

11/06 Debrief Issues

Express appreciation: Terry Mountain's direct support this week

- **Activities**
 - meetings and reviews on the 10 CFR 50.54(f) response
 - observe EAB meeting on SFAS SHRR report
 - review QA reviews of 125/250VDC, Station and Instrument Air, and Decay Heat Removal/Low Pressure Injection
 - Review 4160 VAC system self-assessment
 - Review ARTS and 125/250VDC final SHRRs (George)
 - review equipment reliability self-assessment and related CR on inadequate followup
 - meeting to discuss greasing of struts

- **Issues**
 - extent of condition for greased struts
 - fuses ... in the early 90s there was a fuse evaluation conducted under a PCAQR. 92-0030. Fuses were identified which didn't comply with the E-2014 drawing. These were evaluated and determined to be acceptable for continued operation with the understand that they would be replaced with the correct fuse on failure. Fuses in this condition were identified by a sticker. 2014 was not annotated to identify replacement per the PCAQR upon failure of the fuse. 125/250 VDC SHRR identified per 02-04856, that the work iaw 92-0030 was still to be completed. Our concern is that this issue may be generic to all electrical systems ... not just 125/250. We know that as of this morning the 125/250 SE had not discussed this with other Ses, but he committed to George to do it.
 - two CRs that we considered should have been restart issues. CR 01-1232 which identified a crack in the post seal ring nut on cell 21 of battery 2P and CR 02-00412 which stated dc calculation does not adequately address small loads on dc system. The SE has agreed that 1232 should be restart because battery must be taken out of service to do this and battery is being disassembled during this outage from corrosion product removal so this would be the right time to replace the cracked ring nut. Wrt 00412, it was unclear from CR or the report whether the issue involved actual battery loading or voltage drops. Which is the issue determines whether this is a restart issue or not.
 -
 -

- **Resolved issues**
 -
 -
 -
 -

- **Observations**
 - EAB discussions on the SFAS report were consistent with my previous observations that EAB was comprehensive and probing

B18

- issue of strut greasing ... struts supplied to Davis-Besse were all of the dry-film lubricated type and were not intended to be greased. I did observe greased struts. Now need to determine extent of condition, any operability impacts, and what needs to be done in the future.
- reviewed the package for the 1979 HPI commitment that I mentioned last debrief. I could not find where the response and other information in the package addressed the issue of HPI deadheading in the small break LOCA scenario. Since it has been acknowledged that the commitment tracking program needs attention, I am not taking this issue any further. The technical issue of HPI, as it came out of the team inspection is being addressed by firstenergy staff.
- review of 50.54(f) response program led to discussion about the Validation effort. In my review of that I looked at the SW report. I found where the resolution of an issue assigned a high significance rating was inadequate. Issue concerned that rated flow in system description didn't include all possible flows. Resolution was that this needed to be corrected in the system description. It missed that the analysis related to this number needed to be examined. This was, of course, noted by both the LIR team and the NRC team inspection. Also been told that in the staff's review of this program, other inadequate resolutions have been identified.
- discussions about the validation program also revealed that one of the underlying assumptions was that information in the USAR was considered as baseline.
- regarding SHRR reports of ARTS and 125/250VDC. No concerns wrt to reports conforming to the process.