

December 10, 1990

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

Dear Sir:

The enclosed Licensee Event Report number 90-012-00, Docket No. 50-304/DPR-48 from Zion Generating Station is being transmitted to you in accordance with the requirements of 10CFR50.73(a)(2)(i), which requires a 30 day written report when there has been a condition prohibited by the plant's Technical Specifications.

Very truly yours,

fr T. P. Joyce Station Manager

Zion Generating Station

TPJ/dmg

Enclosure: Licensee Event Report

cc: NRC Region III Administrator NRC Region Resident Inspector INPO Record Center CECo Distribution List

|   | LICENSE  | E EVENT REPORT                  | (LER)   |                                | form Rev 2.0   |  |
|---|--|---------------------------------|---------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Facility Name (1)   |  |                                 |         | Docket Num                     |  |  |
| Zion Unit 2   |  |                                 |         | 0 15 10 10                     | 10 13 10 14 1 of 0 3                                   |  |
| Title (4)   |  |                                 |         |                                |  |  |
|   | ion Statement Due to Personne  |                                 |         |                                |  |  |
| Event Date (5)  | LER Number (6)   | Report Date (7)                 |         | Other Facilities Involved (B)  |  |  |
| Month Day Year Year   |  | Month Day                       | Year    | Facility N                     | ames Docket Number(s)                                  |  |
|   |  |                                 |         | N/A                            |  |  |
| 1 0 1 17 9 0 9 0  | 0 11 12 0 1 0  | 1 1 2 0 19                      | 9 10    |                                |  |  |
| OPERATING<br>MODE (9)   | THIS REPORT IS SUBMITTED PUR<br>(Check one or more of the fo<br>[20.402(b)]    20  |                                 | 1 16/   | MENTS OF 10CF                  |  |  |
| POWER LEVEL   | 20.405(a)(1)(i) 50   | .36(c)(1)<br>.36(c)(2)          | 50      | ).73(a)(2)(v)<br>).73(a)(2)(vi | 73.71(:)   |  |
| (10) 0 0 0  | 20.405(a)(1)(iii) <u>X</u> 50  |                                 |         | ),73(a)(2)(vi                  |  |  |
|   | Transfer of the control of the contr | .73(a)(2)(ii)<br>.73(a)(2)(iii) |         | ).73(a)(2)(vi<br>).73(a)(2)(k) |  |  |
| The second | LICENSEE   | CONTACT FOR TH                  | IS LER  | (12)                           |  |  |
| Name  |  |                                 |         | AREA C                         | TELEPHONE NUMBER                                       |  |
| John H. Windiate F.P. Eng   | ineer ext. 31  | 08                              |         | 7 1 0                          | 18 7 4 6 1 - 3 11 10 18                                |  |
|   | LETE ONE LINE FOR EACH COMPON  | ENT FAILURE DE                  | SCRIBEL | IN THIS REP                    |  |  |
| CAUSE SYSTEM COMPONENT  | MANUFAC- REPORTABLE //// TURER TO NPRDS  | CAUSE S                         | SYSTEM  | COMPONENT                      | MANUFAC- REPORTABLE TUCER TO NPRDS                     |  |
|   |  | 333                             | 1       |                                | 1                |  |
| euppu   | EMENTAL DEPORT EXPECTED (14)   | 441                             |         |                                | Expected March   Day   Vann                            |  |
|   | EMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14)  EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE)  | X I NO                          |         |                                | Expected   Month   Day   Year   Submission   Date (15) |  |

On 10/17/90, during TSSP-96-89 (Damper Drop Test) a fire damper was found inoperable and required compliance with Technical Specification Section 3.21.6.B. The action statement to this Technical Specification had two parts and compliance with either depended on the existence or/non-existence of fire detection means in the area the damper was to isolate. The engineer performing the test was in a different room when reporting the existence of a detection loop. Consequently, a one hour inspection was initiated instead of the required continuous fire watch. The safety significance of the inoperable damper was minimal because system design would have inhibited any spread of a fire starting in the room. Corrective actions include stressing the importance of verification and a confirmatory approach to be taken while performing your job.

ABSTRACT (Limit to 1400 spaces, i.e., approximately fifteen single-space typewritten lines) (16)

|                             | ICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER) TEX | XT CONTINUATION                    | Form Rev 2.0 |  |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| FACILITY NAME (1)           | DOCKET NUMBER (2)              | LER NUMBER (6)                     | Page (3)     |  |
|                             |                                | Year /// Sequential /// Revision   |              |  |
| Zion Unit Z                 | 0   5   0   0   0   3   0   4  | 910 - 01112 - 010                  | 0 12 OF 0 13 |  |
| TEXT Energy Industry Identi | fication System (EIIS) codes a | are identified in the text as [XX] |              |  |

## A. CONDITION PRIOR TO EVENT

MODE 3 - Hot Shutdown RX Power 0% RC5 [AB] Temperature/ Pressure 547 °F/ 2235 psig

#### B. DESCRIPTION OF EVENT

On 10/17/90 at approximately 1500, per acceptance criteria of TSSP-96-89, "Fire Damper Drop Test," 2n charging Dump Room fire damper (OTSV-AV-42) was found and declared inoperable. The fire Marshall and shift engineer were notified of the inoperable damper. Some time later, the test engineer was notified by the fire Marshall that if the room had fire detection, then an hourly watch would be required. If there was no fire detection in the room then a continuous fire watch would be required. This is in compliance with Technical Specification Section 3.21.6.8. When the actual communication between the fire Marshall and the test engineer occurred the group had moved on to the 2C Charging Pump Room. When the test engineer was asked whether detection existed in the inoperable damper room (ie., 2A Chg Pump Room) he walked to where the group was working on the next damper in the 2C Charging Pump Room, looked and saw detection, and reported same to the Fire Marshall. An hourly inspection was incorrectly initiated.

On 10/22/90, at 1845, a review of PT-14 revealed the error, and a continuous fire watch was stationed. A deviation report for this event was written on 10/29/90. It was received by the Operating Engineer on 11/9/90, at which time it was classified as reportable under the requirements of 10CRF50.73(a)(2)(i)(B).

#### C. APPARENT CAUSE OF EVENT

The root cause of the event is a cognitive personnel error by a contractor/test engineer. The error resulted from a failure to properly utiliz~ the Zion Self Check Program. One of the elements of this program is verification of equi, identity.

### D. SAFETY ANALYSIS OF EVENT

The 2A Charging Pump Rm has two inlet dampers (e.g., one is a thermal link fire damper the other is a HVAC pressure control louvre) and one outlet damper (e.g., thermal link fire damper). The inlet fire damper was declared inoperable and a one hour inspection of the room was already in place (due to outdated fire Hazards Analysis Document). If a fire were to have started in the room the outlet fire damper was still functional and would have closed. With the supply fire damper inoperable, supply air would still be sent into the room. A fire coincident with supply air would cause a pressure increase in the room. The HVAC damper would sense the increase in pressure and throttle closed. This would effectively prevent the spread of initial fire to other areas of the plant and the safety margin of the plant would not have been compromised.

| FACILITY NAME (1) | LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER) T   DOCKET NUMBER (2) |      | LER NUMBER (6) |                              |                    |         | Form Rev 2.0<br>Page (3) |  |
|-------------------|---|------|----------------|------------------------------|--------------------|---------|--------------------------|--|
|                   |   | Year | 134            | Sequential ///<br>Number /// | Revision<br>Number |         |                          |  |
| Zion Unit 2       | 0   5   0   0   0   3   0   4                     | 910  |                | 01112 -                      | 0 10               | 0 13 OF | 0 13                     |  |

# E. CORRECTIVE ACTIONS

The correct fire watch was stationed on 10/22/90 at 1845. The elements of the CECo Self Check Program will be reiterated at a Tech Staff meeting:

1. Stop 5. Anticipate 2. Locate 6. F.-form 3. Sense 7. Observe 4. Verify

The procedure will be enhanced to include the actions required when a damper fails the drop test.

The contractor/test engineer was counselled by the Technical Superintendent as to the importance of using the Zion Self Check Program, with particular emphasis on verifying proper equipment identity prior to proceeding with any action.

# F. PREVIOUS EVENTS

There have been no previous events of this nature.

## G. COMPONENT FAILURE DATA

None.