

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT

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

0 1 | M I D C C | 2 | 0 0 - 0 0 0 0 0 0 - 0 0 | 3 | 4 1 1 1 0 | 4 | _____ | 5 |
7 8 9 14 15 25 26 30 57 CAT 58

CON'T
0 1 | REPORT SOURCE | L | 6 | 0 5 | 0 0 0 3 | 1 6 | 7 | 0 6 | 0 1 | 8 2 | 8 | 0 7 | 0 1 | 8 2 | 9 |
7 8 60 61 DOCKET NUMBER 68 69 EVENT DATE 74 75 REPORT DATE 80

EVENT DESCRIPTION AND PROBABLE CONSEQUENCES (10)
0 2 | OPERATORS WHO WERE ABOUT TO ENTER UPPER CONTAINMENT FOUND THE OUTER AIR LOCK DOOR
0 3 | OPEN. THIS WAS CONTRARY TO T.S. 3.6.1.3 AS THE AIR LOCK WAS NOT BEING USED FOR
0 4 | ENTRY/EXIT AT THAT TIME. THE INTERLOCK WHICH PREVENTS SIMULTANEOUS OPENING OF
0 5 | BOTH AIR LOCK DOORS WAS OPERABLE. LEAKAGE TESTS CONDUCTED PURSUANT TO T.S.
0 6 | 3.6.1.3.b WERE ACCEPTABLE BOTH PRIOR TO AND AFTER THE EVENT. THIS IS THE FIRST
0 7 | OCCURRENCE OF THIS TYPE. NO PROBABLE CONSEQUENCES RESULTED.
0 8 | _____
7 8 9 80

0 9 | SYSTEM CODE | S D | 11 | CAUSE CODE | A | 12 | CAUSE SUBCODE | X | 13 | COMPONENT CODE | P E N E T R | 14 | COMP SUBCODE | A | 15 | VALVE SUBCODE | Z | 16 |
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 18 19 20
17 | LER/RO REPORT NUMBER | 8 2 | 21 | 22 | SEQUENTIAL REPORT NO. | 0 5 0 | 24 | 26 | OCCURRENCE CODE | 0 3 | 28 | 29 | REPORT TYPE | L | 30 | 31 | REVISION NO. | 0 | 32 |
ACTION TAKEN | H | 18 | 33 | FUTURE ACTION | H | 19 | 34 | EFFECT ON PLANT | Z | 20 | 35 | SHUTDOWN METHOD | Z | 21 | 36 | HOURS | 0 0 0 0 | 37 | 40 | ATTACHMENT SUBMITTED | Y | 23 | 41 | NPD-4 FORM SUB. | N | 24 | 42 | PRIME COMP. SUPPLIER | N | 25 | 43 | COMPONENT MANUFACTURER | W 3 0 2 | 26 | 44 | 47

CAUSE DESCRIPTION AND CORRECTIVE ACTIONS (27)
1 0 | RESPONSIBILITY COULD NOT BE PLACED ON A SPECIFIC PARTY. A CONTRIBUTING FACTOR
1 1 | RESULTED WHEN A REMOTE ANNUNCIATOR WAS ACKNOWLEDGED BY AN UNKNOWN INDIVIDUAL. A
1 2 | DESIGN CHANGE HAS BEEN PROPOSED WHICH WILL MOVE THE DOOR UNLATCHED ALARMS INTO
1 3 | THE CONTROL ROOM. IN ADDITION THE REQUIREMENTS OF T.S. 3.6.1.3 WILL BE STRESSED
1 4 | WITHIN ALL DEPARTMENTS. SEE ATTACHMENT
7 8 9 80

1 5 | FACILITY STATUS | E | 28 | 8 | 9 | % POWER | 1 0 0 | 29 | 10 | 12 | OTHER STATUS | NA | 30 | 44 | METHOD OF DISCOVERY | B | 31 | 45 | 46 | DISCOVERY DESCRIPTION | ROUTINE CONTAINMENT ENTRY | 32 | 80

1 6 | ACTIVITY RELEASED | Z | 33 | 9 | 10 | CONTENT OF RELEASE | Z | 34 | 11 | AMOUNT OF ACTIVITY | NA | 35 | 44 | LOCATION OF RELEASE | NA | 36 | 80

1 7 | PERSONNEL EXPOSURES NUMBER | 0 0 | 37 | 10 | 11 | TYPE | Z | 38 | 12 | DESCRIPTION | NA | 39 | 13 | 80

1 8 | PERSONNEL INJURIES NUMBER | 0 0 | 40 | 11 | 12 | DESCRIPTION | NA | 41 | 13 | 80

1 9 | LOSS OF OR DAMAGE TO FACILITY TYPE | Z | 42 | 10 | 11 | DESCRIPTION | NA | 43 | 12 | 80

2 0 | ISSUED DESCRIPTION | N | 44 | 10 | 11 | _____ | 45 | 80
PUBLICITY ISSUED DESCRIPTION (45)
8207130429 820701
PDR ADOCK 05000316
S PDR
NRC USE ONLY
NAME OF PREPARER D. M. DRAPER PHONE 616 465-5901

CAUSE DESCRIPTION AND CORRECTIVE ACTIONS

The last documented Upper Containment entry was made by Chemistry Technicians. When interviewed they stated they were certain they closed the air lock door behind them. The Control Room Operator on duty at the time recalls specifically that the Control Room alarm cleared. This alarm only indicated that the status of an unmanned remote panel in the Aux. Bldg. had changed, that is the door unlatched alarm on this panel could have cleared or been acknowledged. There is a possibility that during the 12 hours and 34 minutes after the last documented entry until the door was observed open that an entry could have been made without being monitored by the Security computer. A normal entry is documented when the person entering Containment calls the Control Room. In any case, entry is controlled by the locked high radiation gate adjacent to the air lock door to which only Operations and Radiation Protection are issued keys. Neither of the groups have a record of entry during this time.

The condition had initially been noticed 5 hours and 36 minutes earlier by a Security Guard and Operator performing a door functional check on the adjacent gate. The functional checks were required after returning the Security computer to service. The Security Guard did not report the incident because the Auxiliary Equipment Operator had inferred that work was being done on the door seal, this inference was based on a Job Order Tag hanging on the gate adjacent to the air lock door which read "grease air lock seals". The exact time the door was left open could not be established, a conservative estimate based upon the last documented entry and exit would indicate that the maximum time would be 12 hours and 34 minutes. The individual responsible for leaving the door open could not positively be identified because of the Security computer being removed from service during the day.

A design change has been proposed which will move the door open alarms directly into the Control Room which will eliminate the ability to acknowledge the alarm at a remote panel. In addition, the requirements of the Technical Specification 3.6.1.3 to maintain the doors closed except for entry or exit will be stressed within all departments.