

From: James Wiggins *RT*
 To: Mel Gray
 Date: 4/30/04 12:52PM
 Subject: Re: Call to [REDACTED]

Mel....Good job...Thorough writeup....

Jim

>>> Mel Gray 04/30/04 11:18AM >>>
 Here is a synopsis of my meeting with [REDACTED] two days ago and my follow-up inspection efforts through today.

[REDACTED] had hand written notes that indicated the following:

An EDG at Hope Creek had problem with metal filings or grit in lube oil or jacket water. This was causing lube oil or jacket water leaks. PS did a fix that was not the best.

Also, a shaft needed replacement, but was not because of cost.

I searched the notifications for something along these lines and identified notification [REDACTED] as a possible candidate. This notification was written on 4/26/03 by a maintenance individual. The problem described was that, because Engineering did not listen to the individual and flush the jacket water system, additional jacket water seal leaks developed. Here are the details of the problem description:

1. The jacket water pump seal on the C EDG leaked in 9/02. Maintenance individual initiated a level 2 notification at that time (20112756). The individual asserted (in 9/02) the seals are likely falling due to corrosion products in the jacket water system.
2. Notification 20112756 was closed to order 70026906, then to 70026865 for Engineering to evaluate. Engineering did not agree with the maintenance individual that the seal failed due to corrosion products. The jacket water seal faces were heavily worn. There was some debris in the soft side seal face, but this did not cause the seal failure. Engineering concluded the seal wore due to being inservice for 6 years. Therefore a jacket water system flush was not identified as a corrective action.
3. The maintenance individual asserted in the April 2003 notification that, because engineering did not flush the jw system, there were additional seal failures. He cited notification 20128763 where the B EDG developed a jacket water leak. he cited notification 20141632 where the B EDG common pump shaft for jacket water and intercooler pumps had grooves and required replacement.
4. Notification #20141625 was closed based on engineering response that debris was not cause of seal leaks.

Inspectors conclusions:

a. The SRI is familiar with the likely individual (who no longer works at PSEG) who believed that grit was the cause of chronic EDG seal failures. He talked with the individual in June 2003 when the A EDG intercooler seal leaked and HC began to shutdown per TS because of the problem. The individual believed that jacket water system had grit from sandcastings during initial fabrication, and grit embedded in seals and caused chronic leaks.

PSEG subsequently disassembled the A EDG jw and intercooler pumps and shaft in July 2003 and found a seized thrust bearing. One result of the root cause evaluation done on this was that chronic seal leaks on EDGs may have been due to lack of design spec numbers in seal replacement procedure to check shaft thrust and bearing clearance. PSEG could not ensure jw and intercooler pump seals were consistently being shimmed correctly w/o checking these parameters. This would look like wear out of

Information in this record was deleted
 in accordance with the Freedom of Information
 Act, exemptions 7C
 FOIA- 2004-314

N-97

seals prematurely. See IR 354/2003-004. It documents NCV finding for PSEG not having design specs in seal replacement procedure when it was available in vendor document.

b. Inspector confirmed the B EDG shaft (with grooves worn) was replaced in last refueling outage under work order 60035129.

c. Inspector determined that, based on periodic jw sampling, PSEG plans to flush B EDG jw system. This is tracked under notification 20183204. No other EDG engine flushes are planned. B EDG seals do not currently leak.

d. On Wednesday, Inspector had SOME of this information, but not all. He communicated what he had to [REDACTED] at that time.

e. Inspector plans to call [REDACTED] with additional information Monday and see if this satisfies their questions. Inspector does not plan to submit an allegation form.

f. Based on sparse information and adequate final resolution of likely candidate notification, Inspector does not see an allegation is being made.

Mel Gray
SRI -HC

>>> A. Randolph Blough 04/29/04 05:08PM >>>

I appreciate everyone's concern on this. We need to enforce our protocols and follow our processes.

In this particular case, I think the info has now been provided by the [REDACTED] and, even though [REDACTED] was for some reason guarded, things are on-track now that their [REDACTED] as met with our Inspector - [REDACTED] has given us the info, has not tried to assert the lead, and, further, the info is vague with no allegation of a req't having been violated. So it's okay to handle as a form of "request for inspection" rather than an allegation. I had talked to Glenn earlier, and he confirmed that, in his call with [REDACTED] he had asked [REDACTED] if there was any immediate safety concern as a way of reinforcing the [REDACTED] obligation to get that type of info to us promptly. I spoke with Mel Gray just now, and he agrees with the points I've outlined in bold above.

We will need to watch closely for cases in the future where [REDACTED] tries to over-step their bounds, but I think we're OK for now.

randy

randy>>> David Vito 04/29/04 08:31AM >>>

I agree with Scott that it needs to be made clear that we have the lead on this.....and once we know what the issue(s) actually is (are), they should be tracked via the Allegation process. It is my understanding that [REDACTED] is not allowed to conceal issues from us that relate to NRC regulated activities. Glenn's report of his phone call with [REDACTED] sounded like [REDACTED] has some information that [REDACTED] is not willing to relinquish?

>>> Scott Barber 04/26/04 04:42PM >>>

I think it is good to build cooperation with [REDACTED] and I know we tried to do that in the 95 - 98 Salem Restart era. However, I'm not sure if we want to advertise that we are providing inspection assistance to them. I am fairly certain that there is nothing in the [REDACTED] of an NRC regulated activity. I did talk to Mel and he has a clear image that he is leading the information retrieval activity (i.e. the inspection), but [REDACTED] may think they have the lead to gather the information. Do you think that we should clarify our respective roles or do you think [REDACTED] is clear on the matter?

>>> Glenn Meyer 04/23/04 02:06PM >>>

I reached [REDACTED] this morning and we discussed [REDACTED] interest in following up on a concern on (Hope Creek)

diesel generators (EDGs). The allexer has provided information from a plant individual who wants to remain anonymous, and the information relates to EDG concerns raised within the PSEG work system which have not been addressed. We agreed to work together to determine the status of the concerns.

I offered various options for the followup, but [redacted] was reluctant to allow us to enter it as an allegation and do the followup, to provide a copy of the notification, or to give us the notification number. [redacted] prefers that the [redacted] arrange to visit Hope Creek within weeks and to work through the specifics with the residents, who can access the notification system. I agreed with the approach and briefed Mel Gray, who is prepared to make the arrangements and proceed.

I view the effort as inspection assistance to [redacted] and given the likelihood that the concerns have already been addressed within our inspection program, I do not currently plan to enter the concerns as an allegation.

Glenn

>>> Hubert J. Miller 04/21/04 11:33AM >>>
good instincts on this

we should keep safety related issues within our program and use the established protocols with [redacted] to give them the visibility they think they need on how the issues are being handled.

this, of course, presumes that the diesel issue is being addressed within our process...

>>> Robert Bores 04/16/04 02:53PM >>>

I got a call at 1425hr on Friday (4/16) from [redacted] as a result of the meeting between [redacted] and the Salem/Hope Creek whistle blower. [redacted] indicated that [redacted] is interested in following up on one of the identified issues, that relating to the diesel generator. They were looking at developing a plan to do that in conjunction with the resident inspectors.

Since we may already have worked this issue, I suggested that a better approach might be to see if we had the issue, if so where we were in the follow-up process, and have [redacted] obtain the information from us, rather than to try and re-cover areas we've already done. I suggested that the Branch Chief, Glenn Meyer should be the prime contact on this. [redacted] agreed with this and asked that Glenn call on Monday to discuss. I can be available Monday morning to facilitate if desired.

[redacted]

bob

CC: A. Randolph Blough; Daniel Holody; Daniel Orr; David Vito; Ernest Wilson; Glenn Meyer; Hubert J. Miller; Leanne Harrison; Robert Bores; Scott Barber; Sharon Johnson