



Arkansas Power & Light Company  
425 West Capitol  
P. O. Box 551  
Little Rock, AR 72203  
Tel: 501 377 4000

November 8, 1989

1CAN118901

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Document Control Desk  
Mail Station P1-137  
Washington, D. C. 20555

SUBJECT: Arkansas Nuclear One - Unit 1  
Docket No. 50-313  
License No. DPR-51  
Licensee Event Report No. 50-313/89-033-00

Gentlemen:

In accordance with 10CFR50.73(a)(2)(i)(B), attached is the subject report concerning the power range nuclear instrumentation not being calibrated in accordance with the frequency established by Technical Specifications due to inadequate procedural guidance with respect to Surveillance Test Program implementation.

Very truly yours,

E. C. Ewing  
General Manager,  
Technical Support  
and Assessment

ECE:RHS:sgw  
attachment

cc w/att: Regional Administrator  
Region IV  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 1000  
Arlington, TX 76011

INPO Records Center  
1500 Circle 75 Parkway  
Atlanta, GA 30339-3064

8911160031 891108  
PDR ADOCK 05000313  
S FLC

IE22  
1/1

NRC Form 366  
(9-83)

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Approved OMB No. 3150-0104  
Expires: 8/31/85

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER)

FACILITY NAME (1) Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit One DOCKET NUMBER (2) | PAGE (3)  
|0|5|0|0|0|3|3|3|0|F|0|3

TITLE (4) Power Range Nuclear Instrumentation Not Calibrated in Accordance With Frequency Established by Technical Specifications Due to Inadequate Procedural Guidance For Surveillance Test Program Implementation

EVENT DATE (5)			LER NUMBER (6)		REPORT DATE (7)			OTHER FACILITIES INVOLVED (8)	
Month	Day	Year	Sequential Number	Revision Number	Month	Day	Year	Facility Names	Docket Number(s)
10	09	1989	033	01	10	08	1989		05000330F03

OPERATING MODE (9) N THIS REPORT IS SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF 10 CFR §:

OPERATING MODE (9)	(Check one or more of the following) (11)	20.402(b)	20.405(a)(1)(i)	20.405(a)(1)(ii)	20.405(a)(1)(iv)	20.405(a)(1)(v)	20.405(a)(2)(iv)	20.405(a)(2)(v)	20.405(a)(2)(vi)	20.405(a)(2)(vii)(A)	20.405(a)(2)(vii)(B)	20.405(a)(2)(x)	73.71(b)	73.71(c)	Other (Specify in Abstract below and in Text, NRC Form 366A)
(10) 10/7/89	N			X											

LICENSEE CONTACT FOR THIS LER (12)

Name: Larry A. Taylor, Nuclear Safety and Licensing Specialist  
Telephone Number: 5101916141-131010  
Area: | Code: |

COMPLETE ONE LINE FOR EACH COMPONENT FAILURE DESCRIBED IN THIS REPORT (13)

Cause	System	Component	Manufacturer	Reportable to NPRDS	Cause	System	Component	Manufacturer	Reportable to NPRDS

SUPPLEMENT REPORT EXPECTED (14)

Yes (If yes, complete Expected Submission Date)  No  
EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE (15) | | | | |

ABSTRACT (Limit to 1400 spaces, i.e., approximately fifteen single-space typewritten lines) (16)

On October 9, 1989, it was determined by plant personnel that the power range nuclear instrumentation had not been calibrated twice during the previous week as required by the Technical Specifications. During steady state power operation, a heat balance calibration of the power range instruments is performed each Monday and Friday in order to meet the Technical Specification surveillance requirement. However, after completion of the calibration on Monday, October 9, it was determined that the calibration which had been scheduled for Friday, October 6, had not been performed. It was also determined that, prior to October 9, the last heat balance calibration had been performed on October 2, 1989. This event was not safety significant since the calibration performed on October 9 indicated that the power range instruments had remained within their calibration tolerance and no adjustments were necessary. The cause of this event was determined to be inadequate procedural guidance with respect to specific responsibilities for implementation of the Surveillance Test Program. Interim corrective action consisted of issuance of a memo specifying additional activities to be performed by Test Coordinators, Schedulers, and Supervisors responsible for the performance of surveillances. The Surveillance Test Program is presently being evaluated for determination of long term corrective action to prevent recurrence.

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER) TEXT CONTINUATION

FACILITY NAME (1)	DOCKET NUMBER (2)	LER NUMBER (6)			PAGE (3)
		Year	Number	Revision	
Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit One	05101031313189--	03	3--	0	0102101013

TEXT (If more space is required, use additional NRC Form 366A's) (17)

A. Plant Status

At the time of this event, Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 1 (ANO-1) was operating at approximately 74 percent of rated power.

B. Event Description

On October 9, 1989, it was determined by plant personnel that the power range nuclear instrumentation channels [19] had not been calibrated twice during the previous week as required by the Technical Specifications.

During steady state operating conditions, a heat balance calibration of the power range instruments is scheduled to be performed each Monday and Friday in order to meet the Technical Specifications surveillance requirement. After completion of the calibration on Monday, October 9, 1989, it was determined that the calibration which had been scheduled for Friday, October 6, had not been performed. It was also determined that prior to October 9, the last heat balance calibration had been performed on October 2, 1989. Since the heat balance performed on October 9 indicated that no nuclear instrumentation adjustments were necessary, no immediate corrective actions were necessary.

C. Safety Significance

This event was not safety significant since the power range nuclear instruments were verified to have remained within their calibration tolerance and therefore operable even though a scheduled surveillance was missed.

D. Root Cause

Although the surveillance test discussed in this report was properly scheduled, the associated work package was never delivered to the appropriate maintenance department to be performed. This error was not detected by maintenance personnel. In addition, maintenance did not recognize that a scheduled surveillance had not been performed.

The root cause of this event was determined to be inadequate procedural guidance with respect to specific responsibilities for implementation of the present Surveillance Test Program. The procedure did not specifically direct the craft coordinator to ensure that work packages for all of the scheduled surveillances were in the appropriate department or to verify completion of the tests. In addition, the procedure did not direct the supervisors responsible for performance of the surveillances to verify that all items on their schedules were completed.

E. Basis for Reportability

ANO-1 Technical Specification, Table 4.1-1, Item 3 requires that a heat balance calibration of the power range nuclear instrumentation be performed twice weekly during steady state operating conditions. Since this specified surveillance interval was not met, this condition was determined to be reportable pursuant to 10CFR50.73(a)(2)(1)(B) as operation prohibited by the plant's Technical Specifications.

F. Corrective Actions

Interim corrective actions taken with respect to this event included the issuance of a memo specifying additional activities which are to be performed by Surveillance Test Coordinators, Schedulers, and Supervisors responsible for performance of surveillances. These additional activities include personal verification of the proper scheduling and completion of surveillance tests by responsible individuals, discussion of surveillance tests scheduled for upcoming shifts during the daily scheduling meetings, and color coding of the following days surveillance tests on the daily schedule. In addition, the Surveillance Test Program is presently being evaluated to determine appropriate long term corrective actions to prevent recurrence. This evaluation is scheduled to be completed by November 13, 1989.

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER) TEXT CONTINUATION

FACILITY NAME (1)	DOCKET NUMBER (2)	LER NUMBER (6)			PAGE (3)
		Year	Sequential Number	Revision Number	
Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit One	05000333	89--	033--	0	3103

TEXT (If more space is required, use additional NRC Form 366A's) (17)

G. Additional Information

There have been no previous similar events reported in which a scheduled surveillance test was not performed due to inadequate procedural guidance regarding Surveillance Test Program implementation. However, LERs 50-368/89-002-00 and 50-368/89-017-00 reported missed surveillances due to scheduling errors and LER 50-368/89-010-00 reported a surveillance which was missed due to the improper updating of a Test Program log. As a result of these events, the Surveillance Test Program is being evaluated to determine appropriate enhancements to prevent the recurrence of missed surveillances.

Energy Industry Identification System (EIIS) codes are identified in the text as [XX].