

Originator: Lukens,Larry D**Originator Phone:** 3131**Originator Group:** Eng P&C Codes Mgmt**Operability Required:** Y**Supervisor Name:** Corbett,Patrick B**Reportability Required:** Y**Discovered Date:** 02/08/2007 09:22**Initiated Date:** 02/08/2007 09:37

Condition Description:

Unable to locate 1991 video tape of primary containment sand cushion drain inspections.

As a result of CAR 91-063, a video tape of the sand cushion drain line inspections was made. This tape has not been found, despite an exhaustive search. What is known, however, is that the inspection results were evaluated and specifically found not to have affected the VY response to GL 87-05 (memo attached).

This tape was not a Quality Record; it was not an inspection required by Code or Regulation. Its loss has no effect on any installed plant equipment and has no operability implications.

This CR simply documents an unexpected administrative condition.

No specific action is required or suggested as a result of this CR.

Immediate Action Description:**Suggested Action Description:****Attachments:**

Condition Description
February 1992 memo

Attachment Header

Document Name:

untitled

Document Location

Condition Description

Attach Title:

February 1992 memo

drywell and the sand cushion.

Based upon the above conclusions, the Vermont Yankee FVY 87-52 letter remains accurate and no revision is necessary.

In addition, the corrective actions taken are measures over and above our stated commitment. Most notable is the increased frequency of inspection of the sand drain lines and the torus floor areas.

Additional Note:

OUR ORIGINAL RESPONSE DID STATE (IMPLY THAT WE WOULD REVISE OUR RESPONSE (FOR THEIR REVIEW) IF WATER PENETRATED THE GAP AREA. OUR CLOSE COMMUNICATIONS ON THIS ISSUE WITH THE NRC FULFILLS OUR BASIC COMMITMENT, TO INFORM. ADDITIONALLY, THE FINALIZED CAPL WAS GIVEN TO THE NRC.

fol 2/7/92

Originator: Lukens,Larry D**Originator Phone:** 3131**Originator Group:** Eng P&C Codes Mgmt**Operability Required:** Y**Supervisor Name:** Corbett,Patrick B**Reportability Required:** Y**Discovered Date:** 02/08/2007 09:13**Initiated Date:** 02/08/2007 09:21

Condition Description:

Sand Cushion Drain Line Configuration

The current configuration of the sand cushion drain system cannot be used to identify unambiguously water intrusion into the sand cushion area.

This question was raised during the License Renewal Inspection.

This question does not affect the operability of any installed plant equipment. In the current licensing basis, it is clear that the sand cushion drain lines are not relied upon to help ensure primary containment structural integrity. This is a License Renewal question.

Immediate Action Description:**Suggested Action Description:**

Evaluate the current design and configuration of the drain lines and determine their suitability for use as a leakage detection system.

Evaluate the installation of a collection facility to clearly identify water coming from the drains.

Revise OP 0150 to specifically direct the Operators to observe the 8 drain lines or a potential collection system. Include necessary training for Operators.

Establish and document the design basis and design function for the sand cushion drain lines.

Originator: Lukens,Larry D**Originator Phone:** 3131**Originator Group:** Eng P&C Codes Mgmt**Operability Required:** Y**Supervisor Name:** Corbett,Patrick B**Reportability Required:** Y**Discovered Date:** 02/08/2007 08:44**Initiated Date:** 02/08/2007 08:57

Condition Description:

CAR 91-063 evaluation and conclusions may be potentially confusing.

CAR 91-063 (partial attached) describes a packing leak from valve MS-77. This leak became visible as water in the area of the drywell pedestal. The evaluation and conclusions are worded in such a way that it is difficult to determine precisely how the water from the packing leak found its way to the drywell pedestal.

This CR is written to evaluate whether the Apparent Cause evaluation of CAR 91-063 should be re-evaluated with the intent of making the evaluation and conclusions more clear regarding the path the water may have taken.

This CR has no effect on past or present operability of the primary containment. This issue arose as a result of helping the NRC License Renewal inspection team to understand how the 1991 packing leak of MS-77 relates to License Renewal.

Immediate Action Description:**Suggested Action Description:**

Consider revisiting the apparent cause evaluation for CAR 91-063, looking for opportunities to clarify the probable path the water took before it appeared on the torus room floor.

Attachments:

Condition Description
CAR 91-063

Originator: Lukens,Larry D**Originator Phone:** 3131**Originator Group:** Eng P&C Codes Mgmt**Operability Required:** Y**Supervisor Name:** Corbett,Patrick B**Reportability Required:** Y**Discovered Date:** 02/08/2007 08:58**Initiated Date:** 02/08/2007 09:02

Condition Description:

Results of 2007 Primary Containment Sand Cushion Drain Line Inspections

The inspection results (attached) and evaluations for sand cushion drain inspections completed in January 2007 are being entered into the corrective action process as the first step toward incorporating them into an Engineering document. This CR conveys the results and evaluation of those inspections.

This CR affects no installed plant equipment; has no operability implications; and does not identify a deviation from any requirement.

Immediate Action Description:**Suggested Action Description:**

Evaluate screen conditions; general condition of drain lines; discontinuities in drain lines; deposits or material in drain lines; observations of departure from clean, smooth drain line internal diameter

Attachments:

Condition Description
2007 Sand Cushion Drain Inspections

Vermont Yankee
Non-Code Internal Visual Examination
Report Form for Components and Piping

Work Order No.: 51081726 01

Drawing No/Rev.: G-191481 Rev 2

Page 1 of 2 Date: 02/01/07

Component and/or Piping

Component ID: Sand drain tube BAY 2 System ID: SAND DRAIN Examined: In Place
 Removed

What is Being Examined: SAND DRAIN TUBE INTERNALS

Visual Aids

Light Source (Describe): Installed Lighting Temporary Lighting*
Remote Visual Examination Aids Used (Describe): OLYMPUS FIBER SCOPE IPLEX MODEL

Method		* Photo See Remarks		Sketch	
<input type="checkbox"/> Direct	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Remote	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Attached	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Attached
Indications	Acceptable	Recordable	N/A	Remarks/Observations	
Cracks			X		
Physical Damage		X		Kink at 91"	
Erosion/Corrosion			X		
Arc Strikes			X		
Loose Parts		X		Debris	
Missing Parts			X		
Excessive Movement			X		
Alignment			X		
Clearances			X		
Thread Damage			X		
Loose Bolting			X		
Fractured Bolting			X		
Thread Engagement			X		
Evidence of Leakage			X		
Degraded Coatings			X		
Other (Explain)		X		See Attached	

(*) Remarks: Light source integral to Videoscope
Electronic Video Record Retained in Records Management

Examiner: <u>Mike Griffin / Michael Sullivan</u> Level <u>II</u> Date <u>02/01/07</u>	ISI Group Evaluation Required? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Initials: <u>MMG</u>
Examiner: <u>Dave King / Jeff</u> Level <u>III</u> Date <u>02/01/07</u>	
Reviewer: <u>Wesley / F.T. Underkofler</u> RI Date <u>2/1/07</u>	
Remarks: <u>little change from 1787</u>	

Experience Hours Credit: 4.0

Supplemental Report Sheet

Vermont Yankee Non-Code Internal Visual Examination Procedure NE 8064

Code Programs NDE Report #: 07-001

Page 2 of 2

Supplemental Information

Comments for Sand Drain inspection at Bay #2

1. No screen was evident at the end of the drain tubing. There was no obvious obstruction at the tube inlet.
2. Air flow was noted moving in the direction of the sand cushion.
3. Small stone type particle debris was noted in 10% to 15% of the tube length. While extensive, it does not appear that these obstructions would impede the flow of water that may come from the sand cushion area.
4. A tubing kink exists at 91" from the tubing inlet
5. A tubing joint was noted at 44" from the tubing inlet and appears to be functional.
6. Overall tube length is approximately 167"

Vermont Yankee
 Non-Code Internal Visual Examination
 Report Form for Components and Piping

Work Order No.: 51081726 01
 Drawing No/Rev.: G-191481 Rev 2
 Page 1 of 2 Date: 02/01/07

Component and/or Piping

Component ID: Sand drain tube BAY 4 System ID: SAND DRAIN Examined: In Place
 Removed
 What is Being Examined: SAND DRAIN TUBE INTERNALS

Visual Aids

Light Source (Describe): Installed Lighting Temporary Lighting*
 Remote Visual Examination Aids Used (Describe): OLYMPUS FIBER SCOPE IPLEX MODEL

Indications	Method		* Photo See Remarks		Sketch	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Direct	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Remote	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Attached	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Attached
	Acceptable	Recordable	N/A	Remarks/Observations		
Cracks			X			
Physical Damage		X				<u>Kink at 87"</u>
Erosion/Corrosion			X			
Arc Strikes			X			
Loose Parts			X			
Missing Parts			X			
Excessive Movement			X			
Alignment			X			
Clearances			X			
Thread Damage			X			
Loose Bolting			X			
Fractured Bolting			X			
Thread Engagement			X			
Evidence of Leakage			X			
Degraded Coatings			X			
Other (Explain)		X				<u>See Attached</u>

(*) Remarks: Light source integral to videoscope
Electronic Video Record Retained in Records Management

Examiner: <u>Mike Griffin / [Signature]</u> Level <u>II</u> Date <u>02/01/07</u>	ISI Group Evaluation Required? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Initials: <u>MG</u>
Examiner: <u>Dave King / [Signature]</u> Level <u>III</u> Date <u>02/01/07</u>	
Reviewer: <u>[Signature] / F.J. DeDeo, Office RI</u> Date <u>2/1/07</u>	
Remarks: <u>TV Water was observed in 1987</u>	

Experience Hours Credit: 4.0

Supplemental Report Sheet

Vermont Yankee Non-Code Internal Visual Examination Procedure NE 8064

Code Programs NDE Report #: 07-002

Page 2 of 2

Supplemental Information

Comments for Sand Drain inspection at Bay #4

1. Screen intact with approximately 40% of the screen area clear.
Approximately 60% of the screen area has sand or other deposit impingement.
2. Air flow noted in the direction of the sand cushion.
3. Kink noted at approximately 87" from the drain tube entry.
4. Minor debris noted including what appears to be a nail.
5. Joint at 49" from tube entry appears to be functional.
6. Overall tube length was not measured for this tube due to scaffold obstruction and radiation dose consideration.

Vermont Yankee
 Non-Code Internal Visual Examination
 Report Form for Components and Piping

Work Order No.: 51081726 01
 Drawing No/Rev.: G-191481 Rev 2
 Page 1 of 2 Date: 02/01/07

Component and/or Piping

Component ID: Sand drain tube BAY 6 System ID: SAND DRAIN Examined: In Place
 Removed
 What is Being Examined: SAND DRAIN TUBE INTERNALS

Visual Aids

Light Source (Describe): Installed Lighting Temporary Lighting*
 Remote Visual Examination Aids Used (Describe): OLYMPUS FIBER SCOPE IPLEX MODEL

Indications	Method		* Photo <i>see Remarks</i>		Sketch	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Direct	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Remote	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Attached	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Attached
Acceptable	Recordable	N/A	Remarks/Observations			
Cracks			X			
Physical Damage		X				<u>Kink at 88"</u>
Erosion/Corrosion			X			
Arc Strikes			X			
Loose Parts			X			
Missing Parts			X			
Excessive Movement			X			
Alignment			X			
Clearances			X			
Thread Damage			X			
Loose Bolting			X			
Fractured Bolting			X			
Thread Engagement			X			
Evidence of Leakage			X			
Degraded Coatings			X			
Other (Explain)		X				<u>See Attached</u>

(*) Remarks: Light source integral to videoscope
Electronic Video Record Retained in Records Management

Examiner: <u>Mike Griffin / [Signature]</u> Level <u>II</u> Date <u>02/01/07</u>	ISI Group Evaluation Required? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Initials: <u>MG</u>
Examiner: <u>Dava King / [Signature]</u> Level <u>II</u> Date <u>02/01/07</u>	
Reviewer: <u>F.T. Underhill / [Signature]</u> <u>RI</u> Date <u>2/1/07</u>	
Remarks: <u>Little Degrade 1987</u>	

Experience Hours Credit: 4.0

Supplemental Report Sheet

Vermont Yankee Non-Code Internal Visual Examination Procedure NE 8064

Code Programs NDE Report #: 07-003

Page 2 of 2

Supplemental Information

Comments for Sand Drain inspection at Bay #6

1. Screen appears to be intact with sand and other deposit impingements noted over approximately 98% of the screen surface area.
2. Kink noted at approximately 88" from the tube entry.
3. Joint noted at approximately 42" from tube entry. Joint appears to be intact and functional.
4. Overall length of drain tube is approximately 162" from tube entry.
5. No conclusive air flow was noted in this tube.

Vermont Yankee
 Non-Code Internal Visual Examination
 Report Form for Components and Piping

Work Order No.: 510 81726 01

Drawing No/Rev.: G-191481 Rev 2

Page 1 of 2 Date: 02/01/07

Component and/or Piping

Component ID: Sand drain tube BAY 8 System ID: SAND DRAIN Examined: In Place
 Removed

What is Being Examined: SAND DRAIN TUBE INTERNALS

Visual Aids

Light Source (Describe): Installed Lighting Temporary Lighting*
 Remote Visual Examination Aids Used (Describe): OLYMPUS FIBER SCOPE IPLEX MODEL

Method		* Photo See Remarks		Sketch	
<input type="checkbox"/> Direct	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Remote	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Attached	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Attached
Indications	Acceptable	Recordable	N/A	Remarks/Observations	
Cracks			X		
Physical Damage		X		Kink at 96"	
Erosion/Corrosion			X		
Arc Strikes			X		
Loose Parts			X		
Missing Parts			X		
Excessive Movement			X		
Alignment			X		
Clearances			X		
Thread Damage			X		
Loose Bolting			X		
Fractured Bolting			X		
Thread Engagement			X		
Evidence of Leakage			X		
Degraded Coatings			X		
Other (Explain)		X		See Attached	

(*) Remarks: light source integral to video scope
Electronic Video Record Retained in Records Management

Examiner: Mike Griffin / Michael Griffin Level II Date 02/01/07
 Examiner: Dave King / Dave King Level II Date 02/01/07
 Reviewer: F.T. Underkofler / F.T. Underkofler RI Date 2/1/07
 Remarks: little change from 1987

ISI Group Evaluation Required?
 Yes No
 Initials: MMG

Experience Hours Credit: 4.0

Supplemental Report Sheet

Vermont Yankee Non-Code Internal Visual Examination Procedure NE 8064

Code Programs NDE Report #: 07-004

Page 2 of 2

Supplemental Information

Comments for Sand Drain inspection at Bay #8

1. Screen intact with approximately 40% of the surface area clear and approximately 60% included by sand or other deposits.
2. Kink noted at approximately 96" from tube entry.
3. Joint noted at 47" from tube entry. Joint appears to be intact and functional.
4. Overall length of tube is approximately 172" measured from tube entry.
5. No conclusive air flow was noted in this tube.

Vermont Yankee
 Non-Code Internal Visual Examination
 Report Form for Components and Piping

Work Order No.: 51081726 01

Drawing No/Rev.: G-191481 Rev 2

Page 1 of 2 Date: 02/01/07

Component and/or Piping

Component ID: Sand drain tube BAY 10 System ID: SAND DRAIN Examined: In Place
 Removed

What is Being Examined: SAND DRAIN TUBE INTERNALS

Visual Aids

Light Source (Describe): Installed Lighting Temporary Lighting*
 Remote Visual Examination Aids Used (Describe): OLYMPUS FIBER SCOPE IPLEX MODEL

Indications	Method		* Photo <i>see Remarks</i>		Sketch	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Direct	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Remote	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Attached	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Attached
	Acceptable	Recordable	N/A	Remarks/Observations		
Cracks			X			
Physical Damage		X				<u>Kink at 94"</u>
Erosion/Corrosion			X			
Arc Strikes			X			
Loose Parts			X			
Missing Parts			X			
Excessive Movement			X			
Alignment			X			
Clearances			X			
Thread Damage			X			
Loose Bolting			X			
Fractured Bolting			X			
Thread Engagement			X			
Evidence of Leakage			X			
Degraded Coatings			X			
Other (Explain)		X				<u>See Attached</u>

(*) Remarks: light source integral to video scope
Electronic Video Record Retained in Records Management

Examiner: <u>Mike Griffin / Michael Griffin</u> Level <u>II</u> Date <u>02/01/07</u>	ISI Group Evaluation Required? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Initials: <u>MMG</u>
Examiner: <u>Dave King / [Signature]</u> Level <u>III</u> Date <u>02/01/07</u>	
Reviewer: <u>F. T. [Signature]</u> Date <u>3/1/07</u>	
Remarks: <u>Little damage from 1987</u>	

Experience Hours Credit: 4.0

Supplemental Report Sheet

Vermont Yankee Non-Code Internal Visual Examination Procedure NE 8064

Code Programs NDE Report #: 07-005

Page 2 of 2

Supplemental Information

Comments for Sand Drain inspection at Bay #10

1. Screen appears to have a slight gap between the screen surface and the tube end. Screen is intact with approximately 98% of the screen surface area included by sand and other impinged material.
2. Kink noted at approximately 94" from tube entry.
3. Joint noted at 44" from tube entry. Joint has a significant gap in the coupling, but appears to be intact and functional.
4. Overall tube length is approximately 166".
5. No conclusive air flow was noted.

Vermont Yankee
 Non-Code Internal Visual Examination
 Report Form for Components and Piping

Work Order No.: 51081726 01

Drawing No/Rev.: G-191481 Rev 2

Page 1 of 2 Date: 02/01/07

Component and/or Piping

Component ID: Sand drain tube BAY 12 System ID: SAND DRAIN Examined: In Place
 Removed

What is Being Examined: SAND DRAIN TUBE INTERNALS

Visual Aids

Light Source (Describe): Installed Lighting Temporary Lighting*
 Remote Visual Examination Aids Used (Describe): OLYMPUS FIBER SCOPE IPLEX MODEL

Indications	Method		* Photo See Remarks		Sketch	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Direct	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Remote	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Attached	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Attached
	Acceptable	Recordable	N/A	Remarks/Observations		
Cracks			X			
Physical Damage		X		Kink at 87"		
Erosion/Corrosion			X			
Arc Strikes			X			
Loose Parts		X		light debris		
Missing Parts			X			
Excessive Movement			X			
Alignment			X			
Clearances			X			
Thread Damage			X			
Loose Bolting			X			
Fractured Bolting			X			
Thread Engagement			X			
Evidence of Leakage			X			
Degraded Coatings			X			
Other (Explain)		X		See Attached		

(*) Remarks: light source integral to video scope
Electronic Video Record Retained in Records Management

Examiner: <u>Mike Griffin / Michael Griffin</u> Level <u>II</u> Date <u>02/01/07</u>	ISI Group Evaluation Required? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Examiner: <u>Dave King / Dave King</u> Level <u>II</u> Date <u>02/01/07</u>	
Reviewer: <u>F.T. Uwood / F.T. Uwood</u> <u>RI</u> Date <u>2/1/07</u>	Initials: <u>TKG</u>
Remarks: <u>Little change from 0787</u>	

Experience Hours Credit: 4.0

Supplemental Report Sheet

Vermont Yankee Non-Code Internal Visual Examination Procedure NE 8064

Code Programs NDE Report #: 07-006

Page 2 of 2

Supplemental Information

Comments for Sand Drain inspection at Bay #12

1. Slight gap noted between the screen and tube end. Screen is intact with approximately 30% of the area clear and approximately 70% of the screen area included with sand and other impinged material.
2. Kink noted at approximately 87" from tube entry.
3. Minor debris noted.
4. Joint noted at 45" from tube entry. Joint has a gap but appears to be intact and functional.
5. Overall tube length is approximately 167".
6. Small air flow noted in direction of the sand cushion.

Vermont Yankee
 Non-Code Internal Visual Examination
 Report Form for Components and Piping

Work Order No.: 51081726 01

Drawing No/Rev.: G-191481 Rev 2

Page 1 of 2 Date: 02/01/07

Component and/or Piping

Component ID: Sand drain tube BAY 14 System ID: SAND DRAIN Examined: In Place
 Removed

What is Being Examined: SAND DRAIN TUBE INTERNALS

Visual Aids

Light Source (Describe): Installed Lighting Temporary Lighting*
 Remote Visual Examination Aids Used (Describe): OLYMPUS FIBER SCOPE IPLEX MODEL

Indications	Method		* Photo See Remarks		Sketch	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Direct	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Remote	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Attached	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Attached
	Acceptable	Recordable	N/A	Remarks/Observations		
Cracks			X			
Physical Damage		X				Kink at 72" minor screen damage
Erosion/Corrosion			X			
Arc Strikes			X			
Loose Parts		X				Debris / string
Missing Parts			X			
Excessive Movement			X			
Alignment			X			
Clearances			X			
Thread Damage			X			
Loose Bolting			X			
Fractured Bolting			X			
Thread Engagement			X			
Evidence of Leakage			X			
Degraded Coatings			X			
Other (Explain)		X				See Attached

(*) Remarks: Light source integral to video scope
Electronic Video Record Retained in Records Management

Examiner: <u>Mike Griffin / Michael Griffin</u> Level <u>II</u> Date <u>02/01/07</u>	ISI Group Evaluation Required? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Examiner: <u>Dave King / [Signature]</u> Level <u>II</u> Date <u>02/01/07</u>	
Reviewer: <u>F. J. [Signature] / [Signature]</u> <u>RI</u> Date <u>2/1/07</u>	Initials: <u>TMG</u>
Remarks: <u>Little change from 1987</u>	

Experience Hours Credit: 4.0

Supplemental Report Sheet

Vermont Yankee Non-Code Internal Visual Examination Procedure NE 8064

Code Programs NDE Report #: 07-007

Page 2 of 2

Supplemental Information

Comments for Sand Drain inspection at Bay #14

1. Screen intact and 100% clear. Minor damage to screen.
2. Minor debris noted.
3. Air flow noted in direction of sand cushion.
4. Kink noted at approximately 72" from tube entry.
5. Joint noted at approximately 47" from tube entry. Joint appears to be intact and functional.
6. Overall tube length is approximately 163".

Vermont Yankee
 Non-Code Internal Visual Examination
 Report Form for Components and Piping

Work Order No.: 51081726 01

Drawing No/Rev.: G-191481 Rev 2

Page 1 of 2 Date: 02/01/07

Component and/or Piping

Component ID: Sand drain tube BAY 16 System ID: SAND DRAIN Examined: In Place
 Removed

What is Being Examined: SAND DRAIN TUBE INTERNALS

Visual Aids

Light Source (Describe): Installed Lighting Temporary Lighting*
 Remote Visual Examination Aids Used (Describe): OLYMPUS FIBER SCOPE IPLEX MODEL

Method		* Photo <i>See Remarks</i>		Sketch	
<input type="checkbox"/> Direct	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Remote	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Attached	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Attached
Indications	Acceptable	Recordable	N/A	Remarks/Observations	
Cracks			X		
Physical Damage		X		Kink at 93"	
Erosion/Corrosion			X		
Arc Strikes			X		
Loose Parts			X		
Missing Parts			X		
Excessive Movement			X		
Alignment			X		
Clearances			X		
Thread Damage			X		
Loose Bolting			X		
Fractured Bolting			X		
Thread Engagement			X		
Evidence of Leakage			X		
Degraded Coatings			X		
Other (Explain)		X		See Attached	

(*) Remarks: light source integral to Video Scope
Electronic Video Record Retained in Records Management

Examiner: <u>Mike Griffin / Michael Griffin</u> Level <u>II</u> Date <u>02/01/07</u>	ISI Group Evaluation Required? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Initials: <u>TMG</u>
Examiner: <u>Dave King / Dave King</u> Level <u>III</u> Date <u>02/01/07</u>	
Reviewer: <u>F.T. Vukobratovic / F.T. Vukobratovic</u> <u>RI</u> Date <u>2/1/07</u>	
Remarks: <u>Water was observed in 1987</u>	

Experience Hours Credit: 4.0

Supplemental Report Sheet

Vermont Yankee Non-Code Internal Visual Examination Procedure NE 8064

Code Programs NDE Report #: 07-008

Page 2 of 2

Supplemental Information

Comments for Sand Drain inspection at Bay #16

1. Screen intact approximately 80% clear and approximately 20% included by impinged material.
2. Double kink noted at approximately 93" from tube entry.
3. Air flow noted in the direction of the sand cushion.
4. Joint at approximately 48" from tube entry. Joint appears to have a slight gap but otherwise intact and functional.
5. Overall tube length is approximately 164".

Originator: Lukens,Larry D**Originator Phone:** 3131**Originator Group:** Eng P&C Codes Mgmt**Operability Required:** N**Supervisor Name:** Corbett,Patrick B**Reportability Required:** N**Discovered Date:** 01/24/2007 10:28**Initiated Date:** 01/24/2007 10:31

Condition Description:

NDE Procedures may not be sufficiently clear concerning the writing of CRs for identified indications.

Procedures ENN-NDE-10.01; ENN-NDE-10.02; and ENN-NDE-10.03 do not explicitly reference EN-LI-102, and they do not contain explicit guidance to initiate a Condition Report upon identifying a non-conforming condition.

These procedures should be reviewed and revised to be consistent with EN-LI-102 and Management expectations.

Immediate Action Description:**Suggested Action Description:**

Originator: Lukens,Larry D**Originator Phone:** 3131**Originator Group:** Eng P&C Codes Mgmt**Operability Required:** N**Supervisor Name:** Corbett,Patrick B**Reportability Required:** N**Discovered Date:** 01/24/2007 10:15**Initiated Date:** 01/24/2007 10:26**Condition Description:**

Engineering Standard ENN-EP-S-001, General Visual Containment Inspection, Step 5.2.3 contains unclear direction.

Containment General Visual Inspections are conducted by qualified examiners and the results are reviewed and accepted by the IWE Responsible Individual [RI] (Program Owner).

Steps 5.2.1 & 5.2.2 are the following:

5.2.1: The inspection criteria (Sections 5.3, 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6) form the basis for accepting existing conditions in plants. These inspection criteria have been evaluated and acceptable by calculation or code and do not deter or compromise the structural integrity of the primary containment pressure boundary.

5.2.2 Indications which do not exceed the inspection criteria are not required to be reported and are considered acceptable without the RI's review.

Step 5.2.3 states, "The RI [the IWE Responsible Individual (Program Owner)] will determine if the conditions exceeding the inspection criteria are acceptable. A Condition Report (CR) shall be generated for all unacceptable conditions."

It is possible to interpret this direction as being contrary to the intent of the Corrective Action Process, which expects that non-conforming conditions are identified by CR and investigated in the corrective action process.

This step should be reviewed and revised to clarify that an individual identifying a condition that exceeds the acceptance criteria should initiate a CR.

Immediate Action Description:**Suggested Action Description:**

Originator: Betti, Enrico J

Originator Phone: 2347

Originator Group: Licensing Mgmt

Operability Required: N

Supervisor Name:

Reportability Required: N

Discovered Date: 03/12/1997 00:00

Initiated Date: 03/13/1997 00:00

Condition Description:

The Teledyne corrosion evaluation, performed in 1990, did not consider the

The Teledyne corrosion evaluation, performed in 1990, did not consider the original ASME III design basis pressure when evaluating allowable corrosion limits. The resultant corrosion limits would ultimately compromise the ASME III design pressure capacity. In addition the Teledyne study neglected to address corrosion at the critical penetrations. In the process of performing work for the ECCS strainer design change and for the ITS project, it was discovered that the torus corrosion evaluation did not consider design pressure.

Immediate Action Description:

NOTIFIED APPROPRIATE MANAGERS/DEPT : Complete : Expr1
 DISCUSSED EVENT WITH EMPLOYEE : Complete : Expr1
 INVESTIGATED THE PROBLEM : Complete : Expr1

Suggested Action Description:

INITIATED DOCUMENT CHANGE : Complete : Expr1

EQUIPMENT:

<u>Tag Name</u>	<u>Tag Suffix Name</u>	<u>Component Code</u>	<u>Process System Code</u>
			PCAC
			NB

REFERENCE ITEMS:

<u>Type Code</u>	<u>Description</u>
APPENDIX	ITS
EDCR	EDCR96-415

TRENDING (For Reference Purposes Only):

<u>Trend Type</u>	<u>Trend Code</u>
CAUSE DEPT	CD-FLUID SYSTEMS ENGINEERING
PERSONNEL INJURY	PI-NON-INJURY
CAUSAL FACTOR CODES	CFC-M2A3
KEYWORDS	KW-DOORS
KEYWORDS	KW-ITS

Attachments:

Closure Description
 ECCS STRAINER DESIGN SPECIFICATION PREPARATION IT WAS DISCOVI

Entergy

ADMIN

CR-VTY-1997-00307

Initiated Date: 3/13/1997 0:00

Owner Group :Eng DE Fluid Systems Mgmt

Current Contact:

Current Significance: C

Closed by: CONVERSION,IT

11/20/1997 0:00

Summary Description:

The Teledyne corrosion evaluation, performed in 1990, did not consider the

Remarks Description:

The ER 970307 was migrated from the VY Niagara application on 10/30/2003 to generate this CR.

Closure Description:

CA Number: 1

Group	Name
Tech CA&A HU Staff	CVAX
Eng DE Mech Civil Struct Mgmt	
Eng DE Mech Civil Struct Staff	

Originated By: CVAX

11/18/1997 00:00:00

Performed By: Callaghan,James H

11/30/1999 00:00:00

Subperformed By: Callaghan,James H

11/30/1999 00:00:00

Approved By:

Closed By: McCullough,Richard E

11/30/1999 15:17:00

Current Due Date: 10/22/1999

Initial Due Date: 10/22/1999

CA Type: ER CA

Plant Constraint: NONE

CA Description:

ER-970307_01
ER970307_01

TORUS SHELL CORROSION EVALUATION/ASME III DESIGN BASIS PRESSURE. DETERMINE THICKNESS OF TORUS PLATE SECTIONS/GEOMETRIES OF CONCERN. REVISE CLAC VYC-1032. FORWARD RESULTS TO MECH. MAINT.

Niagara indicators set at Initiation and DH Review:

Commitment Type :: B

Source Type :: Corrective Action

Source Detail :: Event Report

Item to be completed during outage ::

Summary of Niagara Due Date Extensions:

On 06/03/1998 revision 4 changed the due date from 06/01/1998 to 10/01/1998.
On 09/29/1998 revision 5 changed the due date from 10/01/1998 to 11/13/1998.
On 11/10/1998 revision 6 changed the due date from 11/13/1998 to 12/31/1998.
On 01/07/1999 revision 7 changed the due date from 12/31/1998 to 04/30/1999.
On 04/28/1999 revision 8 changed the due date from 04/30/1999 to 06/04/1999.
On 06/02/1999 revision 9 changed the due date from 06/04/1999 to 08/06/1999.
On 08/16/1999 revision 10 changed the due date from 08/06/1999 to 10/22/1999.

Response:

Commitment ER-970307_01

DH Approval Comments:
complete.

Subresponse :

3/20/98 JHC. See detailed closure notes on VYAPF 0028.01; attached "task" by J Fitzpatrick.

Closure Comments:

The Commitment ER-970307_01 was migrated from the VY Niagara application on 10/30/2003 to generate this CA.

Close Out Comments indicated in Niagara ::

Attachment Header

Document Name:

CR-VTY-1997-00307

Document Location

Closure Description

Attach Title:

ECCS STRAINER DESIGN SPECIFICATION PREPARATION IT WAS DISCOVERED THAT THE DESIGN

CA Number: 6

Group**Name**

Assigned By: VTY OE Coordinator

Aho, Wayne Raymond

Assigned To: VTY Eng DE Manager

Callaghan, James H

Subassigned To: VTY Eng DE Mech Civil Struct Mgmt

Originated By: Aho, Wayne Raymond

08/09/2005 16:28:10

Performed By: Goodwin, Scott D

09/13/2005 13:44:16

Subperformed By:

Approved By:

Closed By: Goodwin, Scott D

09/13/2005 13:44:16

Current Due Date: 09/13/2005

Initial Due Date: 09/15/2005

CA Type: APPLICABILITY REVIEW

Plant Constraint: NONE OEN

CA Description:

CR-JAF-2005-02593-RC Torus Leak Discovered Between The Support Between Bays "A" And "P" this requires a review and evaluation at VY.

Response:

requested action previously completed when event first occurred. Concluded that VY is not similar in configuration or susceptible to same event as has occurred at JAF. Refer to Attachment 1 for additional information. No further actions required.

Subresponse :**Closure Comments:****Attachments:**

Ca Description
Torus Leak-JAF root cause
Resp Description
Info on JAF Torus Leak

From: Unsal, Ahmet
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2005 4:32 PM
To: Goodwin, Scott
Subject: FW: Information on JAF Torus Leakage

Attachments: VY HPCI & RCIC Stm Exhaust Arrangement.pdf

Is this what you are looking for?

Ahmet

From: Rogers, James
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2005 2:41 PM
To: Unsal, Ahmet; Goodwin, Scott; Callaghan, James; LEWIS, RAYMOND S; debuman@nppd.com
Cc: Penny, Robert; Smith, Glenroy; Mulcahy, Francis; Mileris, George; Woods, Steven; White, Thomas F (Pilgrim)
Subject: RE: Information on JAF Torus Leakage

VY has reviewed the HPCI and RCIC steam exhaust lines, within the torus, in comparison to the physical arrangement provided. Unlike JAF, VYs lines extend into the torus through a 60° ELL and exit ~ 9 ft. (HPCI) and ~8 Ft. (RCIC) below the water surface. HPCI has a sparger at the exit point with none provided on RCIC

Review of our torus design indicates that we are similar to JAF in that a ring girder is provided.

Additionally, during RFO 24, Visual Examination was performed on the torus external surface and on the internal surface above the water line and as far below the surface as possible. UT examination was performed in all areas where coating issues were identified. No concerns were identified within the HPCI and RCIC areas.



VY HPCI & RCIC
Stm Exhaust Arr...

From: Callaghan, James
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2005 12:59 PM
To: Rogers, James
Subject: FW: Information on JAF Torus Leakage

From: Pace, Raymond
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2005 10:29 AM
To: Unsal, Ahmet; Goodwin, Scott; Callaghan, James; LEWIS, RAYMOND S; 'debuman@nppd.com'
Cc: Penny, Robert; Smith, Glenroy; Mulcahy, Francis; Mileris, George; Woods, Steven; White, Thomas F (Pilgrim)
Subject: RE: Information on JAF Torus Leakage

One more item: What does the detail of the SR elbow stiffener look like? It appears to be welded directly to the torus shell. Or, is it welded to a penetration stiffening pad?

-----Original Message-----

From: Pace, Raymond
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2005 10:23 AM
To: Unsal, Ahmet; Goodwin, Scott; Callaghan, James; LEWIS, RAYMOND S; 'debuman@nppd.com'
Cc: Penny, Robert; Smith, Glenroy; Mulcahy, Francis; Mileris, George; Woods, Steven; White, Thomas F (Pilgrim)
Subject: RE: Information on JAF Torus Leakage

All,

PNPS would like to see a plan drawing so we can figure out a dimension from the column in question the HPCI steam exhaust penetration. Our penetration is at mid-bay so it is more than 10 feet to either column.

Also, have you considered that early in plant life there were numerous problems with condensation in the exhaust line? After a first run the steam would condense in the line, that would suck in water resulting in a severe water hammer situation on a restart. PNPS had to resupport the HPCI line with snubbers for this event. We also added vacuum breakers to eliminate the potential.

Next item, PNPS has a submerged sparger on the end of the HPCI line to reduce the loading in the pool. This was original equipment. Your information seems to indicate that there is no sparger. Can you verify?

Thanks

Ray

-----Original Message-----

From: Unsal, Ahmet
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2005 9:02 AM
To: Pace, Raymond; Goodwin, Scott; Callaghan, James; LEWIS, RAYMOND S; 'debuman@nppd.com'
Cc: Penny, Robert; Smith, Glenroy
Subject: Information on JAF Torus Leakage

To All:

On June 27, 2005, while performing RCIC testing, several cracks were found in the JAF TORUS structure. Further investigation has shown that the cracks are located close to the 24" HPCI steam exhaust line in the torus. There is a ring girder inside the torus close to the location of the cracks. The cracks might be the result of fatigue due to thermal and/or condensation oscillation loads generated by the HPCI steam exhaust. There is also a similar configuration for the RCIC line, which also discharges to the torus.

Attached are sketches, drawings showing the HPCI and RCIC configurations for JAF. Also, the UT mapping of the crack and pictures of the location of the crack are attached.

This information is sent to you so that you can investigate whether you have a similar condition at you plant.

If you need additional information, please contact me or Glen Smith at WPO.

<< File: Info Sites.TIF >> << File: MVC-581S.JPG >> << File: MVC-584S.JPG >>

*Ahmet Unsal, PE
Sr. Staff Engineer
440 Hamilton Avenue
White Plains, NY 10601
Tel: 914 272 3529
Fax: 914 272 3537*

CA Number: 4

	Group	Name
Assigned By: OEN Mgmt		Coulehan, Vincent
Assigned To: OEN VTY Staff		Aho, Wayne Raymond

Subassigned To :

Originated By: Coulehan, Vincent 08/01/2005 07:11:47
Performed By: Aho, Wayne Raymond 09/24/2005 12:22:09

Subperformed By:

Approved By:
Closed By: Coulehan, Vincent 09/25/2005 19:30:30

Current Due Date: 10/01/2005 **Initial Due Date:** 10/01/2005

CA Type: OE IMPACT EVALUATION

Plant Constraint: NONE OEN

CA Description:

CR-JAF-2005-02593-RC Torus Leak Discovered Between The Support Between Bays "A" And "P" this requires an eval at VY

Response:

Design Engineering has evaluated this Root Cause in CA#6, and determined that it does not apply to Vermont Yankee.

Subresponse :

Closure Comments:

Close to the response provided

Attachments:

Ca Description
CR-JAF-2005-02593-RC Torus Leak Discovered Bet

Originator: Lipinski, Frank P

Originator Phone: 5408

Originator Group:

Operability Required: Y

Supervisor Name: Corbett, Patrick B

Reportability Required: Y

Discovered Date: 07/01/2005 09:25

Initiated Date: 07/01/2005 09:35

Condition Description:

Walkdown of Torus - post Fitzpatrick shutdown

Upon learning of the Fitzpatrick torus leak and after informing the shift manager, a walkdown of the torus was performed to look for moisture and weepage. Moisture was noted in bays 11, 10, 3 and 15.

It is suggested that these moisture indications be characterized and documented.

Immediate Action Description:

Walked down the area. Notified shift manager.

Suggested Action Description:

EQUIPMENT:

<u>Tag Name</u>	<u>Tag Suffix Name</u>	<u>Component Code</u>	<u>Process</u>	<u>System Code</u>
TORUS	TORUS	MR=Y		NB

TRENDING (For Reference Purposes Only):

<u>Trend Type</u>	<u>Trend Code</u>
REPORT WEIGHT	1
EU	ESSE
EL	ESSE

Initiated Date: 7/1/2005 9:35**Owner Group :** Eng SYS System Eng Mgmt**Current Contact:** MMD**Current Significance:** C - INVEST & CORRECT**Closed by:** Burger,Frederick J

7/28/2005 11:30

Summary Description:

Walkdown of Torus - post Fitzpatrick shutdown

Upon learning of the Fitzpatrick torus leak and after informing the shift manager, a walkdown of the torus was performed to look for moisture and weepage. Moisture was noted in bays 11, 10, 3 and 15.

It is suggested that these moisture indications be characterized and documented.

Remarks Description:**Closure Description:**

Trend data entered.

Operability Version: 1**Operability Code:** EQUIPMENT OPERABLE**Immediate Report Code:** NOT REPORTABLE**Performed By:** Wisniewski, Andrew T

07/01/2005 12:53

Approved By: Keith, Ronald M

07/01/2005 12:56

Operability Description:

Qualified personnel (Operations and Engineering) walked down the Torus and identified that the leakage in bays 3 and 15 was oil coming from RHR-39A and RHR-34B valve operators. Bays 10 and 11 had indications of condensation or leakage from above the Torus. These indications need to be investigated. These indications are above the Torus water line and therefore are not leakage from the Torus. There is no indication of any Torus leakage.

Approval Comments:

Version: 2

Significance Code: C - INVEST & CORRECT

Classification Code: C

Owner Group: Eng SYS System Eng Mgmt

Performed By: Dudley.Mona M

07/06/2005 10:40

Assignment Description:

Screening Data

Significance C - INVEST & CORRECT

Owner : Eng SYS System Eng Mgmt

Comments:

Trending Items

RW - 1 (SELF-IDENTIFIED)

<<End>>

Version: 1

Significance Code: C - INVEST & CORRECT

Classification Code: C

Owner Group: Eng SYS Manager

Performed By: Lipinski, Frank P

07/01/2005 09:50

Assignment Description:

characterize and document moisture on the torus.

Reportability Version: 1

Report Number:

Report Code: NOT REPORTABLE

Boilerplate Code: NOT REPORTABLE

Performed By : Hamer,Michael J

07/01/2005 11:04

Reportability Description:

Not reportable - This CR does not provide sufficient information for a reportability determination. Moisture on the torus does not present a degraded condition. If further investigation discovers a condition similar to the JAF problem, a new CR would need to be initiated to document that specific condition.

CA Number: 1

Group**Name**

Assigned By: CRG/CARB/OSRC

Assigned To: Eng SYS System Eng Mgmt

Subassigned To : Eng SYS System Eng Staff

Vekasy,Stephen A

Originated By: Dudley,Mona M

07/06/2005 10:42:33

Performed By: LeFrancois.Mark P

07/26/2005 14:31:01

Subperformed By: Vekasy,Stephen A

07/13/2005 15:39:12

Approved By:

Closed By: Burger,Frederick J

07/28/2005 11:29:18

Current Due Date: 08/04/2005

Initial Due Date: 08/04/2005

CA Type: CA - INVEST & CORR

Plant Constraint: 0 NONE

CA Description:

C - INVEST & CORRECT (Review CR for full details)

The CRG has initially classified this CR as

Classification Code - "C"

Significance Code - INVEST & CORRECT

Per the CRG, Perform an Investigation of the issues identified in this CR and determine if additional actions are required within 30 days.

All Attachments are to be in PDF format

Ensure all Screening Comments have been addressed in the investigation - (CR assignment tab)

Develop adequate corrective actions and issue CAs. (Due Dates per LI 102 Attachment 9.5)

LT CAs Require Approval from Site VP/ GMPO or Director prior to initiating.

Response:

Approved. Per review IAW EN LI 102 Section 5.9.1 all correct actions are complete. Please close this CR.

Subresponse :

See attached description of the investigation. No further tracking is required.

Closure Comments:

Trend data entered.

Attachments:

Subresp Description

CR investigation

Attachment Header

Document Name:

untitled

Document Location

Subresp Description

Attach Title:

CR investigation

CR-VTY-2005-2002 indicates that "Upon learning of the Fitzpatrick torus leak and after informing the shift manager, a walkdown of the torus was performed to look for moisture and weepage. Moisture was noted in bays 11, 10, 3 and 15." This walkdown of the entire torus to look for leakage was performed by Frank Lipinski and B.C. Current. System Engineering was immediately asked by OPS to evaluate the findings described in the CR.

Qualified personnel (Operations and System Engineering) performed a walkdown of the Torus to determine the source of the moisture identified on the outside of the torus. The walkdown team included:

Steve Vekasy	System Engineer - qualified for System Engineering walkdowns
Steve Jonasch	System Engineer - qualified for System Engineering walkdowns
Ted Underkoffler	Code Programs Engineer – VT-2 qualified
Bill Fields	Code Programs Engineer
Mike Flory	Auxiliary Operator – VT-2 qualified

The subject CR identified "moisture" trails down the side of the torus shell in bays 3, 10, 11 and 15. The author of the CR initiated the CR based on observations of the torus shell from the floor at elev. 213'. He did not go up to the torus catwalk to identify the source of the leakage.

The inspection began on the torus floor with the initiator of the CR to accurately identify the "moisture" identified in the CR. The five individuals above then went to the torus catwalk to the areas immediately above the identified "moisture" on the torus shell below. The stain tracks leading to the "moisture" identified on the torus shell below were all readily identified. Each of the four stain trails initiated on the upper quadrant of the torus well above water level (which is at approx. mid point on the torus). Each of the four stain trails was caused by external "moisture" leaking onto the upper quadrant of the torus. The upper quadrant is in the air space of the torus. There was no evidence of through wall leakage. Through wall leaks can only begin below the midpoint of the torus.

"Moisture" identified in the CR in bay 3 was determined to be coming from oil leaking from the Limitorque operator of V10-34B. At the request of the duty Shift Manager, I submitted FRF 886 to have the oil cleaned up. I identified the leaking operator to the MOV program coordinator, and discussions are ongoing as to when to repair the gaskets in the operator. WOR 05-064986 was initiated to document the oil leak.

"Moisture" identified in bays 10 and 11 was identified as one of many condensation stains occurring under the general area of the heating steam discharge into the HHB condensate drain system. The fact that heating steam condenses in this area and runs down the upper quadrant of the torus is well known to OPS.

"Moisture" identified in bay 15 was very minor oil leakage from V10-34A which does not need further follow-up.

There are no safety concerns with the current condition of the torus shell. There is no evidence of any through wall leak. All of the conditions described in the CR are moisture trails which initiate above the Torus water line and therefore are not leakage from the Torus. Leakage from other sources onto the exterior of the torus is not a safety concern.