

Tennessee Valley Authority, Post Office Box 2000: Sodra-Dality, Tennessee, 37379

J. L. Wilson Vice President, Seguciyah Nuclear Pla

February 26, 1992

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

Gentlemen:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY - SEQUOYAH NUCLEAR PLANT UNIT 1 - DOCKET NO. 50-327 - FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE DPR-77 - LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER) 50-327/92003

The enclosed IER provides details concerning a failure to verify the valve position for fire protection valves inside the units' containments as required by Technical Specification (TS) Surveillance Requirement 4.7.11.2.a. This event is being reported in accordance with 10 CFR 50.73(a)(2)(i)(B) as an operation prohibited by TSs.

Sincerely,

SM

J. L. Wilson

Enclosure cc: See page 2

9203020292 920226 PDR ADDCK 05000327 S PDR

620020

IE22 111

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Page 2 February 26, 1992

cc (Enclosure): INPO Records Center Institute of Nuclear Power Operations 1100 Circle 75 Parkway, Suite 1500 Atlanta, Georgia 30339

> Mr. D. E. LaBarge, Project Manager U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission One White Flint, North 11555 Rockville Pike Rockville, Maryland 20852

NRC Resident Inspector Sequoyah Nuclear Plant 2600 Igou Ferry Road Soddy-Daisy, Tennessee 37379

Mr. B. A. Wilson, Project Chief U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Region II 101 Marietta Street, NW, Suite 2900 Atlanta, Georgia 30323

NRC Porm 366 (6-89) ,		U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION			Approved OMB No. 3150-0104 Expires 4/30/92					
		LICENS	EE EVENT REF	PORT (LE	ER)					
ACILITY NAME	1)							DOCKET NUM	BER (2)   PA	GE (3)
Sequoyah Nucle	ar Plant.	Unit 1						10151010101	3 2 7 110	E] 0]
ITLE (4)					7.1	100 ·	1.11			
Fire suppress	ion valve	positions insid	le contaiome	it not	verifi	ed beca	suse of a def	icient proce	dure.	
EVENT DAY (5		LER NUMBER	6)	REPOR	T DATE	(7) 1.	OTHER FA	CILITIES INV	OLVED (8)	
	1	SEQUENTIAL	REVISION				FACILITY NA	IME S	DOCKET NU	IMBER ( )
ONTH DAY IYE	AR LYEAR	NUMBER	NUMBER	MONTH	DAY	YEAR L	Sequoyah. U	hit 2	015101010	131218
1 12 7 9	2 9 2	10 0 3	1010	1 01 51	2 6	9 2		a la company a superior de la company a se	1015101010	111
OPERATING	THIS R	EPORT IS SUBMIT	TED PURSUAN	T TO TH	E REQU	IREMENT	IS OF 10 CFR			
MODE	11 . (Che	ick one or more	of the follo	owing)(	11)					
(9)	120.	402(b)	20,405(	c)	1	50.73	(a)(2)(iv)	[73,71	(b)	
POWER	20.	405(a)(1)(i)	[50.36(c	)(])	1	50.73	(a)(2)(v)	73.71	(c)	
LEVEL	_ 20.	405(a)(1)(ii)	50.36(c	)(2)	1 (L.	50.73	(a)(2)(vii)	OTHER	(Specify in	
(10) [1 [0	0   20.	405(a)(l)(iii)	<u>XX</u>  50.73(a	)(2)(1)	1	50.73	(a)(2)(viii)(	A) Abstr	act below an	id in
	1_120.	405(a)(1)(iv) -	50.73(a	)(2)(11	)	50.73	(a)(2)(viii)(	B)   Text,	NRC Form 36	6A).
	20.	405(a)(1)(v)	1 150.73(a	1(2)(11	i)	150.73	(a)(2)(x)			
			LICENSEE C	ONTACT	FOR TH	IS LER	(12)			
IAME								TELEPHONE N	IUMBER	
						AREA CODE				
Melissa Meade. Compliance Engineer					6 1 1 5	8 4 3	- 17 17	611		
	COMPL	ETE ONE LINE FO	OR EACH COMP	ONENT F	ALLURE	DESCR	IBED IN THIS	REPORT (13)		
		1	REPORTABLE	1			1		REPORTABLE	
AUSE SYSTEM!	COMPONENT	[MANUFACTURER]	TO NPRDS	- 4	CAUSE	SYSTEM	COMPONENT	MANUFACTURER	TO NPRDS	
		1							1	
	111	1.1.1.1.1		1.1		. Bern		1.1.1.1.1.1	1	È
		1							1	
	TIT	EELI		1.11		1	L L L L		1.1.1.1.1.1	1.1.1.1
a second s		SUPPLEMENTAL R	EPORT EXPECT	ED (14)			to a second second second	EXPECTED	IMONTH! DAY	1 YEA
				1				SUBMISSION		1
I YES ITE V	es, comple	ete EXPECTED SU	BMISSION DAT	E) IX	1 NO			DATE (15)	i tri t	1. 1
ADCTDACT /Limi	+ + 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	concer i o	anorovimatol			10.00	aca tunaunit	an lines 1	161	

On January 27, 1992, Sequoyah (SQN) determined that Surveillance Requirement (SR) 4.7.11.2.a was not satisfied for fire suppression system valves inside containment with the unit at power. A review of the surveillance procedure's revision history indicated that this condition has existed since the initial issue of the procedure. The root cause of this event appears to be that the intent of the SR was considered to be fulfilled without verifying the position of the valves in containment while the unit was operating because of accessibility considerations. The valves were required to be locked or sealed in the open position throughout this timeframe. The surveillance instruction (SI) implementing the SR was revised on January 28, 1992, and performed on January 29, 1992. The valves were found in the correct position.

N	RC I	Form	36	6A
1	5-8	9)		

.

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

## ITCENCEE EVENT DEDADT /IED)

		TE	EXT CONTINUATION
FACILITY NAME (1) Sequoyah Nuclear Plant Unit 1			DOCKET NUMBER (2) LER NUMBER (6) PAGE (3)   I I SEQUENTIAL REVISION I   I I SEQUENTIAL REVISION I I   I I SEQUENTIAL REVISION I I I
TEXT (I)	fmore	space is required, use a	additional NRC Form 366A's) (17)
Ι.	Pla	nt Conditions	
	Uni rea	ts 1 and 2 were in p ctor thermal power,	ower operation at approximately 100 percent and 96 percent respectively.
II,	Des	cription of Event	
	Α.	Event:	
		On January 27, 1992 (SR) 4.7.11.2.a was containment. The p position of suppres power, although the	2, SQN determined that Surveillance Requirement a not satisfied for fire suppression system valves inside procedure implementing the SR did not require verifying the ssion system valves inside containment with the unit at a SR does not have a waiver for such conditions.
	в.	Inoperable Structur	res, Components, or Systems that Contributed to the Event:
		None.	
	с.	Dates and Times of	Major Occurrences:
		July 1979	A surveillance instruction (SI) was issued to implement SR 4.7.11.2.a containing the statement that he valves inside containment will not have to be checked on a 31-day frequency when locked in position.
		1986	An SI review was performed to ensure that SRs vire properly implemented. This review did not identify the waiver of the containment valve position verification.
		October 1989	The SI was revised to contain a separate checklist for the valves in each unit's containment and to require performance of the containment valve checklists only when the unit is in Modes 4, 5, or 6.
		November 27, 1991	The SI was enhanced in accordance with SQN's fire protection improvement program. The checklists for the containment valves were recombined with the other valves into a single checklist. The waiver to verify the

was not removed. An auxiliary unit operator (AUO) questioned the SI's January 24, 1992 compliance with the SR.

containment valve positions while the units are operating

A problem event report was issued to document the January 27, 1992 confirmed discrepancy.

NRC	\$01	rm.	366	A
(6-8	(9)			

٠

## U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

## Approved OMB No. 3150-0104 Expires 4/30/92

## LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER)

	TERT CONTINUATION
FACILITY NA	ME (1) DOCKET NUMBER (2) LER NUMBER (6) PAGE (3)     SEQUENTIAL   REVISION         Uclear Plant Unit 1
TEXT (If mo	re space is required, use additional NRC Form 366A's) (17)
	January 28, 1992 The SI implementing the SR was revised to include checking the position of these valves on a 31-day frequency.
	January 29, 1992 The SI was performed for these valves and they were found in the correct position.
D.	. Other Systems or Secondary Functions Affected:
	The subject valves supply automatic fire suppression capability for the reactor coolant pumps (RCPs).
E.	. Method of Discovery:
	An AUO questioned the waiver to verify containment valve position while reviewing the procedure.
F	. Operator Actions:
	None.
G	. Safety System Responses:
	Not applicable - no safety system responses were required.
III. Ca	ause of the Event
A	. Immediate Cause:
	The SI implementing the SR did not contain the appropriate requirements to ensure literal compliance with TSs was maintained.
В	. Root Cause:
	The root cause of this event appears to be that the individuals preparing, revising, and evaluating the procedure implementing the SR considered that the intent of the SR was fulfilled without verifying the position of the valves is containment during operation. Several similar TS SRs contain waivers for verifying valve positions in inaccessible areas or for valves that are locked or sealed. For example, the frequency of the SR to cycle suppression system valves is different for "testable" and "nontestable" valves and the SR to inspect hose stations does not require inspections of "inaccessible" hose stations at power; however, the SR for valve position verification does not contain such a waiver. Literal compliance with this SR was apparently not questioned.

C. Contributing Factors:

None.

NRC Porm 366A \* (6-89) \* U.S. NUCLEAP REGULATORY COMMISSION

Approved OMB No. 3150-0104 Expires 4/30/92

LIC	ENSEE	EVENIT	REPORT	(LEK
	TEXT	CONTINU	INTION	

FACILITY NAME (1)	DOCKET NUMBER (2)	LER NUMBER (6)   PAT: (3)	
		SEQUENTIAL   REVISION	
Sequoyah Nuclear F ant Unit 1	1	YEAR NUMBER NUMBER	
	0150003 2 7	19 12 0 0 1 3 0 0 0 0 4 0F 0 4	ł
TEXT (If more space is required, use addi	tional NRC Form 366A's)	(17)	

IV. Analysis of the Event

Following discovery of the condition, the valves were verified to be in the correct position. These valves were required to be locked or sealed in the open position throughout this timeframe. Configuration control processes ensure that if a valve position is off-normal, it is returned to normal configuration following the evolution requiring the position change. Additionally, redundant fire protection capability is provide. for the RCPs via hose stations. For these reasons, this event did not adversely effect the health and safety of the public.

- V. Corrective Actions
  - A. Immediate Corrective Actions:

The SI implementing the SR was revised on January 28, 1992, to include checking the positions of these values on a 31-day frequency. The SI was performed on Januarv /, 1992, and the values were found in the correct position.

- B. Corrective Actions to Prevent Recurrence:
  - Other SIs will be reviewed for provisions to waive requirements with the unit at power to ensure that compliance is maintained.
  - A TS change is being considered to allow waiving the verification of valve positions for containment valves that are locked, sealed, or otherwise secured based on the safety benefit versus dose expenditure.
- WT. Maitional Information
  - A. Failed Components:

None.

B. Previous Similar Events:

The SI review that was performed in 1986, as previously discussed, was intended to verify the technical adequacy of SIs. This review did not identify this condition based on the same interpretation previously discussed. Similarly, the fire protection improvement plan procedure review followed the "inaccessible" interpretation. Following the 1986 review, no previous events were reported involving an inadequate procedure because of an incorrect interpretation.

VII. Commitment

Other Sis will be reviewed for provisions to waive requirements with the unit at power to ensure compliance is maintained by August 10, 1992.