

Design Features & Comp Measures Experience at SRS

- TSR Design Features
 - Methodology aligns with TSR Implementation Guide, DOE STD 1186, etc.
 - Design Features in TSR
 - 9B ORPS reporting
 - 4A(1)3 Performance degradation of any Safety Class or Safety Significant Structure, System, or Component (SSC) that prevents satisfactory performance of its design function when it is required to be operable.
 - 4A(2)4/3 Performance degradation of any Safety Class SSC when not required to be operable.
- Some aspects prompting further consideration:
 - Treatment of PISA compensatory measure
 - Given a PISA, with design features as comp measures
 - USQE goes positive
 - SS or SC equivalent in TSR parlance and ORPs reporting?
 - How should we consider PISA comp measures in functional classification terms
 - What is TSR violation vs. PISA

Design Features & Comp Measures Experience at SRS

- Example: K Area Wall Discrepancy
 - Credited as PC-3
 - Wall covering removed
 - Constructed as PC-2 (50+ years ago)
 - No TSR issue
- NCR/PISA?

Design Features & Comp Measures Experience at SRS

- Example: Wiring Discrepancy
 - Identified during surveillance test
 - Upon signal input, wrong alarm received
 - Wires incorrectly labeled during calibration
 - Installed as wired following calibration
 - Discrepant condition due to human error
 - TSR Violation declared
- NCR/PISA?

Design Features & Comp Measures Experience at SRS

- Example: Probe located above liquid level
 - Probe not submerged as required for operability
 - Personnel not aware
 - LCO declared upon discovery
 - Initial condition provided adequate liquid depth
 - Process changes reduced depth to below probe
 - TSR violation declared
- NCR/PISA?

Design Features & Comp Measures Experience at SRS

- Example: Leaking Tank Decanter
 - Safety Significant
 - Must operate at 90% efficiency
 - Leaking discovered
 - Efficiency may be <90%
 - PISA declared
 - JCO approved
 - TSR violation declared
- TSR Violation/NCR/PISA?