

THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY
 PERRY NUCLEAR POWER PLANT OPERATIONS MANUAL

 *
 * TEMPORARY INSTRUCTION *
 *

TITLE: Identifying and Evaluating January 31, 1986
Earthquake Related Damage

TYPE OF INSTRUCTION: General Temporary

REVISION: 0 EFFECTIVE DATE: 2/7/86 EXPIRATION DATE: 2/7/86

DATE

PREPARER:	T. Hicks/ L. Hinson	2/6/86
REVIEWER:	<i>Paul A Russ</i>	2/6/86
PORC MEETING NO.:	86-29 J. J. WALDRON	2/6/86
APPROVED:	<i>Stewart Kennerly</i>	2/7/86
	<i>M. W. Depell</i> Designated Alternate During Absence	2/7/86

Identifying and Evaluating January 31, 1986
Earthquake Related Damage

GTI-0003

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.0	<u>Purpose</u>	1
2.0	<u>Scope</u>	1
3.0	<u>Responsibility</u>	1
4.0	<u>References</u>	2
5.0	<u>Definitions</u>	2
6.0	<u>Details</u>	2
6.1	General	2
6.2	Review/Documentation of Earthquake Inspection Team Items	3
6.3	Review/Documentation of New Work Orders	4
6.4	Records	5
7.0	<u>Attachments</u>	6
7.1	Attachment 1- Seismic Review Tracking Log Form: GTI-0003-1	7
7.2	Attachment 2- Evaluation Form: GTI-0003-2	8
7.3	Attachment 3- Work Directions Form: GTI-0003-3	9

10CFR50.59 Applicability Check

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Is there a change to the plant as described in the FSAR? Reason: <u>This Temporary Instruction only outlines the additional Review Request for Work Requests.</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is there a change to a procedure/instruction as described in the FSAR? Reason: <u>Temporary Instruction and How the Plant operates in emergency not discussed in the FSAR.</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is there a test or experiment not described in the FSAR? Reason: <u>No Tests or experiments are described in this Temporary Instruction.</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is there a change to the Technical Specifications? <u>No Change to Technical Specifications Requested by this instruction.</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Answers to all questions are "No", no potential for an Unreviewed Safety Question exists, no further review required.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Answers to one or more questions is "Yes", further review required.		

Applicability Check

Prepared By: [Signature]

Date: 3/6/86

Reviewed By: [Signature]

Date: 2/6/86

Approved By: [Signature]

Date: 2/6/86

SCOPE OF REVISION: NA

1.0 Purpose

To describe the process for the documentation, review and evaluation of (1) items identified during the plant inspections conducted immediately after the January 31, 1986 seismic event and (2) newly discovered items resulting from the seismic event.

2.0 Scope

In order to accurately document the impact of the January 31, 1986, seismic event at the Perry Nuclear Power Plant, damage resulting from the event must be identified and properly evaluated.

This instruction describes the process for reviewing and evaluating the system/structural engineering inspection team results identified immediately following the January 31, 1986, seismic event. It is used in conjunction with PAP-0606 "Condition Reports and Immediate Notifications" by documenting the items in the earthquake generated Condition Report Investigation Summary.

This procedure also describes the process for reviewing and evaluating new Work Requests to identify any damage which could have been caused by the earthquake and not identified in the inspection team results described above. Any further documentation of plant system, structure and component (SSC) damage shall be through the generation of a Work Request.

3.0 Responsibilities

- 3.1 The GSE Technical Section shall review the disposition of Earthquake Inspection Team Items (EITIs) identified during the January 31, 1986, seismic event through the Condition Report process. He shall forward the Condition Report dispositioning these items to PORC for review.
- 3.2 The General Supervising Engineer, Outage Planning Section has the overall responsibility for Work Request review and evaluation, and for informing the Nuclear Regulatory Commission of earthquake related damage.
- 3.3 The PWC Review Team is responsible for the review and evaluation of incoming Work Requests. The Review Team will identify plant or equipment damage which could have resulted from the January 31, 1986 earthquake.
- 3.4 The Compliance Engineer shall coordinate the disposition of the EITIs with the appropriate onsite engineering organization for input into the Condition Report process.

4.0 References

- 4.1 PAP-0502, "Preparation, Review, Approval, Revision, and Cancellation of Administrative Procedures".
- 4.2 PAP-0606, "Condition Reports and Immediate Notifications".
- 4.3 PAP-0902, "Work Request System".
- 4.4 Confirmatory Action Letter, (CAL-R111-86-01A), dated February 4, 1986.

5.0 Definitions

5.1 Earthquake Inspection Team Items (EITIs)

Items identified within 24 hours following the January 31, seismic event by the system/structure engineering inspection team and any others items deemed appropriate by the GSE Technical Section.

5.2 Project Work Center (PWC) Review Team

A review team composed of design and PWC engineers assigned to review new Work Requests. The personnel assigned to the review team include engineers with the following backgrounds:

- Engineers who are trained and experienced in plant design features, system testing, operations and plant Technical Specifications.
- An engineer experienced in piping design and construction and in stress analysis.
- An engineer experienced in building structural design and construction.
- Engineers representing the electrical and mechanical disciplines who are experienced in plant design and construction.

6.0 Details

6.1 General

- 6.1.1 Disposition of EITIs will be tracked by the Compliance Engineering Unit and shall be incorporated into an appropriate Condition Report (CR) Investigation Summary.

- 6.1.2 All additional abnormal or unusual observations shall be documented by a Work Request. These items shall not be reworked, repaired, adjusted, or otherwise disturbed prior to review and disposition in accordance with Section 6.3 of this procedure.
- 6.1.3 Those conditions which may involve potentially reportable events or SSC OPERABILITY shall also be processed in accordance with PAP-0606 " Condition Reports and Immediate Notifications".
- 6.2 Review/Documentation of EITIs
- 6.2.1 The Compliance Engineering Unit shall interface with the appropriate onsite engineering group to review and evaluate each EITI.
- 6.2.2 Each EITI shall be evaluated by the appropriate onsite engineering group to determine:
1. If the item was a direct result of the January 31, 1986, seismic event (justification shall be provided for each evaluation) and,
 2. One of the following:
 - (a) If the equipment/structure may be used as is, or
 - (b) If the item must be repaired.
- Note: This determination is made regardless of the evaluation described in 1. above.
- 6.2.3 The Compliance Engineering Unit shall include the engineering disposition of the EITIs (as determined in 6.2.2 above) in the applicable CR Investigation Summary.
- 6.2.4 Equipment determined to be potentially earthquake affected shall be maintained in the "as found" condition until released by the NRC.
- 6.2.5 For those items which must be repaired, the Technical Section shall initiate the appropriate work initiating document (i.e. WR). The initiating document shall include that the item was evaluated, in accordance with this procedure and found to be/not to be directly related to the seismic event.

6.2.6 The applicable Condition Report (CR) documenting the seismic event shall include the disposition of each EITI. After GSE Technical review, the CR shall be reviewed by PORC and approved by the Managers PPOD/PPTD. The applicable CR shall be closed out when all EITIs are dispositioned in accordance with PAP-0606 "Condition Reports and Immediate Notifications".

6.3 Review/Documentation of New Work Requests

6.3.1 New Work Requests generated per PAP-0902, "Work Request System", shall be routed through the PWC Review Team prior to being converted into a Work Order.

Note: This routing typically occurs as part of restraint coding.

6.3.2 The PWC Review Team shall assign a number to the WR and enter it in their Seismic Review Tracking Log (Attachment No. 1). The number assigned shall be a two part number.

XXX - YYY

XXX - Sequential Day of the year

YYY - Sequential number for the day

A brief description of the WR will be entered along with the WR number.

6.3.3 The PWC Review Team will initially screen new WR's to identify those which describe a condition that could possibly have been caused by the earthquake. A "Y"(YES) or "N"(NO) will be entered in the Tracking Log to indicate results of the initial screening process. A conservative approach will be taken during the initial screening. Conditions such as the following will be designated for further evaluation:

- 1) Electrical anomalies
- 2) Instruments found out of calibration
- 3) Unexplained piping, tubing leaks
- 4) Building or structural abnormalities
- 5) Hanger or Snubber abnormalities

WR's that are not earthquake related will be released to the PWC for generation of a Work Order.

Note: Work Requests (WRs) generated as a result of Section 6.2 of this procedure need not be reviewed again by the PWC Review Team for earthquake applicability.

- 6.3.4 WR's initially identified as potentially earthquake related will be further evaluated by the PWC Review Team or by selected individuals from the on-site engineering organizations to determine if the condition could have been caused by the earthquake.
- 6.3.5 Engineering evaluation results will be documented on the Evaluation Form, Attachment 2. This form shall be maintained with the Seismic Review Tracking Log.
- 6.3.6 A brief description of the evaluation results will also be entered in the Seismic Review Tracking Log. Non earthquake related and Non Safety Related WR's will be released for generation of a Work Order.
- 6.3.7 If the Work Request is identified as potentially earthquake related, the GSE Outage Planning Section shall be notified as soon as possible.
- 6.3.8 The NRC shall be notified by the GSE Outage Planning Section of all potentially earthquake related conditions within 24 hours.
- 6.3.9 Safety Related WR's identifying conditions which are designated as caused by or potentially caused by the earthquake will be made available for review by CEI management and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) representative.
- 6.3.10 Those WR's identified in 6.3.9 shall be further processed as follows:
1. Attachment 3, Work Directions, is attached to the WR and sent to the work unit planners.
 2. The Work Package is developed per PAP-0905 "Work Order Process" and Attachment 3.
 3. The Work Package is routed to the NRC representative for review.
 4. Once released by the NRC, the PWC will release the package to the field.

6.4 Records

6.4.1 The following documents are generated by this procedure:

Quality Assurance Records

Seismic Review Tracking Log
Evaluation Form
Work Directions

Non-Quality Records

None

Records identification and disposition are accomplished in accordance with the Records Retention /Disposition Schedule (RR/DS) and handled in accordance with PAP-1701, "Records Management".

7.0 Attachments

- 7.1 Attachment 1 - Seismic Review Tracking Log
Form: GTI-0003-1
- 7.2 Attachment 2 - Evaluation Form: GTI-0003-2
- 7.3 Attachment 3 - Work Directions Form: GTI-0003-3

OMHRA:GTI-0003

Page: 7

Rev: 0

ATTACHMENT 1

Form: GTI-0003-1

WR #	POT. C'D BY ERTHOE (Y/N)	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF WORK REQUEST	ENG Eval	DATE TIME	EVALUATION OF "YES" RESP. IN COLUMN 2

Evaluation Form

Earthquake Evaluation of
Work Request # _____

Engineering Report by _____ Ext. 6090

Time/Date _____

SAFETY RELATED

NON-SAFETY

AUGMENTED SAFETY

Talked to WR Originator

Talked to PPTD Engineer

Field Inspection

COMMENTS:

CONCLUSIONS:

WR # _____

WCRK DIRECTIONS

The attached Work Request has been evaluated as Caused By or Potentially Caused By the January 31, 1986 earthquake. The following special controls are to be implemented:

- 1) Contact a Design Engineering representative to determine if special procedures or controls are necessary in preparing the Work Order.

Ed Christianson
John Eppich
Tom Fetterman

Roger Parker
Daryl Gaffney
Jan Shingler

- 2) Upon arrival at work area, record any additional unusual as-found conditions not described on W.R.

- 3) Route completed Work Order by the NRC Resident Inspector for review and determination of an NRC Hold Point in the W.O. is desired.

NRC HOLD POINT
desired ?

___ YES
___ NO

NRC Resident Inspector

This Control Sheet is to be included as a part of the Work Order Package.