

**Branch Evaluation, Plan & Recommendation**

Allegation Number: RIV-2010-A-0202

Concern: 1.

*RX Code or Functional Area:	Engineering	OI Case No.:	4-20XX-0XX
*Discipline:	Electrical	*OI Priority:	
*Security Category:		*OI Priority Basis:	

**Concern:** (A concern is one or two sentences.)

The licensee failed to properly evaluate the past operability of 4 questionable cells from battery 2B007.

**Concern Background, Supporting Information, & Comments**

The CI claims that the licensee failed to use vendor expertise to evaluate the condition of four cells of a battery, thus failing to properly evaluate the past operability of the battery. (b)(7)(C)

(b)(7)(C) The individual stated an old battery bank (2B007) was replaced (by 2/3B00X) in June 2010. The old battery had four "red" cells for over six months (Copper contamination causes the negative plates to appear red) and the concerned individual believed those cells should have been tested by a laboratory to determine past operability of the old battery. However, the licensee performed a service test of only one cell (NMO8800524124) and concluded the battery would have performed its function.

**Regulatory Requirement** (fill in below)

10 CFR 50.72; Technical Specification 3.8.4.3

**Describe the concern's safety significance.**

(fill in below - REQUIRED)

Not an immediate safety concern - questionable cells were replaced

Check each question as applicable to this concern.

X	Is it a declaration, statement, or assertion of impropriety or inadequacy? Is there a potential deficiency?
X	Is the impropriety or inadequacy associated with NRC regulated activities or policy (e.g. SCWE)?
X	Is the validity of the issue unknown?

If all of the above statements are checked, the issue is an allegation.

**\*Technical Staff Recommendation(s)**

Date	Recommended Action	Assigned Branch	Planned Date
12/20/10	RPBD Inspect	RPBD	

**NOTE: Submit Draft NOV, RFI questions/requests, and/or an inspection plan as a separate document.**

★ For an ARB decision to RFI, any INHIBITING FACTOR(S) that are overruled from the first page must have a justification documented in the ARB Decision(s). Document INHIBITING FACTOR(S) that not applicable to the concern or are not noted on first page. First page reviewed? Yes: X No: N/A:

ARB Date	ARB Decision(s)	Assigned to	Accepted Planned Date
01/04/11	Send Request for Information Letter	ACES	01/07/11
01/04/11	Review licensee response	EB2	

Information in this record was deleted  
in accordance with the Freedom of Information  
Act, exemptions

FOIA-

4-11-01577

E/17

Branch Evaluation, Plan & Recommendation			
Allegation Number: RV-2010-A-0202			
Concern: 2.			
*RX Code or Functional Area:	Engineering	OI Case No.:	4-20XX-0XX
*Discipline:	Electrical	*OI Priority:	
*Security Category:		*OI Priority Basis:	
<b>Concern:</b> (A concern is one or two sentences.) While replacing non-vital charger 3B005 and testing non-vital Battery 3B010, Bus 3D5A was de-energized, however associated power Panels 3D5P1, 3D5P2, 3D5P3 and 3D5P4 were energized using a temporary power source. The licensee did not check for grounds on the loads supplied from these panels during the period with this maintenance configuration.			
<b>Concern Background, Supporting Information, &amp; Comments</b> 7.c (b)(7)(C) and believes there may be grounded circuits which may go undetected. (b)(7)(C) "Presently, 125 volt 3D5A DC bus (supported by 3B22 swing charger and 3B010 battery is providing power to 3D5P1, P2, P3 and P4 panels. [The] 3D5 DC bus has been isolated and de-energized for 3B011 battery performance test and replacement of 3B005 charger and inverter. Non-safety related 3D5P1-4 panels provide 125VDC control power to 480V load centers, 4.16kV switchgears, 6.9 switchgears, turbine trip panels, turbine trip unit actuators, excitation rectifiers, generator trip buses, emergency lighting panels, etc. During the rainy season, there is a high probability that some of these DC control circuits will be grounded during [the] Unit 3 refueling, as we proceed with maintenance/construction work. Unfortunately, [the] 3D5A switch cabinet does not have any continuous ground detection and unless we rectify this deficiency, grounded circuits may stay undetected for a long time." The CI was concerned the bus will be returned to its normal configuration on December 16, 2010, and the chance to identify the situation (grounded circuits) might be missed, and the opportunity to prevent future occurrences will be lost. (b)(7)(C) 7.c (b)(7)(C) "The most critical equipment supplied from these panels would be the protection circuits for the reserve auxiliary transformers. These transformers are presently supplying a tech spec required off-site power source to both Units 2 and 3. Allowing undetected grounds to develop in this protection circuitry could result in spurious tripping of the protection, causing a loss of off-site power to both units. Undetected grounds could also prevent protection relays and breakers from tripping properly, which can lead to extensive equipment damage if an electrical fault should develop."			
<b>Regulatory Requirement</b> (fill in below) Regulatory Guide 1.33			
<b>Describe the concern's safety significance.</b> <b>IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED</b>			
Not an immediate safety concern			
Check each question as applicable to this concern.			
X	Is it a declaration, statement, or assertion of impropriety or inadequacy? Is there a potential deficiency?		
X	Is the impropriety or inadequacy associated with NRC regulated activities or policy (e.g. SCWE)?		
X	Is the validity of the issue unknown?		
If all of the above statements are checked, the issue is an allegation.			
<b>*Technical Staff Recommendation(s)</b>			
Date	Recommended Action	Assigned Branch	Planned Date
12/20/10	Inspect	EB2	

**Branch Evaluation, Plan & Recommendation**

Allegation Number: RIV-2010-A-0202

Concern: 2.

**NOTE:** Submit Draft NOV, RFI questions/requests, and/or an inspection plan as a separate document.

★ For an ARB decision to RFI, any INHIBITING FACTOR(S) that are overruled from the first page must have a justification documented in the ARB Decision(s). Document INHIBITING FACTOR(S) that not applicable to the concern or are not noted on first page. First page reviewed? Yes: ☒ No: ☐ N/A: ☐

ARB Date	ARB Decision(s)	Assigned to	Accepted Planned Date
01/04/11	Send Request for Information Letter	ACES	01/07/11
01/04/11	Review licensee response	EB2	

**Branch Evaluation Plan & Recommendation**

Allegation Number: NRV-2010-A-0202

<b>Concern:</b> 3.			
*RX Code or Functional Area:	Engineering	OI Case No.:	4-20XX-0XX
*Discipline:	Corrective Action	*OI Priority:	
*Security Category:		*OI Priority Basis:	

**Concern:** (A concern is one or two sentences.)

The licensee did not take prompt corrective actions to address Concern 2. Specifically, Notification 201158834 documented the concern on October 18, 2010, but no ground detection monitoring was performed until the maintenance was completed.

**Concern Background, Supporting Information, & Comments**

(b)(7)(C) and believes there may be grounded circuits which may go undetected. (b)(7)(C) Presently, 125 volt 3D5A DC bus (supported by 3B22 swing charger and 3B010 battery is providing power to 3D5P1, P2, P3 and P4 panels. [The] 3D5 DC bus has been isolated and de-energized for 3B011 battery performance test and replacement of 3B005 charger and inverter. Non-safety related 3D5P1-4 panels provide 125VDC control power to 480V load centers, 4.16kV switchgears, 6.9 switchgears, turbine trip panels, turbine trip unit actuators, excitation rectifiers, generator trip buses, emergency lighting panels, etc. During the rainy season, there is a high probability that some of these DC control circuits will be grounded during [the] Unit 3 refueling, as we proceed with maintenance/construction work. Unfortunately, [the] 3D5A switch cabinet does not have any continuous ground detection and unless we rectify this deficiency, grounded circuits may stay undetected for a long time." The CI was concerned the bus will be returned to its normal configuration on December 16, 2010, and the chance to identify the situation (grounded circuits) might be missed, and the opportunity to prevent future occurrences will be lost. The (b)(7)(C) The most critical equipment supplied from these panels would be the protection circuits for the reserve auxiliary transformers. These transformers are presently supplying a tech spec required off-site power source to both Units 2 and 3. Allowing undetected grounds to develop in this protection circuitry could result in spurious tripping of the protection, causing a loss of off-site power to both units. Undetected grounds could also prevent protection relays and breakers from tripping properly, which can lead to extensive equipment damage if an electrical fault should develop."

**Regulatory Requirement** (fill in below)  
10 CFR 50 Appendix B Criterion XVI

**Describe the concern's safety significance.** (fill in below, REQUIRED)  
Not an immediate safety concern

Check each question as applicable to this concern.

X	Is it a declaration, statement, or assertion of impropriety or inadequacy? Is there a potential deficiency?
X	Is the impropriety or inadequacy associated with NRC regulated activities or policy (e.g. SCWE)?
X	Is the validity of the issue unknown?

If all of the above statements are checked, the issue is an allegation.

<b>*Technical Staff Recommendation(s)</b>			
Date	Recommended Action	Assigned Branch	Planned Date
12/20/10	Send Request for Information	ACES	01/04/10
12/20/10	Review licensee response	RPBD	

Branch Evaluation Plan & Recommendation			
Allegation Number: RIV-2010-PA-0202			
Concern: 3.			
NOTE: Submit Draft NOV, RFI questions/requests, and/or an inspection plan as a <u>separate</u> document.			
★ For an ARB decision to RFI, any INHIBITING FACTOR(S) that are overruled from the first page must have a justification documented in the ARB Decision(s). Document INHIBITING FACTOR(S) that not applicable to the concern or are not noted on first page. First page reviewed? Yes: No: N/A:			
ARB Date	ARB Decision(s)	Assigned to	Accepted Planned Date
01/04/11	EB2 to Modify concern 3	EB2	01/04/11
01/04/11	Send Request for Information Letter	ACES	01/07/11
01/04/11	Review licensee response	EB2	

Branch Evaluation Plan & Recommendation			
Allegation Number: RIV-2010-A-0292			
<b>Concern:</b> 4.			
<b>*RX Code or Functional Area:</b>	Engineering	<b>OI Case No.:</b>	4-20XX-0XX
<b>*Discipline:</b>	Engineering	<b>*OI Priority:</b>	
<b>*Security Category:</b>		<b>*OI Priority Basis:</b>	
<b>Concern:</b> (A concern is one or two sentences.) Specific gravity measurements may not be compensated for temperature. Specifically, Notification 201190627 documented that the digital hydrometers used to measure specific gravity in station batteries do not automatically compensate the measurement for temperature, and prompt action was not taken to address this concern.			
<b>Concern Background, Supporting Information, &amp; Comments</b> The licensee's review of operating experience for applicability is not timely, thus allowing the licensee to use a digital hydrometer that does not correct for temperature. The [redacted] stated that Hope Creek identified (b)(7)(C) problem involving a digital hydrometer that did not automatically correct the specific gravity of a battery for temperature. All of the weekly, quarterly, and random surveillance test data had to be re-calculated. The (b)(7)(C) said SONGS used the same hydrometer (Anton Paar) as Hope Creek, but Notification (b)(7)(C) does not have a start date until (b)(7)(C).			
<b>Regulatory Requirement</b> (fill in below) 10 CFR 50 Criterion XVI			
<b>Describe the concern's safety significance.</b> (fill in below - REQUIRED) Not an immediate safety concern			
Check each question as applicable to this concern.			
X	Is it a declaration, statement, or assertion of impropriety or inadequacy? Is there a potential deficiency?		
X	Is the impropriety or inadequacy associated with NRC regulated activities or policy (e.g. SCWE)?		
X	Is the validity of the issue unknown?		
If all of the above statements are checked, the issue is an allegation.			
<b>*Technical Staff Recommendation(s)</b>			
Date	Recommended Action	Assigned Branch	Planned Date
12/20/10	Send Request for Information	ACES	01/04/10
12/20/10	Review licensee response	RPBD	
<b>NOTE: Submit Draft NOV, RFI questions/requests, and/or an inspection plan as a separate document.</b>			
★ For an ARB decision to RFI, any INHIBITING FACTOR(S) that are overruled from the first page must have a justification documented in the ARB Decision(s). Document INHIBITING FACTOR(S) that not applicable to the concern or are not noted on first page. First page reviewed? Yes: X No: N/A:			
ARB Date	ARB Decision(s)	Assigned to	Accepted Planned Date
01/04/11	EB2 to modify Concern 4	EB2	01/04/11
01/04/11	EB2 to call licensee and inform of specific gravity testing methodology	EB2	01/04/11
01/04/11	Send Request for Information Letter	ACES	01/07/11
01/04/11	Review licensee response	EB2	