

APPENDIX B

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
REGION IV

NRC Inspection Report: 50-458/85-49

Construction Permit: CPPR-145

Docket: 50-458

Licensee: Gulf States Utilities  
P. O. Box 2951  
Beaumont, Texas 77704

Facility Name: River Bend Station

Inspection At: St. Francisville, Louisiana

Inspection Conducted: June 17-21, 1985

Inspector:

C. C. Harbuck  
C. C. Harbuck, Reactor Inspector, Project Section A  
Reactor Project Branch 1

8/1/85  
Date

Approved:

J. P. Jaudon  
J. P. Jaudon, Chief, Project Section A, Reactor  
Project Branch

8/1/85  
Date

Inspection Summary

Inspection Conducted June 17-21, 1985 (Report 50-458/85-49)

Areas Inspected: Routine, unannounced inspection of preoperational test results and licensee actions in regard to previous NRC inspection findings. The inspection involved 36 inspector-hours onsite by one NRC inspector.

Results: Within the two areas inspected, one violation was identified (failure to perform adequate review of preoperational test results, paragraph 3.b).

8508060282 850801  
PDR ADOCK 05000458  
G PDR

DETAILS1. Persons ContactedGulf States Utilities

- \*T. C. Crouse, Manager Quality Assurance
- \*P. J. Dautel, Licensing Staff Assistant
- \*J. C. Deddens, Vice President - River Bend Nuclear Group
- D. R. Derbonne, Preoperational Test Supervisor
- \*P. E. Freehill, Superintendent Startup and Test
- \*D. R. Gipson, Assistant Plant Manager - Operations/Chemistry/Radwaste
- \*G. R. Kimmell, Supervisor Operations Quality Assurance
- \*G. V. King, Plant Services Supervisor
- \*T. F. Plunkett, Plant Manager
- \*S. R. Radebaugh, Assistant Superintendent - Startup and Test
- \*S. F. Sawa, Startup and Test Controls Supervisor
- \*J. E. Spivey, Operations Quality Assurance Engineer
- \*P. F. Tomlinson, Director Operations Quality Assurance
- \*A. Valenzuela, Startup and Test Engineer
- \*J. Venable, Mechanical Maintenance Supervisor

Other Personnel

- \*P. H. Griffin, Stone and Webster, Site Advisory Manager
- J. Pawlik, General Electric, Startup and Test Engineer

The NRC inspector also contacted other licensee personnel including administrative and test personnel.

\*Indicates attendance at exit interview on June 21, 1985.

2. Licensee Actions Taken in Regards to Previous Inspection Findings

- a. (Open) Open Item (8520-03) "Control Building Chilled Water Compressors, A and B, Load Sequence Relay Settings." Currently, category II relays are installed, as a temporary system modification, instead of the required Category I relays, which are on order. This item will remain open until the Category I relays have been installed, set in accordance with the current Set Point Data Sheet, and the Chillers have been properly tested to demonstrate they shed and sequence on at the correct times.
- b. (Closed) Violation (8520-05) "Performance of Time Delay Control Relay Set Point Verification Testing." The NRC inspector reviewed the licensee's response letter to the NRC, dated June 7, 1985, concerning this violation, and verified that the corrective actions stated

therein had been completed as stated. It was further determined that the preventive corrective action to avoid further violations in this area appeared to be adequate. This item is therefore considered closed.

- c. Post TMI Action Plan Requirement Item II.K.1.5 Assurance of Proper Engineering Safety Features Functioning - This item requires the licensee to have a system for keeping track of manual valve positions for safety-related systems and, in particular, to include all the manual valves that are in the Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS) mandatory flow paths, to ensure that operators know the status of ECCS system at all times.

Findings: The applicant has revised Administrative Procedure No. 0020, "Key Control." This procedure establishes the methods for access to and control of Locked Valves, among other things. This revision resulted in the procedure specifically stating that all manual valves in the ECCS mandatory flow paths are to be included, by valve number, on the list of all valves that are normally locked. This list is maintained by the General Operations Supervisor (GOS) and is kept in the Shift Supervisor's office. In addition to this list, the procedure now directs the Shift Supervisor to maintain an exceptions list for all valves which are not in their normal position as specified by the GOS's list. From this it is concluded that the applicant has a satisfactory system for keeping track of the positions of the manual valves in the ECCS mandatory flow paths to aid the operators in assuring the proper functioning of engineered safety features.

These findings also apply to Confirmatory Item 62 and to the requirements of IE Bulletin 79-08, Item 6. These three items are therefore considered closed.

### 3. Preoperational Test Results

The purpose of this area of the inspection was to verify that the acceptance criteria for each procedure reviewed had been met and that the licensee had reviewed the procedure and resolved all test exceptions in accordance with the Startup Manual (SUM).

- a. Preoperational Test 1-PT-309-2, Standby Diesel Generator 1EGS\*EG1B

The NRC inspector reviewed the Official Field Copy of the pre-operational test for standby diesel generator 1 EGS\*EG1B, and verified that all test exceptions had been resolved in accordance with the SUM and that all acceptance criteria appeared to have been met. The NRC inspector therefore concluded that "B" standby diesel generator appeared to have been adequately tested.

b. Preoperational Test 1-PT-052, Control Rod Drive Hydraulic

The NRC inspector reviewed all portions of the Official Field Copy of the control rod drive hydraulic system preoperational test, although only certain portions of it are considered directly related to safety. Despite the problems found with the conduct of the test, as noted below, the NRC inspector concluded that the portions of the test having a direct bearing on safety had apparently been tested satisfactorily.

The SUM was written to assure that all testing at RBS is conducted in a proper manner and that all regulatory requirements are fulfilled. ("SUM Introduction," Revision 10, ¶ 1.2.1.) This is done through the individual Test Instructions, or TIs, of the SUM. TI-5, "Joint Test Group," defines the responsibilities of the Joint Test Group (JTG). One of JTG's responsibilities is to ensure that the preoperational test program is conducted in conformance with the SUM (TI-5, ¶ 3.3.1.2). Part of this responsibility is met by fulfilling another JTG responsibility - the review and approval of all preoperational test results (TI-5, ¶ 3.3.1.6). This responsibility is based upon 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix B, Criterion XI, which states, in part, that test results shall be documented and evaluated to assure that test requirements have been satisfied.

The NRC inspector found that the JTG had failed to fulfill adequately its review and approval responsibility as evidenced by the following problems:

(1) Nonconformances to TI-8, "Conduct of Testing":

- Test Exceptions (TEs) - TE-02, TE-07, TE-17, and TE-26 did not document when their disposition actions were completed. This is contrary to TI-8, ¶ 3.3.5, which states, in part, that the resolution document and the date of its approval shall be identified in the Disposition section of the test exception form.
- TE-30 was written against acceptance criteria step 10.4 after that step had been initialed and dated complete. The initials and the date were lined out because of the TE. This is contrary to TI-8, ¶ 3.3.9, which states, that in a like situation, the original signoff need not be lined out.
- Data entries on pages 7 and 8 of the attachment to TE-20 had been corrected by a single line out and initials, but no date. This is contrary to TI-8, ¶ 3.1.2, which requires that the date be written by the initials when correcting an erroneous data entry.



(2) Nonconformance to TI-3, "Changes to Test Procedures":

- Step 10.9 of the procedure acceptance criteria was added to the procedure in accordance with Major Change Request (MCR) No. 06. A reference to MCR-06 was not written in the right hand margin next to this change, as required by T-3, ¶ 3.3.1.5.

(3) Other problems noted:

- The procedure did not justify the use of constant values for the minimum recirculation flow rates for the A and B CRD pumps during system flow testing, Section 7.3. These flow rates are a function of CRD pump discharge pressure. However, the variance in the discharge pressure was relatively small, so the resulting errors were not significant (a maximum of 2 to 3 gpm too high at the low end of discharge pressure range) when compared against the total CRD pump flow (a maximum of about 200 gpm per pump).
- Additional information written in the proposed disposition and the actual disposition sections of TE-14 was not dated and initialed. The person who wrote the information was not one of the two Test Engineers who had signed for each section.
- TE-24 was dispositioned satisfactorily. However, the initial statement of the problem, for which it was written, was in error.
- Steps 7.11.14, 7.11.14.1, and 7.11.14.2 of the procedure were not initialed and dated. The NRC inspector verified that they had been accomplished, but was unable to determine when.
- TE-23, written against acceptance criteria step 10.8.1, was dispositioned prior to the final JTG review of the procedure test results. However, this step had not yet been initialed and dated.

The above noted problems were identified as a single violation, failure to adequately review preoperational test results. (50-458/8549-01)

The NRC inspector also noted that two TEs, TE-28, and TE-30, were still open. Although they were written against two of the acceptance criteria steps of the procedures, the NRC inspector determined that they would not adversely affect the overall adequacy of the test results. For those portions of the test results which were directly related to safety, no

problems were noted. (Sections 7.9, 7.10, 7.11, and 7.12.) Therefore, the NRC inspector concluded that for these portions of the test the acceptance criteria appeared to have been met, and that all test exceptions had been resolved in accordance with the SUM.

4. Exit Meeting

The NRC inspector conducted an exit meeting with those licensee personnel denoted in paragraph 1 of this report. The NRC senior resident inspector also attended. During the meeting the findings of the inspection were summarized.