

# BYR CR PRE-SCREENING SUMMARY REPORT

12/23/03  
Page 100 of 10

Date

Included as part of title  
Owed To: ACAPALL

CR: 191852 Disc Date: 12/17/03 Event Date: 12/08/03 How Discovered: H02 Unit: 01 Level: 4  
SUBJECT: AMAG-Westinghouse letter CAE-03-107 not accurate System: FW Class: D

## ORIGINATOR SECTION

↓  
Title

CR No: 191852

Identified by: DAVID C EDER

### Condition Description:

In support of the AMAG recovery effort a review of various Westinghouse documents was being performed. During the review a Technical problem was discovered. The issue is as follows:

1. Westinghouse letter CAE-03-107 was transmitted on 12/8/03. This letter stated "...the common header locations at Braidwood 1 and 2 and Byron 1 and 2 are confirmed to be free from signal interference/contamination and can be used to provide future CROSSFLOW measurements. The baseline scans which were collected in accordance with Reference 3 are provided in the attachment to this letter for your records." Reference 3 of Westinghouse letter CAE-03-07 is AMAG-INS-FS-013-01 "Frequency Spectrum Using DIAGNOSE Software", December 5, 2003.
2. Step 6.1.12 of AMAG-INS-FS-013-01 states to select the A & B channel frequencies per the QA calc (and also states to set the HP and LP filters).
3. Step 6.1.15 of AMAG-INS-FS-013-01 states to perform the scan for frequency in the QA record.
4. The Byron unit 1 QA calc CN-PS-03-30 rev 0 Page 156, there are 2 different sets of frequencies identified for the common header.
5. The attached frequency scans provided with Westinghouse letter CAE-03-107 were reviewed and were found deficient. The following 2 items were noted:
  - a. The frequencies on the frequency scans for the Byron unit 1 common header do not match the QA calc exactly? (this was the same for 3 of the installations reviewed)
  - b. Per AMAG-INS-FS-013-01 step 6.1.15 a frequency scan should be performed for each set of frequencies in the QA calc but a scan for only one set of frequencies was provided. (this was the same for 3 of the installations reviewed).

The above items were brought to the attention of Westinghouse personnel (R. Doney, G. Kanupka) on 12/17/03. Further discussions with Westinghouse personnel on 12/18/03 confirmed that the scans provided with Westinghouse letter CAE-03-107 did not meet the requirements of AMAG-INS-FS-013-01. Westinghouse personnel stated this occurred because the scans were collected prior to the generation of AMAG-INS-FS-013-01.

In short, Westinghouse letter CAE-03-107 is incorrect and the provided scans cannot be used as official documentation for "a noise free installation".

During the 12/18/03 conference call (G. Kanupka was representing Westinghouse) Byron requested Westinghouse letter CAE-03-107 and documents be retracted.

At the current time Byron and Braidwood do not have the official documentation required to support a "noise free Crossflow installation".

## SCREENING SECTION

Name of Supervisory Reviewer: David Peterson

Provide a clear statement of the Problem and Consequence, if necessary:  
During a site review of AMAG documentation provided by a vendor, problems were discovered. The items were brought to the attention of the vendor, and a recommendation made to retract the incorrect documents.

Recommended Significance Level and Class (provide a basis for Level 3 and above): 4D.

Identify additional actions taken or required to be taken:

- Identify Extent of condition issues that require immediate actions: A generic concern exists with all vendor-supplied information. We must remain vigilant and maintain a questioning attitude when reviewing vendor-supplied information.

Suggested interim and long-term corrective actions: Action tracking already exist to ensure the CROSSFLOW installations are determined to be noise free prior to use. No further actions related to this issue are required.

Additional Comments: Dave Eder exhibited Good questioning attitude, recommend this be considered for a good catch award.

Name of SRO contacted for Shift Management Review: Larry Ruppert. Further review by the Shift Manager is not required because the issue involved equipment not in use at this time.

\*\*\*\*\* Shift Management Comments Section \*\*\*\*\*

Shift Manager Reviewer (Name):

Operable? (Yes/No) Basis:

Reportable? (Yes/No) Basis:

Additional Comments:

\*\*\*\*\* CAPCO/MRC Comments Section \*\*\*\*\*

CAPCO Reviewer (Name): Matt Page

CR. Owed to: A8850CAP

Screening Comments:

\*  
No additional actions required.  
\*

CR AT 173510-47 and 48 exist to ensure noise free installation of AMAC

B-47

# BYR CR PRE-SCREENING SUMMARY REPORT

12/23/03  
Page 101 of 10

Owed To: **ACAPALL**

CR: **191852** Disc Date: **12/17/03** Event Date: **12/08/03** How Discovered: **H02** Unit: **01** Level: **4**  
 SUBJECT: **AMAG-Westinghouse letter CAE-03-107 not accurate** System: **FW** Class: **D**

### ORIGINATOR SECTION

This does not currently impact either Byron or Braidwood site because Crossflow is not in use. This does not affect future Crossflow implementation because the new Byron and Braidwood implementation procedures will require new frequency scans per the approved Westinghouse procedures. This is being tracked by ATs 173510-47 & 173510-48.

This issue is related to Vendor documentation/procedure adherence and Insufficient Technical Rigor by the vendor.

How discovered:  
Review of provided documentation.

Immediate actions taken:  
Notified Westinghouse of the problems.

Westinghouse took an action (G. Kanupka) to revoke Westinghouse letter CAE-03-107.

Name & organization of supervisor personally notified to perform Supervisory Review: David Peterson

\*\*\*\*\* Optional Section \*\*\*\*\*

What activities, processes, or procedures were involved?

What caused the condition to happen?

What are the consequences?  
No actual consequences.  
Potential consequences could have been the implementation of AMAG without sufficient vendor documentation to ensure a "noise free installation."

Were any procedural requirements impacted?  
no changes required.

Were there any adverse physical conditions?

Identify who was notified?  
Jeff Drowley, Terry Printz, George Kanupka (Westinghouse), Brian Ledger, Brad Adams.

List of knowledgeable individuals:

Repeat or similar condition?

### SCREENING SECTION

prior to implementation.  
\*  
Good Catch to Dave Eder initiated by Dave Peterson. Fundamentals displayed  
- Questioning Attitude.  
  
Inform P. Hayenga and B. Kartheiser of this CR for the Good Catch Program.

### INDICATOR CODES

Trd 1	Description	Trd 2	Description	Trd 3	Description	Proc Org	Rank
PRD	PROCESS-DOCUMENT	PRDQ	DOCUMENT QUALITY	3C	COMMUNICATIONS	CC25 VNDR	P

**CR SIGN OFF**

# BYR CR PRE-SCREENING SUMMARY REPORT

12/23/03  
Page 102 of 10

Owed To: **ACAPALL**

CR: **191852** Disc Date: **12/17/03** Event Date: **12/08/03** How Discovered: **H02** Unit: **01** Level: **4**  
SUBJECT: **AMAG-Westinghouse letter CAE-03-107 not accurate** System: **FW** Class: **D**

<u>Orig</u>	<u>Ext</u>	<u>Dept</u>	<u>Orig Date</u>	<u>Approved By</u>	<u>Date</u>
EDER DAVID C		08830	12/19/03	PETERSON DAVID J	12/19/03
<u>Shift Manager Info</u>			<u>Screening Info</u>		
<u>Approved By</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Approved By</u>	<u>Date</u>		

## MRC CONSIDERATIONS ( CR ATTRIBUTE:

### Regulatory Impact

TS OPERABLE:  
REPORTABLE:  
SDP:

### Human Performance

DEPT/CREW RESET:  
DEPT/CREW RESET:  
DEPT CLOCK RESET:  
PLANT CLOCK RESET:

### OPEX

NER:  
NNOE:

## MRC Comments:

Bring Back to MRC? Yes/No