# **Beaver Valley 2 4Q/2003 Plant Inspection Findings**

### **Initiating Events**

**Significance:** Mar 29, 2003

Identified By: NRC

Item Type: NCV NonCited Violation

#### INEFFECTIVE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS TO ADDRESS DEGRADED INSTRUMENT AIR SYSTEM **PERFORMANCE**

Ineffective corrective actions to address degraded instrument air system performance resulted in a Unit 2 loss of instrument air (LOIA) pressure event on March 8, 2003. Specifically, corrective and preventive maintenance (PM) activities were not performed as specified in work orders and station procedures.

The finding was an NCV of 10 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 50.65(a)(1) for failure to take appropriate corrective action for a maintenance rule scope system which did not meet its category (a)(1) performance goals. The finding was of very low safety significance because operator action recovered instrument air pressure in time to avoid a plant transient and mitigation equipment was not affected.

Inspection Report# : 2003002(pdf)

### **Mitigating Systems**

Significance:

Jul 25, 2003

Identified By: NRC

Item Type: NCV NonCited Violation

#### FAILURE TO TAKE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS FOR A SIGNIFICANT CONDITION ADVERSE TO QUALITY INVOLVING THE USE OF UNCALIBRATED M&TE

The inspectors identified a non-cited violation of 10CFR50, Appendix B, Criterion XVI, "Corrective Action," for failure to ensure that a significant condition adverse to quality was promptly identified and corrected. Specifically, the licensee used uncalibrated measuring and test equipment (M&TE) during a surveillance test of safety-related equipment.

The finding was greater that minor because the use of un-calibrated M&TE during surveillance tests of safety-related systems affected the availability and reliability of safety-related mitigating systems required to respond to initiating events. The use of un-calibrated test equipment could result in the failure to identify unavailable mitigating equipment. The finding was of very low safety significance since an actual loss of the safety function of any mitigating system did not occur or go undetected.

Inspection Report#: 2003008(pdf)

### **Barrier Integrity**

Significance: Dec 31, 2003 Identified By: Self Disclosing

Item Type: NCV NonCited Violation

# INADEQUATE WORK INSTRUCTIONS RESULTS IN SPENT FUEL POOL UPENDER CABLE CLAMP FAILURE

The inspectors identified a non-cited violation of 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion V, for failure to have adequate work instructions that led to the failure of a cable clamp associated with the Unit 2 spent fuel pool upender frame. The licensee effected repairs and performed an extent of condition on the containment side upender as well as the Unit 1 upender equipment.

This issue was determined to be more than minor, because if left uncorrected, could become a more significant safety concern involving the potential damage to fuel assemblies. Because this issue involves SFP handling and storage issues, it cannot be evaluated under the NRCs Significance Determination Process. Therefore, this finding was reviewed by NRC management and determined to be of low safety significance, Green, because the event did not result in damage to a fuel assembly, and was identified while the upender was empty.

Inspection Report# : 2003005(pdf)

### **Emergency Preparedness**

Significance: Apr 30, 2003

Identified By: NRC

Item Type: VIO Violation

# ADEQUATE AND TIMELY EMERGENCY RESPONSE STAFFING IN FOUR KEY FUNCTIONAL ARES NOT MAINTAINED AT ALL TIMES

The 12 augmented radiation protection (RP) technician responders (i.e., six to respond in 30 minutes (M) and six to respond in 60 M) in the Emergency Response Organization (ERO) were not capable of meeting the minimum and timely staffing requirements in Emergency Preparedness Plan (EPP), Section 5, Table 5-1. EPP Section 5.2 states that Table 5-1 identifies the staffing requirements and capabilities for additions of the ERO. Table 5-1 requires that 12 RP technicians must respond to augment the shift crew in the four functional areas of offsite surveys (two in 30M and two in 60M), onsite surveys (one in 30M and one in 60M), in-plant surveys (one in 30M and one in 60M), and in-plant protective actions (two in 30M and two in 60M).

This was an apparent violation of 10 CFR 50.47(b)(2) and the EPP for not ensuring that adequate and timely emergency response staffing, in the four stated functional areas, was maintained at all times. This finding was of low to moderate safety significance because staffing augmentation processes were not capable of ensuring augmentation of the initial response staff in accordance with EPP facility activation commitments for RP technicians.

A violation of 10 CFR 50.47(b)(2), 10 CFR 50.54(q), and The 'Emergency Preparedness Plan, Table 5.1, was issued by EA Letter 03-054, dated July 10, 2003. Reference NRC Inspection Report 50-334(412)2003-003.

Inspection Report# : 2003009(pdf)
Inspection Report# : 2003003(pdf)

Inspection Report# : 2003006(pdf)

# **Occupational Radiation Safety**

# **Public Radiation Safety**

# **Physical Protection**

## Miscellaneous

Last modified: March 02, 2004