Deorgia Power Company 133 Padmont Avenue Allanta: Georgia 30308 Telephone 404 525 3185

Mailing Addrese
Binventesi Gener Parkway
Post Office Bix 1285
Binningham, Alabama 85201
Telephone 205 868 1581

W. G. Hairston. III Senior Vice President Nuclear Operations the could be the sector system

HL-1383 000033

November 29, 1990

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission ATTN: Document Control Desk Washington, D.C. 20555

> PLANT HATCH - UNIT 2 NRC DOCKET 50-366 OPERATING LICENSE NPF-5 LICENSEE EVENT REPORT INADEQUATE PROCEDURES AND PERSONNEL ERROR RESULT IN MISSED TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS SURVEILLANCE

Gentlemen:

In accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.73 (a)(2)(i), Georgia Power Company is submitting the enclosed Licensee Event Report (LER) concerning a missed Technical Specifications surveillance. This event occurred at Plant Hatch - Unit 2.

Sincerely,

- In N.S. Hanst

W. G. Hairston, III

JJP/ct

Enclosure: LER 50-366/1990-011

c: (See next page.)

9012070067 901129 PDR ADOCK 05000366 PDC



U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission November 29, 1990 Page Two

c: <u>Georgia Power Company</u> Mr. H. L. Sumner, General Manager - Nuclear Plant Mr. J. D. Heidt, Manager Engineering and Licensing - Hatch GO-NORMS

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. Mr. K. Jabbour, Licensing Project Manager - Hatch

<u>U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Region II</u> Mr. S. D. Ebneter, Regional Administrator Mr. L. D. Wert, Senior Resident Inspector - Hatch

(6-89) (6-89)	DOWN 366 U.S. WILLICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER)						048 NO. 3150 ES: 4/30/92	92 92					
ACTUITY NAME (I	P	LANT HATCH	, UNIT 2			alianatilia. Banton cato cat		000KET NUMBE	k (2) 3 6 6	PAGE 1	ar.		
ITTLE (4) INADEQUATE PROK EVENT DATE (5) NONTH DAY YEAR	YEAR	AND PERSO	NNEL ERRO	OR RESULT I REPORT DAY	N MISSE E (7) YEAR	D TEC	INICAL SPEA	DIFIGATIONS FACTUITIES (ES	S SURVEILL INVOLVED (DOCKET NU O 5 0 0	ANCE B) (BER(S) Q			
11 05 90	9.0	011	0.0	1129	9.0				0500	0			
MODE (9) 1 POWER LEVEL 100	20 20 20 20 20 20 20	402(b) 405(a)(1)(1 405(a)(1)(1 405(a)(1)(1 405(a)(1)(1 405(a)(1)(1) 3) 3) 3) 3) 3) 3) 3) 3) 3) 3) 3) 3) 3)	20.405(c) 50.36(c)(1) 50.36(c)(2) 50.73(a)(2) 50.73(a)(2) 50.73(a)(2) 50.73(a)(2)	(1) (45) (111) R THIS		50.73(a)(2 50.73(a)(2 50.73(a)(2 50.73(a)(2 50.73(a)(2 50.73(a)(2 50.73(a)(2	73.71(t 73.71(c OTHER (Abstrac	(b) (c) (Specify in act below)				
NAME STEVEN B. TIPPS	s, mana	GER NUCLEA	R SAFETY	AND COMPLI	ANCE, H	ATCH	TN THIS REP	TE AREA CODE 912	367-7851	MBER			
CAUSE SYSTEM COMP	ONENT	MANUFAC- TURER	REPORT TO NPRDS		CAUSE	SYSTEM	COMPONENT	MANUFAC- TURER	REPORT TO NPRDS				
		SUPPLEMENT	AL REPORT	EXPECTED (1	4 >			EXDECTED	MONT	H VAG H	EA		
YES(IF yes, c ABSTRACT (16)	omplete	EXPECTED S	UBMISSION	DATE)] NO			SUBMISSIO	N				

On 11/5/90 at 0700 CST, Unit 2 was in the Run mode at an approximate power level of 2436 CMWt (approximately 100% rated thermal power). At that time, the operations Shift Supervisor, acting on erroneous information concerning an illuminated Fission Product Monitoring (FPM, EllS Code IJ) system flow annunciator, terminated a Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) and suspended compensatory actions required by the LCO. At approximately 1430 CST on 11/5/90 corrective action was taken which cleared the annunciator. At approximately 2305 CST on 11/5/90, it was determined that the Particulate Monitoring subsystem of the FPM had not been operable during the interval between 0700 CST when the compensatory actions were suspended and 1430 CST when the flow annunciator was cleared. Thus, sampling of the containment atmosphere, which is required by Unit 2 Technical Specifications section 3.4.3.1, action statement 'a', was not accomplished as required during that time.

The root causes of this event were two deficient procedures and a cognitive personnel error.

Corrective actions for this event included revising the involved procedures, counseling the individual responsible for the personnel error, and reperforming a visual check of the FPM for proper operation.

LICENSEE EXPIN		APPRESAD ONE NO 3150-0104 EXPLICES: 4/30/92									
FACILITY NAME (1)	DOCKET NUMBER (2)	LER NUMBER (5) PAG									
		YEAR		SEQ	NUM	REV	_	TT			
PLANT HATCH, UNIT 2	05000366	9.0		0 1	1	00	2	OF 6	5		

PLANT AND SYSTEM IDENTIFICATION

General Electric - Boiling Water Reactor Energy Industry Identification System codes are identified in the text as (EII; Code XX).

SUMMARY OF EVENT

On 11/5/90 at 0700 CST, Unit 2 was in the Run mode at an approximate power level of 2436 CMWt (approximately 100% rated thermal power). At that time, the operations Shift Supervisor, acting on erroneous information concerning an illuminated Fission Product Monitoring (FPM, EIIS Code IJ) system flow annunciator, terminated a Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) and suspended compensatory actions required by the LCO. At approximately 1430 CST on 11/5/90 corrective action was taken which cleared the annunciator. At approximately 2305 CST on 11/5/90, it was determined that the Particulate Monitoring subsystem of the FPM had not been operable during the interval between 0700 CST when the compensatory actions were suspended and 1430 CST when the flow annunciator was cleared. Thus, sampling of the containment atmosphere, which is required by Unit 2 Technical Specifications section 3.4.3.1, action statement 'a', was not accomplished as required during that time.

The root causes of this event were two deficient procedures and a cognitive personnel error.

Corrective actions for this event included revising the involved procedures, counseling the individual responsible for the personnel error, and reperforming a visual check of the FPM for proper operation.

DESCRIPTION OF EVENT

On 11/1/90, at approximately 0845 CST, a Chemistry Department technician was performing a routine daily surveillance on the FPM system when he observed that the filter paper on the Particulate Monitoring subsystem was not advancing properly. He then initiated Deficiency Card 2-90-3266, in accordance with plant administrative controls, to document the condition and initiate corrective action. By 0920 CST, Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) 2-90-338 was initiated, and four-hour grab samples of Primary Containment Atmosphere were taken, per the requirements of Technical Specifications section 3.4.3.1, action statement 'a'. Maintenance Work Order 1-90-3153 was initiated to implement corrective action.

On 11/5/90, at approximately 0400 CST, Instrument and Controls technicians replaced the filter paper drive motor on the Particulate Monitoring subsystem. A Chemistry Department technician performed the required post-maintenance functional test, which consisted of visual verification of filter paper motion and system lineup. The system lineup is performed by the Chemistry Department via procedure 64CH-CAM-005-0S, "FISSION PRODUCT MONITORS." The procedure,

LICENSEE EVEN			AJ45	EXALED EXCILLING	CIME NO 3156 85: 4/30/92	156-0104 92							
FACILITY NAME (1)	DOCKET NUMBER (2)	LER NUMBER (5) FA											
		TEAR	1	SEQ	NUM	REV	1	T					
PLANT HATCH, UNIT 2	05000366	90		0 1	1	0.0	3	OF	6				

however, did not specify a position for switch 2D11-PO11-HS2, so it was left in the OFF position. Power for the filter paper drive motor is supplied through this switch; thus the paper was not moving at the time the functional test was performed. The paper moves slowly so that twenty to thirty minutes are required in order to visually detect movement. The technician allowed approximately twenty-five minutes to elapse before checking for filter paper motion. The technician mistakenly believed that motion had occurred. Therefore, the technician signed off the functional test as complete and satisfactory even though the power supply switch was in the OFF position and the paper could not have been advancing.

The same Chemistry Department technician who performed the post-maintenance functional test observed that annunciator "FISSION PRODUCT FLOW HI/LOW," was illuminated in the Main Control Room (MCR). The annunciator response procedure directed operators to investigate such things as valve isolations, pump trips, etc. On 11/5/90, by approximately 0700 CST, Chemistry personnel had confirmed by direct observation of the FPM gas flow rotameter and differential pressure gauges that the required gas flow existed in the system. When all the conditions listed in the annunciator response procedure as possible causes for the alarm were determined not to exist, the annunciator was concluded to be spurious. Only later was it discovered that leaving switch 2D11-P011-HS2 in the OFF position also causes the system flow annunciator to alarm.

A Chemistry Department foreman then informed the Shift Supervisor that the post-maintenance functional test had apparently been successfully completed and that the "FLOW HI/LOW" annunciator had been concluded to be spurious. The Shift Supervisor terminated LCO 2-90-338 on the condition that the Chemistry Department continue to monitor FPM system gas flow and differential pressure every four hours until the annunciator was cleared.

On 11/5/90, at approximately 1430 CST, Instrument and Controls technicians investigating the lit annunciator discovered that switch 2D11-PO11-HS2 being in the OFF position was causing the "FLOW HT/LOW" annunciator. When the switch was placed in the ON position, the annunciator cleared immediately (the position of switch 2D11-PO11-HS2 was not listed in the annunciator response procedure as a possible cause for the flow annunciator).

On 11/5/90, at approximately 2305 CST, personnel reviewing the event determined that placing switch 2D11-PO11-HS2 in the OFF position also disconnects power from the filter paper drive motor. Thus, it was recognized that, since the Particulate Monitoring subsystem of the FPM system cannot properly perform its function without the filter paper being in motion, the FPM system had not been operable at the time the LCO was terminated. Since the grab sampling and analysis of containment atmosphere had been suspended when the LCO was terminated, a required Technical Specifications surveillance had not been performed as required between 0700 CST and 1430 CST.

U.S. RECEARCE COMPLEXICE ADMILSCOR ADMILSCOR ADMILSCOR ERPTR							EXPERIO EXPERIO	0000 NO 33.50 5: 4/30/92	8-8164 /				
FACILITY RAME (1)	DOCKET	DOCKET NUMBER (2)		L	ER NUN	BER (5)	PAGE (3				
					YEAR	SEC	NUM	REV					
PLANT HATCH, U	NIT 2	050	0036	6	90	0	1 1	00	4	OF	6		
TEET		And the second se											

CAUSE OF EVENT

The root causes of this event are two deficient procedures and cognitive personnel error. Procedure 64CH-CAM-005-05, "FISSION PRODUCT MONITORS," did not list switch 2D11-P011-HS2 in the system lineup for the affected panel. The adjacent panel, 2D11-P010, is part of the same FPM system and also has a switch labeled "HS2." The switch on panel 2D11-P010 is listed in 64CH-CAM-005-0S and is normally in the OFF position when the system is in operation. The apparent similarity between the two panels led the Chemistry technician not to question the position of the undesignated switch or its omission from the system lineup. Moreover, the HS2 switch on panel 2D11-P011 is not normally manipulated by Chemistry Department personnel; thus, the incorrect position was not conspicuous to the technician.

The annunciator response procedure 34AR-602-430-25, "FISSION PRODUCT FLOW HIGH/LOW," should list all the possible causes of the annunciator "FISSION PRODUCT FLOW HI/LOW." The switch which supplies power to the filter paper drive motors has several functions, one of which is to illuminate the flow annunciator under certain conditions. This potential annunciator cause was omitted from the procedure, and it led operators to a false confidence that all causes for a valid annunciator had been investigated and eliminated. The cause for the annunciator was eventually determined via reviews of elementary drawings and system manuals and by panel walkdowns. While this investigation was undervay, the Shift Supervisor, having been erroneously assured that the annunciator was spurious, terminated the LCO, thus suspending the compensatory actions required by the Technical Specifications.

Finally, the Chemistry technician who performed the post-maintenance functional test on the Particulate Monitoring subsystem made a cognitive personnel error in checking the motion of the filter paper. This error, in conjunction with the deficient procedures, misled other technicians and operations personnel into regarding the flow annunciator as spurious.

REPORTABILITY ANALYSIS AND SAFETY ASSESSMENT

This event is reportable per 10 CFR 50.73(a)(2)(i) because an event occurred in which a Technical Specifications surveillance was not performed as required. Specifically, a four-hour grab sample and analysis of the primary containment atmosphere was not performed as required by Unit 2 Technical Specifications section 3.4.3.1, action statement 'a'.

The Fission Product Monitor is designed to provide continuous monitoring of the primary containment atmosphere during reactor operation as well as during periods when the reactor is shut down and personnel entry into the drywell is required. The system provides an alarm in the Main Control Room if preset

LICENSEE EVENT			APRA I	CRYED CRPIN	0968 NO 3150 E5: 4/30/92	3150-0108 0/92								
FACILITY NAME (1)	DOCKET NUMBER (2)	YEAR	LER	NUM	NUM	(5) REV		PAGE	(3)					
PLANT HATCH, UNIT 2	05000366	9.0		0 1	1	0.0	5	OF	6					

radiation levels are exceeded or if an instrument failure occurs. Per design, a small flow of containment atmosphere is established via piping which penetrates containment and leads to the FPM panels. This flow is passed through a continuously moving paper filter medium which captures and concentrates particulates in the containment atmosphere. As the filter paper advances, it is moved past a sodium 'odide (NaI) scintillation detector which monitors for radioactivity.

In this event, a mispositioned switch caused the filter paper drive motor to be disconnected from its power source. Thus the filter paper could not have been drawn through the Particulate Monitoring subsystem of the FPM system and past the NaI scintillation detector. A high radiation condition resulting from leakage of particulates into the containment atmosphere would thus have remained undetected by the FPM system. However, other containment leakage detection systems were available. The iodine and noble gas monitoring subsystem of the FPK was operable, and would have detected any leakage of these fission products should it have occurred. Also, the equipment and floor drain level and flow monitoring systems were operable during this time frame, and their leakage detection capabilities would have detected any excess reactor coolant system leakage in the containment. Finally, the normal and high range containment radiation monitoring systems were operable. Since no drywell entry was made or contemplated, and since other means of leakage detection were available, it is concluded that this event had no adverse impact on nuclear safety. This analysis is applicable to all pover levels.

CORRECTIVE ACTIONS

- The filter paper in the Particulate Monitoring subsystem was re-examined after the mispositioned switch was corrected, and the paper was determined to be advancing properly.
- Procedure 64CH-CAM-005-0S, "FISSION PRODUCT MONITORS," has been temporarily revised to incorporate the position of switch 2D11-P011-HS2 in the system lineup. This change will be incorporated into the next permanent revision of this procedure.
- 3. Procedure 34AR-602-430-2S, "FISSION PRODUCT FLOW HIGH/LOW," has been temporarily revised to include the position of switch 2D11-P011-HS2 in the list of possible causes for the flow annunciator. This revision has also been incorporated into the corresponding Unit 1 procedure, 34AR-650-313-1S. These changes will be incorporated into the next permanent revisions of these procedures.
- The individual responsible for the cognitive personnel error has been counseled.

LICENSEE EVENI	U.S. NETLENE REFERENCEN CONVESSION	COMMUSSION APPRENTED ONE NO 3150-7 EDOTINES: 4/30/92						-0184				
FACILITY NAME (1)	DOCKET NUMBER (2)	Per al al anti-	LE		PAGE (3)							
		YEAD	R	SEC	NUN	REV						
PLANT HATCH, UNIT 2	05000366	90	,	0	1 1	00		6	OF	6		
TEXT		and the second design of the										

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- 1. Other Systems Affected: None
- Previous Similar Events: There have been no events at Plant Hatch in the past two years in which a Limiting Condition for Operation was prematurely or inappropriately terminated resulting in missed compensatory actions.
- 3. Failed Components Identification: No failed components caused this event.