

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION III

Report No. 50-341/85039(DRS)

Docket No. 50-341

License No. NPF-33

Licensee: Detroit Edison Company  
2000 Second Avenue  
Detroit, MI 48224

Facility Name: Enrico Fermi Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 2

Inspection At: Enrico Fermi 2 Site, Monroe, Michigan

Inspection Conducted: July 8 through 11, 1985

Inspector: Z. Falevits

*C.C. Williams for:*

8-12-85  
Date

Approved By: *Conrad C Williams*  
C. C. Williams, Chief  
Plant Systems Section

8-12-85  
Date

Inspection Summary

Inspection on July 8 through 11, 1985 (Report No. 50-341/85039(DRS))

Areas Inspected: Routine, unannounced inspection of licensee action on previous inspection findings, and independent inspection of electrical issues. The inspection involved a total of 30 inspector-hours onsite by one NRC inspector.

Results: Of the areas inspected, no violations or deviations were identified.

8508160312 850812  
PDR ADOCK 05000341  
G PDR

## DETAILS

### 1. Persons Contacted

#### Detroit Edison Company

F. Agosti, Manager Nuclear Operations  
S. P. Zoma, Principal Resident Engineer  
L. G. Ferguson, Resident Engineer, I&C  
C. L. Morrison, I&C Engineer  
J. Rotondo, Quality Specialist N.Q.A.  
G. M. Ford, Startup Engineer  
J. E. Conen, Licensing Engineer

Those identified above attended the exit meeting on July 11, 1985. In addition to the above persons, other licensee and contractor personnel were contacted during this inspection.

### 2. Licensee Action On Previous Inspection Findings

- a. (Closed) Unresolved Item (341/85009-01(DRS)): This item addressed balance of Plant (BOP) cables which electrically interface with safety-related cables in IE and non-IE circuits. On June 20, 1985, during a telecommunication between Region III, NRR and the licensee's staff, it was concluded that the licensee will be required to take appropriate corrective action to resolve representative samples Nos. 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 12 and 13 of the licensee's analysis, which was submitted to the NRC (Reference DECO letters NE-85-0900 dated June 24, 1985, and NE-85-0907 dated June 28, 1985). Based on NRR acceptance of the licensee's commitments to resolve this issue, this item is considered resolved.
- b. (Closed) Open Item (341/85009-02(DRS)): This item concerned the methodology and record keeping of C&IO testing of instrument loop schematics. A review of instrument loop drawings indicated that the test engineers had not yellow lined the instrument loop schematics as they did with control logic schematics. A 7.8 form was used to document the test performed. The methodology of tracking down components or portions of the loop that were not completely tested appears to be inconsistent among the test engineers. Each engineer followed his own method in keeping track of the portions that were not yet tested; there was no one standard system being used by all test engineers. This made it very difficult to determine whether or not the identified scope of testing to be performed included all instruments in the logic loop. The inspector reviewed selected instrument loop schematics to verify that the required testing was adequately completed. No errors or omissions were identified.
- c. (Closed) Unresolved Item (341/85016-01(DRS)): This item addressed improper documentation and lack of adherence to procedure requirements by the test engineers during yellow lining of logic control diagrams

to identify tested circuits. The inspector reviewed the following yellow lined drawings to ascertain the licensee's engineers conformance to applicable procedures and the process of documenting the yellow lined drawings:

(1) Core Spray System

6I721-2215-2 Revision "L"  
6I721-2215-3 Revision "H"  
6I721-2215-4 Revision "G"  
6I721-2215-5 Revision "L"  
6I721-2215-6 Revision "C"

(2) Residual Heat Removal

6I721-2201-7 Revision "H"  
6I721-2201-9 Revision "E"  
6I721-2201-12 Revision "I"  
6I721-2201-17 Revision "F"

The inspector noted that some of the drawings containing previous revisions were missing from the file. The licensee indicated that some were erroneously disposed of in the past. However, in the future all revised drawings affecting testing will be retained. The drawing revisions missing from the files in this instance did not have an adverse impact on quality requirements.

- d. (Closed) Open Item (341/85028-03(DRS)): This item addressed various deficiencies identified by the inspector during review of the licensee's as-built program. The licensee has subsequently initiated corrective measures to resolve the identified deficiencies as follows:

- (1) Red and green position indicating lights on Reactor Recirculation System generator field breaker have been replaced. The licensee committed to adhere to the operator surveillance requirements in the future.
- (2) Relay K in assemblies B31-P001A/B contained contact designations which were not in conformance with design drawing designations. Licensee corrective action was documented in ABN-2986-2 and DECO letter FE5-0646.
- (3) Connection diagram 6I721-2314-25, Revision "C", titled Division I Rack H11-P917A" did not show the ground bus located in the rear section of the panel. The licensee initiated the following documents to resolve this issue: ABN-20378-1, ABN-20338-1, and DER-85-637. The inspector reviewed these documents.

The inspector reviewed the actions taken by the licensee as outlined above and considered this issue resolved.

- e. (Closed) Open Item (341/85035-01(DRS)): This item addressed various discrepancies observed during a previous inspection of Diesel Generator panel R30-P311 and scram contactors in the Reactor Protection System panels H11-P609/P611. The licensee initiated the following corrective action documents to resolve this issue:

(1) Diesel Generator panel R30-P311

- (a) DER-85-631 dated June 19, 1985
- (b) ABN-2410-3 dated July 3, 1985

(2) Scram Contactors on RPS panel H11-P609/P611

- (a) DER-85-035 dated June 25, 1985
- (b) PN21-66829
- (c) PN21-652367
- (d) PN21-652365

The inspector reviewed the licensee's corrective action documents outlined above. Based on the foregoing this matter is considered resolved.

3. Independent Inspection of Electrical Issues

- a. The inspector noted extensive chattering of LPCI loop selection logic relays E11-K35A/B and E11-K36A/B which are located in the relay room. These relays are utilized to monitor Reactor Recirculation Pumps riser differential pressure and are energized when Recirculation loop "A" riser differential pressure is greater than that of loop "B" by 0.627 psid (Reference Technical Specification table 3.3.3-2). Discussions with licensee's system engineer revealed that Deviation Event Report (DER) 85-0215, dated April 26, 1985, was issued during testing of Reactor Recirculation pumps documenting this problem. However, action by the licensee to resolve this matter was incomplete. At the request of the inspector, the licensee contacted General Electric Company engineers who subsequently issued FDDR-1144, dated July 10, 1985 to modify the LPCI circuitry by adding a water level 2 permissive contact in series with the chattering relays, thereby eliminating this problem. The licensee indicated that this change will be implemented in the field via EDP-4106 within the next week. This item is considered open pending NRC review of the licensee's corrective actions (341/85039-01(DRS)).
- b. The inspector reviewed the licensee's effort to resolve all outstanding "A" and "B" hardware items identified as part of the as-built program. The licensee indicated that six additional "A" items and 72 additional "B" hardware items identified after the original as-built walkdowns were completed. These will be dispositioned either by performing a safety review or by completing the work in the field. This will be done before the unit increases power above 5%. The inspector reviewed the safety evaluation requirement checklists (10 CFR 50.59) for the "A" items associated

with DER-85-610, EDP-3526, DER-85-637, DER-85-032, and DER-85-438. Based on this review, this issue is considered resolved.

No violations or deviations were identified; however, the open item in 3.a above requires further evaluation.

4. Open Items

Open items are matters which have been discussed with the licensee, which will be reviewed further by the inspector, and which involve some action on part of the NRC or licensee or both. An open item disclosed during the inspection is discussed in Paragraph 3.a.

5. Exit Interview

The inspector met with the licensee representatives (Denoted in Persons Contacted) at the conclusion of the inspection on July 11, 1985. The inspector summarized the purpose and findings of the inspections, which were acknowledged by the licensee. The inspector also discussed the likely informational content of the inspection report with regard to documents or processes reviewed by the inspector during the inspection. The licensee did not identify any such documents/processes as proprietary.