

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT

CONTROL BLOCK: _____ (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE ALL REQUIRED INFORMATION)

0 1 | P A T M I 2 | 0 0 - 0 0 0 0 0 - 0 0 | 4 1 1 1 1 | _____
7 8 | 9 | 14 15 | 25 26 | 30 | 57 CAT 58 | 5

CON'T
0 1 | L | 0 5 0 0 0 3 2 0 | 0 9 2 5 8 0 | 1 0 2 7 8 0 |
7 8 | 60 61 | 68 69 | 74 75 | 80

EVENT DESCRIPTION AND PROBABLE CONSEQUENCES (10)

0 2 | On Sept. 24, 1980 the seals of the Personnel Airlock No. 1 outer door failed the seal
0 3 | leakage rate test per procedure 4311-5. The excessive seal leakage was not eliminated
0 4 | within the 24-hour Action Statement so this event is a violation of Tech.Spec. 3.6.1.3
0 5 | and is reportable under Section 6.9.1.8(b). Seal repairs required a containment entry,
0 6 | in order to disengage the pressure differential solenoid pin which inhibited operation
0 7 | of the door. This event had no effect on the plant, its operation, or the health and
0 8 | safety of the public.

0 9 | S A | E | B | P E N E T R | A | Z |
7 8 | 9 10 | 11 12 | 13 18 | 19 20 | 21 22 | 23 24 | 25 26 | 27 28 | 29 30 | 31 32 |
17 | LEP RO | EVENT YEAR | SEQUENTIAL | OCCURRENCE | REPORT | REVISION |
REPORT | NUMBER | 8 0 | REPORT NO. | CODE | TYPE | NO. |
33 34 | 35 36 | 37 40 | 41 42 | 43 44 | 45 47 |

CAUSE DESCRIPTION AND CORRECTIVE ACTIONS (27)

1 0 | The cause of the event was due to malfunctioning door seals. The seals were replaced
1 1 | and satisfactorily leak tested after the door opening mechanism was repaired. During
1 2 | the entry on Oct. 16, 1980 the solenoid pin was disengaged. The door was later opened,
1 3 | the seals replaced, surfaces cleaned, and then retested. The outer airlock door seals
1 4 | passed the leak rate test on October 20, 1980.

1 5 | X | 0 0 0 | Recovery Mode | B | Operator Observation
7 8 | 9 10 | 11 13 | 44 45 | 46 46 | 80
1 6 | Z | Z | N/A | N/A
7 8 | 9 10 | 11 11 | 44 45 | 46 46 | 80
1 7 | 0 0 0 | Z | N/A
7 8 | 9 10 | 11 12 | 13 13 | 80
1 8 | 0 0 0 | N/A
7 8 | 9 10 | 11 12 | 13 13 | 80
1 9 | Z | N/A
7 8 | 9 10 | 11 12 | 13 13 | 80

8010810 439

2 0 | N | _____ | N/A | _____ | _____ |
7 8 | 9 10 | 11 12 | 13 13 | 14 14 | 15 15 | 16 16 | 17 17 | 18 18 | 19 19 | 20 20 | 21 21 | 22 22 | 23 23 | 24 24 | 25 25 | 26 26 | 27 27 | 28 28 | 29 29 | 30 30 | 31 31 | 32 32 | 33 33 | 34 34 | 35 35 | 36 36 | 37 37 | 38 38 | 39 39 | 40 40 | 41 41 | 42 42 | 43 43 | 44 44 | 45 45 | 46 46 | 47 47 | 48 48 | 49 49 | 50 50 | 51 51 | 52 52 | 53 53 | 54 54 | 55 55 | 56 56 | 57 57 | 58 58 | 59 59 | 60 60 | 61 61 | 62 62 | 63 63 | 64 64 | 65 65 | 66 66 | 67 67 | 68 68 | 69 69 | 70 70 | 71 71 | 72 72 | 73 73 | 74 74 | 75 75 | 76 76 | 77 77 | 78 78 | 79 79 | 80 80 |
NAME OF PREPARER Steven D. Chaplin PHONE (717) 948-8461

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT
NARRATIVE REPORT
TMI-2

LER 80-044/01L-0

EVENT DATE - September 25, 1980

I. EXPLANATION OF OCCURRENCE

On September 24, 1980, the seals of the Personnel Airlock No. 1 outer door failed the seal leakage rate test performed to procedure 4311-5. The door could not be returned to service within the 24 hours required by the action statement for Tech. Spec. 3.6.1.3 and, therefore, is reportable under Section 6.9.1.8(b). The excessive leakage could not be eliminated within the action period because access to the seals could not be gained due to an engaged pressure differential solenoid pin. Therefore, seal access required entry into the airlock from the containment side in order to disengage the solenoid pin.

II. CAUSE OF OCCURRENCE

The cause of this occurrence was the malfunction of the door seals. The seal malfunction was most probably the result of a lack of servicing. The airlock seal servicing was restricted by lack of access since the accident.

III. CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING THE OCCURRENCE

At the time of the occurrence, the Unit 2 facility was in a long-term cold shutdown state. The reactor decay heat was being removed via natural circulation to the "A" steam generator which is operating in a 'steaming' mode. Throughout the event there was no Loss of Natural Circulation heat removal in the RCS System.

IV. CORRECTIVE ACTIONS TAKEN OR TO BE TAKEN

During the October 16, 1980, entry, the solenoid pin which inhibited operation of the outer PAL No. 1 door was disengaged. Subsequent to the entry, the outer door was opened, the seals removed, the mating surfaces cleaned, and new seals installed. The outer door was then leak tested satisfactorily on October 20, 1980.

Because of the limited accessibility to the containment, the licensee claims its actions sufficient to satisfy the intent of the Technical Specifications even though the action period time limit was exceeded.

V. COMPONENT FAILURE DATA

N/A