



Commonwealth Edison
Dresden Nuclear Power Station
R.R. #1
Morris, Illinois 60450
Telephone 815/942-2920

Lenka

BBS Ltr. #77-219

March 17, 1977

Mr. James G. Keppler, Regional Director
Directorate of Regulatory Operations - Region III
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
799 Roosevelt Road
Glen Ellyn, Illinois 60137

REFERENCE: Reportable Occurrence report number 50-249/1976-36

Enclosed please find Reportable Occurrence report number 50-249/1977-6.
This report is being submitted to your office in accordance with the Dresden
Nuclear Power Station Technical Specifications, Section 6.6.B.

R. B. Stephenson
Station Superintendent
Dresden Nuclear Power Station

BBS:jo

Enclosure

cc: Director of Inspection & Enforcement
Director of Management Information & Program Control
File/NRC

MAR 21 1977

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT

CONTROL BLOCK:

--	--	--	--	--	--

PLEASE PRINT ALL REQUIRED INFORMATION

LICENSEE NAME														LICENSE NUMBER												LICENSE TYPE					EVENT TYPE	
01	I	L	D	R	S	3	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	4	1	1	1	1	0	3								
7	8	9				14	15											25	26				30	31	32							
01		CONT		CATEGORY		REPORT TYPE	REPORT SOURCE	DOCKET NUMBER					EVENT DATE				REPORT DATE															
01						L	L	0	5	0	-	0	2	4	9	0	2	1	5	7	7	0	3	1	7	7	7					
7	8			57	58	59	60	61							68	69							74	75			80					

EVENT DESCRIPTION

02 | A routine monthly surveillance audit revealed that three Unit-3 surveillance intervals
7 8 9 | 80

03 | had been inadvertently exceeded. Tech Spec section 1.0.CC. (a) and (b) (which
7 8 9 | 80

04 | became effective in May, 1976) specifies that (a) interval extensions are not to
7 8 9 | 80

05 | exceed 25% of the interval; and (b) that the total combined interval of any 3
7 8 9 | 80

06 | consecutive intervals is not to exceed 3.25 times the specified surveillance interval.
7 8 9 | 80

(Continued)

SYSTEM CODE		CAUSE CODE		COMPONENT CODE					PRIME COMPONENT SUPPLIER	COMPONENT MANUFACTURER			VIOLATION		
07	Z	Z	A	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	9	9	9	Y	
7	8	9	10	11	12				17	43	44			47	48

CAUSE DESCRIPTION

08 | The surveillance interval violations were caused by personnel error. The single-
7 8 9 | 80

09 | interval violation resulted from a misinterpretation of the surveillance "due date" by
7 8 9 | 80

10 | instrument maintenance personnel. The other two violations occurred as the result
7 8 9 | 80

(Continued)

FACILITY STATUS		% POWER		OTHER STATUS		METHOD OF DISCOVERY		DISCOVERY DESCRIPTION					
11	E	0	9	5	NA	B	NA						
7	8	9	10	11	12	13	44	45	46				80

FORM OF ACTIVITY RELEASED		CONTENT OF RELEASE		AMOUNT OF ACTIVITY			LOCATION OF RELEASE						
12	Z	Z	NA				NA						
7	8	9	10	11			44	45					80

PERSONNEL EXPOSURES

NUMBER		TYPE		DESCRIPTION									
13	0	0	0	Z	NA								
7	8	9	11	12	13								80

PERSONNEL INJURIES

NUMBER		DESCRIPTION											
14	0	0	0	NA									
7	8	9	11	12									80

OFFSITE CONSEQUENCES

15 | NA
7 8 9 | 80

LOSS OR DAMAGE TO FACILITY

TYPE		DESCRIPTION											
16	Z	NA											
7	8	9	10										80

PUBLICITY

17 | NA
7 8 9 | 80

ADDITIONAL FACTORS

18 | NA
7 8 9 | 80

19 |
7 8 9 | 80

NAME: D. C. Maxwell

PHONE: Ext. 422

EVENT DESCRIPTION (Continued)

A one-interval violation was identified for the instrument department surveillance entitled "Off-Gas High Radiation Isolation;" two other instrument department surveillances -- "Turbine 1st Stage Pressure -- 45% Scram Bypass" and "Main Steam Line Low Pressure Isolation"--- were found to be in violation of the three-consecutive-interval requirement. Surveillance test results indicated that all instrument settings and readings were within specifications.

The number of surveillance items involved in this event represented less than one-half of 1% of the total number of surveillances conducted during the period in question. The safety implications of this event, therefore, were considered to be minimal. Previous surveillance interval violations for Unit-3 were identified on 12/23/76. (50-249/1977-6)

CAUSE DESCRIPTION (Continued)

of changing surveillance scheduling criteria (which are outlined in Reportable Occurrence report no. 50-249/1976-36). Prior to 12/6/76, surveillance scheduling by computer was performed on a frequency basis. This meant that a monthly item was scheduled for the same time period each month regardless of when it had been performed the previous month. Consequently, if a monthly item, for example, were performed nine days "early," by the time the item appeared on the schedule to be performed again, the interval plus 25% would have already elapsed, resulting in a Tech Spec violation. Since the new quarterly interval criteria (3.25 times the specified surveillance interval) are now being applied to intervals which began prior to 12/6/76, occasional interval violations continue to occur.

The surveillance "due date" misinterpretation was reviewed with the personnel involved. It is expected that the surveillance scheduling revisions detailed in the referenced report will greatly reduce the number of recurring surveillance interval violations. The monthly surveillance review described in that report facilitated the prompt identification of these discrepancies.