NRC Form 9-83)	300									u	ICE	ENSE	E EVE	INT RE	PORT	LER)		ł	U		PRRO			0 3150-01	
ACILITY	NAME	(1)								-	-							- 1	DOCKE							GE (3)
-	_			Ind.	ian	Po:	int	: NO		3							_	1	0 15	0	10	0	2	8 6	1 0	013
	1.1			Inm				afe		0.14		tion														
EVI	INT DA	TE		T	EVIC		-	BERI	-	Que	T		NORT DA	TE (7)			OTH	ER	FACIL	TIES	INVO	LVED	(8) C			
MONTH DAY						SEQUENTIAL				NUMBER	ON	MONTH	DAY	YEAR		FACILITY NAME				**			CKET	NUMBI	R(S)	
		$^{+}$				NUMBER										1.1	1.1					0	151	0 1 0	101	11
0 7	1 10		8 4	8	4	-0	13	10	-	00	0	0 7	1 6	8 4								0	151	010		
	RATING	-	+	THE	S REPO	DAT IS	-	MITTE	DPU	REUAN	IT TI	O THE R	EQUIREN	ENTE OF 1	0 CFR &: /0	Sweek or		-	of the	ollow	ingi (1	-			1.1	
	DE (9)		N		20.40	2(6)						20.406	e)			80.73	Ha)(2)(ies .					73.	71(6)		
POWER			L	20.405(a)(1)(i)				50.36(e)(1) 50.734					4.)(2)(71(e)						
(10)	- 1	1	010	-	-	Sia){1	1.000			H	_	80.38is					Ha)(2)(X	- bai	ow and I	n Text, NI	tC Form
				-		36ia)(1				H	-	60.73k			-		Ka)(2)(366	ia)		
				-	-	D6(a)(1				H	x	60.734			-		Sia)(2)(Day	t 2	1	
								-			L	CENSEE	CONTAC	T FOR THE	LER (12)			_				-				
NAME																			L		ODE	_	EPHO	NE NUN	IBER	
	Jo	hn	ı J.	An	der	son																1		~		
		-				-	~~~		-		109	EACH C			DESCRIBE			-	_	_	4	1/	131	91.	1812	010
		T			T	-		-	T	ORTAB	-				T				1	-		T	EPOR			
CAUSE	SYSTEM		COM	PONENT MANUFAC-			TO NPRDS					CAUS	SYSTEM	CON	COMPONENT		MANUFAC-			TO N						
		T							T													T				
	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	_	_				1	1	1	1	-		1	+				
					.										1.											
		1		1	11	-	-	-	INTA		TRO	EXPECT	ID (14)		11		-	1	+		_	1		MONT	DAY	YEAR
								LEM		L HEFS		T							1	SU	MISS	ION		MONT	UAT	TEAN
YE	\$ (If you	, co		EXPE	CTED S	UBMI	5101	DAT	E)			x	NO							0	ATE	15)			11	11
	L H	ab	F ora t R	oll	owin y,	ng a p Sy	pi	revi blem.	Lou m v	s c was Duri	dis po	our	ions ated eva	on J luatio	the uly 10 on, NY	D, 1 PA 1	.984 reco	ogr	onc	ern	tha	g t	the a p	Res	idual	1

Heat Removal System. During our evaluation, NYPA recognized that a postulated loss of Station Battery 32 with a concurrent loss of coolant accident may prevent the automatic starting of some redundant safeguards equipment and thus not meet single failure criteria required in General Design Criteria (GDC 35). A change to plant equipment was developed and installed immediately to alleviate this concern. The NRC was notified of a potential unreviewed safety question. Subsequently NYPA determined that the problem was an unreviewed safety question. However, the installed change relieved this concern and brought the plant into compliance with GDC 35.

This LER also serves to satisfy the requirements of 10CFR21.

8407240507 840716 PDR ADOCK 05000286

PDR

19-83) LICENSEE EVENT	REPORT (LER) TEXT CONTINU	ORT (LER) TEXT CONTINUATION							
FACILITY NAME (1)	DOCKET NUMBER (2)		LER NUMBER (6)		PAGE (3)				
		YEAR	SEQUENTIAL	REVISION					
Indian Point No. 3	0 5 0 0 2 8 6	8 4 -	- 0 1 0	-010	0 2 0	0 3			

On July 2, 1984 discussions were initiated with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and Brookhaven National Laboratory concerning a postulated loss of Station Battery 32. On July 10, 1984 further discussions took place which identified a potential failure to comply with the single failure criteria as defined in GDC 35. During our evaluation of this problem, NYPA recognized that a postulated loss of Station Battery 32 with a concurrent loss of coolant accident may result in the prevention of some redundant trains of safeguards equipment from starting automatically. In particular Residual Heat Removal (RHR) pumps 31 and 32, Auxiliary Boiler Feed Pumps (ABFP) 31 and 33, and selected essential Service Water (SW) Pumps either 35 and 36 or 33 might fail to start automatically. The scenario that develops centers on the loss of two of the four safety related 480 volt electrical buses (3A and 6A). By way of an example the situation concerning the RHR pumps is cited.

RHR pump 31 is powered from 480v Bus 3A and RHR pump 32 is powered from 480v Bus 6A. Control power is supplied to Bus 3A from DC Bus 33 and to Bus 6A from DC Bus 32. DC Bus 33 is normally supplied from Station Battery 33 and DC Bus 32 is normally supplied from Station Battery 32. With the postulated failure of Station Battery 32 the DC Bus 32 would then be supplied power from Battery Charger 32 via Motor Control Center (MCC) 37. An ESS actuation removes non-essential loads from all 480 volt buses. MCC-37 would then be stripped from Bus 6A causing a loss of power to Battery Charger 32 with a subsequent loss of DC Bus 32. RHR pump 32 will not start automatically due to the loss of control power to Bus 6A. RHR pump 31 will start automatically during the normal safeguards loading sequence, but will trip when the 6.9 KV bus fast transfer is initiated from the unit transformer to the station transformer for 480 volt safeguards buses 2A and 3A. Bus 2A will have a successful transfer to the 6.9 KV bus 5. Bus 3A will become de-energized since the transfer to the 6.9 KV bus 6 will not occur due to the loss of control power from failed DC Bus 32 to the tie-breaker UT3-ST6. Even though Bus 2A has a tie-breaker to Bus 3A, it will not automatically close because of an interlock which prevents closure when its associated Diesel Generator supply breaker 52/EG1 is not closed. Thus manual action would be necessary to start both RHR pumps.

As a result of this scenario, NYPA developed a change immediately which would ensure compliance with GDC-35. A "jumper" was installed on July 10, 1984 across the contacts 29 and 30 in Diesel Generator 31 output breaker (52/EG1) which provides for a permissive signal to close the tie-breaker 2AT3A on an undervoltage condition on bus 3A. This allows Bus 2A to supply Bus 3A automatically from the Station Service Transformer No. 2 should normal power to bus 3A become unavailable. Loading on bus 2A is administratively limited to preclude overloading Station Service Transformer No. 2 if it is required to supply both buses 2A and 3A due to an undervoltage on Bus 3A. During a blackout condition normal sequencing will occur and Diesel Generator No. 31 will supply power to both buses 2A and 3A as per the original design.

9-83) LICENSEE EVENT F	REPORT (LER) TEXT CONTINU	IATIO	N	0.8.1		GULATORY COMMISSION OMB NO. 3150-0104 31/85				
ACILITY NAME (1)	DOCKET NUMBER (2)		LE	ER NUMBER (6)			PAGE (3)			
		YEAR		SEQUENTIAL		UMBER		Π		
Indian Point No. 3	0 5 0 0 0 2 8 6	8 4	_	0 1 0	-0	010	0 3	OF	0 3	

The NRC was then notified of the potential unreviewed safety question and of the change to alleviate this concern. A safety evaluation concluded that this corrective action does not involve an unreviewed safety question.

On July 11, 1984, NYPA determined that the postulated scenario was an unreviewed safety question and Westinghouse concurred that the change installed is acceptable from a safety standpoint and ensures compliance with GDC-35. NYPA and Westinghouse are further reviewing the corrective action taken.

Performance of the reactor was not affected by this incident. No similar events have been reported to date.

This LER also serves to satisfy the requirements of 10CFR21.

Indian Point 3 Nuclear Power Plant P.O. Box 215 Buchanan, New York 10511 914 739.8200



July 16, 1984 IP-FWG-2854

Docket No. 50-286 License No. DPR-64

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

Dear Sir:

The attached Licensee Event Report LER 84-010-00 is hereby submitted in accordance with the requirements of 10CFR50.73. This event is of the type defined in Paragraph 50.73(a)(2)(ii)(B).

Very truly yours,

John C. Brons Resident Manager

FWG/bam Attachment

cc: Dr. Thomas Murley
Regional Administrator
Region 1
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
631 Park Avenue
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406

Mr. Leroy W. Sinclair New York Power Authority 123 Main Street White Plains, New York 10601

IP3 Resident Inspectors' Office J. P. Bayne, WPO G. M. Wilverding (SRC), WPO

INPO Records Center Suite 1500 1100 Circle 75 Parkway Atlanta, Georgia 30339

LEZZ