Northeast Nuclear Energy

Rope Ferry Rd. (Route 156), Waterford, CT 06385

Millstone Nuclear Power Station Northeast Nuclear Energy Company P.O. Box 128 Waterford, CT 06385-0128 (203) 444-4300 Fax (203) 444-4277

The Northeast Utilities System Donald B. Miller Jr., Senior Vice President – Millstone

Re: 10CFR50.73(a)(2)(i) Oct. 23, 1995 MP-95-315

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

Reference: Facility Operating License No. DPR-65 Docket No. 50-336 Licensee Event Report 95-037-00

This lette rorwards Licensee Event Report 95-037-00 required to be submitted within thirty (30) days pursuant to 10 CFR50.73(a)(2)(i).

Very truly yours,

NORTHEAST NUCLEAR ENERGY COMPANY

FOR: Donald B. Miller, Jr. Senior Vice President -- Millstone Station

BY: W

William J. Riffer Director - Millstone Unit 1

DBM/TM:bjo

Attachment: LER 95-037-00

cc: T. T. Martin, Region I Administrator
 P. D. Swetland, Senior Resident Inspector, Millstone Unit Nos. 1, 2, and 3
 G. S. Vissing, NRC Project Manager, Millstone Unit No. 2

270016

9510300016 951023 PDR ADDCK 05000336 S PDR

PARCELITY NAME (1) DOCKET NUMBER (2) DOCKET NUMBER (2) PAGE TITLE (4) Control Rod Technical Specification Surveillance Not Performed OTHER FACILITIES INVOLVED (8) OTHER FACILITIES INVOLVED (8) EVENT DATE (6) LER NUMBER (6) REPORT DATE (7) OTHER FACILITIES INVOLVED (8) Martin Dav Teals Number (7) OTHER FACILITIES INVOLVED (8) Martin Dav TALK Number (7) OTHER FACILITIES INVOLVED (8) Martin Dav THIS REPORT IS BEING SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF 10 CFR §: (Check one or more more negative) 1 THIS REPORT IS BEING SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF 10 CFR §: (Check one or more negative) 50 7388(2)(0) </th <th>NDATOR LESSON AND FE ESTIMAT '-6 F33 555 - 000</th> <th>HIS MANI DRTED LE DOESS AU JRDEN ES NCH (T- DC 2055</th> <th>0/98 PLY WITH TH IRS REPO ENSING PRO GARDING BU EMENT BRA SHINGTON. T</th> <th>04/30 COMF 50.0 H E LICE TS REG (ANAGE N, WAS ROJECT</th> <th>COMMENSE TO REQUEST D INTO TH COMMEN COMMENSE COMMISSIO</th> <th>ER RESP TION RE ORATED RWARD (AND REC TORY CO RK REDU</th> <th>URDEN PE I COLLEC I INCORP ISTRY FO RMATION REGULAT</th> <th>IMATED B ORMATION RNED ARI K TO INDU THE INFO NUCLEAF) TO THE I</th> <th>EST INF LEA BAG TO U.S ANI</th> <th>MISSIO</th> <th></th> <th>(LER)</th> <th>PORT</th> <th>REP</th> <th>U.S. N</th> <th>NSEE</th> <th></th> <th>L</th> <th>(4-95)</th>	NDATOR LESSON AND FE ESTIMAT '-6 F33 555 - 000	HIS MANI DRTED LE DOESS AU JRDEN ES NCH (T- DC 2055	0/98 PLY WITH TH IRS REPO ENSING PRO GARDING BU EMENT BRA SHINGTON. T	04/30 COMF 50.0 H E LICE TS REG (ANAGE N, WAS ROJECT	COMMENSE TO REQUEST D INTO TH COMMEN COMMENSE COMMISSIO	ER RESP TION RE ORATED RWARD (AND REC TORY CO RK REDU	URDEN PE I COLLEC I INCORP ISTRY FO RMATION REGULAT	IMATED B ORMATION RNED ARI K TO INDU THE INFO NUCLEAF) TO THE I	EST INF LEA BAG TO U.S ANI	MISSIO		(LER)	PORT	REP	U.S. N	NSEE		L	(4-95)					
Initiative Proceed Power station Onit 2 0500035 1 0 Control Rod Technical Specification Surveillance Not Performed Other Active Station Surveillance Not Performed Other Active Station Surveillance Not Performed EVENT Date (6) LER NUMBER Report Date (7) Other Active Station Surveillance Not Performed 09 23 95 95 - 037 - 00 10 23 95 Pocific Number Docket Number	(3)	PAGE ((2)		OCKET	D		1	*****		tion 11	and the	ar Dou		Millete	}	NAME (1	FACILIT					
Control Root Technical Specification Surveillance Not Performed EVENT DATE (5) LER NUMBER (6) REPORT DATE (7) OTHER FACILITIES INVOLVED (8) (ARTH DAY E48) READ SUDENTIAL REVENT MAREE DOOKET NUMBER (09) 23 95 95 -037 -00 10 23 95 (00) 1 1 THIS REPORT IS BEING SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF 10 CFR \$: Check one or more or more meaning in the post of the provide in the post of t)F 3	1 OF		336	05000	0					11 2		wer Sta	ar Pov	one Nuclear	MINSTO			TTLE (4					
EVEN DATE (5) LER NUMBER (6) REPORT DATE (7) OTHER FACILITIES INVOLVED (8) IONTH Dav TEAR TEAR SOULETTAL PAULTY NAME DOOKT NUMBER 09 23 95 95 -037 -00 10 23 95 PREATING THIS REPORT IS BEING SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF 10 CFR §: (Check one or more more more more more more more								d	orme	ot Perf	ance M	Surveill	ication	pecific	echnical Spe	Rod Te	ntrol I	Co						
Control Control Control Number Numer Numer		8	KET NUMBE	DOCH	LITIES	FACIL	OTHER	NAME	CILITY		RTDA	REPO	(6) REVISION	BER (SEQUENTIAL	VEAD	E (5)	NT DAT	EVE					
OB 23 95 95 037 00 10 23 95 FACILITY NAME DOCKET NUMBER MODE (9) 1 THIS REPORT IS BEING SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF 10 CFR §: (Check one or more mode (9) 1 20.2201(b) 20.2201(c) X 60.73(c)(2)(b) 50.73(c)(2)(b) 50.73(c)(2)(c) 50.73(c)(2)(b)										EAH	UNT	MONTH	NUMBER	1	NUMBER	TEAN	TEAN	UMT	Quin					
THIS REPORT IS BEING SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF 10 CFR §: (Check one or more more more more more more more		R	KET NUMBE	DOC				NAME	CILITY	95	23	10	00	-	- 037 -	95	95	23	09					
MODE (P) 1 20.201(b) 20.2201(a)(2)(h) X 60.73(a)(2)(h) 50.73(a)(2)(h) DOWER POWER (10) 100 20.2203(a)(1) 20.2203(a)(2)(h) 20.2203(a)(2)(h) 50.73(a)(2)(h) <	(11)	more)	ck one or	(Chec	CFR §:	OF 10 C	ENTS C	UIREM	RE	TTOTH	RSUA	TTED PI	G SUBMI	BEING	REPORT IS BE	THIS P		NG	PERATI					
POWER 100 20 2203(a)(1) 20 2203(a)(3)(6) 50 73(a)(2)(6) 50 73(a)(2)(6) 50 73(a)(2)(6) 57 71 20 2203(a)(2)(6) 20 2203(a)(2)(6) 20 2203(a)(2)(6) 20 2203(a)(2)(6) 73 71 20 2203(a)(2)(6) 73 71 20 2203(a)(2)(6) 20 2203(a)(2)(6) 20 2203(a)(2)(6) 50 73(a)(2)(6) 73 71 20 2203(a)(2)(6) 20 2203(a)(2)(6) 50 36(a)(2) 50 73(a)(2)(6) 0 THER 20 2203(a)(2)(6) 20 2203(a)(2)(6) 50 36(a)(2) 50 73(a)(2)(6) 0 THER 20 2203(a)(2)(6) 50 36(a)(2) 50 73(a)(2)(6) 50 73(a)(2)(6) 0 THER LICENSEE CONTACT FOR THIS LER (12) TELEPHONE NUMBER (PROWER AND FOR EXPECTED (14) TELEPHONE NUMBER (PROWER AND FOR EXPECTED (14) SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) <td cols<="" td=""><td></td><td>viii)</td><td>50.73(a)(2)(</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>2)(1)</td><td>50.73(a)</td><td>X</td><td></td><td>(2) (V)</td><td>20.2203(a</td><td></td><td></td><td>2201 (b)</td><td>20.2</td><td></td><td>9)</td><td>AODE</td></td>	<td></td> <td>viii)</td> <td>50.73(a)(2)(</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>2)(1)</td> <td>50.73(a)</td> <td>X</td> <td></td> <td>(2) (V)</td> <td>20.2203(a</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>2201 (b)</td> <td>20.2</td> <td></td> <td>9)</td> <td>AODE</td>		viii)	50.73(a)(2)(2)(1)	50.73(a)	X		(2) (V)	20.2203(a			2201 (b)	20.2		9)	AODE				
NUMBER 202 2008/08/09 202 2008/08/09 50 7340/20/09 75 71 202 2008/02/09 202 2008/02/09 202 2008/02/09 202 2008/02/09 30 7340/20/09 30 77340/20/09 30 7740/20/09 <		x)	50.73(a)(2)(2)(11)	50.73(a)	-		(3) (1)	20.2263(a			2203(a)(1)	20.2	100		POWE					
Description Description Description Description Description 20203(a)(2)(0) 80.36(c)(1) 80.73(a)(2)(0) S0.73(a)(2)(0) S0.73(73.71				2) (HII)	50.73(a)			(3) (6)	20.2203(8			2203(a)(2)(l)	20.2								
Ideal 2033(a)(2)(h) Bol 30((1) Bol 73(a)(2)(h) Bol 80(12) Bol 73(a)(2)(h) LICENSEE CONTACT FOR THIS LER (12) ILICENSEE CONTACT FOR THIS LER (12) TELEPHONE NUMBER (Indue Arr (203) 4402072 COMPLETE ONE LINE FOR EACH COMPONENT FAILURE DESCRIBED IN THIS REPORT (13) ALSE SYSTEM COMPONENT SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) Y*Ed If yee, complete EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE) No DATE (15) BSTRACT (Limit to 1400 spaces, La, approximately 15 single - spaced hypewritem lines) (16) On September 23, 1995, with the plant in Mode 1 at 100% power, the operating shift determined that a Control Element Assembly (CEA) Technical Specification surveillance requirement was not performed as required on t previous two shifts. The surveillance requires monitoring control rod position indication every 4 hours if the CE Motion Inhibit (CMI) interlock is inoperable. During rod testing the previous day, unit personnel did not identify that the CMI interlock was inoperable. During rod testing the previous day, unit personnel did not identify that the CMI interlock was inoperable. During rod testing the previous day, unit personnel did not identify that the CMI interlock was inoperable. During rod testing the previous day, unit personnel did not identify that the CMI interlock was inoperable. During ro		a balavi	OTHER				2) (iv)	50.73(a)	+		(4)	20.2203 (a			2203(a)(2)(ll)	20.2	-							
B0.300(10) LICENSEE CONTACT FOR THIS LER (12) ILICENSEE CONTACT FOR THIS LER (12) TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include An (203) 440 – 2072 COMPLETE ONE LINE FOR EACH COMPONENT FAILURE DESCRIBED IN THIS REPORT (13) AUSE SYSTEM COMPONENT MANUFACTURER NOPONENT SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE) X No SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE) X No SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE) YE3 ON SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE) MAIL No SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) YE3 MONTH DAY YE3 MONTH DAY SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE) NO SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) DATE (15) ON SUPPLEMENT		66A	NAC Form 3	or in N			Z) (V)	50.73(a)	+	-		50.36(c)(1			2203(a)(2)(II)	20.2								
TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include Arr (203) 440 - 2072 COMPLETE ONE LINE FOR EACH COMPONENT FAILURE DESCRIBED IN THIS REPORT (13) AUSE SYSTEM COMPONENT MANUFACTURER REPORTABLE TO MPROS CAUSE SYSTEM COMPONENT SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE) X NO SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE) X NO SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE) YE3 CAUSE SYSTEM COMPONENT MANUFACTURER REPORTABLE TO MPROS YE3 CAUSE SYSTEM COMPONENT MANUFACTURER REPORTABLE TO APPORTABLE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE) YE3 SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE) YE3 NO SUBMISSION DATE) SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE) SUBMISSION D							Z) (VII)	50.73(a)	12)	GLER	FORT	DNTACT	NSEE CO	LICE	2203(a)(2)(iv)	1202								
Philip J. Lutzi, Nuclear Licensing (203) 440 – 2072 COMPLETE ONE LINE FOR EACH COMPONENT FAILURE DESCRIBED IN THIS REPORT (13) AUSE SYSTEM COMPONENT MANUFACTURER REPORTABLE AUSE SYSTEM COMPONENT MANUFACTURER REPORTABLE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE) X NO SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE) X NO SUBMISSION DATE) X MONTH DATE (15) MONTH DATE (15) DATE (15) MONTH DATE (15) SUBMISSION DATE)	ea Code)	lude Area	UMBER (Ind	ONE N	TELEPH	L													ME					
COMPLETE ONE LINE FOR EACH COMPONENT FAILURE DESCRIBED IN THIS REPORT (13) AUSE SYSTEM COMPONENT MANUFACTURER REPORTABLE TO NPRDS CAUSE SYSTEM COMPONENT MANUFACTURER REP TO SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE (15) MONTH DAY YE3 (1 yes. complete EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE) X No SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE (15) BSTRACT (Umit to 1400 space. La., approximately 15 single-spaced typewriten lines) (16) No DAY DAY On September 23, 1995, with the plant in Mode 1 at 100% power, the operating shift determined that a Control Element Assembly (CEA) Technical Specification surveillance requirement was not performed as required on the previous two shifts. The surveillance requires monitoring control rod position indication every 4 hours if the CE Motion Inhibit (CMI) interlock is inoperable. During rod testing the previous day, unit personnel did not identify that the CMI interlock was inoperable when a control rod's indication malfunctioned so the surveillance was not implemented. The cause of this event was determined to be a procedural deficiency in that the Abnormal Operating Procedur (AOP) for CEAs did not address CMI operability in the section on control rod indication problems. Communications and shift turnover issues were also addressed. Contributing causes were a lack of debriefing, communication problems, and Technical Specification		072	440-20	203) 4	(2								nsing	Licen	i, Nuclear Lic	J. Lutzi	hilip J	P						
AUSE SYSTEM COMPONENT MANUFACTURER REPORTABLE TO MPROS CAUSE SYSTEM COMPONENT MANUFACTURER REP TO SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) EXPECTED SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE (15) MONTH DAY SUBMISSION DATE (15) MONTH DAY SUBMISSION DATE (15) BSTRACT (Umit to 1400 spaces, Le, approximately 16 single - spaced typewriten lines) (16) SUBMISSION DATE (15) MONTH DAY SUBMISSION DATE (15) On September 23, 1995, with the plant in Mode 1 at 100% power, the operating shift determined that a Control Element Assembly (CEA) Technical Specification surveillance requirement was not performed as required on the previous two shifts. The surveillance requires monitoring control rod position indication every 4 hours if the CE Motion Inhibit (CMI) interlock is inoperable. During rod testing the previous day, unit personnel did not identify that the CMI interlock was inoperable when a control rod's indication malfunctioned so the surveillance was not implemented. The cause of this event was determined to be a procedural deficiency in that the Abnormal Operating Procedur (AOP) for CEAs did not address CMI operability in the section on control rod indication problems. Communications and shift turnover issues were also addressed. Contributing causes were a lack of debriefing, communication problems, and Technical Specification					r (13)	PORT	HIS RE	ED IN T	CRIE	JRE DE	T FAIL	MPONE	ACH CO	FORE	ONE LINE FOI	APLETE	CON							
SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE (15) YE3 (If yea, complete EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE) X NO DATE (15) BSTRACT (Umit to 1400 spaces, Le., approximately 15 single – spaced typewritten lines) (16) DATE (15) DATE (15) On September 23, 1995, with the plant in Mode 1 at 100% power, the operating shift determined that a Control Element Assembly (CEA) Technical Specification surveillance requirement was not performed as required on the previous two shifts. The surveillance requires monitoring control rod position indication every 4 hours if the CE Motion Inhible (CMI) interlock is inoperable. During rod testing the previous day, unit personnel did not identify that the CMI interlock was inoperable when a control rod's indication malfunctioned so the surveillance was not implemented. The cause of this event was determined to be a procedural deficiency in that the Abnormal Operating Procedur (AOP) for CEAs did not address CMI operability in the section on control rod indication problems. Communications and shift turnover issues were also addressed. Contributing causes were a lack of debriefing, communication problems, and Technical Specification	ORTABL	REPO	TUREE	MANUSACTURE		NENT	COMPO	AUSE SYSTEM CON		CAU		TABLE	REPOR		MANUFACTUR	PONENT	COM	SYSTEM	AUSE					
SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) EXPECTED YE3 NO DATE (15) If yes, complete EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE) X NO DATE (15) BSTRACT (Limit to 1400 spaces, Le., approximately 15 single-spaced typewritten lines) (16) On September 23, 1995, with the plant in Mode 1 at 100% power, the operating shift determined that a Control Element Assembly (CEA) Technical Specification surveillance requirement was not performed as required on the previous two shifts. The surveillance requires monitoring control rod position indication every 4 hours if the CE Motion Inhibit (CMI) interlock is inoperable. During rod testing the previous day, unit personnel did not identify that the CMI interlock was inoperable when a control rod's indication malfunctioned so the surveillance was not implemented. The cause of this event was determined to be a procedural deficiency in that the Abnormal Operating Procedur (AOP) for CEAs did not address CMI operability in the section on control rod indication problems. Communications and shift turnover issues were also addressed. Contributing causes were a lack of debriefing, communication problems, and Technical Specification		101	- Turtur				ICITI MA						SC 5151	136 5										
SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) EXPECTED SUBMISSION MONTH DAY YE3 (If yes, complete EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE) X NO DATE (15) Image: Submission Date (15) Image: Submission Date (15) Image: Submission Date (15) Image: D																								
SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14) EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE) MONTH DAY YES NO SUBMISSION DATE (15) MONTH DAY BSTRACT (Umit to 1400 spaces, 1.e., approximately 15 single – spaced typewritten lines) (16) On September 23, 1995, with the plant in Mode 1 at 100% power, the operating shift determined that a Control Element Assembly (CEA) Technical Specification surveillance requirement was not performed as required on the previous two shifts. The surveillance requires monitoring control rod position indication every 4 hours if the CEM Motion Inhibit (CMI) interlock is inoperable. During rod testing the previous day, unit personnel did not identify that the CMI interlock was inoperable when a control rod's indication malfunctioned so the surveillance was not implemented. The cause of this event was determined to be a procedural deficiency in that the Abnormal Operating Procedur (AOP) for CEAs did not address CMI operability in the section on control rod indication problems. Communications and shift turnover issues were also addressed. Contributing causes were a lack of debriefing, communication problems, and Technical Specification																								
YE3 NO EXPECTED If yes. complete EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE) X NO DATE (15) BSTRACT (Umit to 1400 spaces, i.e., approximately 15 single-spaced typewritten lines) (16) On September 23, 1995, with the plant in Mode 1 at 100% power, the operating shift determined that a Control Element Assembly (CEA) Technical Specification surveillance requirement was not performed as required on the previous two shifts. The surveillance requires monitoring control rod position indication every 4 hours if the CE Motion Inhibit (CMI) interlock is inoperable. During rod testing the previous day, unit personnel did not identify that the CMI interlock was inoperable when a control rod's indication malfunctioned so the surveillance was not implemented. The cause of this event was determined to be a procedural deficiency in that the Abnormal Operating Procedur (AOP) for CEAs did not address CMI operability in the section on control rod indication problems. Communications and shift turnover issues were also addressed. Contributing causes were a lack of debriefing, communication problems, and Technical Specification	YEA	DAY	MONTH							1)	TED (TEXPE	REPOR	ENTAL	SUPPLEMEN									
If yes, complete EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE) X DATE (15) IBSTRACT (Umit to 1400 space, i.e., approximately 15 single -spaced typewritten lines) (16) On September 23, 1995, with the plant in Mode 1 at 100% power, the operating shift determined that a Control Element Assembly (CEA) Technical Specification surveillance requirement was not performed as required on the previous two shifts. The surveillance requires monitoring control rod position indication every 4 hours if the CE Motion Inhibit (CMI) interlock is inoperable. During rod testing the previous day, unit personnel did not identify that the CMI interlock was inoperable when a control rod's indication malfunctioned so the surveillance was not implemented. The cause of this event was determined to be a procedural deficiency in that the Abnormal Operating Procedur (AOP) for CEAs did not address CMI operability in the section on control rod indication problems. Communications and shift turnover issues were also addressed. Contributing causes were a lack of debriefing, communication problems, and Technical Specification		JBMISSION			SUE				./	NO		L TILLY OF	to r t r t to				8	1 18						
 On September 23, 1995, with the plant in Mode 1 at 100% power, the operating shift determined that a Control Element Assembly (CEA) Technical Specification surveillance requirement was not performed as required on the previous two shifts. The surveillance requires monitoring control rod position indication every 4 hours if the CE Motion Inhibit (CMI) interlock is inoperable. During rod testing the previous day, unit personnel did not identify that the CMI interlock was inoperable when a control rod's indication malfunctioned so the surveillance was not implemented. The cause of this event was determined to be a procedural deficiency in that the Abnormal Operating Procedu (AOP) for CEAs did not address CMI operability in the section on control rod indication problems. Communications and shift turnover issues were also addressed. Contributing causes were a lack of debriefing, communication problems, and Technical Specification 				5)	DATE (18	D						×		()	EMISSION DATE)	CTED SUE	ieia EXPE	/es. comp	01					
This event is being reported pursuant to the requirements of 10CFR50.73(a)(2)(i), a condition prohibited by the plant's Technical Specifications.	e	ontrol l on th ne CE/ entify as not cedur	hat a Co equired burs if th d not idd ance wa ting Pro- tion	ed th as re 4 ho el dic veilla ms. ficati	etermin formed n every ersonne the sui mal Op proble I Speci ndition	ift deta perfo ation nit per d so t bnorn ation p anical a cond	ing shi ras not n indic day, ur ctioned t the Al i indica d Tech (2) (i), a	operat ment w positio evious malfun in tha trol roc ms, an 0.73(a)	the uire rod e pro- tion ency con oble	powe nce re- contro sting the indica d defice tion or essed. ation p of 100	t 100% inveilla toring rod te bl rod cedur he se o add munic	ode 1 a ation s as mon During a contr be a pro bility in vere als ng, com	ant in M Specific erable. e when ned to t l operat ssues v lebriefir	e plan ical S lance inope arable ermin CMI over is k of de	95. with the p EA) Technica The surveillan Interlock is ind was inopera I was deterr ot address C I shift turnove were a lack o ported pursu cifications.	23, 199 ibly (Cl iifts. TI CMI) in erlock is ever did not ns and iuses w bing rep al Spec	mber : kssem wo sh nibit ((MI inte ted. CEAs cation ng ca tion. t is be chnica	Septer ment A vious t ion Int the C lemen cause P) for nmuni ntributi rpreta s even nt's Ter	On Ele pre Mo tha imp (AC Col inte Thi pla					

A.125.0		-	200	14.1
INPEC.	- P*O	nn.	3058	272
1.47.54			000	
(Acres)	151			

i.

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER) TEXT CONTINUATION

FACILITY NAME (1)	DOCKET NUMBER (2)		LE	PAC					
		YEAR	S	NUMBER	L	REVISION NUMBER			
Millstone Nuclear Power Station Unit 2	05000336	95	_	037	_	00	02	OF	03

TEXT (If more space is required, use additional copies of NRC Form 366A) (17)

Description of Event

On September 23, 1995, with the plant in Mode 1 at 100% power, the operating shift determined that a Control Element Assembly (CEA) Technical Specification surveillance requirement was not performed as required on the previous two shifts. The surveillance requires monitoring control rod position indication every 4 hours if the CEA Motion Inhibit (CMI) interlock is inoperable. During rod testing the previous day, unit personnel did not identify that the CMI interlock was inoperable when a control rod's indication malfunctioned so the surveillance was not implemented. When the problem was identified, the operating shift logged into the applicable Technical Specification Action Statement (TSAS) which required that the malfunctioning control rod's position be verified every 4 hours using redundant backup indication. The malfunctioning control rod indication was repaired later that day and the TSAS was exited.

Background Information

On September 22, 1995, during day shift unit personnel were conducting testing in accordance with Control Element Drive System surveillance procedures. SP 2620A, "CEA Partial Movement" verifies that all CEAs are capable of moving properly at least 10 steps. IC 2411A, "CEA Motion Inhibit Verification" checks that a CEA group deviation generates a CMI.

During testing, a control rod was determined to be inoperable because its Control Element Assembly Position Display System (CEAPDS) signal was not indicating actual rod motion as compared with redundant control rod position indication. The operating shift referred to CEA Malfunction Abnormal Operating Procedure (AOP), section 4.5, "Inoperable CEA Position Indication." In accordance with the guidance in section 4.5, Operations personnel verified that the control rod was fully out using backup indication. However, section 4.5 does not address the CEA Motion Inhibit interlock associated with a control rod problem. CMI is discussed in section 4.6, "Inoperable CEA Motion Inhibit." Consequently, the operating shift did not implement the required Technical Specification surveillance to verify the position of the malfunctioning control rod every four hours.

The resolution of the individual control rod problem was deferred to the end of the control rods testing. However, at the end of the testing at 1500 hours, no formal debriefing took place between personnel conducting the testing and the need to specifically identify how the control rod indication would be repaired was not discussed.

During the swing shift turnover briefing, when the status of the CEA testing was discussed, the offgoing Shift Supervisor incorrectly indicated to all shift personnel that all testing was complete and no remaining problems existed. The swing shift CO interpreted this to mean that he did not have to log the control rod position on the Control Room Shiftly Checks surveillance using the backup indication. Consequently, this was not done on the swings or the mid shift. The swing shift on September 22, 1995 believed that no open items existed relative to the CEA testing that occurred that day.

II. Cause of Event

This event occurred because the CEA malfunctions AOP did not address CMI operability in the section on control rod indication problems. The procedure section on control rod indication problems did not address the correlation between the control rod indication problem and its effect on CMI operability. Unit personnel identified the problem the next day. By then, the requirement to perform the required Technical Specification surveillance had been violated. If the AOP had addressed the potential impact of a rod failure on CMI in the referenced section and then directed Operators to another section, the need to perform the surveillance would have been identified. Contributing causes were a lack of debriefing communications problems, and Technical Specification interpretation.

NF	RC	For	m	366A	
14	-0	5)			

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER) TEXT CONTINUATION

FACILITY NAME (1)	DOCKET NUMBER (2)		1.5	R NUMBE	PA				
		YEAR	8	NUMBER	VL I	REVISION			
Millstone Nuclear Power Station Unit 2	05000336	95	-	037	-	00	03	OF	03

TEXT (If more space is required, use additional copies of NRC Form 366A) (17)

III. Analysis of Event

This event is being reported pursuant to the requirements of 10CFR50.73(a) (2) (i), a condition prohibited by the plant's Technical Specifications. In accordance with Technical Specification surveillance requirement 4.1.3.1.1, if the CEA deviation circuit and/or CEA motion Inhibit are inoperable, then the position of each CEA shall be determined to be within 10 steps of all other CEAs in its group at least once per 4 hours. This did not occur for approximately 20 hours.

No control rod misalignments resulted during the period when the surveillances were missed. If the malfunctioning control rod had inserted and CEAPDS did not indicate this misalignment, a number of features of the Control Element Drive System would have alerted Operators to this condition. The core mimic upper electrical limit light would no longer be lit, core power distribution measurements would be affected by the rod misalignment, the plant computer would provide continuous alarm functions and alarms would occur on control panel C-04.

IV. Corrective Action

- (AOP) 2556, "CEA Malfunctions" vill be revised to ensure that CMI is considered during CEA position indication troubleshooting. Other enhancements are also planned during procedure revision.
- <u>Need for debriefing</u>: At the end of the CEA testing, a formal debriefing should have been performed to provide the status of the testing and to determine the resolution of any open items. The Operations Department is developing more specific criteria for debriefing.
- <u>Communications problems</u>: The communications problems and lessons learned have been presented to Operations personnel in a shift briefing.
- <u>Training</u>: The Unit 2 Operations Training Department was requested to provide training on the Technical Specifications associated with this event. The training will describe potential operational problems related to CEA Technical Specifications and discuss the appropriate TSAS and surveillance requirements.

V. Additional Information

Related Events: In the past, Millstone Station has missed scheduled Technical Specification surveillances. This problem is different in that the surveillance was missed due to failure to identify the need to log into a Technical Specification Action Statement and then perform the required surveillances.