

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT

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

0 1 | M A P P S I | 0 0 0 - 0 0 0 0 0 - 0 0 | 4 1 1 1 1 | _____
7 8 9 LICENSEE CODE 14 15 LICENSE NUMBER 25 26 LICENSE TYPE 30 57 CAT 58

CON'T
0 1 | L | 0 5 0 - 0 2 9 3 | 1 0 0 4 8 2 | 1 1 0 3 8 2 |
7 8 9 REPORT SOURCE 60 61 DOCKET NUMBER 68 69 EVENT DATE 74 75 REPORT DATE 80

EVENT DESCRIPTION AND PROBABLE CONSEQUENCES (10)
0 2 | On 10/4/82, during power increase from hot shutdown, reactor water conductivity was |
0 3 | observed to be above T.S. limits. This event was noted after the 'A' condensate de- |
0 4 | mineralizer was placed in service. At 0300 the water was analyzed to be 20 mho/cm |
0 5 | and 4.5 PH. A plant shutdown was initiated and the NRC notified via ENS. The "A" unit |
0 6 | was isolated and removed from service. This event caused no threat to the public |
0 7 | health and safety. |

0 8 | _____
7 8 9
0 9 | C G | X | Z | O E M I N X | Z | Z |
7 8 9 SYSTEM CODE 9 10 CAUSE CODE 11 CAUSE SUBCODE 12 COMPONENT CODE 13 COMP. SUBCODE 19 VALVE SUBCODE 20

17 | 8 2 | _____ | 0 4 5 | / | 0 3 | L | _____ | 0 |
7 8 9 LER/RO REPORT NUMBER 21 22 EVENT YEAR 23 24 SEQUENTIAL REPORT NO. 25 26 OCCURRENCE CODE 27 28 REPORT TYPE 29 30 REVISION NO. 31 32
E X | B | A | 0 0 0 0 | Y | N | A | I 0 2 0 |
33 34 ACTION TAKEN 35 FUTURE ACTION 36 EFFECT ON PLANT 37 SHUTDOWN METHOD 38 HOURS 39 ATTACHMENT SUBMITTED 40 NFRD-4 FORM SUB. 41 PRIME COMP. SUPPLIER 42 COMPONENT MANUFACTURER 43 44 45 46 47 48

CAUSE DESCRIPTION AND CORRECTIVE ACTIONS (27)
1 0 | No cause has been found as of this date. The initial evaluation of this event was a |
1 1 | resin intrusion as reported in previous LER's (Ref: 82-31 and 80-43). However, in- |
1 2 | spection of the demineralizer internals disclosed no evidence of damage which could |
1 3 | result in significant resin intrusion. Cause determination is still under investiga- |
1 4 | tion. See Attachment for further details. |

1 5 | C | 0 2 5 | NA | A | Operator observation |
7 8 9 FACILITY STATUS 10 11 % POWER 12 13 OTHER STATUS 30 METHOD OF DISCOVERY 44 45 46 DISCOVERY DESCRIPTION 32

1 6 | Z | Z | NA | NA |
7 8 9 ACTIVITY CONTENT 10 11 RELEASED OF RELEASE 12 13 AMOUNT OF ACTIVITY 35 LOCATION OF RELEASE 36

1 7 | 0 0 0 | Z | NA |
7 8 9 PERSONNEL EXPOSURES 10 11 NUMBER 12 13 TYPE 14 15 DESCRIPTION 39

1 8 | 0 0 0 | NA |
7 8 9 PERSONNEL INJURIES 10 11 NUMBER 12 13 DESCRIPTION 41

1 9 | Z | NA |
7 8 9 LOSS OF OR DAMAGE TO FACILITY 10 11 TYPE 12 13 DESCRIPTION 43

2 0 | N | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
7 8 9 ISSUED DESCRIPTION 45 PUBLICITY 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 NRC USE ONLY

NAME OF PREPARER G. G. Whitney PHONE 617-746-7900

BOSTON EDISON COMPANY
PILGRIM NUCLEAR POWER STATION
DOCKET NO. 50-293

Attachment to LER # 82-045

On 10/4/82 at 0230, while increasing power from a hot shutdown, the reactor water conductivity began to increase after the "A" condensate demineralizer was put into service.

The Technical Specification (section 3.6.B) limit of 10 $\mu\text{mho/cm}$ was exceeded and at 0300 the analysis of the water indicated 20 $\mu\text{mho/cm}$ at 4.5 Ph. A plant shutdown was initiated and the NRC notified via ENS.

The immediate corrective action was to remove the "A" condensate demineralizer from service and to return the "B" unit to service. In addition, the APRM and rod block flow biased scram settings were adjusted per procedure 9.1 to compensate for the apparent non-conservative recirculation flow versus speed indications referenced in LER 82-31.

When the conductivity was again below the 10 $\mu\text{mho/cm}$ limit, the plant shutdown was terminated.

On 10/5/82, while increasing power from the high conductivity event on 10/4/82, the 10 $\mu\text{mho/cm}$ limit was again exceeded when the conductivity increased from 7.55 $\mu\text{mho/cm}$ to 10.97 $\mu\text{mho/cm}$. Again, a plant shutdown was initiated, the NRC notified and compensatory measures taken. The plant shutdown was terminated when the water again was within limits.

Initial investigation and evaluation indicated that the event originated as the result of a resin intrusion as reported in previous LER: (82-31 and 80-43). However, a visual inspection of the "A" demineralizer, conducted during a scheduled plant maintenance outage, indicated no visible damage to the laterals and no other source of significant resin release from the "A" demineralizer was found. A small quantity of resin beads and fines was found in the post strainer whose screen was found to be not properly secured.

No cause has been determined as of this time. The investigation into the source of this high conductivity event is continuing and an up-to-date report will be necessary.

On 10/24/82, while increasing power from the previously mentioned maintenance outage, both recirculation pumps again exhibited higher than expected core flow versus pump speeds. This event required the resetting of APRM flow bias factors per procedure 9.1, has been linked to the 10/4/82 event and will be factored into the investigation.