

From: Jeffrey Teator, ^{OT}
To: Daniel Orr
Date: 12/22/03 7:22AM
Subject: Fwd: Re: hub meeting/new issue

Scott, let's talk about this before we ask Dan to contact [redacted] jeff

>>> Daniel Orr 12/19/03 01:37PM >>>

Scott,

I did some research through SAP. The one issue that involves all four valves, the four valves are the parallel BIT inlet and outlet MOVs is a DCP issue generated from NRC Bulletin 88-08. The issue involved thermal stratification and stresses to RCS piping past single isolation valves. Salem used to maintain only one isolation at the BIT outlet. The cold leg injection lines were identified as susceptible if the BIT outlet valves leaked by. Looks like Salem 2 was modified first, not sure when. Salem 1 looks like it was modified in Fall 2002 outage. In any case, all four BIT valves are now maintained closed for both units. I verified this in the main control room for both units.

I did see a notification that involved a PM deferral for leak testing the unit 2 BIT outlet valves. This requirement still exists even with the DCP that double isolates charging from RCS. It was interesting in the notification that a statement was made that the ops manager agreed with engineering and licensing that the PM could be deferred for the outage. The notification was from February of 2002. The PM was deferred to the outage, which would have been spring 2002. Interesting. Oh by the way, performing this test in mode 1 would have placed the unit in a 1 hour shutdown statement.

Bottomline is that I think we need to go back to [redacted] and understand this issue(s) more clearly. For now, my sense is that the leak test should have been completed in Spring 2002, or if it involved the DCP issue, both units are complete.

I can go to [redacted] if you like.
Dan

>>> Scott Barber 12/19/03 07:40AM >>>

Information in this record was deleted
in accordance with the Freedom of Information
Act, exemptions b7C
FOIA 2005-0194

P-169