



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION II
101 MARIETTA STREET, N.W.
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

Report Nos.: 50-438/84-04 and 50-439/84-04

Licensee: Tennessee Valley Authority
500A Chestnut Street
Chattanooga, TN 37401

Docket Nos.: 50-438 and 50-439

License Nos.: CPPR-122 and CPPR-123

Facility Name: Bellefonte 1 and 2

Inspection at Bellefonte site near Scottsboro, Alabama

Inspector: For Albert P. Ruff 3/21/84
T. D. Gibbons Date Signed

Approved by: M. D. Hunt for 3/21/84
T. E. Conlon, Section Chief Date Signed
Engineering Program Branch
Division of Engineering and Operational Programs

SUMMARY

Inspection on February 7-11, 1984

Areas Inspected

This routine, unannounced inspection involved 27 inspector-hours on site in the areas of instrumentation work and work activities, instrumentation cable and terminations work and work activities, and station batteries.

Results

Of the areas inspected, no violations or deviations were identified in two areas; one apparent violation was found in one area, (Failure to Document a Condition Adverse to Quality, paragraph 7).

8411080355 841031
PDR ADOCK 05000438
Q PDR

REPORT DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Licensee Employees

- *B. J. Thomas, Quality Manager
- *R. E. Young Construction Engineer
- *D. E. Baese, Instrumentation Engineer
- *J. T. Barnes, Section Supervisor CQAB
- *D. C. Smith, Nuclear Compliance Engineer
- *P. C. Mann, Nuclear Licensing Supervisor
- *E. Bennich, Assistant Construction Engineer
- V. Storch, Supervisor Electrical Engineering

*Attended exit interview

2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on February 11, 1984, with those persons indicated in paragraph 1 above. The licensee acknowledged the following findings.

438/84-04-01, 439/84-04-01, Unresolved Item Station Battery Life expectancy

438/84-04-02, Violation, Failure to Document a Condition Adverse to Quality

3. Licensee Action on Previous Enforcement Matters

Not inspected.

4. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items are matters about which more information is required to determine whether they are acceptable or may involve violations or deviations. New unresolved items identified during this inspection are discussed in paragraph 7.

5. Instrumentation (Cable and Termination I) Observation of Work and Work Activities (52063B)

The inspector selected five instrumentation cables for examination to assure that the requirements of the SAR and QAM were complied with in the areas of storage, handling, identification, segregation of nonconforming material, issue, material identification, procedures for work and inspection, size and type of cable, location, routing, protection, separation, and wireway identification. The cables selected were OIR-ECA2-101A, IVE-ECA1-77-A, IVE-ECA1-84A, IVE-ECA2-85A, and OIR-ECA4-510B.

Within the areas examined there were no violations or deviations identified.

6. Instrumentation (Components and System I) - Observation of Work and Work Activities (52053B)

The following safety-related instruments were selected for examination, 1RJ-IPT-001A, 1RJ-IPT-001B, 1NB-1LT-027A, 1RJ-IPT-905A and 1RJ-IPT-906A.

The instruments were examined to assure that the requirements of the SAR, QAM and installation drawings were complied with in the areas of identification, location, installation, inspection, separation, protection, cleanness, procedures and nonconformance control.

7. Station Batteries - Units 1 and 2

The inspector examined the station batteries because of reports of material floating in the electrolyte. The licensee noted that a "white froth" was observed in September 1981. The vendor identified the material as broken strands of glass fiber. The licensee's laboratory has identified the material as short, white fibers of polypropylene. In May 1982 the vendor was requested to remove the "froth". The froth removal was performed in December 1982. The froth was again reported on October 4, 1983. The inspector observed froth on the top of many cells and a paper like material floating in a large number of cells.

During examination of the records the inspector identified the fact that Battery 1EB-EU-50-D failed to meet the performance test on May 17, 1983. There were five cells which were below the required 1.75 volts per cell when the battery reached the lower limit of volts. A Test Deficiency Report (TDR) PT-29 was issued. The TDR was dispositioned to equalize charge for 24 hour and retest. The retest was performed on September 6, 1983, with no improvement. Revision 1 to TDR PT-29 was issued and dispositioned to implement the vendors recommendations. The vendor recommended a 30 day equalizing charge, 3 days float charge and then retest. This procedure was completed and the retest failed. Revision 2 to TDR PT-29 was issued on January 9, 1984, documenting the above failure.

The station batteries will be an unresolved item pending the answer to the following Region II inspector's questions.

a. Froth and floating material

- (1) What is the specific impact to cell life and capacity caused by the froth and floating material?
- (2) Will there be continuing froth removals on an annual bases?
- (3) Is the problem on battery 1D related to this condition?

b. Battery 1D Reduced Capacity

- (1) What the vendors explanation for the low cell voltage?
- (2) What is the status of battery IEB-EU-50-D?
- (3) What is the status of the remaining batteries?

The unresolved item will be identified as 438/439/84-04-01, Station Battery Life Expectancy.

The inspector questioned the fact that the batteries for Unit 1 have been under the control of Nuclear Power for several years. However, there is no Corrective Action Report as required by BLA 16.1 nor was a NCR written even though it was first identified in September 1981. The battery problem has been and is now being handled by memos to ENDES. This is a violation which will be identified as 438/84-04-02, Failure to Document a Condition Which is Adverse to Quality.