

(7.77)

previous report date 07-07-80
Followup report

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT

CONTROL BLOCK: _____ (1)

(PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE ALL REQUIRED INFORMATION)

0 1 | A | L | B | E | F | L | 2 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | _____ | 5
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35
LICENSEE CODE 14 15 LICENSE NUMBER 25 26 LICENSE TYPE 30 31 CAT 58 32

CON'T
0 1 | R | E | P | O | R | T | S | O | U | R | C | E | L | 6 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 9
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35
REPORT SOURCE 60 61 DOCKET NUMBER 68 69 EVENT DATE 74 75 REPORT DATE 80

EVENT DESCRIPTION AND PROBABLE CONSEQUENCES (10)

0 2 | During normal operation, the technical specification limit of 13.28 Kw/ft. for
0 3 | linear heat generation rate was exceeded in one node. The node was 13.41 Kw/ft.
0 4 | A re-evaluation of the event indicated that the unit was not at steady-state. The
0 5 | rod moves associated with the event and subsequent corrective action all occurred
0 6 | within less than 15 minutes. Therefore, the limits of technical specifications
0 7 | section 3.5.J were not applicable and the event should not have been reported.

0 8 | _____ 80

0 9 | SYSTEM CODE [Z Z] (11) CAUSE CODE [A] (12) CAUSE SUBCODE [A] (13) COMPONENT CODE [Z Z Z Z Z Z] (14) COMP SUBCODE [Z] (15) VALVE SUBCODE [Z] (16)
17 | LER NO. REPORT NUMBER [8 0] (17) SEQUENTIAL REPORT NO. [0 5 6] (18) OCCURRENCE CODE [0 3] (19) REPORT TYPE [L] (20) REVISION NO. [1] (21)
ACTION TAKEN [X] (18) FUTURE ACTION [Z] (19) EFFECT ON PLANT [Z] (20) SHUTDOWN METHOD [Z] (21) HOURS [0 0 0 0] (22) ATTACHMENT SUBMITTED [Y] (23) NPRO-4 FORM SUB [N] (24) PRIME COMP SUPPLIER [Z] (25) COMPONENT MANUFACTURER [Z 9 9 9] (26)

CAUSE DESCRIPTION AND CORRECTIVE ACTIONS (27)

1 0 | When four control rods were withdrawn 5 notches, the LHGR was exceeded in one node.
1 1 | The same four control rods were inserted 3 notches and the resultant LHGR was within
1 2 | limits. No recurrence control required. The event has been re-evaluated as
1 3 | non-reportable. (See description section above).

1 4 | _____ 90
1 5 | FACILITY STATUS [E] (28) % POWER [0 8 0] (29) OTHER STATUS [N/A] (30) METHOD OF DISCOVERY [] (31) DISCOVERY DESCRIPTION [STA observation] (32)

1 6 | ACTIVITY RELEASED [Z] (33) CONTENT OF RELEASE [Z] (34) AMOUNT OF ACTIVITY [N/A] (35) LOCATION OF RELEASE [N/A] (36)

1 7 | PERSONNEL EXPOSURES NUMBER [0 0 0] (37) TYPE [Z] (38) DESCRIPTION [N/A] (39)

1 8 | PERSONNEL INJURIES NUMBER [0 0 0] (40) DESCRIPTION [N/A] (41)

1 9 | LOSS OF OR DAMAGE TO FACILITY TYPE [Z] (42) DESCRIPTION [N/A] (43)

2 0 | PUBLICITY ISSUED [N] (44) DESCRIPTION [N/A] (45) NRC USE ONLY _____ 80

NAME OF PREPARER _____

PHONE _____

8010070 490

GPO 91-7-826

LER SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

BFRO-50- 259 / 8056 Technical Specification Involved 3.5.J

Reported Under Technical Specification 6.7.2.b(2)

Date of Occurrence 7/11/80 Time of Occurrence 2233 Unit 1

Identification and Description of Occurrence:

Following four control rods being withdrawn 5 notches, the process computer showed one node out of limits for linear heat generation rate by .13 Kw/ft.

(Cancelled (see form 366))

Conditions Prior to Occurrence:

Unit 1 @ 863 MWe

Unit 2 @ 976 MWe

Unit 3 @ 0 MWe

Action specified in the Technical Specification Surveillance Requirements met due to inoperable equipment. Describe: _____

N/A

Apparent Cause of Occurrence:

Problem caused by withdrawing the four control rods 5 notches instead of 3 notches.

Analysis of Occurrence:

There was no damage to plant equipment. There was no activity release, no personnel exposure or injury and no danger to the health or safety of the public.

Corrective Action:

Immediately, the four withdrawn control rods were inserted three notches, which brought the LHGR to within limits.

Failure Data:

*Retention: Period - Lifetime; Responsibility - Administrative Supervisor

*Revision: 