1)
M2sd1

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING AS OF April 13,1984
Date

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
001	X	1B	15, 3/29/84
002	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
003	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
004	X	2E	22, 4/09/84
005	X	1B	15, 3/29/84
006	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
007	X	2F	15, 3/29/84
008	X	2H	17, 4/01/84
009	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
010	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
011	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
012	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
013	X	3A	21, 4/08/84
014	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
015	X	1B	17, 4/01/84
016	X	1B	15, 3/29/84
017	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
018	X	3B	15, 3/29/84
019	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
020	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
021	X	1C	15, 3/29/84
022	X	2A	17, 4/01/84
023	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
024	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
025	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
026	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
027	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
028	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
029	X	3B	17, 4/01/84
030	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
031	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
032	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
033	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
034	X	1C	18, 4/02/84
035	X	2C	15, 3/29/84

L26sd1

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
036	X	2E	20, 4/06/84
037	X	1C	15, 3/29/84
038	X	1C	15, 3/29/84
039	X	2G	17, 4/01/84
040	X	2F	17, 4/01/84
041	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
042	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
043	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
044	X	3B	17, 4/01/84
045	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
046	X	2F	15, 3/29/84
047	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
048	X	2H	15, 3/29/84
049	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
050	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
051	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
052	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
053	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
054	X	1B	21, 4/08/84
055	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
056	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
057	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
058	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
059	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
060	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
061	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
062	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
063	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
064	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
065	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
066	X	2D	22, 4/09/84
067	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
068	X	3B	15, 3/29/84
069	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
070	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
071	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
072	X	2D	17, 4/01/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RFO	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
073	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
074	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
075	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
076	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
077	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
078	X	1B	15, 3/29/84
079	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
080	X	N/A (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
081	X	3A	15, 3/29/84
082	X	3A	15, 3/29/84
083	X	2B	22, 4/09/84
084	X	3A	15, 3/29/84
085	X	2D	20, 4/06/84
086	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
087	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
088	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
089	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
090	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
091	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
092	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
093	X	2E	22, 4/09/84
094	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
095	X	2E	22, 4/09/84
096	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
097	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
098	X	2G	15, 3/29/84
099	X	2G	21, 4/08/84
100	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
101	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
102	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
103	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
104	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
105	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
106	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
107	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
108	X	2C	15, 3/29/84
109	X	2D	15, 3/29/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
110	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
111	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
112	X	2A	15, 3/29/84
113	X	N/A (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
114	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
115	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
116	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
117	X	N/A (Resolved)	18, 4/02/84
118	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
119	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
120	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
121	X	N/A (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
122	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
123	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
124	X	2C	18, 4/02/84
125	X	N/A (Resolved)	18, 4/02/84
126	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
127	X	2G	17, 4/01/84
128	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
129	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
130	X	N/A (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
131	X	2G	15, 3/29/84
132	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
133	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
134	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
135	X	N/A (Resolved)	18, 4/02/84
136	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
137	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
138	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
139	X	1C	15, 3/29/84
140	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
141	X	2F	17, 4/01/84
142	X	2F	15, 3/29/84
143	X	2G	15, 3/29/84
144	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
145	X	2F	17, 4/01/84
146	X	2E	15, 3/29/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY KPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
147	X	3B	16, 3/31/84
148	X	3A	17, 4/01/84
149	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
150	X	2G	17, 4/01/84
151	X	3B	17, 4/01/84
152	X	2E	16, 3/31/84
153	X	2H	17, 4/01/84
154	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
155	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
156	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
157	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
158	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
159	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
160	X	2E	21, 4/08/84
161	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
162	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
163	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
164	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
165	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
166	X	3B	17, 4/01/84
167	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
168	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
169	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
170	X	2E	16, 3/31/84
171	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
172	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
173	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
174	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
175	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
176	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
177	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
178	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
179	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
180	X	2A	17, 4/01/84
181	X	2F	17, 4/01/84
182	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
183	X	2D	18, 4/02/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
184	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
185	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
186	X	N/A (Resolved)	18, 4/02/84
187	X	2G	18, 4/02/84
188	X	3B (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
189	X	2H	18, 4/02/84
190	X	2D	20, 4/06/84
191	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
192	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
193	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
194	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
195	X	3A	18, 4/02/84
196	X	2B	16, 3/31/84
197	X	3A	21, 4/08/84
198	X	1C	16, 3/31/84
199	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
200	X	2G	18, 4/02/84
201	X	2B	22, 4/09/84
202	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
203	X	2D	22, 4/09/84
204	X	2H	18, 4/02/84
205	X	2H	16, 3/31/84
206	X	2G	16, 3/31/84
207	X	2H	18, 4/02/84
208	X	2H	18, 4/02/84
209	X	2H	15, 3/29/84
210	X	2G	18, 4/02/84
211	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
212	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
213	X	1C	16, 3/31/84
214	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
215	X	3B	16, 3/31/84
216	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
217	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
218	X	3A	21, 4/08/84
219	X	2I	16, 3/31/84
220	X	3A	18, 4/02/84

L26sd6

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
221	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
222	X	3B	16, 3/31/84
223	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
224	X	3B	16, 3/31/84
225	X	2D	20, 4/06/84
226	X	3A	18, 4/02/84
227	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
228	X	3B	17, 4/01/84
229	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
230	X	2B (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
231	X	3B	17, 4/01/84
232	X	3B	17, 4/01/84
233	X	1B	20, 4/06/84
234	X	3A	18, 4/02/84
235	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
236	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
237	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
238	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
239	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
240	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
241	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
242	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
243	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
244	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
245	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
246	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
247	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
248	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
249	X	2D	22, 4/09/84
250	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
251	X	2F	18, 4/02/84
252	X	*3B	18, 4/02/84
253	X	2C	18, 4/02/84
254	X	3B	18, 4/02/84

* Priority changed from 1A per J. C. Roberts 3/27/84.

L26sd7

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
255	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
256	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
256-1	X	Sub, 2E	18, 4/02/84
257	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
258	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
259	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
260	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
261	X	3A	18, 4/02/84
262	X	1C	16, 3/31/84
263	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
264	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
265	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
266	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
267	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
268	X	2F	18, 4/02/84
269	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
270	X	2E	22, 4/09/84
271	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
272	X	2D	22, 4/09/84
273	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
274	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
275	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
276	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
277	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
278	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
279	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
280	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
281	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
282	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
283	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
284	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
285	X	1C	18, 4/02/84
286	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
287	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
288	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
289	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
290	X	2E	18, 4/02/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
291	X	*3B	18, 4/02/84
292	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
293	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
294	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
295	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
296	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
297	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
298	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
299	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
300	X	3A	18, 4/02/84
301	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
302	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
303	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
304	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
305	X	2I	18, 4/02/84
306	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
307	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
308	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
309	X	2A	18, 4/02/84
310	X	2A	18, 4/02/84
311	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
312	X	2B	22, 4/09/84
313	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
314	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
315	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
316	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
317	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
318	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
319	X	2E	21, 4/08/84
320	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
321	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
322	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
323	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
324	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
325	X	2I	18, 4/02/84

* Priority changed from 1A per J. C. Roberts 3/27/84.

L26sd9

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
326	X	2I	18, 4/02/84
327	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
328	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
329	X	1C	18, 4/02/84
330	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
331	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
332	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
333	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
334	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
335	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
336	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
337	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
338	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
339	X	2I	18, 4/02/84
340	X	2I	18, 4/02/84
341	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
342	X	2B	19, 4/05/84
343	X	2D	19, 4/05/84
344	X	1B	19, 4/05/84
345	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
346	X	2B	23, 4/10/84
347	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
348	X	2E	21, 4/08/84
349	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
350	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
351	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
352	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
353	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
354	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
355	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
356	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
357	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
358	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
359	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
360	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
361	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
362	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
363	X	2D	21, 4/08/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
364	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
365	X	2D	24, 4/13/84
366	X	2D	24, 4/13/84
367	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
368	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
369	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
370	X	3A	24, 4/13/84
371	X	2D	24, 4/13/84
800	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
801	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
802	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
803	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
804	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
805	X	3B	24, 3/13/84
806	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
807	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
808	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
809	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
810	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
811	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
812	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
813	X	3B	22, 4/09/84
814	X	3B	22, 4/09/84
815	X	3B	22, 4/09/84
816	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
817	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
818	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
819	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
820	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
821	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
822	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
823	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
824	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
825	X	3B	24, 4/13/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 365 Priority: 2D

Impell / 4/3/84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 4.8.2.1.e, 4.8.2.1.f

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 8-12

Problem Title: Battery Performance/Service Test

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

a. FSAR Appendix 3A states that GGNS complies with Regulatory Guide 1.32, Revision 2. The Regulatory Guide position C.1.c states: "The battery service test described in IEEE Standard 450-1975 should be performed in addition to the battery performance discharge test." GGNS Technical Specification 4.8.2.1.e states: "Once per 60 month interval, this performance discharge test may be performed in lieu of the battery service test." These requirements seem to be in conflict.

b. Regulatory Guides 1.32 and 1.129 refer to IEEE Standard 450-1975, which states that a performance test of battery capacity should be made within the first two years of service. This test is not addressed in the Technical Specifications.

c. Surveillance Requirement 4.8.2.1.e requires a performance discharge test once per 60 months to verify battery capacity is at least 80 percent of the manufacturer's rating. However, Surveillance Requirement 4.8.2.1.f requires annual performance discharge tests when battery capacity drops below 90 percent of manufacturer's rating.

2. Safety Significance:

a. None. Both the service test and the discharge test are performed according to IEEE Standard 450-1975. It is not necessary to perform the service test when the discharge test is required, since the discharge test is more severe and envelopes the service test requirements.

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 365 Priority: 2D

b. None. Present Technical Specifications are adequate. Present testing requirements include a pre-installation service test and a service test within 18 months of installation.

c. None. There is no conflict. The requirements as presently stated in the Technical Specification is to perform a performance test once every 60 months to verify battery capacity is at least 80 percent of rated. If the battery capacity drops below 90 percent, however, this test is performed annually, again to verify battery capacity is at least 80 percent of rated.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate to confirm that all regulatory requirements pertaining to battery testing are adequately addressed by the Technical Specifications.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 24, 4/13/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 366 Priority: 2D

RPD /3/31/84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3/4.3.8, Table 3.3.8-2

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-97, 3/4 3-99 B3/4 3-6

Problem Title: Containment Spray System Response Time

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

The present Technical Specification does not provide for a complete containment spray system response time test. Presently, administrative controls are required to assure that the combination of instrumentation response times, Table 3.3.8-2, and the opening time for the E12-F028 valves does not exceed the 13 minute limit derived from FSAR 6.2.1.1.5.5.

An LCO and Surveillance could be developed in a similar fashion to the ECCS system response time testing presently in 4.3.3.3.

2. Safety Significance:

None. The total time for containment spray response can be administratively controlled, determined, and verified to be less than the required overall time by both:

1. Performing the surveillance required by Table 3.3.8-2.

2. Measuring valve opening time in accordance with ASME Section X.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Investigate and evaluate the need to add a requirement for containment spray system response time testing to the GGNS Technical Specification.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 24, 4/13/84

P1sd283

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 366 Priority: 2D

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 367 Priority: 3B

W. A. Russell / 3/20/84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.3.7.5

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-70, 3-71

Problem Title: Action Statement Not Consistent with Table

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Item 13, containment/drywell area monitors, of Table 3.3.7.5-1 references Action 81. Action 81 addresses only operation with less than the "minimum channels operable". The Action Statement for item 13 should address "Required number of channels," as well as the "minimum channels operable"; therefore, Action 81 is inappropriate for item 13.

2. Safety Significance:

None. As long as the minimum operable channel requirement of Action 81 is met, accident monitoring capability is provided.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate changing Action Statement to Action 80 for item 13.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 24, 4/13/84

P1sd283.1

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 368 Priority: 3B

W. A. Russell / 3/20/84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.3.7.5

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-70

Problem Title: Incorrect Nomenclature

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Table 3.3.7.5-1 and 4.3.7.5-1, Items 13 through 18, should be revised to read "radiation monitor" instead of "monitor".

2. Safety Significance:

Resolved as part of Problem Sheet Item 329.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Resolved as part of Problem Sheet Item 329.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: Refer to Problem Sheet Item 329.

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 24, 4/13/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 369 Priority: 3B

W. A. Russell /3/19/84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.3.1 Tables 3.3.1-1 and 4.3.1.1-1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-2, 3, 7, and 8

Problem Title: Applicable Operational Condition Inconsistencies

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Table 3.3.1-1 specifies applicable operational conditions for reactor protection system instrumentation and several items have footnotes describing exceptions to these operational conditions. Table 4.3.1.1-1 specifies Surveillance Requirements for the instrumentation listed in Table 3.3.1-1, but does not contain the same footnotes for the affected items. This in effect requires Surveillance to be performed when the instrumentation is not required to be operable.

2. Safety Significance:

None. Current instrumentation Surveillance Requirements are more conservative than the operability requirements.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate to determine if appropriate footnotes should be added to Table 4.3.1.1-1, to make it consistent with Table 3.3.1-1.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____/_____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 24, 4/13/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 369 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 370 Priority: 3A

W. A. Russell / 3/19/84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.3.1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-1

Problem Title: RPS Trip Bypass Instruments Not Addressed in Technical Specification

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Instrumentation that provides for bypassing reactor protection system (RPS) trip functions is not addressed in GGNS Technical Specifications or the BWR-6 Standard Technical Specifications. The BWR owners group should give consideration toward including this instrumentation in Technical Specification.

2. Safety Significance:

None. Instrumentation that provides RPS trips is included in the Technical Specification.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate incorporating any BWR onwer's group resolutions.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 24, 4/13/84

P1sd283.4

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 371 Priority: 2D

GE / 3/16/84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.1.3.4

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 1-10

Problem Title: Control Rod Drive Coupling

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

The BWR/6 Standard Technical Specification 3.1.3.4 states "The provisions of Specification 3.0.4 are not applicable" at the end of the Action Statements but the Grand Gulf Technical Specification 3.1.3.4 does not contain this provision.

2. Safety Significance:

None. The Grand Gulf Technical Specification 3.1.3.4 is conservative as written by not allowing exception to the provisions of Technical Specification 3.0.4

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Investigate the necessity of a Technical Specification change to add "The provisions of Technical Specification 3.0.4 are not applicable" to provide operational enhancement.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 24, 4/13/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 371 Priority: 2D

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 805 Priority: 3B

GE FSAR/SER Review / 3-19-84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.1.5, FSAR Figure 9.3-26, 9.3.5.3

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 1-18

Problem Title: Sodium Pentaborate Volume

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

a. FSAR Figure 9.3-26 specifies that the SLC shall be able to deliver 4,170 gallons of sodium pentaborate solution or the equivalent into the reactor. Technical Specification 4.1.5.a.2 requires verification that the available volume of sodium pentatorate solution is greater than or equal to 4,587 gallons. Technical Specification requirements are more restrictive than that required by FSAR Figure 9.3-26.

b. FSAR Section 9.3.5.3 implies that operation of the redundant SLC pump will be demonstrated when an SLC pump is out for maintenance. There is no Technical Specification requirement to perform this type of surveillance.

2. Safety Significance:

a. None. Technical Specifications are conservative, relative to the FSAR.

b. None. Pump operability is verified by normal Surveillance every 31 days. Since the loops are redundant, there is no need to increase Surveillance on the operable loop where a redundant component of one loop is out for maintenance.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

a. Confirm that changes to FSAR Figure 9.3-26 are not required.

b. Revise the FSAR to reflect the testing required by Technical Specifications.

Rev. 24, 4/13/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 805 Priority: 3B

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____/_____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____/_____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 821 Priority: 3B

Impell /4/3/84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3/4 1.3.3, FSAR 4.6.3.1.1.5.d

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 1-9

Problem Title: Control Rod Drive Accumulator Level

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

FSAR Section 4.6.3.1.1.5.d states that "Experience with control rod drive systems of the same type indicates that weekly verification of accumulator pressure and level is sufficient to assure operability of the accumulator portion of the control rod drive system." This is inconsistent with Surveillance 4.1.3.3.a, which only requires weekly verification of accumulator pressure. Plant design does not provide an indicator for accumulator level; however, a high level alarm is provided for leakage past the accumulator seals.

2. Safety Significance:

None. When the high water level alarm is noted for an accumulator proper actions are taken to ensure accumulator operability.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Revise FSAR to delete the implication of a weekly accumulator Surveillance test.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 24, 4/13/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 821 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 822 Priority: 3B

Impell / 4/13/84 -

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3/4.6.6.3; FSAR 6.2.3, 6.5.3

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 6-54

Problem Title: Standby Gas Treatment System Flow Test

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

a. FSAR Appendix 3A states GGNS is in compliance with Regulatory Guide 1.52 Revision 1, but should reference Revision 2.

b. Regulatory Guide 1.52 paragraph C.5.b describes an air flow distribution test, but this test is not included in Technical Specification 3/4.6.6.3.

c. GGNS FSAR erroneously states that the time for secondary containment negative pressure to be achieved is 120 seconds instead of 101 seconds in paragraph 6.5.1.3. FSAR paragraph 6.2.3.1.1.c should be revised to reflect the correct value of the 120 seconds

d. FSAR Section 6.5.3 states that long term operation flow rate of the standby gas treatment system is 2300 cfm. However, Technical Specification 3/4.6.6.3 and the Surveillance Procedure state that long term flow rate is less than 4000 cfm.

2. Safety Significance:

a. None. This is a typographical error.

b. None. The referenced test is not required for normal operational surveillances. The FSAR should be changed to reflect this.

c. The FSAR Section 6.2.3.1.1.c does not accurately reflect the standby gas treatment system paramater. However, this has no effect on plant operation or safety.

d. None. Technical Specification and Surveillance Procedures are correct, and FSAR should be changed to reflect GGNS design requirements.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Perform an evaluation to determine what FSAR changes, if any, are required.

Rev. 24, 4/13/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 822 Priority: 3B

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____/_____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____/_____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 823 Priority: 3B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Table 3.6.6.2-1; FSAR Table 7.6-12

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 6-48 through 6-52; FSAR Table 7.6-12

Problem Title: FSAR/Secondary Containment Ventilation System Automatic Isolation Dampers/Valves

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

The completeness of Technical Specification Table 3.6.6.2-1 cannot be verified by FSAR Table 7.6-12, auxiliary building isolation, since the specific isolation dampers are not listed in FSAR Table 7.6-12.

Additionally, FSAR Table 7.6-12 does not list the RHR "A" loop discharge to liquid radwaste valve (E12-F203) which is listed in Technical Specification Table 3.6.6.2-1.

2. Safety Significance:

None. The Technical Specification requirements can be verified by plant design documents other than the FSAR.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate the necessity of adding the isolation dampers and isolation valve E12-F203 to FSAR Table 7.6-12 and, if necessary, include the appropriate changes in the next annual FSAR update per 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4).

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____/_____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 24, 4/13/84

P1sd313.1

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 823 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 824 Priority: 3B

INEL Audit of Tech Specs / _____

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Technical Specification Table 3.6.4-1; FSAR Table 6.2-44

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 6-13 through 44

Problem Title: Containment and Drywell Isolation Valves

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
Technical Specification Table 3.6.4-1, items 1.b through 4.b, lists several containment and drywell isolation valves that are not listed in FSAR Table 6.2-44 (containment isolation valve information). However, some of these valves are listed in FSAR Tables 7.6-12, 6.2-48, and 6.2-49.

2. Safety Significance:
None. The Technical Specification requirements can be verified by plant design documents other than the FSAR.

3. Anticipated Resolution:
Investigate the need to revise FSAR Table 6.2-44 and, if necessary, include appropriate changes in the next annual FSAR update per 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4).

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 24, 4/13/84

Pled315

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 825 Priority: 3B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Table 3.3.2-1; FSAR Section 5.4.6

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-12 & 13; FSAR Pages 5.4-15 & -16

Problem Title: FSAR/RCIC Isolation Instrumentation

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

FSAR Section 5.4.6, reactor core isolation cooling system (RCIC), does not currently reflect that valve group 9 requires concurrent drywell high pressure and RCIC steam supply pressure-low signals to isolate. However, note (m) to Technical Specification Table 3.3.2-1, items 5.b and 5.m for the RCIC steam supply pressure-low and drywell pressure-high actuation signals of the RCIC isolation trip function states that "Valve Group 9 require concurrent drywell high pressure and RCIC steam supply pressure-low signals to isolate".

2. Safety Significance:

None. The note (m) in Table 3.3.2-1 adds explanatory information not necessary for safe operation of the isolation function. This information will only add clarification to the FSAR.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate the need to revise FSAR Section 5.4.6 and, if necessary, include appropriate changes in the next annual FSAR update per 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4).

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ /

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 24, 4/13/84

Plsd316

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 825 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

"TECH SPEC PRIORITY"

MEMO TO: Tech Spec Review Personnel

FROM: C. L. Tyrone

SUBJECT: Rev. 25 to Technical Specification Problem Sheet

TSRT: 84/0934

DATE: April 16, 1984

The following changes/additions are to be incorporated into the Tech Spec Problem Sheets:

ITEM NUMBER	CHANGES/ADDITION
009	Remove Rev. 17, Insert Rev. 25
019	Remove Rev. 15, Insert Rev. 25
069	Remove Rev. 17, Insert Rev. 25
096	Remove Rev. 15, Insert Rev. 25
100	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 25
105	Remove Rev. 15, Insert Rev. 25
106	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 25
120	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 25
151	Remove Rev. 17, Insert Rev. 25
177	Remove Rev. 17, Insert Rev. 25
225	Remove Rev. 20, Insert Rev. 25
233	Remove Rev. 20 Insert Rev. 25
234	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 25

C. L. Tyrone

CLT:sad
Attachment

cc: S. H. Hobbs (w/1)
File (Tech Spec Records) (w/1)
M2sd1

"TECH SPEC PRIORITY"

ITEM NUMBER	CHANGES/ADDITION
256	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 25
281	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 25
299	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 25
305	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 25
328	Remove Rev 18, Insert Rev. 25
372	Remove Rev. —, Insert Rev. 25
826	Remove Rev. —, Insert Rev. 25
827	Remove Rev. —, Insert Rev. 25
828	Remove Rev. —, Insert Rev. 25
829	Remove Rev —, Insert Rev. 25
830	Remove Rev —, Insert Rev. 25
831	Remove Rev. —, Insert Rev. 25
832	Remove Rev —, Insert Rev. 25

cc: S. H. Hobbs (w/1)
File (Tech Spec Records) (w/1)

M2sd2

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING AS OF April 16, 1984
Date

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
001	X	1B	15, 3/29/84
002	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
003	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
004	X	2E	22, 4/09/84
005	X	1B	15, 3/29/84
006	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
007	X	2F	15, 3/29/84
008	X	2H	17, 4/01/84
009	X	2B	25, 4/16/84
010	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
011	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
012	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
013	X	3A	21, 4/08/84
014	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
015	X	1B	17, 4/01/84
016	X	1B	15, 3/29/84
017	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
018	X	3B	15, 3/29/84
019	X	2B	25, 4/16/84
020	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
021	X	1C	15, 3/29/84
022	X	2A	17, 4/01/84
023	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
024	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
025	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
026	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
027	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
028	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
029	X	3B	17, 4/01/84
030	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
031	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
032	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
033	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
034	X	1C	18, 4/02/84
035	X	2C	15, 3/29/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
036	X	2E	20, 4/06/84
037	X	1C	15, 3/29/84
038	X	1C	15, 3/29/84
039	X	2G	17, 4/01/84
040	X	2F	17, 4/01/84
041	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
042	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
043	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
044	X	3B	17, 4/01/84
045	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
046	X	2F	15, 3/29/84
047	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
048	X	2H	15, 3/29/84
049	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
050	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
051	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
052	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
053	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
054	X	1B	21, 4/08/84
055	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
056	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
057	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
058	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
059	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
060	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
061	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
062	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
063	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
064	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
065	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
066	X	2D	22, 4/09/84
067	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
068	X	3B	15, 3/29/84
069	X	2E	25, 4/16/84
070	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
071	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
072	X	2D	17, 4/01/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
073	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
074	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
075	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
076	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
077	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
078	X	1B	15, 3/29/84
079	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
080	X	N/A (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
081	X	3A	15, 3/29/84
082	X	3A	15, 3/29/84
083	X	2B	22, 4/09/84
084	X	3A	15, 3/29/84
085	X	2D	20, 4/06/84
086	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
087	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
088	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
089	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
090	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
091	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
092	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
093	X	2E	22, 4/09/84
094	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
095	X	2E	22, 4/09/84
096	X	2E	25, 4/16/84
097	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
098	X	2G	15, 3/29/84
099	X	2G	21, 4/08/84
100	X	2B	25, 4/16/84
101	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
102	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
103	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
104	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
105	X	2E	25, 4/16/84
106	X	2E	25, 4/16/84
107	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
108	X	2C	15, 3/29/84
109	X	2D	15, 3/29/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
4110	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
111	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
112	X	2A	15, 3/29/84
113	X	N/A (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
114	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
115	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
116	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
117	X	N/A (Resolved)	18, 4/02/84
118	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
119	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
120	X	2B	25, 4/16/84
121	X	N/A (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
122	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
123	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
124	X	2C	18, 4/02/84
125	X	N/A (Resolved)	18, 4/02/84
126	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
127	X	2G	17, 4/01/84
128	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
129	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
130	X	N/A (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
131	X	2G	15, 3/29/84
132	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
133	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
134	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
135	X	N/A (Resolved)	18, 4/02/84
136	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
137	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
138	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
139	X	1C	15, 3/29/84
140	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
141	X	2F	17, 4/01/84
142	X	2F	15, 3/29/84
143	X	2G	15, 3/29/84
144	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
145	X	2F	17, 4/01/84
146	X	2E	15, 3/29/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
147	X	3B	16, 3/31/84
148	X	3A	17, 4/01/84
149	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
150	X	2G	17, 4/01/84
151	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
152	X	2E	16, 3/31/84
153	X	2H	17, 4/01/84
154	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
155	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
156	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
157	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
158	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
159	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
160	X	2E	21, 4/08/84
161	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
162	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
163	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
164	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
165	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
166	X	3B	17, 4/01/84
167	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
168	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
169	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
170	X	2E	16, 3/31/84
171	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
172	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
173	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
174	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
175	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
176	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
177	X	2D	25, 4/16/84
178	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
179	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
180	X	2A	17, 4/01/84
181	X	2F	17, 4/01/84
182	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
183	X	2D	18, 4/02/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RFD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
184	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
185	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
186	X	N/A (Resolved)	18, 4/02/84
187	X	2G	18, 4/02/84
188	X	3B (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
189	X	2H	18, 4/02/84
190	X	2D	20, 4/06/84
191	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
192	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
193	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
194	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
195	X	3A	18, 4/02/84
196	X	2B	16, 3/31/84
197	X	3A	21, 4/08/84
198	X	1C	16, 3/31/84
199	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
200	X	2G	18, 4/02/84
201	X	2B	22, 4/09/84
202	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
203	X	2D	22, 4/09/84
204	X	2H	18, 4/02/84
205	X	2H	16, 3/31/84
206	X	2G	16, 3/31/84
207	X	2H	18, 4/02/84
208	X	2H	18, 4/02/84
209	X	2H	15, 3/29/84
210	X	2G	18, 4/02/84
211	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
212	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
213	X	1C	16, 3/31/84
214	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
215	X	3B	16, 3/31/84
216	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
217	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
218	X	3A	21, 4/08/84
219	X	2I	16, 3/31/84
220	X	3A	18, 4/02/84

L26sd6

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
221	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
222	X	3B	16, 3/31/84
223	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
224	X	3B	16, 3/31/84
225	X	2D	25, 4/16/84
226	X	3A	18, 4/02/84
227	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
228	X	3B	17, 4/01/84
229	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
230	X	2B (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
231	X	3B	17, 4/01/84
232	X	3B	17, 4/01/84
233	X	2E	25, 4/16/84
234	X	3A	25, 4/16/84
235	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
236	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
237	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
238	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
239	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
240	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
241	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
242	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
243	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
244	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
245	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
246	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
247	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
248	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
249	X	2D	22, 4/09/84
250	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
251	X	2F	18, 4/02/84
252	X	*3B	18, 4/02/84
253	X	2C	18, 4/02/84
254	X	3B	18, 4/02/84

* Priority changed from 1A per J. C. Roberts 3/27/84.

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
255	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
256	X	2E	25, 4/16/84
256-1	X	Sub, 2E	18, 4/02/84
257	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
258	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
259	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
260	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
261	X	3A	18, 4/02/84
262	X	1C	16, 3/31/84
263	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
264	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
265	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
266	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
267	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
268	X	2F	18, 4/02/84
269	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
270	X	2E	22, 4/09/84
271	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
272	X	2D	22, 4/09/84
273	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
274	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
275	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
276	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
277	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
278	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
279	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
280	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
281	X	2E	25, 4/16/84
282	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
283	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
284	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
285	X	1C	18, 4/02/84
286	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
287	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
288	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
289	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
290	X	2E	18, 4/02/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
291	X	*3B	18, 4/02/84
292	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
293	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
294	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
295	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
296	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
297	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
298	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
299	X	2B	25, 4/16/84
300	X	3A	18, 4/02/84
301	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
302	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
303	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
304	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
305	X	2I	25, 4/16/84
306	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
307	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
308	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
309	X	2A	18, 4/02/84
310	X	2A	18, 4/02/84
311	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
312	X	2B	22, 4/09/84
313	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
314	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
315	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
316	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
317	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
318	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
319	X	2E	21, 4/08/84
320	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
321	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
322	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
323	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
324	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
325	X	2I	18, 4/02/84

* Priority changed from 1A per J. C. Roberts 3/27/84.

L26sd9

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
326	X	2I	18, 4/02/84
327	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
328	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
329	X	1C	18, 4/02/84
330	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
331	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
332	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
333	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
334	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
335	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
336	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
337	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
338	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
339	X	2I	18, 4/02/84
340	X	2I	18, 4/02/84
341	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
342	X	2B	19, 4/05/84
343	X	2D	19, 4/05/84
344	X	1B	19, 4/05/84
345	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
346	X	2B	23, 4/10/84
347	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
348	X	2E	21, 4/08/84
349	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
350	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
351	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
352	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
353	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
354	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
355	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
356	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
357	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
358	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
359	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
360	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
361	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
362	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
363	X	2D	21, 4/08/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
364	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
365	X	2D	24, 4/13/84
366	X	2D	24, 4/13/84
367	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
368	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
369	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
370	X	3A	24, 4/13/84
371	X	2D	24, 4/13/84
372	X	2B	25, 4/16/84
800	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
801	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
802	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
803	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
804	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
805	X	3B	24, 3/13/84
806	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
807	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
808	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
809	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
810	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
811	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
812	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
813	X	3B	22, 4/09/84
814	X	3B	22, 4/09/84
815	X	3B	22, 4/09/84
816	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
817	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
818	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
819	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
820	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
821	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
822	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
823	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
824	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
825	X	3B	24, 4/13/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
826	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
827	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
828	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
829	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
830	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
831	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
832	X	3B	25, 4/16/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 009 Priority: 2B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.3.7.6, 3.9.2 and Table 3.3.6-1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-50, 3/4 3-73, 3/4 9-3

Problem Title: SRM Operability Requirements

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

The Technical Specifications give different requirements for the minimum number of operable source range monitor (SRM) channels in the same applicable operational conditions.

1. Technical Specification Table 3.3.6-1, Item 3 requires a minimum of four operable SRM channels per trip function in Operational Conditions 2 and 5.
2. Technical Specification 3.3.7.6 states that at least three SRM channels be operable in Operational Condition 2* (with IRMs on range 2 or below), 3 and 4. However, preliminary investigation indicates that four are required.
3. Technical Specification 3.9.2 requires that at least two SRM channels be operable and inserted to the normal operating level with several additional special requirements in Operational Condition 5.

2. Safety Significance:

None. There are different requirements for the minimum number of Operable SRM channels in the same operational condition because some requirements are addressing control rod block trip functions and other requirements are addressing the monitoring of the neutron level in the core.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate the different requirements for the required minimum number of operable SRM channels in Operational Conditions 2 and 5 (with respect to control rod block trip functions and monitoring of the neutron level in the core). Propose Technical Specification changes if necessary.

Rev. 25, 4/16/84

Mlsd14

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 009 Priority: 2B

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0153, page 14
TSRT-84/0283, pages 1, 2, 4, 8, and 9.

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 019 Priority: 2B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 4.6.7.3.b.1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 6-58

Problem Title: Drywell Purge Flow Rate Definition

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
Technical Specification 4.6.7.3.b.1 requires verification of a drywell purge flow rate of 1000 cfm every 18 months. However, MP&L's response to NUREG-0588 specified a drywell purge flow rate of 1000 scfm. Since the flow rate is temperature and pressure dependent, it may be appropriate to require scfm flow rates to meet NUREG-0588 requirements.

Delete the word "continued" adjacent to "Surveillance Requirements" under Technical Specification 3.6.7.3.

2. Safety Significance:
Adequate drywell purge flow is needed to ensure that drywell conditions are maintained within equipment qualification limits. The use of cfm instead of scfm may result in flow rates less conservative than those required to meet qualification requirements. MP&L surveillance procedures require the use of the more conservative method.

3. Anticipated Resolution:
Review requirements of the response to NUREG-0588 and evaluate whether a Technical Specifications revision from cfm to scfm is required. Present plant surveillance procedures use scfm.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____/_____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 25, 4/16/84

Mled23

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number 019 Priority 2B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0440, Page 5

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 069 Priority: 2E

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 4.6.7.2

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 6-57

Problem Title: H2 Igniter Surveillance

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Surveillance Requirement 4.6.7.2.a specifies that at least 41 hydrogen igniter glow plugs per containment and drywell hydrogen ignition subsystem must be verified to be energized after the supply breakers are energized during the surveillance test. The wording for this Surveillance Requirement may need clarification since there is a question whether the igniter glow plugs are energized after the supply breakers are energized. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has suggested that the Surveillance Requirement should be supplemented with an additional requirement to ensure operability for a minimum of one igniter on each redundant circuit in an enclosed region. A question has been raised with respect to the NRC's suggestion that if all inoperable igniters were located in the drywell, igniter coverage in the drywell might be inadequate.

2. Safety Significance:

The wording of the Surveillance Requirement has no safety significance since the igniters will be determined to be operable regardless of whether or not they are energized after the supply breakers are energized or after some other action. Igniters from redundant emergency safeguard feature power supplies are located in each enclosed region in the containment or drywell. The present requirement for containment and drywell hydrogen ignition subsystem operability would allow 41 out of 45 glow plugs to be operable. It is possible that, of the 4 igniters per division which could be inoperable, igniters from both divisions in an enclosed region could be inoperable at the same time. This could create conditions which allow pocketing of hydrogen in enclosed regions.

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 069 Priority 2E

The issue of all inoperable igniters from each igniter subsystem being located in the drywell has no safety significance. The igniter system has been designed with sufficient redundancy so that the igniters powered from a single division would be sufficient to assure initiation of hydrogen combustion, in the drywell or containment. Thus, inoperability of 8 igniters in the drywell would not impair the hydrogen ignition system's ability to perform its intended function.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

A review by the Architect/Engineer concluded that the wide spread distribution of the igniters provides assurance that the system would perform its intended function even with up to 4 igniters per division inoperable. An additional evaluation will be completed to determine if the wording for Surveillance Requirement 4.6.7.2.a should be modified so that it accurately reflects how the igniter glow plugs are energized. An additional evaluation will be performed to determine if the igniter glow plug operability requirements should be modified to require operability of at least one glow plug per redundant circuit in an enclosed region. This evaluation will also confirm that inoperability of up to 4 igniters in the drywell per igniter subsystem is acceptable.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 069 Priority 2E

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0341, page 27 (items 1 and 2), page 12-14
AECM-82/193

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 096 Priority: 2E

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 6.5.2.7

Tech Spec Page: 6-10

Problem Title: SRC Duties - ALARA

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

FSAR Section 12.1.1.2 states that the Safety Review Committee (SRC) will review the audits of ALARA appraisals semiannually. This item is not included in the list of items to be reviewed by the SRC in Technical Specification 6.5.2.7.

2. Safety Significance:

None. This item has no impact on plant safety.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Investigate the necessity of changing Technical Specification 6.5.2.7 to add review of ALARA appraisals to SRC duties.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ /

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

/

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0741, pages 8 and 14
TSRT-84/0550

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 25, 4/16/84

Mlsd169

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 100 Priority: 2B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Table 3.7.8-1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 7-44

Problem Title: ESF Switchgear and Battery Room Maximum Temperature

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

During the environmental qualification review performed in response to NUREG-0588, Bechtel determined that the control building ESF switchgear and battery room maximum temperature specified in Technical Specification 3/4.7.8 should be reduced to 90°F from 104°F. This temperature reduction is necessary to maintain a 40-year lifetime rating for the ESF switchgear transformer. The existing ventilation system for the ESF switchgear and battery room may not be able to maintain the area temperature at 90°F during some portions of the year. Other temperatures within Table 3.7.8-1 may not reflect or be consistent with NUREG-0588 qualification assumptions.

2. Safety Significance:

None. The effect of subjecting equipment to an elevated normal operating temperature is limited to a reduction in its qualified lifetime. The equipment would operate as required to satisfy its design function with a shortened qualified life.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

A design modification is being implemented to provide additional ventilation to the ESF switchgear and battery room to permit the normal operating area temperature to be maintained below 90°F. The Bechtel environmental qualification analysis for the ESF switchgear transformer will be reviewed and a Technical Specification change to the room temperature limit will be submitted if necessary. An engineering evaluation of any equipment in the ESF switchgear and battery room which experiences an elevated normal operating temperature will be performed to determine the associated reductions in

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number 100 Priority 2B

qualified life for the affected equipment. The results of this investigation will be incoprorated into appropriate maintenance and surveillance programs to ensure proper equipment qualifications. Evaluate Table 3.7.8-1 to determine if it should reflect NUREG-0588 requirements.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0750

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 105 Priority: 2E

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 5.1.3, (Figure 5.1.1-1 note 3, Figure 5.1.2-1 note 2, 5.1.3-1

Tech Spec Page: 5-1, 5-2, 5-3, and 5-4

Problem Title: Effluent Release Boundary for Gaseous and Liquid Effluent

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

a) The terminology "Unrestricted Area Boundary" used in Technical Specification 5.1.3 is incorrect for gaseous and liquid effluents. "Effluent release boundary" is the appropriate terminology for the Technical Specification. "Unrestricted area boundary" is also used in the text of Technical Specification 5.1.3, and in the title of Figure 5.1.3-1, and in note 3 of Figure 5.1.1-1. b) A typographical error exists in note 3 of Figure 5.1.1-1, as it references "Figure 5.1.4-1" instead of the correct "Figure 5.1.3-1." c) A typographical error exists on Figure 5.1.2-1, note 2; "if" should be "is."

2. Safety Significance:

None. The change is purely administrative in nature, since it involves only the correction of terminology and typographical errors.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Submit proposed Technical Specification changes to correct the terminology in Technical Specification 5.1.3, Figure 5.1.1-1 note 3, and Figure 5.1.3-1 and the typographical errors in Figure 5.1.1-1, note 3 and Figure 5.1.2-1, note 2.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ /

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 25, 4/16/84

Mlsd185

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number 105 Priority 2E

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0211

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 106 Priority: 2E

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 6.5.1.2

Tech Spec Page: 6-7

Problem Title: Change in PSRC Membership

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Technical Specification 6.5.1.2 currently limits the Plant Safety Review Committee (PSRC) composition to seven members. This proposed change would add two members to the PSRC. The plant responsibilities of the proposed new members are described in FSAR Section 13.1.2.2.10.

2. Safety Significance:

None. The proposed change would add two members whose job specification requires a broad-based knowledge of GGNS operation and would enhance the capabilities of the PSRC by permitting the insights based on these new members functional responsibilities to be utilized in the review function.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

A Technical Specification change has been proposed to the NRC in a letter from L. F. Dale to H. R. Denton, dated September 9, 1983 (AECM-83/0565, Item 20).

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 25, 4/16/84

Mlsd187

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 106 Priority: 2E

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0551

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 120 Priority: 2B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Tables. 3.3.7.1-1, 4.3.7.1-1, 3.3.7.12-1, and 4.3.7.12-1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-56, 3-59, 3-90, 3-94

Problem Title: Offgas Pretreatment and Post-treatment Radiation Monitors

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

The offgas pre-treatment and post-treatment radiation monitors appear in Tables 3.3.7.1-1, 4.3.7.1-1, 3.3.7.12-1, and 4.3.7.12-1. Tables 3.3.7.1-1 and 4.3.7.1-1 identify requirements for radiation monitors while Tables 3.3.7.12-1 and 4.3.7.12-1 identify requirements for radioactive gaseous effluent monitors. Since the offgas pre-treatment and post-treatment radiation monitors provide a gaseous effluent monitoring function, the instruments should be included in Tables 3.3.7.12-1 and 4.3.7.12-1 and not in Tables 3.3.7.1-1 and 4.3.7.1-1.

The minimum number of operable channels for the offgas post-treatment monitors should be increased to 2 for consistency with the GE Standard Technical Specifications.

2. Safety Significance:

None. The changes are purely administrative and will provide consistency in the Technical Specifications.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Mississippi Power & Light Company submitted the changes required to resolve this item in a letter to H. R. Denton from L. F. Dale, dated September 9, 1983 (AECM-83/0565).

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ /

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 25, 4/16/84

M1sd211

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number 120 Priority 2B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0264, page 8

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 151 Priority: 3B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Table 2.2.1-1, Item 2

Tech Spec Page: 2-4

Problem Title: APRM Power Setpoint Discrepancy

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

a. Section 7.2.2 of the Safety Evaluation Report (SER) for Grand Gulf (NUREG-0831) states:

"The average power range monitor for Grand Gulf is designed to permit different setpoints for slow and rapid changes in flux level. Each APRM signal is fed to two trip amplifers rather than one. The APRM signal is connected directly to one trip amplifier that operates with a fixed high speed trip point to be specified in the Technical Specifications, but no more than 112.5 percent power according to the current FSAR."

b. Technical Specification Table 2.2.1-1 item 2 lists the allowable values for APRM neutron flux-high as less than or equal to 120 percent of rated thermal power.

2. Safety Significance:

None. The Technical Specifications are correctly written to the current General Electric Specification data sheet 22A3739AE Revision 4, Sheet 11.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

A change to FSAR Table 7.2.1 will be submitted.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ /

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 25, 4/16/84

M1sd262

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 151 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

References: 1) TSRT-84/0235

2) TSRT-84/0648, page 11

cc: J. E. Cross

R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 177 Priority: 2D

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.8.2.2

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 8-14

Problem Title: D.C. Sources - Operating and Shutdown - Action Statement

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Action Statement c. of Technical Specification 3.8.2.2 is not worded consistently with Action Statement c. of Technical Specification 3.8.2.1. Both of these Action Statements require completion of essentially the same action and the Action Statements should be worded consistently to avoid any possible confusion. In Technical Specification 3.8.2.2 Action Statement c., the phrase "with the above required full capacity charger inoperable..." should be changed to "with one of the above required full capacity chargers inoperable."

2. Safety Significance:

None. The Technical Specifications are correct as currently worded and reflect the requirements for D.C. sources - operating and shutdown.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

None. The wording of each Technical Specification is correct for that Technical Specification. No changes are required.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 25, 4/16/84

Mlsd308

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 177 Priority: 2D

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0422

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 225 Priority: 2D

NRC (I&E plus NRR) /1/24/84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Figures That Are Illegible or Contain Nonsafety-Related Errors.

Tech Spec Page: Applicable Pages

Problem Title: Illegible Figure Unrestricted Area Boundary

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Various Technical Specification Figures have been identified as being difficult to read to the point of being illegible. Some of these include inappropriate terminolgy or misspelled words as well (e.g. unrestricted area boundary should be site boundary).

Additionally, Figure 5.1.3-1 which is presently illegible must be corrected such that it is legible and well marked. This figure must also identify the "site" with respect to Technical Specification 3.1.2.1.

2. Safety Significance:

None. This is an enhancement item. These figures can presently be obtained from the FSAR or other plant specific documents.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Review those figures considered illegible and obtain new and corrected figures, as appropriate, for inclusion into the Techncial Specifications.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 25, 4/16/84

Plsd49

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 225 Priority: 2D

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

References: TSRI-84/0035
TSRT-84/0220
TSRT-84/0212
TSRT-84/0210
TSRT-84/0288
TSRT-84/0211
Proof and Review comments from Enclosure 3, Attachment A, Items 8 and 9 of Category 1

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 233 Priority: 2E

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 4.5.1.b, 4.6.3.2.b

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 5-4, 3/4 6-24

Problem Title: RHR Flows for Containment Spray Mode

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
The flow rates for the RHR pumps required in Surveillance Requirements 4.5.1.b and 4.6.3.2.b are not consistent. Surveillance Requirement 4.5.1.b, which is the flow test for low pressure coolant injection (LPCI), requires a flow of 7,450 gpm through the RHR heat exchanger to the suppression pool, while Surveillance Requirement 4.6.3.2.b, for the containment spray system, only requires a flow of 5,650 gpm. It appears that the containment spray flow rate of 5,650 gpm was taken from the design value of flow at the spray nozzles (see FSAR Figures 5.4-18 and 19 and FSAR Section 6.5.2.2). This flow value is lower than the LPCI value of 7,450 gpm since the RHR pump must overcome a greater head to deliver flow to the nozzles. Therefore, testing to confirm a flow rate of 7,450 gpm through the heat exchangers to the suppression pool should be sufficient to demonstrate adequate flow at the spray nozzles.

2. Safety Significance:
None. The requirements of 4.5.1.b and 4.6.3.2.b may not be satisfied by the performance of the same surveillance procedure. This procedure verifies that a flow of 7,450 gpm is delivered through the heat exchangers to the suppression pool.

3. Anticipated Resolution:
Verify that a tested flow rate of 7,450 gpm through the RHR heat exchangers to the suppression pool corresponds to the required flow rate of 5,650 gpm at the spray nozzles. A Technical Specification change may be required to assure that the performance test will demonstrate containment spray operability.

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 233 Priority: 2E

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: The ECCS scope of Problem Sheet 233 has been transferred to Problem Sheet 344.

Items Closed: (How) _____ _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0585, Page 22

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 234 Priority: 3A

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 4.3.7.5-1, 4.5.3.1, 4.6.3.1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-72, 3/4 5-9, 3/4 6-22

Problem Title: Suppression Pool Water Level

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

An NRC inspector identified in his exit interview on February 24, 1984, the following:

FSAR Section 6.2.7.5 indicates that the suppression pool level indication system is made up of four level detector channels, (two detector channels per division). It also indicates that each of these channels provides a high-water-level alarm, low-water-level alarm, low-low-water-level alarm, as well as a signal to open suppression pool makeup valves.

In actuality, there are three active level detector channels per division. Two channels are wide range and one channel is narrow range. There is also one additional channel per division which is only used for indication at the remote shutdown panel. Each wide range channel supplies input to their respective division's suppression pool makeup system in a one-out-of-two logic as well as providing a low-low-level alarm at 16 feet 10 inches. The narrow range channel in each division provides the divisional low-level and high-level alarms (18 feet 5 1/2 inches and 18 feet 9 inches, respectively). Surveillance Requirements 4.3.7.5-1 (Item 3), 4.5.3.1, and 4.6.3.1.c are written to conform to the FSAR but are not in clear agreement with actual plant design.

2. Safety Significance:

None. The provisions in the current Technical Specifications, FSAR, and plant design can cause misinterpretation as to which instrument channel is being addressed and which Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) and Surveillance Requirement apply.

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 234 Priority: 3A

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate and submit changes to FSAR and Technical Specifications to make them consistent with plant design and to be specific as to which channel and associated requirements are being addressed.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

References: TSRT-84/0243
TSRT-84/0461
TSRT-84/0621
TSRT-84/0329

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 256 Priority: 2E

/3-15-84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.7.4, Bases 3/4.7.4, Bases 3/4.5.1, and 3/4.5.2

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 7-13, B3/4 7-2, and B3/4 5-1

Problem Title: Generic Bases Problems

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Minor typographical errors were found and identified on pages 3/4 7-13 and B 3/4 7-2 of the GGNS Technical Specifications. Also, the values for high pressure core spray (HPCS) operating pressures were not revised in Bases 3/4.5.1 and 2 when those values were changed in Technical Specification 4.5.1 by Amendment 9.

2. Safety Significance:

None: These are minor typographical errors and inadvertent omissions which do affect plant safety or operational requirements.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Propose a Technical Specification change to correct the typographical error on page 3/4 7-13 from "maintanence" to "maintenance" and page B3/4 7-2 from "enusre" to "ensure." Also propose a change to correct the HPCS operating pressures in Bases 3/4.5.1 and 2 to be consistent with the values in Technical Specification 4.5.1 if necessary.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ /

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 25, 4/16/84

P1sd101

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 256 Priority: 2E

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

References: TSRT-84/0143, Page 9
TSRT-84/0447, Pages 4 - 9
TSRT-84/0649, Page 11
TSRT-84/0651, Pages 12 and 13
TSRT-84/0554, Page 5 and 6
TSRT-84/0882, Page 1

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 281 Priority: 2E

Burgess / 3/14/84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 5.3.1

Tech Spec Page: 5-5

Problem Title: Fuel Assemblies

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Technical Specification 5.3.1 lists the maximum average enrichments for the fuel assemblies in the initial core loading and in subsequent core reloads. The values of enrichment in this Technical Specification are not consistent with the loaded core design.

2. Safety Significance:

None. The cycle analyses performed by the fuel vendor verify the existing core design to meet all 10 CFR 50 design criteria with adequate margin. These analyses were performed using the core design data and not the Technical Specification 5.3.1 values.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

An evaluation of the fuel assemblies Technical Specification will be performed and appropriate Technical Specification revisions submitted as necessary. The core reload parameters may be addressed in the reload licensing submittal.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 25, 4/16/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 281 Priority: 2E

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0738, Pages 1 - 5
TSRT-84/0233, Page 1

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 299 Priority: 2B

R. W. McNally / 3/16/84 R. C. Slovic

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3/4.7.6.3

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 7-33, 7-34

Problem Title: CO_2 Storage Tank Level

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

GGNS Technical Specification 4.7.6.3.2.a requires at least a 50 percent level in the CO_2 storage tank. A Bechtel analysis concluded that the amount of CO_2 represented by this minimum level would not be sufficient to satisfy the design requirement for two system discharges to the largest room protected by the CO_2 system and one purge of the main generator. This preliminary evaluation indicates that a minimum 60 percent level in the CO_2 storage tank would be necessary to meet the design requirements.

Technical Specification 3.7.6.3 contains two minor typographical errors in the list of areas having CO_2 protection. The Auxiliary Building elevation should be revised from 139' 6" to 139' 0". The system number for the motor generator room should be revised from N1P64D214 to N1P64D214B. These corrections should be included in any Technical Specification changes resulting from the CO_2 tank level concern.

2. Safety Significance:

The existing CO_2 storage tank level requirement may not be sufficient to fulfill the design intent for the system.

The typographical errors do not involve a safety implication. The errors are minor and do not affect system performance.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

A review of the Bechtel analysis will be performed. If the results of this evaluation confirm the preliminary conclusions, a Technical Specification change will be proposed to reflect the corrected CO_2 storage tank minimum level.

Rev. 25, 4/16/84

P1sd181

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number 299 Priority 2B

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: NPE concurs with correcting system number to N1P64D214B. (See TSRI-84/0079, PDTS-84/0061)

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0521, Pages 2, 3, and 18

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 305 Priority: 2I

Identified By / Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3/4 (New Specification)

Tech Spec Page: N/A

Problem Title: Potential For Plant Flooding From Probable Maximum Precipitation

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

The evaluation for the local Probable Maximum Precipitation (PMP) on the plant area presented in the SER (Section 2.4.4) was based on a finished plant grade of elevation 132.5 feet mean sea level and a finished entrance floor level of 133.0 feet mean sea level. It was concluded that runoff from the local PMP would not exceed elevation 133.0 feet mean sea level in the plant area. It was subsequently determined that (1) finished plant grade on some areas (mainly parking areas) exceeded the 132.5 feet mean sea level, (2) some drainage swales in the main plant area had been filled in, (3) berms and fencing for security might impede local runoff, and (4) security skirting on trailers parked in the main plant area would block flow and impede runoff from local intense storms. These changes from the original design condition might induce flood levels above the 133.0 feet mean sea level finished floor elevation and cause flooding of safety-related equipment.

In order to ensure that proper flood protection is maintained, a new Grand Gulf Technical Specification has been proposed which is consistent with the BWR/6 Standard Technical Specifications, the provisions of which have been approved by the NRC. However, BWR/6 Standard Technical Specification 3/4.7.3 states that 3/4.7.3 is not required if the facility design has adequate passive flood control protection features sufficient to accommodate the Design Basis Flood identified in Regulatory Guide 1.59, August 1973.

2. Safety Significance:

The potential exists for PMP flood levels reaching above the 133.0 feet mean sea level finished floor elevation.

Rev. 25, 4/16/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET(CONT'D)

Item Number: 305 Priority: 2I

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Perform an evaluation to determine the need for the new Technical Specification addressing this issue. Submit the new Technical Specification, if deemed required.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0928

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 328 Priority: 3B

Dave Noonan / 3/13/84 J. Catlin

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Table 3.3.7.5-1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-70

Problem Title: Containment/Drywell Area Radiation Monitor Minimum Channels Operable

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Technical Specification Table 3.3.7.5-1 item 13 requires one minimum operable channel each for containment and drywell area monitors. However, GE Standard Technical Specifications (STS) Table 3.3.7.5-1, item 14 requires two minimum operable channels each for containment and drywell area monitors and GGNS has committed to having two channels operable. Also, the note at the bottom of Table 3.3.7.5-1 in the Standard Technical Specification indicates "secondary containment and drywell," whereas the corresponding GGNS note states "containment and drywell." There is no Action Statement for item 13 for less than the Required Channels Operable. Action 81 does not include less than Required Channels Operable.

2. Safety Significance:

None. The proposed change does not affect the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction. The proposed change enhances the assurance that the system will perform its intended monitoring function.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Perform an evaluation to determine if two channels are required. Verify that the note at the bottom of Technical Specification Table 3.3.7.5-1 is correct. Submit Technical Specification changes, if necessary. Evaluate item 13 and Action 81 to make them consistent.

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 328 Priority: 3B

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 372 Priority: 2B

S. Loeper / 4/16/84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Tables 3.3.2-1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-10

Problem Title: Manual Initiation of Valve Group 6A

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

According to Isolation Actuation Instrumentation Technical Specification Table 3.3.2-1, valve group 6A receives a closure signal from manual initiation (item 1.h) of primary containment isolation. Eight valves in group 6A do not close from the manual initiation of primary containment isolation. These valves isolate chilled water to the drywell coolers (P44-F070, P44-F069, P44-F053, P44-F076, P44-F074 and P44-F077) and the auxiliary building floor and equipment drain tanks line to the suppression pool (P45-F273 and P45-F274).

2. Safety Significance:

The accident analysis does not take credit for the manual initiation function for primary containment isolation. Automatic isolation signals are assumed to provide the necessary isolation function. Emergency and off-normal procedures for the plant do not take credit for the manual initiation of primary containment isolation. Since the automatic isolation signals close all group 6A valves, the subject problem description is not safety significant. However, Technical Specification Table 3.3.2-1 is currently misleading and can lead to mininterpretation as to which valves receive manual initiation isolation signals.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate the problem to determine if a plant design change or Technical Specification change is required.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 25, 4/16/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 372 Priority: 2B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 826 Priority: 3B

J. G. Cesare / _____

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3/4.7.9; FSAR Section 9.1.3.4; SER Section 9.1.3

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 7-45; FSAR Page 9.1-17; SER Page 9-4

Problem Title: SER/Periodic Operation of Spare Fuel Pool Cooling Pump

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Technical Specification 3.7.9 requires that the spent fuel storage pool be maintained at less than or equal to 150°F, but does not explicitly address operability requirements for system components. Operability is discussed in Section 9.1.3.4 of the FSAR, which states that the "spare" system components (i.e., the pump, heat exchanger, and filter-demineralizer) are operated periodically to handle abnormal heat loads or to allow the normal components to be serviced.

Section 9.1.3 of the Safety Evaluation Report (SER) presently states that the spare pump will be operated periodically in accordance with plant Technical Specifications. As stated above, the Technical Specifications do not explicitly require the spare pump to be operated periodically; therefore, the SER is not consistent with respect to its reference to the Technical Specifications. The SER may need to be revised to state that the spare pump will be operated periodically in accordance with the FSAR.

2. Safety Significance:

Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Investigate the need to request a change to the SER in an SER supplement to correctly address the periodic operation of the spare fuel pool cooling pump.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 25, 4/16/84

Plsd317.1

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 826 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: LCTS Item Number 198
TSRT-84/0102

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 827 Priority: 3B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3/4.7.6.1, FSAR 9.5.1.2.1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 7-28

Problem Title: Firewater Storage Tank Automatic Level Makeup

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

FSAR 9.5.1.2.1 states that automatic makeup to the storage tank occurs at 18" below the overflow pipe. The actual makeup point is 45" below the overflow pipe. FSAR also states the system is maintained at 125 psig vs. Technical Specification 120 psig.

2. Safety Significance:

None. The actual makeup point provides adequate water volume in the fire storage tanks. The water of 120 psig is adequate as only 118 psig is required for maximum 2717 gpm for sprinkler flow plus 1000 gpm for hose strains.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Review FSAR 9.5.1.2.1 to reflect the proper level of 45". Revise FSAR 9.5.1.2.1 and 9.5.1.2.2.1 to reflect 120 psig.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____/_____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____/_____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 25, 4/16/84

P1sd318

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 828 Priority: 3B

S. M. Feith / _____

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3/4.3.5; FSAR Section 7.4.1.1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-44 through 3-49; FSAR Pages 7.4-3 & 7.4-5

Problem Title: FSAR/RCIC Actuation on Reactor Low-Water Level

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

FSAR Sections 7.4.1.1.3.2 and 7.4.1.1.3.5 indicate that the reactor core isolation cooling (RCIC) system is actuated by a reactor low-water level signal. This is different that the title for the functional unit in Technical Specification Tables 3.3.5-1, 3.3.5-2, and 4.3.5.1-1 which indicate that RCIC is actuated by the reactor vessel water level-low low, Level 2 signal.

2. Safety Significance:

Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Review the discussions contained in FSAR Sections 7.4.1.1.3.2 and 7.4.1.1.3.5 with respect to the need to indicate the title for the functional unit that actuates RCIC. If necessary, include the appropriate changes in the next annual FSAR update per 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4).

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 25, 4/16/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 828 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____ _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0903, Item 3

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 25, 4/16/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 829 Priority: 3B

S. M. Feith / 4/4/84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3/4.4.4; FSAR Table 5.2-6

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 4-11, 4-12 and 4-13

Problem Title: FSAR/Reactor Coolant System Chemistry Requirements

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

a. FSAR Table 5.2-6 (Coolant Chemistry Requirements) requires that the reactor be shutdown if the pH is out of limits for 24 hours. However, Technical Specification 3.4.4.a.2 allows the pH to be out of limits for up to 72 hours before taking action.

b. FSAR Table 5.2-6 requires checking the continuous conductivity monitor with an in-line flow cell once a week and performance of an in-line conductivity calibration every 24 hours whenever the reactor coolant conductivity is 1.0 umho/cm at 25°C. Technical Specification Surveillance Requirement 4.4.4.d requires the performance of a channel check of the continuous conductivity monitor with an in-line flow cell at least once per 7 days and 24 hours whenever conductivity is greater than the limit in Technical Specification Table 3.4.4-1.

2. Safety Significance:

Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate the need to revise FSAR Table 5.2-6 and, if necessary, include appropriate changes in the next annual FSAR update per 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4).

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 25, 4/16/84

Plsd321

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 829 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 830 Priority: 3B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.4.1.4; FSAR Section 5.3.3.6

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 4-4; FSAR Page 5.3-21

Problem Title: FSAR/Temperature Difference Between Dome and Bottom Head-Drain

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

FSAR Section 5.3.3.6 states that if the coolant temperature difference between the dome and the bottom head drain exceeds 145°F, neither reactor power level nor recirculation pump flow shall be increased. This temperature limit value is for BWR 4/5 plants and is incorrect for BWR/6 plants. The correct value for BWR/6 plants in 100°F as specified in Technical Specification 3.4.1.4.

2. Safety Significance:

Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Revise the temperature limit value identified in FSAR Section 5.3.3.6 in the next annual FSAR update per 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4).

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____/_____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____/_____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 25, 4/16/84

Plsd323

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 831 Priority: 3B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Table 3.3.1-2; FSAR Table 7.2-5

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-6; FSAR Table 7.2-5

Problem Title: FSAR/RPS Response Times

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

FSAR Table 7.2-5, RPS time response (design), gives incorrect response times for the reactor vessel low water level, the reactor vessel high water level, the turbine stop valve closure, and the turbine control valve fast closure functions. Technical Specification Table 3.3.1-2 identifies the correct response times which are in agreement with GE Design Specification 22A3771AE, as supplemented by letter number MPGE-82/077.

2. Safety Significance:

Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Review FSAR Table 7.2-5 with respect to the response times identified in Technical Specification Table 3.3.1-2 and, if necessary, include appropriate changes in the next annual FSAR update per 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4).

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____/_____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____/_____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross

R. F. Rogers

Rev. 25, 4/16/84

Plsd324

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 832 Priority: 3B

C. D. Stafford / 3/17/84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.6.6.3; FSAR Section 7.3.1.1.8.2

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 6-53; FSAR Page 7.3-67

Problem Title: FSAR/Incorrect Description of SGTS Logic

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

FSAR Section 7.3.1.1.8.2 is incorrect in stating that any manual or automatic initiation signal starts both trains of the standby gas treatment system (SGTS). The logic for the SGTS is divisional and will only start its associated SGTS train. The system design and Technical Specification 3.6.6.3 are consistent with divisional separation criteria.

2. Safety Significance:

Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Revise FSAR to reflect correct as-built configuration of the SGTS logic in the next annual FSAR update per 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4).

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 25, 4/16/84

Plsd325

"TECH SPEC PRIORITY"

MEMO TO: Tech Spec Review Personnel

FROM: C. L. Tyrone

SUBJECT: Rev. 26 to Technical Specification Problem Sheet

TSRT: 84/ 0939

DATE: April 24, 1984

The following changes/additions are to be incorporated into the Tech Spec Problem Sheets:

ITEM NUMBER	CHANGES/ADDITION
002	Remove Rev. 15, Insert Rev. 26
012 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 26
013 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 21, Insert Rev. 26
025 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 17, Insert Rev. 26
027 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 17, Insert Rev. 26
036 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 20, Insert Rev. 26
042 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 15, Insert Rev. 26
044 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 17, Insert Rev. 26
064 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 15, Insert Rev. 26
065	Remove Rev. 15, Insert Rev. 26
069 (3 pgs)	Remove Rev. 25, Insert Rev. 26
070 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 13, Insert Rev. 26
071 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 17, Insert Rev. 26

C. L. Tyrone

CLT:sad
Attachment

cc: S. H. Hobbs (w/1)
File (Tech Spec Records) (w/1)
M2sd1

"TECH SPEC PRIORITY"

ITEM NUMBER	CHANGES/ADDITION
094 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 21, Insert Rev. 26
128	Remove Rev. 17, Insert Rev. 26
131	Remove Rev. 15, Insert Rev. 26
166 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 17, Insert Rev. 26
181 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 17, Insert Rev. 26
195 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 26
197 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 21, Insert Rev. 26
211 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 26
214 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 21, Insert Rev. 26
218 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 21, Insert Rev. 26
222 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 16, Insert Rev. 26
223 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 17, Insert Rev. 26
241 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 17, Insert Rev. 26
259 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 26
271 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 26
273	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 26
284 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 26
295 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 26
296 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 26
297 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 26
302 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 26
305 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 25, Insert Rev. 26

cc: S. H. Hobbs (w/1)
File (Tech Spec Records) (w/1)

M2sd2

"TECH SPEC PRIORITY"

ITEM NUMBER	CHANGES/ADDITION
306 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 26
316 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 26
321 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 26
325	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 26
326	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 26
328 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 25, Insert Rev. 26
330 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 26
331	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 26
339 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 26
339	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 26
340 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 18, Insert Rev. 26
3-3 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 7, Insert Rev. 26
346 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 23, Insert Rev. 26
348 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 21, Insert Rev. 26
362 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 21, Insert Rev. 26
367	Remove Rev. 24, Insert Rev. 26
368	Remove Rev. 24, Insert Rev. 26
369 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 24, Insert Rev. 26
372 (2 pgs)	Remove Rev. 25, Insert Rev. 26
	Remove Rev. , Insert Rev.
	Remove Rev. , Insert Rev.
	Remove Rev. , Insert Rev.

cc: S. H. Hobbs (w/1)
File (Tech Spec Records) (w/1)

M2ad2

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING AS OF April 25, 1984
Date

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
001	X	1B	15, 3/29/84
002	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
003	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
004	X	2E	22, 4/09/84
005	X	1B	15, 3/29/84
006	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
007	X	2F	15, 3/29/84
008	X	2H	17, 4/01/84
009	X	2B	25, 4/16/84
010	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
011	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
012	X	2B	26, 4/24/84
013	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
014	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
015	X	1B	17, 4/01/84
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
017	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
018	X	3B	15, 3/29/84
019	X	2B	25, 4/16/84
020	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
021	X	1C	15, 3/29/84
022	X	2A	17, 4/01/84
023	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
024	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
025	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
026	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
027	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
028	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
029	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
030	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
031	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
032	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
033	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
034	X	1C	18, 4/02/84
035	X	2C	15, 3/29/84

L26sd1

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
036	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
037	X	1C	15, 3/29/84
038	X	1C	15, 3/29/84
039	X	2G	17, 4/01/84
040	X	2F	17, 4/01/84
041	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
042	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
043	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
044	X	2B	26, 4/24/84
045	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
046	X	2F	15, 3/29/84
047	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
048	X	2H	15, 3/29/84
049	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
050	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
051	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
052	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
053	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
054	X	1B	21, 4/08/84
055	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
056	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
057	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
058	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
059	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
060	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
061	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
062	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
063	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
064	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
065	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
066	X	2D	22, 4/09/84
067	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
068	X	3B	15, 3/29/84
069	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
070	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
071	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
072	X	2D	17, 4/01/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
073	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
074	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
075	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
076	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
077	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
078	X	1B	15, 3/29/84
079	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
080	X	N/A (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
081	X	3A	15, 3/29/84
082	X	3A	15, 3/29/84
083	X	2B	22, 4/09/84
084	X	3A	15, 3/29/84
085	X	2D	20, 4/06/84
086	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
087	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
088	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
089	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
090	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
091	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
092	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
093	X	2E	22, 4/09/84
094	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
095	X	2E	22, 4/09/84
096	X	2E	25, 4/16/84
097	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
098	X	2G	15, 3/29/84
099	X	2G	21, 4/08/84
100	X	2B	25, 4/16/84
101	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
102	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
103	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
104	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
105	X	2E	25, 4/16/84
106	X	2E	25, 4/16/84
~~107~~	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
108	X	2C	15, 3/29/84
109	X	2D	~~15~~, 3/29/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
4110	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
111	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
112	X	2A	15, 3/29/84
113	X	N/A (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
114	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
115	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
116	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
117	X	N/A (Resolved)	18, 4/02/84
118	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
119	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
120	X	2B	25, 4/16/84
121	X	N/A (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
122	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
123	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
124	X	2C	18, 4/02/84
125	X	N/A (Resolved)	18, 4/02/84
126	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
127	X	2G	17, 4/01/84
128	X	2E	26, 4/24/84
129	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
130	X	N/A (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
131	X	2B	26, 4/24/84
132	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
133	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
134	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
135	X	N/A (Resolved)	18, 4/02/84
136	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
137	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
138	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
139	X	1C	15, 3/29/84
140	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
141	X	2F	17, 4/01/84
142	X	2F	15, 3/29/84
143	X	2G	15, 3/29/84
144	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
145	X	2F	17, 4/01/84
146	X	2E	15, 3/29/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
147	X	3B	16, 3/31/84
148	X	3A	17, 4/01/84
149	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
150	X	2G	17, 4/01/84
151	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
152	X	2E	16, 3/31/84
153	X	2H	17, 4/01/84
154	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
155	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
156	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
157	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
158	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
159	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
160	X	2E	21, 4/08/84
161	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
162	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
163	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
164	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
165	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
166	X	2H	26, 4/24/84
167	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
168	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
169	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
170	X	2E	16, 3/31/84
171	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
172	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
173	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
174	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
175	X	3B	21, 4/09/84
176	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
177	X	2D	25, 4/16/84
178	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
179	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
180	X	2A	17, 4/01/84
181	X	2A	26, 4/24/84
182	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
183	X	2D	18, 4/02/84

L26sd5

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
184	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
185	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
186	X	N/A (Resolved)	18, 4/02/84
187	X	2G	18, 4/02/84
188	X	3B (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
189	X	2H	18, 4/02/84
190	X	2D	20, 4/06/84
191	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
192	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
193	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
194	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
195	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
196	X	2B	16, 3/31/84
197	X	2B	26, 4/24/84
198	X	1C	16, 3/31/84
199	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
200	X	2G	18, 4/02/84
201	X	2B	22, 4/09/84
202	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
203	X	2D	22, 4/09/84
204	X	2H	18, 4/02/84
205	X	2H	16, 3/31/84
206	X	2G	16, 3/31/84
207	X	2H	18, 4/02/84
208	X	2H	18, 4/02/84
209	X	2H	15, 3/29/84
210	X	2G	18, 4/02/84
211	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
212	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
213	X	1C	16, 3/31/84
214	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
215	X	3B	16, 3/31/84
216	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
217	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
218	X	2H	26, 4/24/84
219	X	2I	16, 3/31/84
220	X	3A	18, 4/02/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
221	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
222	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
223	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
224	X	3B	16, 3/31/84
225	X	2D	25, 4/16/84
226	X	3A	18, 4/02/84
227	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
228	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
229	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
230	X	2B (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
231	X	3B	17, 4/01/84
232	X	3B	17, 4/01/84
233	X	2E	25, 4/16/84
234	X	3A	25, 4/16/84
235	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
236	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
237	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
238	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
239	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
240	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
241	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
242	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
243	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
244	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
245	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
246	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
247	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
248	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
249	X	2D	22, 4/09/84
250	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
251	X	2F	18, 4/02/84
252	X	*3B	18, 4/02/84
253	X	2C	18, 4/02/84
254	X	3B	18, 4/02/84

* Priority changed from 1A per J. C. Roberts 3/27/84.

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
255	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
256	X	2E	25, 4/16/84
256-1	X	Sub, 2E	18, 4/02/84
257	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
258	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
259	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
260	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
261	X	3A	18, 4/02/84
262	X	1C	16, 3/31/84
263	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
264	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
265	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
266	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
267	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
268	X	2F	18, 4/02/84
269	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
270	X	2E	22, 4/09/84
271	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
272	X	2D	22, 4/09/84
273	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
274	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
275	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
276	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
277	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
278	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
279	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
280	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
281	X	2E	25, 4/16/84
282	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
283	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
284	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
285	X	1C	18, 4/02/84
286	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
287	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
288	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
289	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
290	X	2E	18, 4/02/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
291	X	*3B	18, 4/02/84
292	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
293	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
294	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
295	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
296	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
297	X	2E	26, 4/24/84
298	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
299	X	2B	25, 4/16/84
300	X	3A	18, 4/02/84
301	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
302	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
303	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
304	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
305	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
306	X	1B	26, 4/24/84
307	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
308	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
309	X	2A	18, 4/02/84
310	X	2A	18, 4/02/84
311	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
312	X	2B	22, 4/09/84
313	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
314	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
315	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
316	X	2I	26, 4/24/84
317	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
318	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
319	X	2E	21, 4/08/84
320	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
321	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
322	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
323	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
324	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
325	X	3B	26, 4/24/84

* Priority changed from 1A per J. C. Roberts 3/27/84.

L26sd9

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
326	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
327	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
328	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
329	X	1C	18, 4/02/84
330	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
331	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
332	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
333	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
334	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
335	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
336	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
337	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
338	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
339	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
340	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
341	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
342	X	2B	19, 4/05/84
343	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
344	X	1B	19, 4/05/84
345	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
346	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
347	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
348	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
349	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
350	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
351	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
352	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
353	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
354	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
355	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
356	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
357	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
358	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
359	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
360	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
361	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
362	X	2B	26, 4/24/84
363	X	2D	21, 4/08/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
364	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
365	X	2D	24, 4/13/84
366	X	2D	24, 4/13/84
367	X	2D (Resolved)	26, 4/24/84
368	X	3B (Resolved)	26, 4/24/84
369	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
370	X	3A	24, 4/13/84
371	X	2D	24, 4/13/84
372	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
800	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
801	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
802	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
803	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
804	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
805	X	3B	24, 3/13/84
806	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
[illegible]	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
808	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
809	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
810	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
811	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
812	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
813	X	3B	22, 4/09/84
814	X	3B	22, 4/09/84
815	X	3B	22, 4/09/84
816	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
817	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
818	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
819	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
820	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
821	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
822	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
823	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
824	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
825	X	3B	24, 4/13/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
826	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
827	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
828	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
829	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
830	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
831	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
832	X	3B	25, 4/16/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 002 Priority: 2D

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.7.1.2

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 7-3

Problem Title: HPCS Service Water Operability, Typographical Error

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

The footnote (*), involving Operational Conditions 4 and 5, has the acronym "HPSCS" instead of "HPCS."

2. Safety Significance:

None: Typographical error.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Propose a Technical Specification change to correct the typographical error.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ /

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

/

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Mlsd3

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 012 Priority: 2B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.6.3.2 and 3.6.3.3

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 6-24 and 25

Problem Title: Typographical Error Referring to SSW Heat Exchanger

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

a. Technical Specifications 3.6.3.2.b (containment spray) and 3.6.3.3.b (suppression pool cooling) require an operable flow path for containment spray and suppression pool cooling through an "SSW heat exchanger." This is not the correct component, and should be changed to "RHR heat exchanger."

b. The footnotes on pages 3/4 6-24 and 25 states, "Whenever both RHR subsystems are inoperable . . .", but should read "Whenever both RHR shutdown cooling subsystems are inoperable . . .".

c. Action Statement b. to Technical Specification 3.6.3.3 contains the statement, " . . . restore at least one loop to operable status within 6 hours or . . .". However, the GE Standard Technical Specification does not contain this statement. Also, Action Statement a. specifies 7 days to restore one inoperable loop, but the GE-STS specifies 72 hours.

2. Safety Significance:

a. None. This change corrects the component name and is consistent with terminology used in Surveillance Requirements 4.6.3.2.b and 4.6.3.3.b.

b. None. The current footnotes may be confusing since cold shutdown can be attained with one shutdown cooling loop. Therefore, the footnotes would not be necessary unless both shutdown cooling loops were inoperable.

c. The proposed change is more conservative than present Technical Specifications but has not been substantiated.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Perform an evaluation to determine the necessity for making the above changes.

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Mlsd19

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 012 Priority: 2B

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT: 84/0048, page 10

TSRT: 84/0157, pages 12 through 17

cc: J. E. Cross

R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 013 Priority: 2D

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Table 3.3.2-1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-10

Problem Title: High Radiation MSIV Isolation Terminology

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

a. Table 3.3.2-1 "Isolation Actuation Instrumentation," indicates main steam isolation valve (MSIV) closure as a result of a main steam line (MSL) high radiation signal. MSIV closure also occurs, however, upon receipt of an MSL low radiation signal indication of a sensor failure (reference FSAR 7.3.1.1.2.4.1.2.3). The MSL low radiation signal is not listed in Table 3.3.2-1 as an MSIV closure signal. This situation is one example of a generic situation wherein the various instrument trip function tables in the Technical Specifications do not necessarily list all signals producing the indicated trip function.

b. The NRC, Division of Project and Resident Programs, has identified that four valves of the combustible gas control system (E61-F009, F010, F056, F057) receive Group 5 isolation signals and that clarifying notes should be placed in the specification or in Table 3.3.2-1.

c. Refer to anticipated resolution item "c".

2. Safety Significance:

a. None. The unlisted signals which also result in the trip functions identified in the various instrument trip function tables are not safety significant. These unlisted signals are not necessary to initiate actions to mitigate the consequences of accidents and, as such, should not be listed in the Technical Specification

b. None. Preliminary investigations revealed that the four valves received Group 7 isolation signals which is reflected in Technical Specification Table 3.6.4-1.

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 013 Priority: 2D

3. Anticipated Resolution:

a. Evaluate the importance of those signals not currently listed in the Technical Specification instrumentation trip function tables (e.g., Table 3.3.2-1) and confirm that these signals are not necessary to initiate actions to mitigate the consequences of accidents.

b. Evaluate the isolation signals to the four valves identified in the problem description and confirm that Technical Specification changes are not necessary.

c. Evaluate the need to add testing auxiliary building and containment isolation signal upon depressing respective divisional ECCS manual initiate pushbuttons.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

References: TSRT-84/0344

NRC/NRR Second Proof and Review Comments, Page 10 of letter from Richard C. Lewis to Darrell G. Eisenhut, dated February 9, 1984

cc: J. E. Cross

R. F. Rogers

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Mlsd22

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 025 Priority: 3B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.4.7

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 4-22

Problem Title: MSIV Minimum Closing Stroke Time

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
Technical Specification 3.4.7 requires that two main steam line isolation valves (MSIVs) per main steam line be operable with closing times greater than or equal to 3 seconds and less than or equal to 5 seconds. The 3-second closing time is inconsistent with the NSSS vendor design specification which is reflected in the Level 1 Acceptance Criteria of the Startup Test Program (FSAR Section 14.2.12.3.22). This section of the FSAR states that:

"MSIV closure time, exclusive of electrical delay, shall be no faster than 3.0 seconds (average of the fastest valve in each steam line). The time between the isolation trip signal and valve full closed must be 5.0 seconds or less for each valve. The electrical time delay at 100 percent open shall be less than or equal to 0.5 seconds, and the fastest valve closure time shall be greater than or equal to 2.5 seconds."

FSAR Section 15.2.4 states that the MSIVs close in 3 to 5 seconds and that the 3-second closure time is assumed in the transient analysis for the closure of all MSIVs events. The transient analysis assumptions for MSIV closure times are also based on the NSSS vendor design specifications which are more explicitly defined in FSAR Section 14.2.12.3.22, Level 1 Acceptance Critera.

2. Safety Significance:
None. The present Technical Specification closure time limits are more conservative than the NSSS vendor design specifications and FSAR analysis assumptions. Changes to the Technical Specification limits would provide consistency and provide more margin in MSIV closure times.

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 025 Priority: 3B

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Perform an evaluation of the MSIV closure time requirements to determine whether the present Technical Specification 3/4.4.7 should be changed to reflect the methodology presented in FSAR Section 14.2.12.3.22.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0035

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 029 Priority: 3B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Table 4.3.6-1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-53 and 3/4 3-54

Problem Title: Changing Mode Switch Neutron Monitoring Instrumentation Test

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Technical Specification Table 4.3.6-1 lists the control rod block instrumentation surveillance requirements for the neutron monitoring system in Operational Conditions 1, 2, and 5. Technical Specification 4.3.7.6.b requires a channel functional test of the source range monitors (SRMs) prior to moving the reactor mode switch out of SHUTDOWN. The surveillance procedures for neutron monitoring system channel functional test require the reactor mode switch to be placed in REFUEL. Following discussions with the GGNS NRC Resident Inspector and NRC Region II, an interim measure was established to permit placing the reactor mode switch in REFUEL for the SRM channel functional test until a final resolution could be implemented.

2. Safety Significance:

None. The interim administrative control did not compromise plant safety in that the reactor mode switch was placed conditionally in REFUEL for performance of the SRM channel functional test. The design intent of Technical Specification 4.3.7.6.b was satisfied.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

An interim administrative control reviewed by the Commission was implemented to allow the SRM channel functional test to be performed using existing surveillance procedures. GE has identified an alternate surveillance method for the neutron monitoring system which is independent of reactor mode switch position. An evaluation of this method has been completed and appropriate surveillance procedure revisions are being prepared. The alternate surveillance method will remove the need for the interim administrative control.

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 029 Priority: 3B

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross

R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 036 Priority: 2D

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3/4.12

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 12-1 through 3/4 12-12, B 3/4 12-1, 6-19, and 6-25

Problem Title: Environmental Monitoring Specifications

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

The Radiological Environmental Monitoring requirements contained in Technical Specification 3/4.12 are inconsistent. The environmental monitoring section should be revised to correct typographical errors, eliminate inconsistencies, and ensure compliance with the appropriate regulations.

Specific typographical errors and inconsistencies for the Radiological Environmental Monitoring Program requirements include the following:

1. Superscript "c" which describes the meaning for the term "gamma isotopic analysis" in Table 3.12.1-1 was used in the "Type and Frequency of Analysis" column entry on pages 3/4 12-3, but was omitted in the applicable entries on pages 3/4 12-4 and 3/4 12-5.
2. Entries in the "Type and Frequency of Analysis" column of Table 3.12.1-1 have been omitted for the last two items concerning food products on page 3/4 12-5.
3. Changes in the Offsite Dose Calculation Manual should be reported in the Semiannual Radioactive Effluent Release Report rather than in monthly reports. Monthly reports of changes are presently required by Technical Specifications 6.9.1.10 and 6.14.2.

A comprehensive revision to Technical Specification 3/4.12 is being addressed by Problem Sheet 249.

2. Safety Significance:

See Problem Sheet 249 for the safety significance of this item and related items on the Radiological Environmental Technical Specifications.

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Mlsd64

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 036 Priority: 2D

3. Anticipated Resolution:

See Problem Sheet 249 for the proposed resolution to this item and related items on Radiological Environmental Technical Specifications.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: Proof and Review comments from Enclosure 3, Attachment A, Items 3, 4, and 10 of Category 1

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 042 Priority: 3B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.4.1.3

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 4-3

Problem Title: Recirculation Flow Nomenclature

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Technical Specification 3.4.1.3 uses the terms recirculation loop flow and rated recirculation flow. The reference to "recirculation loop flow" should be changed to "jet pump flow" and the reference to "rated recirculation flow" should be changed to "effective core flow."

2. Safety Significance:

None. Technical Specification 3.4.1.3 as written can be used to determine recirculation loop mismatch for the purpose of the Technical Specifications. This change provides an alternate method of measuring recirculation loop flow mismatch. Operation under the present specifications does not lead to nonconservative conditions.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Perform evaluation of both methods of determining recirculation flow mismatch and select the most effective method. Incorporate results of this evaluation into the GGNS Technical Specification.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____/_____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Mlsd75

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 042 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: Per TSRT-84/0031 GE, SRO and NPE recommend canceling Item #042. RPD concurs and is closing this item.

Items Closed: (How) Closed based on RPD review of TSRT-84/0031.

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 044 Priority: 2B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Table 3.3.3-2, Item D.2

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-29

Problem Title: Division 3 LOP Time Delay Trip

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

In Technical Specification Table 3.3.3-2, the 2.3-second time delay for Division 3, 4.16 kV bus undervoltage (loss of voltage) is presented in the same format as the time delays for Divisions 1 and 2. In Divisions 1 and 2, the time delay means that the undervoltage condition must exist for the specified time before ECCS actuation occurs. For Divison 3, a momentary undervoltage condition is sufficient to initiate the ECCS actuation logic. The time delay for Division 3 relates to the time before the Division 3 diesel receives a start signal.

2. Safety Significance:

None. The problem described above is for clarification of the information presented in Table 3.3.3-2.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Investigate the necessity for revising the format or providing explanatory footnotes to Table 3.3.3-2 to clarify the information presented.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ /

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

M1sd78

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 044 Priority: 2B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0273

cc: J. E. Cross

R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 064 Priority: 3B

NRC (I&E plus NRR) /1/24/84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 6.5.1.3

Tech Spec Page: 6-7

Problem Title: PSRC Alternates

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Technical Specification 6.5.1.3 states that "alternate members" may be appointed by the Plant Manager to serve on the PSRC on a "temporary basis." However, this section does not define "temporary basis" nor provide criteria for the qualifications of the alternate members.

Additionally, the Standard Technical Specifications state that all alternate members shall be appointed in writing by the PSRC Chairman. Technical Specification 6.5.1.3 is inconsistent with the Standard Technical Specification in that the Plant Manager rather than the PSRC Chairman in the Standard Technical Specification appoints alternate members.

2. Safety Significance:

None. This is an administrative change to clarify the qualifications, duration of assignment, and appointment responsibility for alternate members of the Plant Safety Review Committee.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Determine if the qualification requirements and duration of assignment for alternate members of the Plant Safety Review Committee should be specified in plant procedures and, if necessary, in the Technical Specifications.

Investigate the necessity of changing the appointment responsibility for alternate members.

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number 064 Priority 3B

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0495, Sheets 5 through 9

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 065 Priority: 3B

/ /

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 6.5.2.3

Tech Spec Page: 6-9

Problem Title: SRC Alternatives

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Administrative Controls 6.5.2.3 states that "alternate members" may serve on the SRC on a "temporary basis." However, the section does not define "temporary basis" nor provide criteria for the qualification of the alternates.

2. Safety Significance:

None. This item clarifies the qualification requirements and the duration of appointment for "alternate members" of the Safety Review Committee.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate qualification requirements and duration of appointment for alternate members of the Safety Review Committee and investigate the need for incorporation in the Technical Specifications.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / /

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

/ /

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0509

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Mlsd115

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 069 Priority: 3B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 4.6.7.2

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 6-57

Problem Title: H2 Igniter Surveillance

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Surveillance Requirement 4.6.7.2.a specifies that at least 41 hydrogen igniter glow plugs per containment and drywell hydrogen ignition subsystem must be verified to be energized after the supply breakers are energized during the surveillance test. The wording for this Surveillance Requirement may need clarification since there is a question whether the igniter glow plugs are energized after the supply breakers are energized. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has suggested that the Surveillance Requirement should be supplemented with an additional requirement to ensure operability for a minimum of one igniter on each redundant circuit in an enclosed region. A question has been raised with respect to the NRC's suggestion that if all inoperable igniters were located in the drywell, igniter coverage in the drywell might be inadequate.

2. Safety Significance:

The wording of the Surveillance Requirement has no safety significance since the igniters will be determined to be operable regardless of whether or not they are energized after the supply breakers are energized or after some other action. Igniters from redundant emergency safeguard feature power supplies are located in each enclosed region in the containment or drywell. The present requirement for containment and drywell hydrogen ignition subsystem operability would allow 41 out of 45 glow plugs to be operable. It is possible that, of the 4 igniters per division which could be inoperable, igniters from both divisions in an enclosed region could be inoperable at the same time. This could create conditions which allow pocketing of hydrogen in enclosed regions.

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 069 Priority 3B

The issue of all inoperable igniters from each igniter subsystem being located in the drywell has no safety significance. The igniter system has been designed with sufficient redundancy so that the igniters powered from a single division would be sufficient to assure initiation of hydrogen combustion, in the drywell or containment. Thus, inoperability of 8 igniters in the drywell would not impair the hydrogen ignition system's ability to perform its intended function.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

A review by the Architect/Engineer concluded that the wide spread distribution of the igniters provides assurance that the system would perform its intended function even with up to 4 igniters per division inoperable. An additional evaluation will be completed to determine if the wording for Surveillance Requirement 4.6.7.2.a should be modified so that it accurately reflects how the igniter glow plugs are energized. An additional evaluation will be performed to determine if the igniter glow plug operability requirements should be modified to require operability of at least one glow plug per redundant circuit in an enclosed region. This evaluation will also confirm that inoperability of up to 4 igniters in the drywell per igniter subsystem is acceptable.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 069 Priority 3B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0341, page 27 (items 1 and 2), page 12-14
AECM-82/193

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 070 Priority: 3B

NRR /1/24/84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.7.6.1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 7-28

Problem Title: Fire Suppression Water System (Action Clarification)

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

The NRC Chemical Engineering Branch has recommended rewriting Action Statements a and b of Technical Specification 3.7.6.1 in order to clarify the language. The NRC recommendation is as follows:

Technical Specification 3.7.6.1 Action Statements a and b should be rewritten as follows:

a. With one pump and/or one fire water storage tank inoperable, restore the inoperable equipment to OPERABLE status with 7 days or provide an alternate backup pump or supply. The provisions of Technical Specifications 3.0.3 and 3.0.4 are not applicable.

b. With the fire suppression water system otherwise inoperable, establish a backup fire suppression water system within 24 hours.

2. Safety Significance:

None. The problem represents a clarification only and no safety significance is identified.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate and determine the changes, if any, required for incorporation into the GGNS Technical Specifications and submit proposed changes to the NRC.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): CEB Notified NRR 11-7-83

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Mlsd124

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 070 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 071 Priority: 2D

NRC (I&E plus NRR) /1/24/84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.7.6.1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 3.7.7

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 7-28 through 3/4 7-39 and 3/4 7-41

Problem Title: Deletion of Special Reporting Requirements Fire Protection

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
Technical Specifications 3.7.6.1, 3.7.6.2, 3.7.6.3, 3.7.6.4, 3.7.6.5, 3.7.6.6, and 3.7.7, involving fire protection systems and assemblies, require a Special Report be filed with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) in the event of system inoperability beyond 14 days (7 days for 3.7.7). This is a requirement in addition to the establishment of fire watches and fire patrols. The NRC has recommended that this Special Reporting requirement be deleted.

2. Safety Significance:
None. This change involves reportability only and has no effect on plant operations.

3. Anticipated Resolution:
Evaluate the reportability requirements of these specifications to determine the effect that deletion of these reportability requirements would have on plant safety and regulatory commitments. Implement the appropriate Technical Specification changes.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Mlsd126

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 071 Priority: 2D

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0366 and TSRT-84/0460

cc: J. E. Cross

R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 094 Priority: 3B

NRC Proof & Review /10-26-84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 4.7.1.2

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 7-3

Problem Title: HPCS Service Water

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

The NRC noted that in Surveillance Requirement 4.7.1.2, two of the high pressure core spray (HPCS) service water system surveillance requirements have been deleted and should be added as follows:

"At least once per 18 months during shutdown, verifying:

1. Each automatic valve servicing nonsafety-related equipment actuates to its isolation position on an isolation signal.
2. Each pump starts automatically to maintain service water pressure greater than or equal to (60) psig."

These surveillance requirements are in the General Electric Standard Technical Specifications.

2. Safety Significance:

None. There is one HPCS service water pump and this system does not service nonsafety-related equipment and, therefore, has no automatic valves for that isolation function. There is, however, one automatic valve, the HPCS pump discharge valve, which is tested monthly. Pump characteristics, including discharge pressure, are tested quarterly per Surveillance Requirement 4.0.5 and service water initiation logic is tested every 18 months per Surveillance Requirement 4.8.1.1.2.d.4.b.2. These required tests are sufficient to verify HPCS service water system operability.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate the need to incorporate the NRC concerns.

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Mlsd166

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 094 Priority: 3B

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: Handout from April 4, 1984 meeting with NRC Staff, TVI Comments.

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 128 Priority: 2E

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Bases 3/4.6.7

Tech Spec Page: B3/4 6-7

Problem Title: Upgrade Revision Date of NRC Regulatory Guide

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Technical Specification Bases 3/4.6.7 references NRC Regulatory Guide 1.7, dated March 1971. The applicable revision according to the FSAR is Revision 1, dated September, 1976.

2. Safety Significance:

None. The change is administrative to reflect the commitment to Regulatory Guide 1.7, Revision 1 and has no effect on plant safety.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

A Technical Specification change to reflect the correct reference to Regulatory Guide 1.7, Revision 1, dated September 1976, was transmitted by letter to the NRC, Harold R. Denton from L. F. Dale, dated September 9, 1983 (AECM-83/0565).

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE):

NRC Notified: /

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition:

Items Closed: (How)

/

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross

R. F. Rogers

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

M1sd226

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 131 Priority: 2B

/ /

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Table 3.7.6.5-1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 7-37

Problem Title: Additional Fire Hose Stations to Table 3.7.6.5-1

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Two additional hose stations are required to be added to Table 3.7.6.5-1. One station (13G) was added per design change, and the other hose station (55C) was inadvertently omitted from the table.

2. Safety Significance:

Inclusion of all fire hose stations in Technical Specification operability requirements is important to ensure adequate fire protection for safety-related equipment.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

A proposed Technical Specification change adding fire hose stations 13G and 55C to Table 3.7.6.5-1 has been submitted to the NRC in a letter from L. F. Dale to H. R. Denton, dated September 9, 1983 (AECM-83/0565, Item 23).

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / /

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

/ /

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Mlsd231

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 166 Priority: 2H

NRC/CSB / _____

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 4.6.1.5

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 6-8

Problem Title: Feedwater Leakage Control System Interlocks

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

The NRC Containment Systems Branch (CSB) has expressed concern regarding the ability of the Feedwater Leakage Control System (FWLCS) to maintain a water seal in the feedwater system following a LOCA. The NRC proposed that feedwater valves F010A and B, F032A and B, and F065A and B be pneumatically leak tested per Appendix J to 10 CFR 50, unless further analysis can demonstrate that the FWLCS can maintain a water seal following a LOCA. The scheduled performance of any leak rate testing would be at the first refueling outage. Technical Specification 4.6.1.5 does not currently contain surveillance requirements for the referenced valves.

2. Safety Significance:

None. The existing design of the feedwater system has been determined not to be a credible drywell bypass leakage path.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

The feedwater leakage control system design and operation will be reviewed to determine the long-term resolution to the NRC-CSB concern. This investigation will consider design modifications to the FWLCS to ensure a 100 percent water seal on the feedwater check valves after a LOCA, surveillance testing requirements to verify check valve leakage integrity, and procedure revisions to optimize FWLCS response in an accident. Appropriate Technical Specification revisions, if any, will be submitted following completion of this evaluation.

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 166 Priority: 2H

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0131

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 181 Priority: 2A

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.8.4.3

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 8-46

Problem Title: RPS Electric Power Monitor

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Technical Specification 3.8.4.3.a and 3.8.4.3.b require that an inservice RPS M-G set or alternate power supply be removed from service when time requirements for inoperable electric power monitor assemblies are not met. Compliance with these Action Statements could result in a full scram if a half scram condition previously existed. Provisions should be made so that an RPS power supply need not be removed from service where this would cause a full scram.

2. Safety Significance:

None. The change will help to clarify Technical Specification Action Statements 3.8.4.3.a and 3.8.4.3.b so that compliance with these Action Statements will not result in an unwarranted scram.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Submit a Technical Specification change to 1) clarify Action Statements 3.8.4.3.a and 3.8.4.3.b to prevent the unnecessary tripping of an instrument channel, 2) specify actions to be taken to allow operation in this condition, and 3) provide a Bases Section for Technical Specification 3.8.4.3.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ /

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Mlsd315

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 181 Priority: 2A

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0451, page 8

cc: J. E. Cross

R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 195 Priority: 2D

R. Keeton / _____

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 4.6.1.4

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 6-7

Problem Title: MSIV-LCS Operability

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Surveillance Requirement 4.6.1.4.a.2 should be reworded to properly reflect the design of the main steam isolation valve leakage control system as follows: "Inboard subsystem heater operability by demonstrating . . ."

Surveillance Requirement 4.6.1.4.c.2 should be modified as follows:

a. Inboard System, 10"±1" H_2O vacuum at greater than or equal to 100 scfm.

b. Outboard System, greater than or equal to 15" H_2O vacuum at greater than or equal to 200 scfm.

2. Safety Significance:

None. The proposed changes, if accepted, would enhance the surveillance testing of the system and provide clarification.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate the proposed changes described in the problem description and incorporate into the Technical Specifications, as required.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ /

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Mlsd339

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 195 Priority: 2D

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0152

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 197 Priority: 2B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.3.6-1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-50

Problem Title: Rod Block Instrumentation

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Tables 3.3.6-1, 3.3.6-2, and 4.3.6-1 list certain control rod block trip functions which are required to be operable but this list does not include refueling equipment interlocks or all rod blocks initated by the RCIS and RPIS. In addition, the reactor mode switch initiated rod blocks are not shown on the tables.

2. Safety Significance:

None. The refueling platform and reactor mode switch interlocks are included in the refueling operations specifications (3.9.1). Controls on rod withdrawal are presently specified in Technical Specification 3.1.3.3 concerning control rod position indication.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Perform an evaluation to determine if Table 3.3.6-1, 3.3.6-2, and 4.3.6-1 should be revised to include the refueling equipment, RCIS, RPIS, and reactor mode switch rod block functions.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____/_____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Mlsd342

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 197 Priority: 2B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

References: TSRT-84/0644, page 11

TSRT-84/0369, page 11 & 12

cc: J. F. Cross

R. F. Rogers

Mlsd342.1

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 211 Priority: 3B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Table 3.3.2-1 note (e) & Table 3.3.7.1-1 note (h)

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-14 and 3/4 3-57

Problem Title: Isolation Actuation Instrumentation Notes and Radiation Monitoring Notes

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

The Isolation Actuation Instrumentation Table 3.3.2-1 note (e) and Table 3.3.7.1-1 note (h) states "Two upscale Hi Hi, one upscale Hi Hi and one downscale, or two downscale signals from the same trip system...". This statement is incorrect in that the downscale trip only actuates an alarm. The statement should read, "Two upscale Hi Hi, or one upscale Hi Hi and one Inop, or two Inop signals from the same trip system actuates the trip system...."

2. Safety Significance:

None. For clarification only, current notes do not affect system operation.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Investigate the necessity of clarifying note (e) of Table 3.3.2-1 and note (h) of Table 3.3.7.1-1 in the Technical Specifications.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ /

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Plsd21

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 211 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0344

cc: J. E. Cross

R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 214 Priority: 3B

Jim McMahan (QA) /

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 4.1.3.3.b.2

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 1-9

Problem Title: Reactivity Control System Acceptance Criteria

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Technical Specification 4.1.3.3.b.2 requires an integrity test of the control rod scram accumulator check valves to be performed at least once per 18 months. A concern was identified that the existing Technical Specification conflicted with the Standard Technical Specifications in that it did not list appropriate acceptance criteria for the check valve surveillance. A review of the scram accumulator operability requirements has been performed to resolve this issue.

Additionally, the NRC, Division of Project and Resident Programs, has recommended deletion of Surveillance Requirement 4.1.3.3.b.2, since it appears to be unnecessary.

2. Safety Significance:

None. General Electric indicates that the design intent of the Technical Specification's Surveillance Requirement is adequately satisfied by the existing Technical Specification.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

An evaluation of the Technical Specifications Surveillance Requirements for the control rod scram accumulators determined that a Technical Specification revision is not necessary and that the Technical Specifications, as presently written, are correct.

Evaluate the NRC recommendation to delete Surveillance Requirement 4.1.3.3.b.2 and propose a Technical Specification change, if required.

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Plsd27

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 214 Priority: 3B

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): IE recommended deletion of specification. NRR (Hoffman) on 4/11/84 meeting indicated that the Tech Spec will have to be changed and acceptance criteria established.

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____

Date Time

References: 1) TSRT-84/0268
2) TSRT-84/0201
3) Memo from R. C. Lewis to D. G. Eisenhut,"Comments on Draft Appendix A Technical Specifications. Grand Gulf Unit 2", February 9, 1984.

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 218 Priority: 2H

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Technical Specification 3.3

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-1

Problem Title: Trip Setpoint-Allowable Values

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

An NRC proof-and-review item (NRC-ICSB, 10/31/83) identified a potential area of concern relating to setpoint methodology used at Grand Gulf. This item states that at Grand Gulf, the numerical difference between the Technical Specification's trip setpoints and allowable values is deficient in that both trip unit drift and sensor drift are included. It is suggested that only trip unit drift should be included in the setpoint and allowable values.

2. Safety Significance:

The safety significance of setpoint methodology is currently the subject of a BWR Owners' Group study on instrument setpoints.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate the results of the owner's group study and its effect on the GGNS Technical Specifications

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____/_____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Plsd35

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 218 Priority: 2H

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: FSAR Chapter 7 Question and Responses, NRC Question No. 031.60, pages Q&R 7.3-12 through 7.3-12d and Figure 031.60-1.

cc: J. E. Cross

R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 222 Priority: 3B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.7.2

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 7-5

Problem Title: Control Room Emergency Filtration System

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) suggested in its proof and review comments, that Surveillance Requirement 4.7.2 should be revised to include the following requirement:

"At least once per 12 hours, by verifying that the control room air temperature is less than or equal to 120°F."

This requirement was believed to be necessary for ensuring operability of the control room emergency filtration subsystems.

2. Safety Significance:

None. This proposed revision is already addressed by Surveillance Requirement 4.7.8 which assures that the control room air temperatures will be verified to be below 77°F at least once every 12 hours.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

A response to the NRC's suggestion should be prepared and transmitted to the NRC. This response should state that the proposed requirement is implemented by Surveillance Requirement 4.7.8. This requirement specifies that the control room temperature must be verified to be below 77°F at least once every 12 hours.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): NRR per 4/11/84 meeting is planning to mandate a change to this specification based on human factors, equipment qualification and delete from control room temperature specification.

NRC Notified: / /

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Plsd43

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 222 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 228 Priority: 3B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Table 3.8.4.2-1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 8-39

Problem Title: Valve Identifier Nomenclature

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
Some of the valve identification numbers in Technical Specification Table 3.8.4.2-1 have a suffix of A or B. The NRC has informally suggested that the numbering system should be modified to make it consistent. The suffix uniquely identifies valves that are duplicated in redundant process trains. This concerns I&E exit item on 21-24 February, 1984 meeting pertaining to P41-F189.

2. Safety Significance:
None. There is no indication at this time that any valves are mislabled or omitted from the table.

3. Anticipated Resolution:
Perform an evaluation and determine the necessity to revise the valve ID system in these tables (Technical Specification 3/4.8.4.2). Consideration should be given to the use of hyphens followed by letters, as in the drawings, which are used to denote divisional power sources.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE):

NRC Notified: / /

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

P1sd55

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 228 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0304

cc: J. E. Cross

R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 241 Priority: 2D

Identified By / Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.1.3.1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 1-3

Problem Title: Control Rod Operability Clarification

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

a. Surveillance Requirement 4.1.3.1.2 specifies that, when above the low power setpoints, all control rods which are withdrawn shall be demonstrated operable within a given time period. The requirement is limited to rods that have not had their directional control valves disarmed. The frequency for performing this Surveillance Requirement changes when any control rod is immovable as a result of excessive friction or mechanical interferences as described in Technical Specification 3.1.3.1, Action Statement a. The Action Statement should be revised to reference completion of Surveillance Requirement 4.1.3.1.2.b. Also, Technical Specification 3.1.3.1.b.1.a requires inoperable withdrawn control rods to be separated from all other inoperable control rods, but GE Standard Technical Specification requires they be separated from other inoperable withdrawn control rods.

b. The lack of specific Action Statements for inoperability of the scram discharge volumn requires that Technical Specification 3.0.3 be invoked if the scram discharge volume is declared inoperable. In some cases this would be an overly conservative action.

2. Safety Significance:

a. None. Surveillance Requirement 4.1.3.1.2 will be completed with the correct frequency under the present Technical Specifications. Inclusion of a cross reference in Technical Specification 3.1.3.1, Action Statement a. would reduce the effort required to ensure compliance with the surveillance requirements. The addition of the word "withdrawn" to Action Statement b.1.a would be an operational enhancement.

b. None. However, invoking the requirements of 3.0.3 in the event of scram discharge volume inoperability may be overly conservative.

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Plsd75

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number 241 Priority 2D

3. Anticipated Resolution:

a. An evaluation of the Action Statements in Technical Specification 3.1.3.1 will be completed to determine if the Action Statement should reference Surveillance Requirement 4.1.3.1.2.b. A revision to the Technical Specifications will be proposed if it is determined that: 1) the Surveillance Requirement should be referenced in the Action Statement, and 2) "withdrawn" should be included in 3.1.3.1.b.1.a to be consistent with the GE Standard Technical Specifications.

b. Evaluate the specific Action Statement(s) which address scram discharge volume inoperability and, if necessary, propose appropriate Technical Specification changes.

4. NRC Response to Item (NUREG/CR): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0628

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Plsd76

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 259 Priority: 3B

Brian L. Steinman /3-15-84 W. E. Edge/L. C. Burgess

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 5.7.1 & Table 5.7.1-1

Tech Spec Page: 5-6 and 5-7

Problem Title: Designed and Maintained Component Cyclic or Transient Limit

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Technical Specification Table 5.7.1-1 gives the cyclic or transient limits for the reactor pressure vessel. A possible discrepancy between this table and FSAR tables 3.9-1 and 5.2-11 and the vendor instruction manual had been identified. Preliminary investigation, however, indicates that the FSAR tables, vendor information, and the Technical Specifications are in agreement. If the scrams from the normal and upset conditions and emergency conditions sections of the FSAR tables and the vendor manual are added together, the results are consistent with Technical Specification Table 5.7.1-1.

2. Safety Significance:

None, assuming confirmation of agreement between the Technical Specifications and the FSAR tables.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Confirm agreement between Technical Specification Table 5.7.1-1 and FSAR Tables 3.9-1 and 5.2-11. Revise Surveillance Procedure and FSAR to reflect correct cyclic breakdown.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

P1sd108

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 259 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0227

cc: J. E. Cross

R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 271 Priority: 3B

Hylander / _____

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.7.6.4

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 7-35

Problem Title: Halon Storage Requirements

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Technical Specification 3.7.6.4 requires the halon storage tanks to have at least 95 percent of full charge weight and 90 percent of full charge pressure. The requirement to maintain 90 percent of full charge pressure is adequate to ensure that the initial system pressure will be sufficient to overcome system pressure losses. However, a recent review of system design requirements and the system preoperational test reports indicates that 95 percent of full charge weight is not sufficient to provide a flooding concentration of 5 percent by volume, 10 minutes after discharge, as required.

2. Safety Significance:

Present system design may not ensure that minimum fire suppression capabilities of the halon system, required by the Technical Specification, will meet fire suppression design requirements.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

A design change has been requested to increase the charge weight per cylinder from 174 pounds to the manufacturer's maximum charge of 186 pounds. This change would ensure that the 95 percent of full charge weight LCO criterion presently in the Technical Specification will provide a minimum halon concentration of 5 percent at 10 minutes after discharge within the protected area. With this design change, no change to Technical Specification 3.7.6.4 will be required.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

P1sd130

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 271 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

References: TSRT-84/0409

TSRT-84/0597, Page 3

cc: J. E. Cross

R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 273 Priority: 3B

RPD / _____

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Table 3.3.3-1, 3.5.1.e

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-25, 3/4 5-3

Problem Title: ADS Action Statements

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Table 3.3.3-1, ECCS Actuation Instrumentation, may need clarification with respect to what action should be taken when an ADS trip system is out of service.

2. Safety Significance:

None. See the anticipated resolution below.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate this item for deletion since the appropriate actions for an inoperable ADS system are defined in Technical Specification 3.5.1, Action Statement c, and Table 3.3.3-1, Action Statements 31 through 34.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Plsd133

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 284 Priority: 3B

W. A. Russell / 3/19/84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.3.7.12, Table 4.3.7.12-1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-87, 3/4 3-94

Problem Title: Surveillance Frequency Less Conservative Than BWR/6 Standard Technical Specifications

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
Technical Specification 3.3.7.12 lists the requirements for radioactive gaseous effluent monitoring instrumentation. The surveillance frequencies for channel checks and channel functional tests for the offgas pre-treatment and post-treatment monitors given in Table 4.3.7.12-1 may not be consistent with the frequencies in the BWR/6 Standard Technical Specifications.

2. Safety Significance:
None. The existing Technical Specification Surveillance Requirements are consistent with the requirements in the Radiological Environmental Technical Specifications (NUREG-0473, Revision 3, Draft 7) for the condenser air ejector radioactivity monitor.

3. Anticipated Resolution:
Evaluate the Surveillance Requirements for the offgas system radiation monitors and confirm adherance to the frequencies for channel checks and channel functional tests specified in Grand Gulf design documents.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Plsd150

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 284 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 295 Priority: 3B

J. D. Petty /3-18-84 L. C. Burgess

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 6.5.2.8

Tech Spec Page: 6-11

Problem Title: Audits Performed under the Cognizance of the SRC

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
Technical Specification 6.5.2.8 describes the audits of unit activities performed under the cognizance of the SRC. However, some of the items are not worded consistent with the GE Standard Technical Specifications. For example, item h, concerning the 24-month audit of the fire protection program and implementing procedures, does not contain the GE-Standard Technical Specification statement " . . . by qualified licensee QA personnel." Similar problems may exist for other programs listed.

2. Safety Significance:
None. The composition of the SRC would ensure that the appropriate people are available to conduct the audit. Any changes made would be to clarify this point.

3. Anticipated Resolution:
Perform an evaluation of GGNS Technical Specification 6.5.2.8 and GE Standard Technical Specification to determine what, if any, changes are required.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Plsd173

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 295 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 296 Priority: 3B

J. D. Petty / L. C. Burgess

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 6.5.1.6

Tech Spec Page: 6-7 and 8

Problem Title: PSRC - Responsibilities

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

The following items are requirements in the GE Standard Technical Specifications that are not requirements in the Grand Gulf Nuclear Station Technical Specifications.

- The PSRC shall be responsible for investigation of all violations of Technical Specifications, including preparation and forwarding of reports covering evaluation and recommendations to prevent recurrence to the Vice President - Nuclear Operations and to the Company Nuclear Review and Audit Group.
- The PSRC shall be responsible for review of all proposed procedures required by Technical Specification 6.8 and changes thereto. The Grand Gulf Nuclear Station Technical Specifications require the PSRC to review proposed procedures and changes to procedures, which may involve an unreviewed safety question as defined in 10 CFR 50.59.
- The Standard Technical Specifications require the PSRC to review all proposed tests and experiments that affect nuclear safety. The Grand Gulf Nuclear Station Technical Specifications require the PSRC to review proposed tests or experiments which may involve an unreviewed safety question as defined in 10 CFR 50.59.
- The Standard Technical Specifications require the PSRC to review all proposed modifications to unit systems or equipment that affect nuclear safety. The Grand Gulf Nuclear Station Technical Specifications require the PSRC to review all proposed modifications to unit equipment or systems which may involve an unreviewed safety question as defined in 10 CFR 50.59.

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number 296 Priority 3B

- The Standard Technical Specifications require the PSRC to perform special reviews, investigations, or analysis thereon requested by the Nuclear Plant Manager. The Grand Gulf Nuclear Station Technical Specifications require the PSRC to review the investigations or analysis of special subjects as requested by the Chairman of the Nuclear Safety Review Committee.
- The Standard Technical Specifications require the PSRC to review the implementing procedures of the Security Plan and the Emergency Plan. This is not required by the Grand Gulf Nuclear Station Technical Specifications.

2. Safety Significance:

None. Any changes made would be to clarify the responsibilities of the PSRC. The intended functions of the Technical Specifications are being conducted by the PSRC.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Perform an evaluation to determine what, if any, changes are required to the Technical Specifications.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Plsd176

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 297 Priority: 2E

Edwin Edlacher / 3-15-84 WEE/L. C. Burgess

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 5.4.2

Tech Spec Page: 5-5

Problem Title: Reactor Vessel and Recirculation System Water and Steam Temperature Discrepancy

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

The nominal T_{ave} of 533°F presented in Technical Specification 5.4.2 does not appear to agree with the temperatures shown on FSAR Figure 5.1-1.

2. Safety Significance:

None. The numerical values presented in Section 5.0 are typical nominal values, presented for informational purposes, and are not meant to reflect precise design figures.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate the temperatures given on FSAR Figure 5.1-1 to determine if the temperature presented in Technical Specification 5.4.2 can accurately be termed "nominal." If a revision of the Technical Specification is appropriate, submit the necessary change to the NRC.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 297 Priority: 2E

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0219

cc: J. E. Cross

R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 302 Priority: 2D

C. Stafford /3-17-84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 4.8.4.1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 8-20

Problem Title: Electrical Equipment Protective Devices

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
Technical Specification 4.8.4.1.a.2 statement "Circuit breakers found inoperable during functional testing shall be restored to OPERABLE status prior to resuming operation." may be construed to imply operation of the plant shall not be resumed. This should be changed to clarify that the statement is only applicable to resuming operation of the affected system or component. Determine if the 125VDC and the 120VAC circuit breakers in the Technical Specifications.

2. Safety Significance:
None. The intent of the statement is to require that inoperable circuit breakers be restored to OPERABLE status prior to resuming operation of the affected system or component. This change would be for clarification only.

3. Anticipated Resolution:
Evaluate the above statement in the context of Technical Specification 3.8.4.1 to determine if clarification is warranted. Propose a Technical Specification change if required.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Plsd185

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 302 Priority: 2D

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 305 Priority: 3B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3/4 (New Specification)

Tech Spec Page: N/A

Problem Title: Potential For Plant Flooding From Probable Maximum Precipitation

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

The evaluation for the local Probable Maximum Precipitation (PMP) on the plant area presented in the SER (Section 2.4.4) was based on a finished plant grade of elevation 132.5 feet mean sea level and a finished entrance floor level of 133.0 feet mean sea level. It was concluded that runoff from the local PMP would not exceed elevation 133.0 feet mean sea level in the plant area. It was subsequently determined that (1) finished plant grade on some areas (mainly parking areas) exceeded the 132.5 feet mean sea level, (2) some drainage swales in the main plant area had been filled in, (3) berms and fencing for security might impede local runoff, and (4) security skirting on trailers parked in the main plant area would block flow and impede runoff from local intense storms. These changes from the original design condition might induce flood levels above the 133.0 feet mean sea level finished floor elevation and cause flooding of safety-related equipment.

In order to ensure that proper flood protection is maintained, a new Grand Gulf Technical Specification has been proposed which is consistent with the BWR/6 Standard Technical Specifications, the provisions of which have been approved by the NRC. However, BWR/6 Standard Technical Specification 3/4.7.3 states that 3/4.7.3 is not required if the facility design has adequate passive flood control protection features sufficient to accommodate the Design Basis Flood identified in Regulatory Guide 1.59, August 1973.

2. Safety Significance:

The potential exists for PMP flood levels reaching above the 133.0 feet mean sea level finished floor elevation.

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET(CONT'D)

Item Number: 305 Priority: 3B

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Perform an evaluation to determine the need for the new Technical Specification addressing this issue. Submit the new Technical Specification, if deemed required.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0928

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 306 Priority: 1B

Val Malafew /3-21-84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Table 3.6.4-1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 6-27 to 6-44

Problem Title: Containment and Drywell Isolation Valves

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Table 3.6.4-1 does not presently include combustable gas control system valves E61-F002A & B; F004A & B; and the upper containment pool drain system valve G41-F265.

Also, valves G33-F001, F004, F250, and F251 (RWCU pump suction valves) apparently have a GE requirement (30 seconds) concerning valve isolation time used in the analyses of potential offsite releases.

NRC, in a letter from Mr. L. F. Dale to Mr. H. R. Denton, dated August 29, 1983, (AECM-83/0492), requested the maximum isolation times for these valves be changed from the present 30 seconds to 42 seconds. Determine if electrical division identification should be placed on valve numbers.

2. Safety Significance:

There is no safety significance concerning the valve omission, since valves E61-F002A & B and F004A & B are governed by the more restrictive requirements of Technical Specification 3/4.6.5. Valve G41-F265 is operated only during a refueling outage, and if inadvertently left open, the resultant leakage into the drywell would be detected by the drywell leakage detection system. However, if the specified closing times for the RWCU pump suction valves are not within the GE analytical limits, this may result in a radiological release following a RWCU pipe break in excess of previously analyzed releases.

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 306 Priority: 1B

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Determine if valves 1E61-F002A & B, F004A & B and G41-F265 should be added to Table 3.6.4-1. A preliminary assessment indicates that valves 1E61-F002A & B, F004A & B should not be included in this table since the valves do not provide an isolation function for the drywell. The isolation function for the drywell vacuum breaker lines is provided by motor-operated valves 1E61-F003A & B and F005A & B which are included in Table 3.6.4-1. Perform an evaluation to determine if the RWCU pump suction valve closure times are correct and submit appropriate changes, if required. Determine if electrical division identification should be placed on valve numbers.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0595, Pages 21, 32, and 120

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 316 Priority: 2I

GE Tech Review / 3/17/84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.3.2, 3.3.3

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-15 and 28

Problem Title: Drywell Press-High (ECCS Setpoints)

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Grand Gulf Technical Specification Table 3.3.2-2 items e and f and Table 3.3.3-2 items A.1.b, A.2.b, B.1.b, B.2.b, and C.1.b specify the high drywell ECCS setpoint and allowable value as 1.89 psig and 1.94 psig, respectively. Recent GE design specification data sheets indicate that these values should be revised to 1.73 psig and 1.93 psig.

2. Safety Significance:

The new values provided by GE are more conservative than the values currently in the Technical Specification; however, calculations and analysis to support these new values have not been provided by GE. It is, therefore, impossible to determine the safety significance until this data is available.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Perform an evaluation to determine if setpoint changes are required and submit Technical Specification changes, if needed.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET(CONT'D)

Item Number: 316 Priority: 2I

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 321 Priority: 3B

GE /

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.6.3.1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 6-20

Problem Title: Standard Technical Specification Additional Action Statement with respect to 95°F

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Action Statement b.2 to Technical Specification 3.6.3.1 differs from the GE Standard Technical Specifications (STS) on the temperature limits for the suppression pool. The STS contains a provision allowing suppression pool temperature to exceed 95°F as long as reactor thermal power is less than 1 percent. The GGNS Technical Specifications omit this condition and its associated surveillance requirements.

2. Safety Significance:

None. The Technical Specification is adequate as currently written.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate the temperature requirements for the suppression pool and confirm that no Technical Specification change is required.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 321 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 325 Priority: 3B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3/4.6.1.9

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 6-12

Problem Title:

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

License Condition 2.C (19) requires the drywell purge valves to be sealed closed when operating above 200°F.

2. Safety Significance:

None. This item is presently a license condition.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate converting the license condition into a Technical Specification.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

/

Date Time

Reference: LCTS 9128

cc: J. E. Cross

R. F. Rogers

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Plsd223

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 326 Priority: 3B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3/4.7.9

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 7-45

Problem Title:

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

License Condition 2.C (29) requires plant shutdown if spent irradiated fuel is placed in the spent fuel pool prior to installation and operability of backup room coolers for the fuel pool cooling pump rooms.

2. Safety Significance:

None. This item is presently a license condition.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate converting the license condition into a Technical Specification.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ /

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

/

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Flad224

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 328 Priority: 2D

Dave Noonan / 3/13/84 J. Catlin

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Table 3.3.7.5-1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-70

Problem Title: Containment/Drywell Area Radiation Monitor Minimum Channels Operable

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Technical Specification Table 3.3.7.5-1 item 13 requires one minimum operable channel each for containment and drywell area monitors. However, GE Standard Technical Specifications (STS) Table 3.3.7.5-1, item 14 requires two minimum operable channels each for containment and drywell area monitors and GGNS has committed to having two channels operable. Also, the note at the bottom of Table 3.3.7.5-1 in the Standard Technical Specification indicates "secondary containment and drywell," whereas the corresponding GGNS note states "~~containment and drywell.~~" ~~There~~ is no Action Statement for ~~item 13~~ for less than the Required Channels Operable. Action 81 does not include less than Required Channels Operable.

2. Safety Significance:

None. The proposed change does not affect the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction. The proposed change enhances the assurance that the system will perform its intended monitoring function.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Perform an evaluation to determine if two channels are required. Verify that the note at the bottom of Technical Specification Table 3.3.7.5-1 is correct. Submit Technical Specification changes, if necessary. Evaluate item 13 and Action 81 to make them consistent.

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 328 Priority: 2D

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 330 Priority: 3B

Dave Noonan /3/12/84 J. Catlin

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 4.3.7.5-1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-72

Problem Title: Surveillance Requirements

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Technical Specification Table 4.3.7.5-1 requires a monthly channel check for the accident monitoring instrumentation. This agrees with the Standard Technical Specification but differs from the daily checks required by other Grand Gulf Technical Specification sections for the same or similar instrumentation. In addition, FSAR 11.5.2.3.1 states that "During Reactor Operation, daily checks of system operability are made by observing channel behavior."

2. Safety Significance:

None. The frequency of accident monitoring instrumentation channel checks should be made consistent with other Technical Specifications and the FSAR. This represents an enhancement to the Grand Gulf Technical Specifications.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

The Technical Specification should be evaluated to determine if a daily channel check is required for those instruments which are normally operating in non-accident conditions. Also, evaluate continuing monthly calibration checks for those instruments which are turned on automatically upon an isolation system trip signal. Those instruments are:

Containment hydrogen

Drywell hydrogen

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 330 Priority: 3B

Those instruments which operate continuously during normal plant operation are:

Drywell/containment differential pressure
Drywell pressure
Containment pressure
Suppression pool water level
Suppression pool water temperature
Drywell and CRD cavity temperature
Containment air temperature
All radiation monitors

4. ~~NRC Response to Item (NRC/IE):~~

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____
Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____
Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 331 Priority: 3B

J. Catlin / 3/22/84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Table 3.4.3.2-2

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 4-10

Problem Title: RCIC System Valve Leakage Alarm Setpoint

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

The alarm setpoint in Technical Specification Table 3.4.3.2-2 for the RCIC (Reactor Coolant System Interface valves leakage pressure) system should be changed from 480 to 485 psig. The 485 psig setpoint is based on a Bechtel calculation using current data for instrument accuracies and as-built instrument elevations.

2. Safety Significance:

None. The 480 psig setpoint is adequately conservative. The 485 psig setpoint is merely a reflection of current data.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Review the need for incorporating the proposed new setpoint into the Technical Specifications.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

References: TSRT-84/0787, page 6 and 7
TSRT-84/0656, page 11

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

P1sd232

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 333 Priority: 3B

L. Rowe /3/19/84 J. Catlin

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 4.8.1.1.2.d.12.a

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 8-6

Problem Title: Verification of ECCS Sequencing of Loads on Offsite Power

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
When the diesel generator is operating in a test mode and is connected to its bus, Surveillance Requirement 4.8.1.1.2.d.12.a requires verification that a simulated ECCS actuation will return the diesel generator to standby operation. The General Electric Standard Technical Specification also includes the requirement to verify that a simulated ECCS actuation will automatically energize the emergency loads with offsite power.

2. Safety Significance:
The present Technical Specification Surveillance Requirements may not ensure verification of all safety functions associated with the transfer of loads from the diesel generators to offsite power. This could result in a failure to detect unavailability of this transfer function.

3. Anticipated Resolution:
Complete an evaluation of the Surveillance Requirements contained in the Technical Specification and in the General Electric Standard Technical Specifications. Propose any Technical Specification modifications which are required to ensure verification of availability for safety functions associated with transfer of loads from the diesel generators to the offsite power supplies.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

P1sd235

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET(CONT'D)

Item Number: 333 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 339 Priority: 3B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 6.2.2

Tech Spec Page: 6-4, 6-5

Problem Title: Non-Licensed vs. Auxiliary Operator Titles

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
Technical Specification 6.2.2, Table 6.2.2-1 and Figure 6.2.2-1 identifies the title of "Auxiliary Operator" within the shift crew composition. This title is inconsistent with the response to TMI related requirements (FSAR Section 18.1.3) for shift manning, which identifies the title of "Non-Licenses Operator".

2. Safety Significance:
None. The term "Non-Licenses Operator" is consistent with the title "Auxiliary Operator" with respect to the shift crew composition.

3. Anticipated Resolution:
Investigate the necessity of clarifying the term "Non-Licensed Operator" in FSAR Section 18.1.3.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ /

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

/

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Plsd246

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 340 Priority: 3B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 6.2.2

Tech Spec Page: 6-2

Problem Title: Time Off Between Working Periods

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
Technical Specification 6.2.2.f specifies guidelines that shall be followed (for unit staff who perform safety-related functions) in the event that unforeseen problems require substantial amounts of overtime to be used. Item 3. of this Technical Specification states that a break of at least eight hours should be allowed between work periods, including shift turnover time. The eight hour break is inconsistent with FSAR Section 13.1.2.1 which discusses a break of at least twelve hours.

2. Safety Significance:
None. FSAR Section 13.1.2.1 should be revised to be consistent with FSAR Section 18.1.3 and Technical Specification 6.2.2.f.

3. Anticipated Resolution:
Evaluate the inconsistencies between the SER, NUREG-0737, FSAR Section 13.1.2.1 and Technical Specification 6.2.2.f. Revise FSAR Section 13.1.2.1 with respect to the break time between work periods in the FSAR update if appropriate.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ /

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Plsd247

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 340 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 343 Priority: 3B

GE Review /4/3/84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.3.3

Tech Spec Page:

Problem Title: Grand Gulf Technical Specification / BWR/6 Standard Technical Specification Inconsistency

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
The BWR/6 Standard Technical Specification has requirements for "Division 1, 2, and 3 Bus Power Monitor"; the Grand Gulf Technical Specification does not. GE interprets the "Bus Power Monitor" as the battery bus low voltage instrumentation.

2. Safety Significance:
None. This instrument is for annunciation only and has no actuation function. Battery voltage is surveillanced weekly and administratively monitored every 8 hours. The DC bus monitors are in service with setpoints of 109 volts; thus the only change here would be a change to the Technical Specification.

3. Anticipated Resolution:
Add requirements to Grand Gulf Technical Specifications for Division 1, 2, and 3 bus power monitor to make consistent with BWR/6 Standard Technical Specification.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Plsd249.2

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 343 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 346 Priority: 2D

Loeper /4/5/84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.3.7.8

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-75

Problem Title: Chlorine Detection System

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
Technical Specification 3.3.7.8 requires two independent chlorine detection systems to be operable in all Operational Conditions. The GGNS design for the chlorine detection system includes a sensor with output contacts providing signals to the control room emergency filtration system isolation logic. The specification should be revised to replace "chlorine detection systems" with "chlorine detection channels" for consistency with the GGNS instrumentation definitions.

Action Statements (a) and (b) require at least one control room emergency filtration system subsystem to be operating in the isolation mode when there are inoperable chlorine detection channel(s). The Action Statements should require that the control room emergency filtration subsystem which is associated with the Control Room HVAC subsystem that is in operation be initiated and maintained in the isolation mode of operation.

2. Safety Significance:
None. Replacing "systems" with "channels" for the chlorine detection instrumentation is for clarification of terminology and does not affect compliance with the intent of the Technical Specification.

None. This is an enhancement item for operations. As presently worded, Action Statements (a) and (b) would permit initiating and maintaining the control room emergency filtration subsystem which is associated with the control room HVAC subsystem that is not in operation in the isolation mode. The operating control room HVAC subsystem in this event would only be recirculating air through its normal filter and would not be circulating air

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 346 Priority: 2D

through the filters of the emergency filtration subsystem. This is not a concern for an outside accidental chlorine release since the common intake for both control room HVAC subsystems would be isolated.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate the necessity of changing Technical Specification 3.3.7.8 to provide the proper terminology and provide consistency with the GGNS instrumentation channel definitions.

Evaluate Action Statements (a) and (b) with respect to the design intent of the control room emergency filtration subsystems and their associated chlorine detection channels. Propose appropriate Technical Specification changes as necessary.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 348

Loeper — /4/5/84 — Priority: 2D

Identified By — Date — Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.3.7.3-1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-63

Problem Title: Met Monitoring Instrumentation

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
Technical Specification Table 3.3.7.3-1 requires a minimum of one operable instrument for each of the listed meteorological monitoring functions. Action Statement (a) requires a Special Report to the NRC if "one or more meteorological monitoring instrumentation channels" is inoperable for more than 7 days. The GGNS design includes 2 instrument channels for each meteorological monitoring parameter of Table 3.3.7.3-1. The existing Action Statement (a) could require a Special Report to the NRC for a single inoperable instrument event though the minimum operable instruments requirement of Table 3.3.7.3-1 is satisfied. Action Statement (a) should be revised to delete this unnecessary reporting requirements.

2. Safety Significance:
None. The GGNS Technical Specification ensures adequate meteorological monitoring instrumentation response. The proposed change would only affect the reporting requirements of this specification.

3. Anticipated Resolution:
Review Action Statement (a) with respect to the reporting requirement for inoperable instrument channels and evaluate the necessity of a Technical Specification change based on this review.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified — Date — Time

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 348 Priority: 2D

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
B. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 362 Priority: 2B

Loeper /

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.3.2 and 3.3.5

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-9 and 3/4 3-44

Problem Title: RCIC Time Delay for Actuation and Isolation

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Recent design changes have been made to the reactor core isolation cooling (RCIC) system to add two time delays. One time delay was added to the actuation logic to prevent RCIC turbine trip on overspeed following the opening of steam admission valve E51-F045. The second time delay was added to the isolation logic to prevent system isolation immediately following a loss of offsite power signal. Technical Specification 3.3.2 and 3.3.5 contain Surveillance Requirements for similar RCIC timers, but not for the timers installed for the new time delays.

2. Safety Significance:

None. Operability of the timers installed for the new time delays is currently checked during the logic system functional tests required by Technical Specifications 4.3.2.2 and 4.3.5.2.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Perform an evaluation of the additional time delays in the RCIC actuation logic and RCIC isolation logic and confirm that Technical Specification changes are unnecessary.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Plsd277

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 362 Priority: 2B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 367

Priority: 2D

W. A. Russell / 3/20/84

Identified By Date

Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.3.7.5

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-70, 3-71

Problem Title: Action Statement Not Consistent with Table

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
Item 13, containment/drywell area monitors, of Table 3.3.7.5-1 references Action 81. Action 81 addresses only operation with less than the "minimum channels operable". The Action Statement for item 13 should address "Required number of channels," as well as the "minimum channels operable"; therefore, Action 81 is inappropriate for item 13. Duplicate of Problem Sheet #328.

2. Safety Significance:
None. As long as the minimum operable channel requirement of Action 81 is met, accident monitoring capability is provided.

3. Anticipated Resolution:
Evaluate changing Action Statement to Action 80 for item 13.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: Refer to Problem Sheet #328.

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Plsd283.1

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 368 Priority: 3B

W. A. Russell / 3/20/84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.3.7.5

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-70

Problem Title: Incorrect Nomenclature

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Table 3.3.7.5-1 and 4.3.7.5-1, Items 13 through 18, should be revised to read "radiation monitor" instead of "monitor".

2. Safety Significance:

Resolved as part of Problem Sheet Item 329.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Resolved as part of Problem Sheet Item 329.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: Refer to Problem Sheet # 329.

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross

R. F. Rogers

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Plsd283.2

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 369 Priority: 2D

W. A. Russell /3/19/84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.3.1 Tables 3.3.1-1 and 4.3.1.1-1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-2, 3, 7, and 8

Problem Title: Applicable Operational Condition Inconsistencies

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Table 3.3.1-1 specifies applicable operational conditions for reactor protection system instrumentation and several items have footnotes describing exceptions to these operational conditions. Table 4.3.1.1-1 specifies Surveillance Requirements for the instrumentation listed in Table 3.3.1-1, but does not contain the same footnotes for the affected items. This in effect requires Surveillance to be performed when the instrumentation is not required to be operable.

2. Safety Significance:

None. Current Instrumentation Surveillance Requirements are more conservative than the operability requirements.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate to determine if appropriate footnotes should be added to Table 4.3.1.1-1, to make it consistent with Table 3.3.1-1.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____/_____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 369 Priority: 2D

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 372 Priority: 3B

S. Loeper / 4/16/84

Identified By Date

Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Tables 3.3.2-1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-10

Problem Title: Manual Initiation of Valve Group 6A

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
According to Isolation Actuation Instrumentation Technical Specification Table 3.3.2-1, valve group 6A receives a closure signal from manual initiation (item 1.h) of primary containment isolation. Eight valves in group 6A do not close from the manual initiation of primary containment isolation. These valves isolate chilled water to the drywell coolers (P44-F070, P44-F069, P44-F053, P44-F076, P44-F074 and P44-F077) and the auxiliary building floor and equipment drain tanks line to the suppression pool (P45-F273 and P45-F274).

2. Safety Significance:
The accident analysis does not take credit for the manual initiation function for primary containment isolation. Automatic isolation signals are assumed to provide the necessary isolation function. Emergency and off-normal procedures for the plant do not take credit for the manual initiation of primary containment isolation. Since the automatic isolation signals close all group 6A valves, the subject problem description is not safety significant. However, Technical Specification Table 3.3.2-1 is currently misleading and can lead to mininterpretation as to which valves receive manual initiation isolation signals.

3. Anticipated Resolution:
Evaluate the problem to determine if a plant design change or Technical Specification change is required.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ /

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 26, 4/24/84

Plsd283.4.3

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 372 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

"TECH SPEC PRIORITY"

MEMO TO: Tech Spec Review Personnel

FROM: C. L. Tyrone

SUBJECT: Rev. 27 to Technical Specification Problem Sheet

TSRT: 84/ 0940

DATE: April 21, 1984

The following changes/additions are to be incorporated into the Tech Spec Problem Sheets:

ITEM NUMBER	CHANGES/ADDITION
048 (2 cys)	Remove Rev. 15, Insert Rev. 27
25 x (2 cys)	Remove Rev. 25 Insert Rev. 27
	Remove Rev. , Insert Rev.
	Remove Rev. , Insert Rev.
	Remove Rev. , Insert Rev.
	Remove Rev. , Insert Rev.
	Remove Rev. , Insert Rev.
	Remove Rev. , Insert Rev.
	Remove Rev. , Insert Rev.
	Remove Rev. , Insert Rev.
	Remove Rev. , Insert Rev.
	Remove Rev. , Insert Rev.
	Remove Rev. , Insert Rev.

C. L. Tyrone

CLT:sad
Attachment

cc: S. H. Hobbs (w/1)
File (Tech Spec Records) (w/1)
M2sd1

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING AS OF April 26, 1984
Date

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
001	X	1B	15, 3/29/84
002	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
003	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
004	X	2E	22, 4/09/84
005	X	1B	15, 3/29/84
006	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
007	X	2F	15, 3/29/84
008	X	2H	17, 4/01/84
009	X	2B	25, 4/16/84
010	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
011	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
012	X	2B	26, 4/24/84
013	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
014	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
015	X	1B	17, 4/01/84
016	X	1B	15, 3/29/84
017	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
018	X	3B	15, 3/29/84
019	X	2B	25, 4/16/84
020	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
021	X	1C	15, 3/29/84
022	X	2A	17, 4/01/84
023	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
024	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
025	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
026	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
027	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
028	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
029	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
030	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
031	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
032	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
033	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
034	X	1C	18, 4/02/84
035	X	2C	15, 3/29/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
036	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
037	X	1C	15, 3/29/84
038	X	1C	15, 3/29/84
039	X	2G	17, 4/01/84
040	X	2F	17, 4/01/84
041	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
042	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
043	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
044	X	2B	26, 4/24/84
045	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
046	X	2F	15, 3/29/84
047	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
048	X	2H	27, 4/26/84
049	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
050	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
051	X	D	15, 3/29/84
052	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
053	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
054	X	1B	21, 4/08/84
055	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
056	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
057	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
058	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
059	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
060	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
061	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
062	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
063	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
064	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
065	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
066	X	2D	22, 4/09/84
067	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
068	X	3B	15, 3/29/84
069	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
070	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
071	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
072	X	2D	17, 4/01/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
073	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
074	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
075	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
076	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
077	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
078	X	1B	15, 3/29/84
079	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
080	X	N/A (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
081	X	3A	15, 3/29/84
082	X	3A	15, 3/29/84
083	X	2B	22, 4/09/84
084	X	3A	15, 3/29/84
085	X	2D	20, 4/06/84
086	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
087	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
088	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
089	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
090	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
091	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
092	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
093	X	2E	22, 4/09/84
094	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
095	X	2E	22, 4/09/84
096	X	2E	25, 4/16/84
097	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
098	X	2G	15, 3/29/84
099	X	2G	21, 4/08/84
100	X	2B	25, 4/16/84
101	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
102	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
103	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
104	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
105	X	2E	25, 4/16/84
106	X	2E	25, 4/16/84
107	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
108	X	2C	15, 3/29/84
109	X	2D	15, 3/29/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
110	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
111	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
112	X	2A	15, 3/29/84
113	X	N/A (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
114	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
115	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
116	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
117	X	N/A (Resolved)	18, 4/02/84
118	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
119	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
120	X	2B	25, 4/16/84
121	X	N/A (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
122	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
123	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
124	X	2C	18, 4/02/84
125	X	N/A (Resolved)	18, 4/02/84
126	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
127	X	2G	17, 4/01/84
128	X	2E	26, 4/24/84
129	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
130	X	N/A (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
131	X	2B	26, 4/24/84
132	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
133	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
134	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
135	X	N/A (Resolved)	18, 4/02/84
136	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
137	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
138	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
139	X	1C	15, 3/29/84
140	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
141	X	2F	17, 4/01/84
142	X	2F	15, 3/29/84
143	X	2G	15, 3/29/84
144	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
145	X	2F	17, 4/01/84
146	X	2E	15, 3/29/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
147	X	3B	16, 3/31/84
148	X	3A	17, 4/01/84
149	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
150	X	2G	17, 4/01/84
151	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
152	X	2E	16, 3/31/84
153	X	2H	17, 4/01/84
154	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
155	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
156	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
157	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
158	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
159	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
160	X	2E	21, 4/08/84
161	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
162	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
163	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
164	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
165	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
166	X	2H	26, 4/24/84
167	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
168	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
169	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
170	X	2E	16, 3/31/84
171	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
172	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
173	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
174	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
175	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
176	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
177	X	2D	25, 4/16/84
178	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
179	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
180	X	2A	17, 4/01/84
181	X	2A	26, 4/24/84
182	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
183	X	2D	18, 4/02/84

L26sd5

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
184	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
185	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
186	X	N/A (Resolved)	18, 4/02/84
187	X	2G	18, 4/02/84
188	X	3B (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
189	X	2H	18, 4/02/84
190	X	2D	20, 4/06/84
191	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
192	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
193	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
194	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
195	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
196	X	2B	16, 3/31/84
197	X	2B	26, 4/24/84
198	X	1C	16, 3/31/84
199	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
200	X	2G	18, 4/02/84
201	X	2B	22, 4/09/84
202	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
203	X	2D	22, 4/09/84
204	X	2H	18, 4/02/84
205	X	2H	16, 3/31/84
206	X	2G	16, 3/31/84
207	X	2H	18, 4/02/84
208	X	2H	18, 4/02/84
209	X	2H	15, 3/29/84
210	X	2G	18, 4/02/84
211	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
212	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
213	X	1C	16, 3/31/84
214	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
215	X	3B	16, 3/31/84
216	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
217	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
218	X	2H	26, 4/24/84
219	X	2I	16, 3/31/84
220	X	3A	18, 4/02/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
221	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
222	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
223	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
224	X	3B	16, 3/31/84
225	X	2D	25, 4/16/84
226	X	3A	18, 4/02/84
227	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
228	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
229	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
230	X	2B (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
231	X	3B	17, 4/01/84
232	X	3B	17, 4/01/84
233	X	2E	25, 4/16/84
234	X	3A	25, 4/16/84
235	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
236	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
237	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
238	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
239	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
240	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
241	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
242	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
243	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
244	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
245	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
246	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
247	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
248	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
249	X	2D	22, 4/09/84
250	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
251	X	2F	18, 4/02/84
252	X	*3B	18, 4/02/84
253	X	2C	18, 4/02/84
254	X	3B	18, 4/02/84

* Priority changed from 1A per J. C. Roberts 3/27/84.

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
255	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
256	X	2E	27, 4/26/84
256-1	X	Sub, 2E	18, 4/02/84
257	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
258	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
259	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
260	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
261	X	3A	18, 4/02/84
262	X	1C	16, 3/31/84
263	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
264	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
265	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
266	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
267	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
268	X	2F	18, 4/02/84
269	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
270	X	2E	22, 4/09/84
271	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
272	X	2D	22, 4/09/84
273	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
274	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
275	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
276	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
277	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
278	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
279	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
280	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
281	X	2E	25, 4/16/84
282	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
283	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
284	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
285	X	1C	18, 4/02/84
286	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
287	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
288	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
289	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
290	X	2E	18, 4/02/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
291	X	*3B	18, 4/02/84
292	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
293	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
294	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
295	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
296	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
297	X	2E	26, 4/24/84
298	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
299	X	2B	25, 4/16/84
300	X	3A	18, 4/02/84
301	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
302	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
303	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
304	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
305	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
306	X	1B	26, 4/24/84
307	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
308	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
309	X	2A	18, 4/02/84
310	X	2A	18, 4/02/84
311	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
312	X	2B	22, 4/09/84
313	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
314	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
315	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
316	X	2I	26, 4/24/84
317	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
318	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
319	X	2E	21, 4/08/84
320	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
321	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
322	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
323	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
324	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
325	X	3B	26, 4/24/84

* Priority changed from 1A per J. C. Roberts 3/27/84.

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
326	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
327	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
328	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
329	X	1C	18, 4/02/84
330	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
331	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
332	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
333	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
334	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
335	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
336	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
337	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
338	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
339	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
340	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
341	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
342	X	2B	19, 4/05/84
343	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
344	X	1B	19, 4/05/84
345	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
346	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
347	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
348	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
349	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
350	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
351	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
352	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
353	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
354	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
355	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
356	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
357	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
358	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
359	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
360	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
361	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
362	X	2B	26, 4/24/84
363	X	2D	21, 4/08/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
364	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
365	X	2D	24, 4/13/84
366	X	2D	24, 4/13/84
367	X	2D (Resolved)	26, 4/24/84
368	X	3B (Resolved)	26, 4/24/84
369	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
370	X	3A	24, 4/13/84
371	X	2D	24, 4/13/84
372	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
800	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
801	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
802	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
803	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
804	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
805	X	3B	24, 3/13/84
806	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
807	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
808	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
809	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
810	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
811	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
812	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
813	X	3B	22, 4/09/84
814	X	3B	22, 4/09/84
815	X	3B	22, 4/09/84
816	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
817	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
818	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
819	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
820	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
821	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
822	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
823	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
824	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
825	X	3B	24, 4/13/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
826	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
827	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
828	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
829	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
830	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
831	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
832	X	3B	25, 4/16/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 048 Priority: 2H

Ray Patterson / -

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.2.2, 3/4.3.6

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 2-5, 3/4 3-49

Problem Title: Maximum Extended Operating Domain

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
Technical Specification 3.2.2 contains the limits on the APRM flow-biased scram and rod block setpoints. GE is performing Maximum Extended Operating Domain (MEOD) and Increased Core Flow (ICF) analyses which are expected to allow these APRM setpoints to be revised to accommodate operational enhancements.

2. Safety Significance:
None. The extension of the operating domain which includes the MEOD and ICF analyses will remain within the established design criteria.

3. Anticipated Resolution:
A Technical Specification revision will be prepared to incorporate the MEOD and ICF requirements when these analyses are completed. GE is expected to provide the NRC with a licensing topical report to support the analyses and Technical Specification submittal.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 27, 4/26/84

Mlsd86

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number 048 Priority 2H

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 256 Priority: 2E

/3-15-84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.7.4, Bases 3/4.7.4, 3/4.5.1, 3/4.5.2, and 2.2.1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 7-13, B3/4 7-2, and B3/4 5-1

Problem Title: Generic Bases Problems

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Minor typographical errors were found and identified on pages 3/4 7-13 and B 3/4 7-2 of the GGNS Technical Specifications. Also, the values for high pressure core spray (HPCS) operating pressures were not revised in Bases 3/4.5.1 and 2 when those values were changed in Technical Specification 4.5.1 by Amendment 9.

2. Safety Significance:

None: These are minor typographical errors and inadvertent omissions which do affect plant safety or operational requirements.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Propose a Technical Specification change to correct the typographical error on page 3/4 7-13 from "maintanence" to "maintenance" and page B3/4 7-2 from "enusre" to "ensure." Also propose a change to correct the HPCS operating pressures in Bases 3/4.5.1 and 2 to be consistent with the values in Technical Specification 4.5.1 if necessary.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ /

Individual Notified Date Time

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 256 Priority: 2E

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

References: TSRT-84/0143, Page 9
TSRT-84/0447, Pages 4 - 9
TSRT-84/0649, Page 11
TSRT-84/0651, Pages 12 and 13
TSRT-84/0554, Page 5 and 6
TSRT-84/0882, Page 1

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

"TECH SPEC PRIORITY"

MEMO TO: Tech Spec Review Personnel

FROM: C. L. Tyrone

SUBJECT: Rev. 28 to Technical Specification Problem Sheet

TSRT: 84/0944

DATE: April 28, 1984

The following changes/additions are to be incorporated into the Tech Spec Problem Sheets:

ITEM NUMBER	CHANGES/ADDITION
373	Remove Rev.—, Insert Rev. 28
374	Remove Rev.—, Insert Rev. 28
375	Remove Rev.—, Insert Rev. 28
376	Remove Rev.—, Insert Rev. 28
377	Remove Rev.—, Insert Rev. 28
378	Remove Rev.—, Insert Rev. 28
379	Remove Rev.—, Insert Rev. 28
380	Remove Rev.—, Insert Rev. 28
381	Remove Rev.—, Insert Rev. 28
382	Remove Rev.—, Insert Rev. 28
833	Remove Rev.—, Insert Rev. 28
	Remove Rev. , Insert Rev.
	Remove Rev. , Insert Rev.

C. L. Tyrone

CLT:sad
Attachment

cc: S. H. Hobbs (w/1)
File (Tech Spec Records) (w/1)
M2sd1

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING AS OF April 28, 1984
Date

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
001	X	1B	15, 3/29/84
002	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
003	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
004	X	2E	22, 4/09/84
005	X	1B	15, 3/29/84
006	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
007	X	2F	15, 3/29/84
008	X	2H	17, 4/01/84
009	X	2B	25, 4/16/84
010	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
011	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
012	X	2B	26, 4/24/84
013	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
014	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
015	X	1B	17, 4/01/84
016	X	1B	15, 3/29/84
017	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
018	X	3B	15, 3/29/84
019	X	2B	25, 4/16/84
020	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
021	X	1C	15, 3/29/84
022	X	2A	17, 4/01/84
023	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
024	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
025	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
026	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
027	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
028	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
029	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
030	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
031	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
032	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
033	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
034	X	1C	18, 4/02/84
035	X	2C	15, 3/29/84

L26sd1

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
036	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
037	X	1C	15, 3/29/84
038	X	1C	15, 3/29/84
039	X	2G	17, 4/01/84
040	X	2F	17, 4/01/84
041	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
042	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
043	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
044	X	2B	26, 4/24/84
045	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
046	X	2F	15, 3/29/84
047	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
048	X	2H	27, 4/26/84
049	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
050	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
051	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
052	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
053	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
054	X	1B	21, 4/08/84
055	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
056	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
057	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
058	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
059	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
060	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
061	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
062	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
063	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
064	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
065	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
066	X	2D	22, 4/09/84
067	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
068	X	3B	15, 3/29/84
069	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
070	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
071	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
072	X	2D	17, 4/01/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
073	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
074	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
075	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
076	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
077	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
078	X	1B	15, 3/29/84
079	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
080	X	N/A (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
081	X	3A	15, 3/29/84
082	X	3A	15, 3/29/84
083	X	2B	22, 4/09/84
084	X	3A	15, 3/29/84
085	X	2D	20, 4/06/84
086	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
087	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
088	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
089	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
090	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
091	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
092	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
093	X	2E	22, 4/09/84
094	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
095	X	2E	22, 4/09/84
096	X	2E	25, 4/16/84
097	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
098	X	2G	15, 3/29/84
099	X	2G	21, 4/08/84
100	X	2B	25, 4/16/84
101	X	2E	15, 3/29/84
102	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
103	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
104	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
105	X	2E	25, 4/16/84
106	X	2E	25, 4/16/84
~~107~~	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
108	X	2C	15, 3/29/84
109	X	2D	~~15~~, 3/29/84

L26sd3

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
110	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
111	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
112	X	2A	15, 3/29/84
113	X	N/A (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
114	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
115	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
116	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
117	X	N/A (Resolved)	18, 4/02/84
118	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
119	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
120	X	2B	25, 4/16/84
121	X	N/A (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
122	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
123	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
124	X	2C	18, 4/02/84
125	X	N/A (Resolved)	18, 4/02/84
126	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
127	X	2G	17, 4/01/84
128	X	2E	26, 4/24/84
129	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
130	X	N/A (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
131	X	2B	26, 4/24/84
132	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
133	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
134	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
135	X	N/A (Resolved)	18, 4/02/84
136	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
137	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
138	X	2D	15, 3/29/84
139	X	1C	15, 3/29/84
140	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
141	X	2F	17, 4/01/84
142	X	2F	15, 3/29/84
143	X	2G	15, 3/29/84
144	X	2B	15, 3/29/84
145	X	2F	17, 4/01/84
146	X	2E	15, 3/29/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
147	X	3B	16, 3/31/84
148	X	3A	17, 4/01/84
149	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
150	X	2G	17, 4/01/84
151	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
152	X	2E	16, 3/31/84
153	X	2H	17, 4/01/84
154	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
155	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
156	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
157	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
158	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
159	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
160	X	2E	21, 4/08/84
161	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
162	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
163	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
164	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
165	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
166	X	2H	26, 4/24/84
167	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
168	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
169	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
170	X	2E	16, 3/31/84
171	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
172	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
173	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
174	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
175	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
176	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
177	X	2D	25, 4/16/84
178	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
179	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
180	X	2A	17, 4/01/84
181	X	2A	26, 4/24/84
182	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
183	X	2D	18, 4/02/84

L26sd5

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
184	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
185	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
186	X	N/A (Resolved)	18, 4/02/84
187	X	2G	18, 4/02/84
188	X	3B (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
189	X	2H	18, 4/02/84
190	X	2D	20, 4/06/84
191	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
192	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
193	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
194	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
195	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
196	X	2B	16, 3/31/84
197	X	2B	26, 4/24/84
198	X	1C	16, 3/31/84
199	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
200	X	2G	18, 4/02/84
201	X	2B	22, 4/09/84
202	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
203	X	2D	22, 4/09/84
204	X	2H	18, 4/02/84
205	X	2H	16, 3/31/84
206	X	2G	16, 3/31/84
207	X	2H	18, 4/02/84
208	X	2H	18, 4/02/84
209	X	2H	15, 3/29/84
210	X	2G	18, 4/02/84
211	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
212	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
213	X	1C	16, 3/31/84
214	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
215	X	3B	16, 3/31/84
216	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
217	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
218	X	2H	26, 4/24/84
219	X	2I	16, 3/31/84
220	X	3A	18, 4/02/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
221	X	2D	16, 3/31/84
222	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
223	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
224	X	3B	16, 3/31/84
225	X	2D	25, 4/16/84
226	X	3A	18, 4/02/84
227	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
228	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
229	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
230	X	2B (Resolved)	15, 3/29/84
231	X	3B	17, 4/01/84
232	X	3B	17, 4/01/84
233	X	2E	25, 4/16/84
234	X	3A	25, 4/16/84
235	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
236	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
237	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
238	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
239	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
240	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
241	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
242	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
243	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
244	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
245	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
246	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
247	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
248	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
249	X	2D	22, 4/09/84
250	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
251	X	2F	18, 4/02/84
252	X	*3B	18, 4/02/84
253	X	2C	18, 4/02/84
254	X	3B	18, 4/02/84

* Priority changed from 1A per J. C. Roberts 3/27/84.

L26sd7

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
255	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
256	X	2E	27, 4/26/84
256-1	X	Sub, 2E	18, 4/02/84
257	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
258	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
259	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
260	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
261	X	3A	18, 4/02/84
262	X	1C	16, 3/31/84
263	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
264	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
265	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
266	X	2B	17, 4/01/84
267	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
268	X	2F	18, 4/02/84
269	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
270	X	2E	22, 4/09/84
271	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
272	X	2D	22, 4/09/84
273	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
274	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
275	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
276	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
277	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
278	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
279	X	2D	17, 4/01/84
280	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
281	X	2E	25, 4/16/84
282	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
283	X	2E	17, 4/01/84
284	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
285	X	1C	18, 4/02/84
286	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
287	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
288	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
289	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
290	X	2E	18, 4/02/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
291	X	*3B	18, 4/02/84
292	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
293	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
294	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
295	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
296	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
297	X	2E	26, 4/24/84
298	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
299	X	2B	25, 4/16/84
300	X	3A	18, 4/02/84
301	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
302	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
303	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
304	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
305	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
306	X	1B	26, 4/24/84
307	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
308	X	1B	18, 4/02/84
309	X	2A	18, 4/02/84
310	X	2A	18, 4/02/84
311	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
312	X	2B	22, 4/09/84
313	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
314	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
315	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
316	X	2I	26, 4/24/84
317	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
318	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
319	X	2E	21, 4/08/84
320	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
321	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
322	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
323	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
324	X	2E	18, 4/02/84
325	X	3B	26, 4/24/84

* Priority changed from 1A per J. C. Roberts 3/27/84.

L26sd9

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
326	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
327	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
328	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
329	X	1C	18, 4/02/84
330	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
331	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
332	X	3B	21, 4/08/84
333	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
334	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
335	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
336	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
337	X	2D	18, 4/02/84
338	X	2B	18, 4/02/84
339	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
340	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
341	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
342	X	2B	19, 4/05/84
343	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
344	X	1B	19, 4/05/84
345	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
346	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
347	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
348	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
349	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
350	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
351	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
352	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
353	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
354	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
355	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
356	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
357	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
358	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
359	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
360	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
361	X	2D	21, 4/08/84
362	X	2B	26, 4/24/84
363	X	2D	21, 4/08/84

L26sd10

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
364	X	2B	21, 4/08/84
365	X	2D	24, 4/13/84
366	X	2D	24, 4/13/84
367	X	2D (Resolved)	26, 4/24/84
368	X	3B (Resolved)	26, 4/24/84
369	X	2D	26, 4/24/84
370	X	3A	24, 4/13/84
371	X	2D	24, 4/13/84
372	X	3B	26, 4/24/84
373	X	2G	28, 4/28/84
374	X	2B	28, 4/28/84
375	X	2E	28, 4/28/84
376	X	3B	28, 4/28/84
377	X	3B	28, 4/28/84
378	X	3B	28, 4/28/84
379	X	2E	28, 4/28/84
380	X	2D	28, 4/28/84
381	X	2D	28, 4/28/84
382	X	2H	28, 4/28/84
800	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
801	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
802	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
803	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
804	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
805	X	3B	24, 3/13/84
806	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
807	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
808	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
809	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
810	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
811	X	3B	18, 4/02/84
812	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
813	X	3B	22, 4/09/84
814	X	3B	22, 4/09/84
815	X	3B	22, 4/09/84

PROBLEM SHEET LISTING

ITEM NUMBER	REVIEWED BY RPD	PRIORITY	REVISION, DATE
816	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
817	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
818	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
819	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
820	X	3B	23, 4/10/84
821	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
822	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
823	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
824	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
825	X	3B	24, 4/13/84
826	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
827	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
828	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
829	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
830	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
831	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
832	X	3B	25, 4/16/84
833	X	3B	28, 4/28/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 373 Priority: 2G

NRR/PSB / _____

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Table 3.3.3-2

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-29

Problem Title: Division 3 Undervoltage Level(s)

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Division 3 bus does not have the same degraded voltage protection compared with Divisions 1 and 2. Only one level is provided, for Division 3 (72 percent). Divisions 1 and 2 have 90, 80, and 70 percent.

2. Safety Significance:

None. Design is in accordance with FSAR 8.3.1.1.2.2, 8.3.1.1.4.2, Q&R 040.90, and NEDO 10905.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Ensure all auxiliary equipment can operate at 72 percent degraded voltage. Consider design change and Technical Specification change if appropriate.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ /

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 28, 4/28/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 374 Priority: 2B

NRR/ICSB /

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: Table 3.3.7.5-1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-70

Problem Title: Category 1 Accident Monitoring Instrumentation

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

Per NRR/ICSB, all Category 1 Accident Monitoring Instrumentation as identified by MP&L should be in the Technical Specifications.

2. Safety Significance:

None. Proposed change updates Technical Specification to latest commitments associated with Regulatory Guide 1.97, Revision 2.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Determine from MP&L submittals to NRC on implementation of Regulatory Guide 1.97, Revision 2, which variables are Category 1. Revise Technical Specifications accordingly.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 28, 4/28/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number 374 Priority: 2B

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

References: AECM-82/0078
AECM-82/0317
AECM-82/0563
AECM-83/0286
AECM-83/0486
AECM-83/0652
AECM-84/0027

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 375 Priority: 2E

NRR/CPB / _____

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: B3/4.2.3

Tech Spec Page: B3/4 2-5

Problem Title: MCPR Bases Reference

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

No reference is given in the Bases Figures 3.2.3-1 and 3.2.3-2. Probably should reference NEDO-24011, Revision 4 (January 1982).

2. Safety Significance:

Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Determine reference and add to Bases.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: 4/3/84, NRC Handout from Capra

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 28, 4/28/84

Plsd283.4.8

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 376 Priority: 3B

NRR/CSB / _____

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3/4.6.6.1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 6-46

Problem Title: SBGT Flow Rate of 2300 CFM

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

NRC recommended changing 4000 cfm to 2300 cfm for Standby Gas Treatment Flow.

2. Safety Significance:

None. Technical Specification is correct.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

No action is required.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

Reference: 4/3/84, NRC Handout from Capra

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 28, 4/28/84

Plsd283.4.9

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 377 Priority: 3B

NRR/RAB / _____

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3/4.7.2

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 7-5

Problem Title: Control Room In-Leakage

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

NRC noted that post-licensing tests indicate excessive control room in-leakage.

2. Safety Significance:

Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

This issue is associated with License Condition (Attachment 1, Item 3). No Technical Specification change is required.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

/ _____

Date Time

Reference: 4/3/84, NRC Handout from Capra

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 28, 4/28/84

P1sd283.5

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 378 Priority: 3B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3/4.6.6.1 and 3/4.6.6.3

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 6-46 and 3/4 6-55

Problem Title: SBGT Flow Ambiguity

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

3/4.6.6.1 lists a flow rate not to exceed 4000 cfm. 3/4.6.6.3 lists a flow rate of 4000 plus or minus 10 percent.

2. Safety Significance:

None. Both Technical Specifications are correct.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

The lower limit of 3/4.6.6.1 is based on dose vs. in-leakage. 3/4.6.6.3 is based on HEPA Filter efficiency testing. No action is needed.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____/_____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____/_____

Date Time

Reference: 4/3/84, NRC Handout from Capra

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 28, 4/28/84

Plsd283.6

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 379 Priority: 2E

MP&L/IE / _____

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3/4.6.2.3.d.3 and 3/4.6.1.3.d.3

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 6-16, 6-6; B3/4 6-1, 6-3

Problem Title: Air Lock Seal Decay Test

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
Technical Specification specifies the leakage rate acceptance criteria in terms of a 2 psig pressure drop in a 48 hour period.

2. Safety Significance:
None. Clarification only.

3. Anticipated Resolution:
Modify Bases to clarify that a shorter time period may be used if it can be justified given instrument accuracies. This is in accordance with ANSI N45.4-1972.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

/ _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 28, 4/28/84

Plsd283.7

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 380 Priority: 2D

NRC/IE / _____

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3/4.10.1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 10-1

Problem Title: Low Power Physics Test

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
Technical Specification allows low power physics tests to be conducted with the head removed and containment/drywell integrity not established. Region II states Technical Specification only allows low power physics tests as a part of open vessel testing.

2. Safety Significance:
None. Clarification only.

3. Anticipated Resolution:
Discuss with NRR the purpose of this specification and revise Technical Specification as necessary.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 28, 4/28/84

Plsd283.8

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 381 Priority: 2D

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3/4.3.1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-1

Problem Title: Confusing Terms

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

The terms "redundant channel" and "monitoring that parameter" result in some confusion due to their use:

a. Technical Specifications 4.3.1.3 (page 3/4 3-1), 4.3.2.3 (page 3/4 3-9), and 4.3.3.3 (page 3/4 3-24) use the words "redundant channel" with relation to response time testing. What does "redundant" mean? This is particularly critical to IRM, APRM, Main Steam Isolation Valve-Closure, Main Steam Line Flow-High, Main Steam Line Radiation-High, etc.

b. Surveillance intervals of 2 hours are allowed on some Technical Specifications, but not others. When the 2 hours is allowed, it is tied to the term "channels monitoring that parameter." The terminology is confusing and implies surveillance outage intervals are not allowed on equipment like Main Steam Line Radiation-High, APRM, IRM, Main Steam Line Isolation Valve-Closure, etc.

2. Safety Significance:

None. Technical Specification is confusing, but would not lead to non-conservative operation.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate options of (a) rewording the individual Technical Specifications, or (b) defing the terms.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ /

Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 28, 4/28/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 381 Priority: 2D

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____ / _____

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 382 Priority: 2H

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3/4.4.1.1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 4-1

Problem Title: Hydraulic Instability

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

GE, NRC, and BWR Owners are presently proposing resolutions to the hydraulic instability concerns associated with single recirculation loop operation.

2. Safety Significance:

GE is preparing a SIL to alert plants to the new data and recommend actions to avoid and control abnormal neutron flux oscillations.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate the concerns and propose Technical Specification change if appropriate.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ _____/_____

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

_____/_____

Date Time

Reference: 4/3/84, NRC Handout from Capra

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 28, 4/28/84

Plsd283.9.2

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 833 Priority: 3B

/

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 4.8.1.1.2.d.2; FSAR Table 8.3-1, 8.3-2, 8.3-3

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 8-4; FSAR Tables 8.3-1, 8.3-2, 8.3-3

Problem Title: Reject of Diesel Generator Largest Single Load

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):

AECM-83/0356, item 5 corrected the Technical Specification load reject values to conform with testable KW values associated with maximum pump loads.

2. Safety Significance:

Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Update FSAR tables to list the testable load reject values in addition to the motor nameplate ratings.

4. NRC Response to Item (NRR/IE): _____

NRC Notified: _____ /

Individual Notified Date Time

5. Disposition: _____

_____

_____

Items Closed: (How) _____

/

Date Time

cc: J. E. Cross
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 28, 4/28/84

Plsd326