

JUN 20 1984

Interim response #5
to Secy 84-0294 ✓

The Honorable Edward J. Markey, Chairman
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs
United States House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

The enclosed information supplements three responses contained in my June 4, 1984 letter in which NRC staff provided draft responses to the questions in your March 13, 1984 letter to Chairman Palladino. The enclosed supplemental information was prepared by the NRC staff in response to Mr. Udell's memorandum to Mr. Rehm of June 6, 1984.

Sincerely,

(Signed) Jack W. Roe

William J. Dircks
Executive Director
for Operations

Enclosures:
Supplemental Information for
Response to Questions 1(e),
3(a & b) and 9

201 Rep. Ed. J. Markey (C) 1984

Distribution

Docket File

EDO R/F

WDircks

MBridgers

HDenton/ECASE

DEisenhut/RPurple

FMiraglia

CThomas

DBrinkman

EAdensam

OCA

SSPB Reading File

~~APP~~ *SEE PREVIOUS CONCURRENCE SHEET - REVISED PER EDO 6/18/84

EDO JWR
WDircks
6/18/84

OCA
6/18/84

Al6

OFC	:DL/SSPB*	:DL/SSPB*	:LB#4*	:DL/AD/SA*	:DL/DIR*	:NRR/DD*	:NRR/D*
NAME	:DBrinkman	:CThomas	:EAdensam	:FMiraglia	:DEisenhut	:ECASE	:HDenton
DATE	: 6/12/84	: 6/12/84	: 6/12/84	: 6/12/84	: 6/12/84	: 6/12/84	: 6/13/84

3407050007

XA

Mr. Richard Udell
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs
United States House of Representatives
Washington, D. C. 20515

Dear Mr. Udell:

The enclosed information supplements three responses contained in my June 4, 1984 letter to Congressman Markey in which NRC staff provided draft responses to the questions in his March 13, 1984 letter to Chairman Palladino. The enclosed supplemental information was prepared by the NRC staff in response to your memorandum to Mr. Rehm of June 6, 1984.

Sincerely,

William J. Dircks
Executive Director for Operations

Enclosures:
Supplemental Information for
Response to Questions 1(e),
3(a & b) and 9

DISTRIBUTION:
Docket File

DCS
ACRS
W. Dircks
M. Bridgers
H. Denton/E. Case
D. Eisenhower/R. Purple
F. Miraglia
C. Thomas
D. Brinkman
E. Adensam
EDO R/F
OCA
SSPB Reading

*See Previous Concurrence

*DL:SSPB
DBrinkman:cc
6/12/84

*DL:SSPB
CThomas
6/12/84

*LB#4
EAdensam
6/12/84

*DL:AD/SA
FMiraglia
6/12/84

*DL:DIR
DEisenhut
6/12/84

*NRR:DD
ECase
6/12/84

NRR:D
HDenton
6/12/84

EDO OCA
WDircks
6/12/84

Supplemental Information for Response to Question 9

The licensee has identified various inconsistencies between the FSAR and the technical specifications in submittals of problem sheets received since early March 1984. These problem sheets are attached. None of these inconsistencies have called into question the validity of the safety analysis of the plant, as recorded in either the FSAR or the NRC's safety evaluation (SER). For this reason, there is no basis to require an extensive re-review of these documents at this time. NRC regulations require each licensee to periodically update the FSAR to assure that the information contained therein contains the latest material developed. In the case of Grand Gulf, we anticipate the licensee will conduct a thorough review of the FSAR, as part of its required update, to insure that it accurately reflects the as-built plant.

Supplemental Information for Response to Question 1(e)

Technical specifications for nuclear power plants include items in the following categories: safety limits, limiting safety system settings, limiting conditions for operation, surveillance requirements, design features, and administrative controls. Of these categories, the first two have the most immediate safety significance since a violation of (or error in) these could represent unsafe operation. None of the Grand Gulf Technical Specification deficiencies involved errors in these two categories that would have caused unsafe operation. The third category, limiting conditions for operation, are the lowest functional capability or performance levels of equipment required for safe operation. The technical specifications in this category identify, among other things, the minimum set of equipment that must be operable in order to safely operate the plant at various power levels, and the actions to be taken in the event such equipment is not operable. For Grand Gulf, there were numerous errors in this section of the Technical Specifications. Most of the errors were nonsubstantive and would not likely have caused an unsafe condition to exist during plant operation. However, in some cases the errors could have resulted in operation without assurance that equipment important to safety was, in fact, operational. An example is the error wherein only seven Automatic Depressurization System valves were identified in the technical specifications while eight such valves existed and credit for all valves operating was assumed in the accident analysis. Had this error not been identified, and if the unidentified valve was not operable, the reactor's response to an accident may not have provided the safety margins required by the NRC.

Deficiencies that existed in the remaining sections of the Grand Gulf Technical Specifications were of lesser immediate safety significance in terms of risk to public health and safety for operation of the reactor at full power. However, the cumulative effect of the numerous inconsistencies, inaccuracies, and lack of clarity represented the potential for operator errors or confusion detrimental to safe operation.

The surveillance procedures were deficient in that they did not provide for adequate demonstration of equipment operability. Had these deficiencies not been corrected, the plant would have been operated without the high degree of assurance necessary that important safety equipment was operable.

JUN 20 1964

OFC	:DL/SSPB*	:DL/SSPB*	:LB#4*	:DL/AD/SA*	:DL/DIR*	:NRR/DD*	:NRR/D*
NAME	:DBrinkman	:CThomas	:EAdensam	:FMiraglia	:DEisenhut	:ECase	:HDenton
DATE	: 6/12/84	: 6/12/84	:6/12/84	:6/12/84	:6/12/84	:6/12/84	:6/13/84

Mr. Richard Udell
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs
United States House of Representatives
Washington, D. C. 20515

Dear Mr. Udell:

The enclosed information supplements three responses contained in my June 4, 1984 letter to Congressman Markey in which NRC staff provided draft responses to the questions in his March 13, 1984 letter to Chairman Palladino. The enclosed supplemental information was prepared by the NRC staff in response to your memorandum to Mr. Rehm of June 6, 1984.

Sincerely,

William J. Dircks
Executive Director for Operations

Enclosures:
Supplemental Information for
Response to Questions 1(e),
3(a & b) and 9

DISTRIBUTION:

~~Docket File~~

DCS
ACRS
W. Dircks
M. Bridgers
H. Denton/E. Case
D. Eisenhut/R. Purple
F. Miraglia
C. Thomas
D. Brinkman
E. Adensam
EDO R/F
OCA
SSPB Reading

*See Previous Concurrence

*DL:SSPB
DBrinkman:cc
6/12/84

*DL:SSPB
CThomas
6/12/84

*LB#4
EAdensam
6/12/84

*DL:AD/SA
FMiraglia
6/12/84

*DL:DIR
DEisenhut
6/12/84

*NRR:DD
ECase
6/12/84

NRR:D
HDenton
6/12/84

EDO OCA
WDircks
6/ /84

Supplemental Information for Response to Question 9

The licensee has identified various inconsistencies between the FSAR and the technical specifications in submittals of problem sheets received since early March 1984. These problem sheets are attached. None of these inconsistencies have called into question the validity of the safety analysis of the plant, as recorded in either the FSAR or the NRC's safety evaluation (SER). For this reason, there is no basis to require an extensive re-review of these documents at this time. NRC regulations require each licensee to periodically update the FSAR to assure that the information contained therein contains the latest material developed. In the case of Grand Gulf, we anticipate the licensee will conduct a thorough review of the FSAR, as part of its required update, to insure that it accurately reflects the as-built plant.

Supplemental Information for Response to Question 1(e)

Technical specifications for nuclear power plants include items in the following categories: safety limits, limiting safety system settings, limiting conditions for operation, surveillance requirements, design features, and administrative controls. Of these categories, the first two have the most immediate safety significance since a violation of (or error in) these could represent unsafe operation. None of the Grand Gulf Technical Specification deficiencies involved errors in these two categories that would have caused unsafe operation. The third category, limiting conditions for operation, are the lowest functional capability or performance levels of equipment required for safe operation. The technical specifications in this category identify, among other things, the minimum set of equipment that must be operable in order to safely operate the plant at various power levels, and the actions to be taken in the event such equipment is not operable. For Grand Gulf, there were numerous errors in this section of the Technical Specifications. Most of the errors were nonsubstantive and would not likely have caused an unsafe condition to exist during plant operation. However, in some cases the errors could have resulted in operation without assurance that equipment important to safety was, in fact, operational. An example is the error wherein only seven Automatic Depressurization System valves were identified in the technical specifications while eight such valves existed and credit for all valves operating was assumed in the accident analysis. Had this error not been identified, and if the unidentified valve was not operable, the reactor's response to an accident may not have provided the safety margins required by the NRC.

Deficiencies that existed in the remaining sections of the Grand Gulf Technical Specifications were of lesser immediate safety significance in terms of risk to public health and safety for operation of the reactor at full power. However, the cumulative effect of the numerous inconsistencies, inaccuracies, and lack of clarity represented the potential for operator errors or confusion detrimental to safe operation.

The surveillance procedures were deficient in that they did not provide for adequate demonstration of equipment operability. Had these deficiencies not been corrected, the plant would have been operated without the high degree of assurance necessary that important safety equipment was operable.

Supplemental Information for Response to Question 3(a & b)

It is doubtful that performance of these deferred tests would have revealed technical specification or surveillance procedure errors due to the type of systems involved and the fact that the preoperational and acceptance tests are performed as a series of tests independent of the routine surveillance tests.

The deferral of these tests was requested by the licensee in their February 12, 1982 two-phased start-up program. The NRC staff performed a technical review/evaluation of this program and determined that satisfactory completion of all tests prior to the facility exceeding five percent power would, for the system being tested, demonstrate satisfactory performance and would not impact the health and safety of the public or result in any environmental impacts other than those evaluated in the Final Environmental Statement.

The technical basis for the deferrals was that none of the plant systems for which tests were deferred are required to support or are needed for any event during low power operation. As expected, many of these systems (i.e., certain turbine generator, feedwater control and steam systems) are not placed into operation until after the facility has achieved at least a five percent power level.

To ensure that the deferred tests were performed prior to exceeding a power level of five percent, the completion and evaluation of these tests were included as a license condition.

Supplemental Information for Response to Question 9

The licensee has identified various inconsistencies between the FSAR and the technical specifications in submittals of problem sheets received since early March 1984. These problem sheets are attached. None of these inconsistencies have called into question the validity of the safety analysis of the plant, as recorded in either the FSAR or the NRC's safety evaluation (SER). For this reason, there is no basis to require an extensive re-review of these documents at this time. NRC regulations require each licensee to periodically update the FSAR to assure that the information contained therein contains the latest material developed. In the case of Grand Gulf, we anticipate the licensee will conduct a thorough review of the FSAR, as part of its required update, to insure that it accurately reflects the as-built plant.

On June 1, the licensee determined that the plant, as currently designed and constructed and without operable Unit 2 pumps, was unable to provide a 30 day water supply for the ultimate heat sink, as specified in the FSAR. The Company shut the plant down at that time. In recognition of the fact that this represented a different type of occurrence in which the plant did not conform to the application, the licensee directed its contractors, General Electric and Bechtel, to review all other shared or common features of Units 1 and 2 and to certify whether there were any other similar problems. Region II will audit these reviews.

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 800 Priority: 3B

GE FSAR/SER Review / 3/19/84

Identified By _____ Date _____ Responsible Supervisor _____

Tech Spec Reference: 3.2.2, FSAR Reference 7-6

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 2-5, FSAR Table 7.6-6

Problem Title: APRM Flow Biased Scram Setpoint

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
FSAR Table 7.6-6 conflicts with Technical Specification 3.2.2 on the settings for the APRM flow-biased control rod block and scram functions. The FSAR should be revised to be consistent with the Technical Specifications and plant design.

2. Safety Significance:
Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:
Revise the APRM flow-biased setpoints in FSAR Table 7.6-6 to reflect plant design and include in the next annual FSAR update per 10 CFR 50.71 (e)(4).

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

NRC Notified: _____ / _____
Individual Notified _____ Date _____ Time _____

5. Disposition: _____

Items Closed: (How) _____

Date . Time

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

Rev. 18, 4/2/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 801 Priority: 3B

GE Review / 3/30/84

Identified By _____ Date _____ Responsible Supervisor _____

Tech Spec Reference: 3.6.1.7, FSAR Table 3.11-1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 6-10

Problem Title: Technical Specification/FSAR Inconsistency

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

The FSAR (Table 3.11-1) and the response to NUREG-0588 (Table B-2) do not reflect the current Technical Specification (3.6.1.7) limits on containment to auxiliary building differential pressure.

2. Safety Significance:

Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Revise the FSAR and the response to NUREG-0588 if required in the next annual 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. 18, 4/2/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 802 Priority: 3B

GE Review / 3/30/84

Identified By _____ Date _____ Responsible Supervisor _____

Tech Spec Reference: 3.3.4.2, FSAR Section 7.6.1.8.1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-38

Problem Title: Technical Specification/FSAR Inconsistency

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
Technical Specification 3.3.4.2 states that the end-of-cycle recirculation pump trip (EOC-RPT) system instrumentation shall be OPERABLE in Operational Condition 1, when thermal power is greater than or equal to 40 percent of rated thermal power. However, the discussion in FSAR Section 7.6.1.8.1 implies that the system is required when thermal power is greater than 30 percent of rated thermal power. The correct value is the 40 percent specified in the Technical Specification.

2. Safety Significance:
Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:
Submit the necessary changes to the FSAR Section 7.6.1.8.1 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. 18, 4/2/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 803 Priority: 3B

GE Review /3/30/84

Identified By _____ Date _____ Responsible Supervisor _____

Tech Spec Reference: 3.3.7.1, FSAR Table 11.5-1

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 3-56 and 3/4 3-57

Problem Title: Technical Specification/FSAR Inconsistency

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
Technical Specification Table 3.3.7.1-1 Radiation Monitoring Instrumentation and FSAR Table 11.5-1 are not identical. A review of these two tables identified the following differences:
 - a. FSAR Table 11.5-1 contains the following information that is not addressed in the Technical Specification: (a) detector type; (b) sample line or detector location; (c) scale; (d) purpose of measurement; and (e) principal radionuclides detected. This information is not required to be in the Technical Specifications.
 - b. The Technical Specification makes reference to the minimum channels OPERABLE and the FSAR addresses the number of channels. Therefore, the number of channels given in the FSAR and the number of minimum channels OPERABLE given in the Technical Specification may not be identical.
 - c. FSAR Table 11.5-1 addresses monitoring processes for the main steam line and liquid radwaste effluent. Technical Specification Table 3.3.7.1-1 does not address these items, but they are addressed by Technical Specifications 3/4.3.2 and 3/4.3.7.11, respectively.
 - d. FSAR Table 11.5-1 references several GE systems and microprocessor systems used for monitoring containment vent, offgas and radwaste building vent, fuel handling area vent, and turbine building vent. Technical Specification Table 3.3.7.1-1 does not specifically identify the different types of monitoring systems used at Grand Gulf. The FSAR table references the Technical Specification for the alarm/trip setpoint values for these types of systems.

Rev. 18, 4/2/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 803Priority: 3B

- e. Line number 10 of Technical Specification Table 3.3.7.1-1 addresses area monitors for the fuel handling area and the control room. FSAR Table 11.5-1 does not address area monitors, but they are covered by Table 12.3-3 of the FSAR. Table 12.3-3 gives a description of all the area radiation monitors used throughout the plant. Technical Specification Table 3.3.7.1-1 only addresses area monitors for the fuel handling area and the control room.

2. Safety Significance:

Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Evaluate the need to make the FSAR and Technical Specification identical. Provide appropriate FSAR changes, if required, in the next annual 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. 18, 4/2/84

Plsd247

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 804

Priority: 3B

GE Review /3-30-84

Identified By _____ Date _____ Responsible Supervisor _____

Tech Spec Reference: 3.8.1.1

Tech Spec Page: None

Problem Title: Technical Specification/FSAR Inconsistency

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

It has been identified that FSAR Section 9.5.4.2 states that the HPCS diesel generator day tank has a capability equivalent to approximately 2 hours of engine operation while supplying post-LOCA maximum loads. FSAR Section 9.5.4.3 states the day tank low level annunciates when approximately 30 minutes of fuel remains.

2. Safety Significance:

Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

No action is required since the low level alarm is not associated with the day tank 2 hour capacity. The statements in both Section 9.5.4.2 and 9.5.4.3 are correct as written.

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

NRC Notified: _____ / _____

Individual Notified _____ Date _____ Time _____

5. Disposition: _____

Items Closed: (How) _____

/ _____
Date _____ Time _____

cc: J. E. Cross

R. F. Rogers

Rev. 18, 4/2/84

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 pentaborate 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
E. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 806

Priority: 3B

GE FSAR/SER Review / 3-19-84

Identified By

Date

Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.2.3, FSAR Table 15.4-8

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 2-5

Problem Title: MCPR

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

SER 15.4.3 indicates a delta MCPR of 0.13 for the fuel load error analysis. Added to the MCPR safety limit of 1.06, this would give an operating limit of 1.19. This is in conflict with the MCPR limit of 1.18 specified by Technical Specification 3.2.3. The FSAR Table 15.4-8 states a delta MCPR of 0.13 for the fuel load error and an operating limit of 1.23. The specific Grand Gulf analysis for the fuel load error gives a delta MCPR of 0.1. Thus the operating limit of 1.18 is adequate.

2. Safety Significance:

Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Change the FSAR to reflect the Technical Specification operating limit and the plant specific fuel load error analysis 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. 18, 4/2/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 806 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

Items Closed: (How) _____

Date Time

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

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 807

Priority: 3B

/

Identified By	Date	Responsible Supervisor
---------------	------	------------------------

Tech Spec Reference: FSAR Section 11.5.2.3.1, 11.5.2.3.2, 12.3.4.2.7

Tech Spec Page: FSAR Page 11.5-14, 12.3-34

Problem Title: FSAR Revision to Update Surveillance Requirements

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

Surveillance Requirements in FSAR pages 11.5-14 and 12.3-34 are not consistent with Technical Specifications. The calibration frequency requirement for each continuous radiation monitor is worded differently in various sections of the FSAR and the Technical Specifications namely:

FSAR Section 11.5.2.3.2: " . . . annually during plant operation or during the refueling outage if the detector is not readily accessible."

FSAR Section 12.3.4.2.7: " . . . annually . . ."

Technical Specification Table 4.3.7.1-1: "R" (refueling outage)

2. Safety Significance:

Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Revisions to the appropriate FSAR sections to reflect plant design will be included 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. 18, 4/2/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 807 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

Items Closed: (How) _____

Date Time

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

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 808

Priority: 3B

/

Identified By

Date

Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 4.8.1.1.2.d.16

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 6-7

Problem Title: SER Evaluation of Diesel Generator Not in Agreement with FSAR
and Technical Specifications in Regard to Diesel Generator Trip
Parameters

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

The SER evaluation of the diesel generator does not address diesel generator trip on ground overcurrent and low lube oil pressure as identified in the design documents, FSAR Section 8.3.1.1.4.1.f.2 and Technical Specification 4.8.1.1.2.d.8.a.

2. Safety Significance:

Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Request that the next supplement to the SER reflects the correct design condition.

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. 18, 4/2/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 809

Priority: 3B

Identified By

Date

Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3/4.8.4.2

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 8-38

Problem Title: FSAR and SER Do Not Properly Describe MOV Thermal Overload

Bypass Circuitry

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
Section 7.1.2.6.22 of the FSAR does not reflect all three methods of wiring used for the Grand Gulf MOV thermal overload bypass circuitry.

2. Safety Significance:
Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:
FSAR Section 7.1.2.6.22 indicates that the Grand Gulf design complies with Regulatory Guide 1.106. This statement is correct and an FSAR revision is not 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. 18, 4/2/84

Plsd253

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 810 Priority: 3B

F. Gardner / 3-8-84

Identified By Date Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 3.8.4.1 (Table 3.8.4.1-1)

Tech Spec Page: 3/4 8-21

Problem Title: Trip Setpoints for 6.9 KV Circuit Breakers

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

Technical Specification Table 3.8.4.1-1 identifies trip setpoints for the reactor recirculation pump 6.9 kv circuit breakers. The setpoints identified in this table are correct based on plant design changes implemented in DCP-82/3173. However, the information contained in FSAR Figure 040.5-1 of Question and Response 040.5 is inconsistent with the information contained in Technical Specification Table 3.8.4.1-1.

In addition, the response to NRC question 040.5 describes preoperational calibration and periodic checks for the primary protection circuit breakers. The discussion contained in the response to this question is not consistent with the Surveillance Requirements identified in Section 4.8.4.1 of the Technical Specifications.

2. Safety Significance:

Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Implement revisions to FSAR Figure 040.5-1 to incorporate DCP-82/3173. Revise the response to Question 040.5 to maintain consistency with the Surveillance Requirement 4.8.4.1 of the GGNS Technical Specifications.

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

NRC Notified: _____ / _____
Individual Notified Date Time

Rev. 18, 4/2/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 810 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

Items Closed: (How) _____

Date / Time

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

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 811

Priority: 3B

Identified By

Date _____

Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 6.5.1

Tech Spec Page: 6-6

Problem Title: OOAM Not in Compliance with Technical Specifications

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

OQAM, Revision 3, Section 1.3.10 does not contain all of the PSRC requirements contained in Technical Specification 6.5.1. The OQAM does not mention that PSRC functions are addressed in the Technical Specification.

2. Safety Significance:

Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Investigate whether a revision to the OQAM is required.

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

NRC Notified: _____ /

Individual Notified

Date _____

Time .

5. Disposition: _____

Items Closed: (How) _____

Date _____

Time

Referendat: TSRT-84/0464

cc: J. E. Cross

R. F. Rogers

Rev. 18, 4/2/84

P1sd255

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

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: 813

Priority: 3B

Identified By _____

Date _____

Responsible Supervisor _____

Tech Spec Reference: 6.5.2.2

Tech Spec Page: 6-9

Problem Title: Manager of QA Technical Specification Requirements Differ from
OOAM

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, FSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
Technical Specification 6.5.2.2 states that the Manager of Quality Assurance shall be a member of the safety review committee (SRC) and establishes educational and experience requirements for all members of the SRC. The requirements for the Manager of QA, as shown in the GCNS Operational Quality Assurance Manual, differ from the Technical Specification.

2. Safety Significance:
Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:
Investigate the difference between the requirements of the two documents and make appropriate changes.

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

NRC Notified: _____

Individual Notified	Date	Time
---------------------	------	------

Rev. 22, 4/9/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 813 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

Items Closed: (How) _____

Date Time

Reference: TSRT-84/0485

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

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 814

Priority: 3B

Identified By

Date

Responsible Supervisor

Tech Spec Reference: 6.5.2.2

Tech Spec Page: 6-9

Problem Title: SER Requirements per SRC Composition

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

Section 13.4 of Supplement 2 to the SER is in conflict with Technical Specification 6.5.2.2 concerning the titles of the specific personnel who compose the SRC.

2. Safety Significance:

Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

No Technical Specification change is required. The titles of the personnel composing the SRC were changed and these changes were reflected in a Technical Specification revision, thereby causing the SER and the Technical Specifications to differ.

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

NRC Notified: _____

Individual Notified

Date

Time

Rev. 22, 4/9/84

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 814 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

Items Closed: (How) _____

Date / Time

Reference: TSKT-84/0483

cc: J. E. Cross

R. F. Rogers

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 815 Priority: 3B

QA Review /

Identified By _____ Date _____ Responsible Supervisor _____

Tech Spec Reference: 3/4.4.4, PSAR Table 5.2.6

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

Problem Title: Reactor Coolant Chemistry

1. Problem Description (Tech Spec, PSAR, SER, GE Design, Other):
PSAR Table 5.2-6, sheet 2 of 2 requires (1) shutdown if pH is out of limits for 24 hours, and (2) in-line calibration for continuous conductivity monitored weekly and every 24 hours if conductivity is greater than 1 micro MHO. These are inconsistent with the ACTION and Surveillance Requirements under Grand Gulf Technical Specification 3/4.4.4.

2. Safety Significance:
Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:
Update PSAR Table 5.2-6 to be consistent with Grand Gulf 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. 22, 4/9/84

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 accommodate the setpoint.

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

2. Safety Significance:

Not Applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:

Revise FSAR Table 7.3-10 to correct the main steam line flow-high instrumentation values 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

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 Nomenclature

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

FSAR Section 3.7 describes the seismic design and seismic monitoring for GCNS. 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

Plsd302

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:

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

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

<u>Function</u>	<u>FSAR Value</u>	<u>GGNS-TS Value</u>
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

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

Rev. 23, 4/10/84

P1s4304

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 821 Priority: 3B

Impell 14/3/84

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/IX): _____

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

Rev. 24, 4/13/84

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 parameter. 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 Timecc: J. E. Cross.
R. F. Rogers

Rev. 24, 4/13/84

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

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 6-33 through 44

Problem Title: Containment and Drywall 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 drywall 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

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

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 825 Priority: 3B

S. 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

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET (CONT'D)

Item Number: 826 Priority: 3B

5. Disposition: _____

Items Closed: (How) _____

Date Time

Reference: LOTS Item Number 198
ISRI-84/0102

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

Rev. 25, 4/16/84

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

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 828

Priority: 3d

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 than 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: TSRI-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

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 is 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-82/677.

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

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 7.3-57

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 (NER/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

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION PROBLEM SHEET

Item Number: 833

Priority: 3B

Identified By _____ Date _____ Responsible _____
Tech Spec Reference: 4.8.1.1.2.d.2; FSAR Table 8.3-1, 8.3-2, 8
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,
AECM-83/0356, item 5 corrected the Technical Specification load
to conform with testable KW values associated with maximum pump

2. Safety Significance:
Not applicable.

3. Anticipated Resolution:
Update FSAR tables to list the testable load reject values in a
motor nameplate ratings.

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

NRC Notified: _____

Individual Notified

Date

5. Disposition: _____

Items Closed: (How) _____

Date

Time

cc: J. E. Cross

R. F. Rogers

Rev.