U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT

CONTROL BLOCK / / / / / / / / (1) (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE ALL REQUIRED INFORMATION)

/0/1/ /V/A/N/A/S/1/ (2) /0/0/-/0/0/0/0/0/-/0/0/ (3) /4/1/1/1/1/ (4) / / / (5)
LICENSEE CODE — LICENSE NUMBER — LICENSE TYPE — CAT

/0/1/ REPORT SOURCE /L/ (6) /0/5/0/0/0/3/3/8/ (7) /1/0/'/9/8/2/ (8) /1/1/1/6/8/2/ (9)
DOCKET NUMBER — EVENT DATE — REPORT DATE

EVENT DESCRIPTION AND PROBABLE CONSEQUENCES (10)

/0/2/ / On October 19, 1982, with Unit 1 in Mode 6, Station Battery I-IV failed an 18 /
/0/3/ / month Discharge Surveillance Test. Since 480V Emergency Bus 1J was available to /
/0/4/ / feed 120V AC Vital Bus I-IV, the health and safety of the public were not affect-/
/0/5/ / ed. This event is reportable pursuant to T.S. 6.9.1.9.b. /
/0/6/ / /
/0/7/ / /
/0/8/ / /

	SYSTEM CODE	CAUSE CODE	CAUSE SUBCODE	COMPONENT CODE	COMP. SUBCODE	VALVE SUBCODE
/0/9/	/E/C/ (11)	/E/ (12)	/F/ (13)	/B/A/T/T/R/Y/ (14)	/Z/ (15)	/Z/ (16)

(17)	LER/RO REPORT NUMBER	EVENT YEAR	SEQUENTIAL REPORT NO.	OCCURRENCE CODE	REPORT TYPE	REVISION NO.
		/8/2/	/-/ /0/6/0/	/0/3/	/L/	/-/ /0/

ACTION TAKEN	FUTURE ACTION	EFFECT ON PLANT	SHUTDOWN METHOD	HOURS	ATTACHMENT SUBMITTED	NPRD-4 FORM SUB.	PRIME COMP. SUPPLIER	COMPONENT MANUFACTURER
/C/ (18)	/Z/ (19)	/Z/ (20)	/Z/ (21)	/0/0/0/0/ (22)	/Y/ (23)	/N/ (24)	/A/ (25)	/C/1/7/3/ (26)

CAUSE DESCRIPTION AND CORRECTIVE ACTIONS (27)

/1/0/ / Battery I-IV failed because it had reached its natural end of life. Aging of /
/1/1/ / the battery may have been accelerated by imposing discharge rates on the battery /
/1/2/ / required by the 18 month discharge test. Corrective action was to replace the /
/1/3/ / battery. /
/1/4/ / /

	FACILITY STATUS	%POWER	OTHER STATUS	METHOD OF DISCOVERY	DISCOVERY DESCRIPTION (32)
/1/5/	/H/ (28)	/0/0/0/ (29)	/ NA / (30)	/B/ (31)	/ Surveillance Test /

	ACTIVITY RELEASED	CONTENT OF RELEASE	AMOUNT OF ACTIVITY (35)	LOCATION OF RELEASE (36)
/1/6/	/Z/ (33)	/Z/ (34)	/ NA /	/ NA /

	PERSONNEL EXPOSURES NUMBER	TYPE	DESCRIPTION (39)
/1/7/	/0/0/0/ (37)	/Z/ (38)	/ NA /

	PERSONNEL INJURIES NUMBER	DESCRIPTION (41)
/1/8/	/0/0/0/ (40)	/ NA /

	LOSS OF OR DAMAGE TO FACILITY TYPE	DESCRIPTION (43)
/1/9/	/Z/ (42)	/ NA /

	PUBLICITY ISSUED	DESCRIPTION (45)	NRC USE ONLY
/2/0/	/N/ (44)	/ NA /	/ / / / / / / / / / / / /

NAME OF PREPARER W. R. CARTWRIGHT PHONE (703) 894-5151

Virginia Electric and Power Company
North Anna Power Station, Unit No. 1 Attachment: Page 1 of 2
Docket No. 50-338
Report No. LER 82-060/03L-0

Description of Event

On October 19, 1982, with Unit 1 in Mode 6, Station Battery I-IV failed 1-PT-87, an 18 month discharge surveillance test. Battery I-IV is the backup power supply to 125 V D.C. Distribution Cabinet I-IV and 120 V A.C. Vital Bus I-IV.

Probable Consequences of Occurrence

Battery I-IV provides a backup power supply to 120 V A.C. Vital Bus I-IV which provides power to safety related Protection Instrumentation, channel IV. Since the normal power supply, 480V Emergency Bus 1J was available to feed 120 V A.C. Vital Bus I-IV the health and safety of the public were not affected. In addition Battery I-IV would have been able to provide power to the vital bus, but not for the duration assumed in the Final Safety Analysis Report.

Cause of Event

Station Battery I-IV failed its 18 month Discharge Surveillance Test (Design Discharge) because the battery was at its natural end of life. Although the battery had not experienced its design life of 20 years, aging may have been accelerated by the battery being imposed to a discharge test of 17 amp hours under the battery design rating of 900AH. Test discharge rate is determined by worst case calculated applied load on the Battery I-IV.

Immediate Corrective Action

Since Battery I-IV is not required in the Mode (Mode 6) which failure was discovered, no immediate action was taken.

Subsequent Corrective Action

Battery I-IV was replaced by Design Change 82-S34. The three other station batteries were checked to determine if worst case calculated load was close to battery design rating so as to determine whether to suspect accelerated aging. A minimum of 19% difference existed between battery rating and applied load on the remaining three batteries so accelerated aging is not suspected.

Scheduled Corrective Action

None

Actions Taken to Prevent Recurrence

No further actions are required.

Generic Implications

No generic implications exist for this event.