From: "Head, Scott" <smhead@STPEGS.COM>
To: <dhj@nrc.gov>
Date: 7/8/04 1:50PM
Subject: FW: Feedback to NRC on ASCO Solenoid Valve Teleconference

Per your request.
-----Original Message-----
From: Schinzel, Glen
Sent: Thursday, July 08, 2004 12:36 PM
To: Head, Scott
Cc: Grantom, Carl
Subject: FW: Feedback to NRC on ASCO Solenoid Valve Teleconference

Scott,

I sat down with Gilbert Guerra this morning and discussed the below feedback on the ASCO solenoid valve issue. Gilbert didn't have any significant feedback on the below information, but he did ask about how we control the quality of received material from industrial vendors. I reviewed the information that we had verbally discussed on the teleconference to address this aspect, and Gilbert seemed okay with that. Also, he did ask about how we intended to factor in the Exemption allowances into the design modification process. This was also addressed, and Gilbert seemed okay with the response.

I emphasized to Gilbert that if he had any additional questions associated with the Exemption, to get in touch with either yourself or myself.

The below info should be ready to be forwarded to Dave Jaffe.

Glen

-----Original Message-----
From: Schinzel, Glen
Sent: Thursday, July 08, 2004 6:33 AM
To: Schinzel, Glen
Subject: RE: Feedback to NRC on ASCO Solenoid Valve Teleconference

A teleconference was held on June 22, 2004 between STPNOC personnel, the STP NRC site resident inspector, NRC Region IV personnel, and NRC Headquarters personnel to discuss an STPNOC engineering evaluation addressing ASCO solenoid valves. This engineering evaluation had been previously forwarded to the staff, at their request, following a status briefing on the Exemption from Certain Special Treatment Requirements provided by STPNOC to the staff on

March 23, 2004.

During the teleconference, two actions were identified which required STPNOC follow-up and feedback. The NRC asked if there were additional engineering evaluations that had been performed and documented for other models of ASCO solenoid valves other than the Main Steam/Feedwater applications assessed in the engineering evaluation provided to the staff under proprietary cover. STPNOC reviewed this request, and has verified that there have been no other engineering evaluations performed on other models of ASCO solenoid valves for the intent of implementing the Exemption from Certain Special Treatment allowances. In addition, no other ASCO replacement components in the STP warehoused inventory have been flagged for use in Exemption-related replacements.

The second action resulted from a comment made by the STP NRC site resident inspector stating that a recent Condition Report, 04-6848, had addressed a deficiency in an ASCO solenoid valve, had an engineering evaluation performed on the situation, and had the solenoid valve replaced. Subsequent to the phone call, STPNOC investigated this situation and determined the following:

* Preventive Maintenance activity IC-1-95003616 to replace solenoid valve FY-4152 associated with the Unit 1 Steam Generator 1B Blowdown outside Reactor Containment Building isolation valve FV-4152 was scheduled and performed on May 5, 2004.
* The Steam Generator Blowdown isolation valve had been previously categorized as Medium safety significant. The two solenoid valves associated with the main valve were categorized as Low safety significant due to redundancy.
* The old FY-4152 solenoid valve was replaced with ASCO model 206-381-4VF-125VDC (equivalent part number NPEF8300381VF) which is a safety-related, qualified solenoid valve.
* CR 04-6848 was written on May 5, 2004 to address a failed surveillance stroke time test on the Steam Generator 1B Blowdown outside Reactor Containment isolation valve following solenoid valve replacement. The acceptance criteria for the valve stroke was between 19-27 seconds. Actual as-tested stroke time was 28 seconds.
* An Engineering evaluation was performed on the surveillance stroke time acceptance criteria. The Engineering evaluation concluded that a new reference stroke time of 21-35 seconds was acceptable.

While the Exemption allowances could have been exercised in this case (i.e., the solenoid valve was determined to be Low safety significant), the Exemption was not utilized, and a safety-related, qualified solenoid valve was installed. In addition, the Steam Generator Blowdown isolation valve remains within the regulated In-service Testing (IST) Program due to its Medium safety significance.

In addition, no Engineering evaluation has been performed on this specific model of ASCO solenoid valve (the Design Change Package forwarded to the staff evaluated the use of ASCO Model 212-633-1RVF as an alternate to ASCO Model 206-381-6RF only). Until such Engineering evaluation is performed and successfully concludes that an alternate provides proper

reasonable confidence that the design functional requirements are satisfied, the solenoid valve will continue to be procured and installed under the existing regulatory safety-related controls.

If there are any questions concerning this feedback, please contact either Glen Schinzel at (361)972-7854 or Scott Head at (361)972-7136.