# U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

## **REGION I**

Docket No:	50-443
License No:	NPF-86
Report No:	50-443/98-07
Licensee:	North Atlantic Energy Service Corporation
Facility:	Seabrook Generating Station, Unit 1
Location:	Post Office Box 300 Seabrook, New Hampshire 03874
Dates:	August 3 - 7, 1998
Inspectors:	<ul> <li>S. Alexander, Reactor Engineer, NRR</li> <li>L. Cheung, Senior Reactor Inspector, Team Leader</li> <li>A. Pal, Electrical Engineer, NRR</li> <li>K. Young, Reactor Engineer</li> <li>Julio Crespo, Quality Assurance Engineer, Consejo de</li> <li>Sequridad Nuclear, Spain (Observer)</li> </ul>
Approved by:	William H. Ruland, Chief Electrical Engineering Branch Division of Beactor Safety

9810130068 731002 PDR ADOCK 05000443 0 PDR

1

4

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Seabrook Generating Station Unit 1 NRC Inspection Report 50-443/98-07

An inspection was conducted on August 3 - 7, 1998, using the guidance of Temporary Instruction (TI) 2515/137, Inspection of Medium-Voltage and Low-Voltage Power Circuit Breakers, dated March 1998. The inspection team comprised Region I and Headquarters personnel.

### Maintenance

- The areas where circuit breakers were located were clean, well maintained and adequately lighted. The physical condition of the switchgear was good. The breaker refurbishment room was well-equipped and provided a good environment for performing breaker refurbishment work. The technicians performing breaker refurbishment were knowledgeable and familiar with the refurbishment procedure. (M2.1)
- The breakers at Seabrook had performed well during the past five years. The breaker refurbishment program at Seabrook Station was good. (M2.2)
- The licensee's practice of using reduced-control-voltage testing was good. The preventive maintenance and refurbishment procedures for medium-voltage breakers was generally good with the exception of the lubrication instructions. Most vendor recommendations had been incorporated and deviations from vendor recommendations were adequately justified. However, the lubrication instructions in both preventive maintenance and refurbishment procedures were not sufficiently specific to ensure consistent and appropriate breaker lubrication. (M3.1)
- The maintenance procedures for low-voltage breakers were clear, and detailed. Data sheets for completed maintenance provided a good record of the results of all measurements made and the breaker condition at time of maintenance. However, Seabrook had large number of maintenance procedures for low-voltage breakers making coordination among procedures cumbersome. (M3.2)
- Work Requests and Adverse Condition Reports (ACR) associated with breaker corrective maintenance were well documented. Corrective actions were appropriate and timely. Root cause and apparent cause evaluations were thorough, of good quality, and contained appropriate recommendation for corrective actions. (M4.1)
- The licensee's Operating Experience Review (OER) Program to review industry events and problems was generally adequate, and their actions in response to those events were appropriate. However, the licensee's OER reviews for some Information Notices (IN) were narrowly focused, without considering the generic implication of the INs. (M6.1)