



MISSISSIPPI POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

Helping Build Mississippi

P. O. BOX 1640, JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI 39205

January 30, 1985

J. B. RICHARD
SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT - NUCLEAR

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

Attention: Mr. Harold R. Denton, Director

Dear Mr. Denton:

SUBJECT: Grand Gulf Nuclear Station
Unit 1
Docket No. 50-416
License No. NPF-29
File 0260/0840/L-860.0
Proposed Amendment to the Operating
License (PCOL-85/01)
AECM-85/0033

In accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR 50.59 and 10 CFR 50.90, Mississippi Power & Light (MP&L) requests an amendment to License NPF-29, for Grand Gulf Nuclear Station (GGNS) Unit 1.

In accordance with provisions of 10 CFR 50.30, three (3) signed originals and forty (40) copies of the requested amendment are enclosed. The attachment provides the complete technical justification and discussion to support the requested amendment. This amendment has been reviewed and accepted by the Plant Safety Review Committee (PSRC) and the Safety Review Committee (SRC).

Based on the guidelines presented in 10 CFR 50.92, it is the opinion of MP&L that this proposed amendment involves no significant hazards considerations.

In accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 170.22, we have determined that the proposed amendment is considered to be administrative in nature. Based on the guidance provided by the Project Manager (NRC), we have determined that the application fee is \$150. A remittance of \$150 is attached to this letter.

Yours truly,

JBR:rg

Attachments: GGNS PCOL-85/01

cc: (See Next Page)

8502040216 850130
PDR ADOCK 05000416
P PDR

*Appl w/ check
3/40 \$150.00
#01-0122*

MISSISSIPPI POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

AECM-85/0033

Page 2

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

Mr. J. P. O'Reilly (w/a)
Regional Administrator
Region II
101 Marietta Street, N.W., Suite 2900
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

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

Dr. Alton B. Cobb (w/a)
State Health Officer
State Board of Health
Box 1700
Jackson, Mississippi 39205

BEFORE THE
UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

LICENSE NO. NPF-29


DOCKET NO. 50-416

IN THE MATTER OF

MISSISSIPPI POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
and
MIDDLE SOUTH ENERGY, INC.
and
SOUTH MISSISSIPPI ELECTRIC POWER ASSOCIATION

AFFIRMATION

I, J. B. Richard, being duly sworn, stated that I am Senior Vice President - Nuclear of Mississippi Power & Light Company; that on behalf of Mississippi Power & Light Company, Middle South Energy, Inc., and South Mississippi Electric Power Association I am authorized by Mississippi Power & Light Company to sign and file with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, this application for amendment of the Operating License of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Station; that I signed this application as Senior Vice President - Nuclear of Mississippi Power & Light Company; and that the statements made and the matters set forth therein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.



J. B. Richard

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI
COUNTY OF HINDS

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO before me, a Notary Public, in and for the County and State above named, this 30th day of January, 1985.

(SEAL)



Notary Public

My commission expires:

Oct 27, 1987

SUBJECT:

QA-85/01

Technical Specification 6.5.1.2, and Tables 6.2.1-1 and 6.2.2-1, pages 6-3, 6-4 and 6-7

DISCUSSION:

A reorganization of the Mississippi Power & Light (MP&L) Quality Assurance (QA) organization is proposed to make Plant Quality (PQ) independent of the GGNS plant staff and to merge PQ with the corporate QA organization. This necessitates a request for revision to the technical specifications as follows:

- 1) change the title of Manager, Supplier QA to Manager, Audits QA, on the Offsite Organization chart, p. 6-3;
- 2) delete the Nuclear Plant Quality Superintendent from the Unit Organization chart, p. 6-4;
- 3) change the assignment of the Quality Superintendent to Manager, Nuclear Site QA, in the Plant Safety Review Committee (PSRC) composition, p. 6-7;

JUSTIFICATION:

- 1) The change of the title Manager, Supplier QA to Manager, Audits QA is purely administrative in nature in that all lines of responsibility and communication are retained but the title will more accurately reflect the primary responsibility of the position.
- 2) The proposed deletion of the Quality Superintendent from the Unit Organization chart will allow MP&L QA to reorganize in such a way that it may act independently of plant staff. This change is an enhancement to the organizational structure in that the Quality Superintendent will no longer be responsible to the GGNS General Manager but to the Manager, Nuclear Site QA, thereby eliminating possible conflicts of interest associated with line responsibility in management of the plant. He will retain responsibility for the quality inspection function at the plant, but the majority of his other responsibilities including review of procedures and procurement documents will be delegated to other QA organizations to allow concentration primarily on the inspection functions.
- 3) The assignment of the Manager, Nuclear Site QA to the PSRC in the place of the Quality Superintendent will maintain the level of review from a Quality Assurance standpoint that is critical to proper PSRC function. The Manager, Nuclear Site QA is responsible to the Director, Quality Assurance, as can be noted on the Offsite Organization chart, Technical Specification Figure 6.2.1-1.

These proposed changes are responsive to general NRC policy concerns with the assurance that quality activities be independent from routine plant activities.

SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION:

These proposed changes are conservative in nature in that they allow QA activities to focus entirely on quality requirements and to be independent of routine plant policies and activities. They are also responsive to general NRC concerns. These changes do not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated or create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated, nor do they involve a reduction in a margin of safety. Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration.