



Inspection Procedure 71111.21N
Attachment 2
Power-Operated Valve Inspection
Public Workshop

Douglas Bollock, Kenneth Kolaczyk, Thomas G. Scarbrough,
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

January 9, 2020




POV Public Meeting Agenda

- Discuss why we are inspecting POVs
- Review of the POV inspection procedure requirements and guidance
- Overview of EQ inspection lessons learned
- Review questions we have received (FAQ)s
- Mock POV scenario discussion
- Question and answer period



Why Are We Inspecting POVs Now?

- Baseline inspection efforts do not examine all POV program attributes described in Generic Letter 96-05
- Operating experience indicates POV/MOV performance gaps still exist:
 - Browns Ferry Unit 1, October 23, 2010, Stem Disc Separation
 - LaSalle Station Unit 2, February 11, 2017, Wedge Pin and Stem Disc Separation



POV Procedure and Guidance





IP 71111.21N.02 Objective

- IP 71111.21.02 (July 26, 2019), “Design-Basis Capability of Power-Operated Valves under 10 CFR 50.55a Requirements,” specifies that the objective is to: *assess the reliability, functional capability, and design basis of risk-important POVs as required by 10 CFR 50.55a and applicable 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix A and Appendix B.*



General Guidance

Section 02.01 Sample Selection

- As a pre-inspection activity, inspectors will select 30 POVs:
 - Multiple systems and different valve types (MOVs, AOVs, HOVs, SOVs, and Squib Valves (as applicable), sizes and manufacturers
 - Risk assessment
 - Historical performance
- The Inspectors will request the licensee to make available:
 - Design-basis capability information including function, safety significance, sizing, margin, and setting assumptions
 - See Appendix C to the POV inspection procedure



General Guidance

Section 02.01 Sample Selection

- Based on POV design-basis capability information, the inspectors will consider the following for selection of a 10 POV sample for detailed inspection review:
 - System Risk
 - POVs with high incidence of corrective maintenance and/or poor performance
 - POVs with low margin
 - POVs with questionable assumptions (e.g., low VF, low friction values, not all uncertainties captured)
 - POVs in untreated water systems
 - POVs in high energy systems
 - POVs located in elevated environments (e.g., high temperature, high radiation areas)



Inspection Preparation Activities

- Discuss inspection with site POV engineers and obtain information (such as POV capability calculations and assumptions)
- Evaluate POV parameter assumptions for potential issues
- Determine the basis of POV assumptions (such as EPRI, JOG, ComEd) and whether the conditions for each source are correctly applied



Typical Sample Gate Valve Data Sheet


- Valve ID – 1-SI-123
- Safety Function – Open/Close
- Manufacturer – Westinghouse
- Valve Type – Flex Wedge
- Valve Size – 4”
- Actuator Make – Limitorque
- Actuator Size – SMB-000
- Risk – Medium
- DB Pressure C/O – 105 / 105
- Assumed VF C/O - 0.3 / 0.3
- Assumed LSB – 5%
- Assumed SFC - .12
- Calc Th/Tq Close – 5685 lbs
- Calc Th/Tq Open – 8250 lbs
- Least Available – 8500 lbs
- Th/Tq Dyn Close – 6200 lbs
- Th/Tq Dyn Open – 8700 lbs
- Meas Close VF – 0.5
- Meas Open VF – 0.47
- Meas LSB – 9.5%
- Margin Close – 5%
- Margin Open – 3.2%
- Basis – Extrapolated test & revised calc



What Should Licensees Be Concerned With?

- For All Valves
 - Assumed friction coefficient is less than bounding values (0.2 stem-to-stem nut friction for gate, globe and 0.6 bearing coefficient for bronze bearings on butterfly valve)
 - As left valve settings near structural limits
 - Misapplication of EPRI MOV PPM data and methodology
 - Using EPRI MOV PPM test data to justify valve factor assumptions in valve capability calculations
 - Using static testing as basis for monitoring valve degradation with no engineering analysis or data

Inspection Process Flow





EQ Inspection Lessons Learned





EQ Inspection Takeaways

- EQ inspection procedure could have benefited from further background guidance
- Inspectors had difficulty interpreting each nuclear power unit's unique EQ licensing basis
- Communication between inspectors and NRR technical program office not consistent
- The minor, more than minor screening criteria contained in current NRC guidance was not as helpful in assessing specific EQ related issues



POV Inspection Enhancements

- Identified singular technical and programmatic points-of-contact within the NRC
- Minor/more-than-minor examples developed
- Enhanced training for inspectors was developed (both technical and inspection implementation focused)
- Enhanced Interactive SharePoint Site developed.
- Tabletop dry runs performed
- Findings review panel established proactively



FAQs

- Q: What has been communicated to stakeholders?
- A: ROP monthly public meetings since May 2019
 - POV inspections replacing EQ inspections beginning in January 2020
 - NRC incorporated lessons learned from EQ inspection implementation



FAQs

- Q: What is publicly available in regards to POV material?
- A: Publicly available now:
 - Inspection Procedure IP71111.21N.02 (ML19067A240)
 - MOV technical training (ADAMS Package: ML19235A1212020)
 - EQ lessons learned (ML19183A063)



FAQs

- Q: What is publicly available in regards to POV material?
- A: Public availability forthcoming:
 - POV Inspection implementation training
 - Minor/More-than-minor examples specific to POVs (as an appendix to the IP)



FAQs

- Q: What are the NRC resources uses per POV inspection?
- A: 3 NRC inspectors, 2 weeks onsite
 - 210 hrs (+/- 32 hrs)
 - No use of contract inspectors planned



FAQs

- Q: Will there be other public workshops?
- A: The NRC staff has now held two public workshops on POV inspections.
 - Staff is open to more as needed and will consider any input received today.



Scenario Discussions

- Scenario one:
 - Service water/emergency service water isolation valve testing
- Scenario two:
 - Block valve design assumptions

Q & A Session





**For additional information,
contact**

Doug Bollock

Douglas.Bollock@nrc.gov

Ken Kolaczyk

Kenneth.Kolaczyk@nrc.gov

Tom Scarbrough

Thomas.Scarbrough@nrc.gov

Mike Farnan

Michael.Farnan@nrc.gov