LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER)

ESTIMATED BURDEN PER RESPONSE TO COMPLY WIT THIS INFORMATION COLLECTION PEQUEST SO 0 HRS FORWARD COMMENTS REGARDING GUNDEN ESTIMATE TO THE RECORDS AND REPORTS MANAGEMENT BRANCH (F-530): U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON DC 20555. AND TO THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION PROJECT (3150-0104): OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET WASHINGTON DC 20503.

ACILITY !	HAME (1)			-210000			STREET SPECIAL			AN A THE RESIDENCE AND ADDRESS.	000	KET NUMBER	(2)		PAG	(3)
		Pe	rry	Nuc l	ear Powe	r Plant	, Un	1 21			0	15 0 0	0 4	4 10	1 OF	0 15
17 LE (4)		itro	1 Ro	od Sc	SECURITION OF THE PARTY OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF T	ertion T	ime	Testi			in Discove	ry of Co	mmon	Mode		
EVEN	T DATE	FREEDOM ROS		NAME OF STREET	ER NUMBER IS	arrant transcent and op-	emiles venion-en	PORT	Constitution of the Consti	-	CONTRACTOR OF STREET	CILITIES INVO	VED (8)	AND RESIDENCE OF THE PARTY OF	-	
HONTH	DAY	YEAR	YE	RA	SEQUENTIAL	MEVISION NUMBER	REVISION MONTH DAY YE			FACILITY MAMES			DOCKET NUMBERISI			
				NUMBER NUMBER					-	*			0 5 0 0 0 1			
10	0 6	9	9	-	0 1 8	0 1	0 4	1 6	9 2				0 5	0 0	0	
	ATING		THE	REMOR	T IS SUBMITTE	D PURBUANT T	O THE R	LOUIREM	ENTS OF 10	GF# 9 /C/	teck are ar mare of	inu tariawingi (1	1).			
MOC	DE 191			20 402	(6)		20.406	(e)		The control of	50.73(a)(2)(i+)		22	1.731bi		
POWER				20.406	Said THO		50.36(e)111			X 50.79(a)(2)(v)			73,71 isi			
1101 0 8 4 29.406(4)111(4)				X 50.73(a+(211)) 50.73(a+(21))			56 73iai(21(vii)	record SWCW		OTHER (Specify in Adstract Swow and in Taxt NRC Form						
20.408(a)(1)(iii)							X			50.73(a)(2)(vei)(A)						
20.406(a)(1)(liv)							50.73(4)(21(mir)(8)									
				20.406	(a)(1)(v)		50.736	18(215)60			50.73(s)(2)(x)					
							ICEMBEE	CONTACT	FOR THIS	LER (12)						
NAME													TELEPHI	ONE NUM	, ER	
												AREA CODE				
Н	enry	T.	Hez	rat.	Complia	nce Engi	neer	Ext	ension	5 85		2 11 16	2 5	19.1-	1317	13 1 7
					COMPLETE	ONE LINE FOR	EACH C	OMPONEN	Y PAILURE	DESCRIBE	D IN THIS REPORT	1131				
CAUSE	SYSTEM	co	MPONE	NT	WANUFAC. TURSA	REPORTABLE TO NPROS			CAUSE	SYSTEM	COMPONENT	MANUFAC TURKR		ATABLE NPROS		
X	AIA	P	SI I		A 1 5 1 1 1 0	Vac										
-	-	-	-	and the street of the street o		165	-	-	-						-	******
					111											
	tryuser/samue	of the second	and a second	-	SUPPL EM	ENTAL REPOR	T EXPEC	TED (14)	washing and the same of the sa	Mary where man	the same of the sa	A to p. a. a.	ero.	MONTH	PAY	YEAR
				eren e	AMISSION DAT			V NO		Maria Socialismos de		SUBMISS DATE	SION			
-	K MARIO HORSES	-	n consideration	ments where the	MANISTON DAT	Marketin Co. Statement	-		-		-	-	-		-	-

On October 6, 1991, at 1037, control rod 46-23 exceeded its maximum scram time to position 43. Operators then took action to demonstrate that the eight adjacent control rods surrounding control rod 46-23 could satisfy the maximum scram insertion time limits. Control rod 42-19 also exceeded its maximum scram insertion time to position 43. Because control rods 46-23 and 42-19 are adjacent rods, the plant was required by Technical Specifications to be in at least Hot Shutdown within 12 hours. On October 6, 1991, at 1436, operators commenced a shutdown of the plant.

The cause of the "slow" control rods is attributed to component failure. The Automatic Switch Company (ASCO) Model Number HVA176-816-1 Scram Solenoid Pilot Valve (SSPV) for each of the affected control rods was determined to be the cause of the "slow" control rods. A combination of contaminants found on the valve disk and seats is believed to have formed an adhesive which could have bound the valve seat. All of the suspect SSPVs were from the same lot remanufactured by ASCO in November, 1990.

After shutdown of the plant, all 49 of the SSPVs from lot number 184010001 were removed from their associated HCUs and replaced. A maintenance instruction will be revised to further restrict the contaminants that may have been introduced at Perry. As part of the established requalification training program, all plant licensed operators will be instructed on the lessons learned from this event.

APPROVED OMB NO 3150-0104 EXPIRES 4/30/92

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER) TEXT CONTINUATION

ESTIMATED BURDEN PER RESPONSE TO COMPLY WITH THIS INFORMATION COLLECTION REQUEST 500 HRS FORWARD COMMENTS REQUADING BURDEN ESTIMATE TO THE RECORDS AND REPORTS MANAGEMENT BRANCH IP \$30! US NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON DC 20585 AND TO THE PARENWORK REDUCTION PROJECT (3)50-0104 OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET WASHINGTON DC 20503.

FACILITY NAME (1)	DOCKET NUMBER (2)	UN NUMBER (6)	*AGE (3)		
		YEAR SEQUENTIAL REVISION NUMBER			
Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1	0 5 0 0 0 4 4 0	9 1 - 0 1 1 8 - 0 1 0	12 OF 0 5		

TEXT (If more space is required, use edutional NRC Form 2664's) 1171

I. Introduction

On October 6, 1991, at 2334, operators completed a shutdown of the plant in accordance with Technical Specifications as a result of two adjacent control rods exceeding maximum insertion scram time limits. At the time of the control rod scram time failures, the plant was in Operational Condition 1 (Power Operation) at 84 percent of rated thermal power, with the Reactor Pressure Vessel [RPV] at saturated conditions at approximately 1000 psig. The required non-emergency four-hour notifications were made to the NRC pursuant to the requirements of 10CFR50.72(b)(2)(iii) and (b)(1)(i)(A). This event is being reported under the requirements of 10CFR50.73(a)(2)(i), (a)(2)(v) and (a)(2)(vii).

II. Description of Event

On July 20, 1991, at 1055, while performing Surveillance Instruction (SVI-C11-T1006) "Control Rod Maximum Scram Insertion Time", control rod 26-59 exceeded its maximum scram time to position 43. Technical Specification 3.1.3.2 prescribes a maximum insertion time to notch position 43 of 0.31 seconds. The time to notch position 43 for control rod 26-59 was 0.32 seconds. This resulted in control rod 26-59 being classified in accordance with Technical Specification 3.1.3.2 Action a.1 as "slow".

Operators then took action to demonstrate that the adjacent control rods surrounding control rod 26-59 could satisfy the maximum scram insertion time limits in accordance with Technical Specification 3.1.3.2 Action c. After successful testing of the eight adjacent rods, testing of other control rods continued. The Scram Solenoid Pilot Valve [PSV] (SSPV) was replaced and control rod 26-59 was successfully retested. As a result of this event, scram time testing frequency was increased.

On October 6, 1991, at 0445, while performing SVI-Cl1-Tl006, control rod 26-19 exceeded its maximum scram time to position 43. The time to notch position 43 for control rod 26-19 was 0.38 seconds. This resulted in control rod 26-19 being classified in accordance with Technical Specification 3.1.3.2 Action a.1 as "slow".

Operators then took action to demonstrate that the eight adjacent control rods surrounding control rod 26-19 could satisfy the maximum scram insertion time limits in accordance with Technical Specification 3.1.3.2 Action c. After successful testing of the eight adjacent rods, testing of other control rods continued.

On October 6, 1991, at 1037, control rod 46-23 exceeded its maximum scram time to position 43. The time to notch position 43 for control rod 46-23 was 0.37 seconds. This resulted in control rod 46-23 being classified as "slow". Operators then took action to demonstrate that the eight adjacent control rods surrounding control rod 46-23 could satisfy the maximum scram insertion

MRC FORM 388A

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

EXPIRES 4/30/92

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER) TEXT CONTINUATION

ESTIMATED BURDEN PER RESPONSE TO COMPLY WITH THINFORMATION COLLECTION REQUEST 50.0 HRS. FORWAR COMMENTS REGARDING BURDEN ESTIMATE TO THE RECORD AND REPORTS MANAGEMENT SHANCH (F-530). U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON DC 20555. AND THE PAPENWORK REDUCTION PROJECT (3150-0104) (7FFIC OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, WASHINGTON, DC 2050)

		THE RESIDENCE AND ADDRESS OF THE PERSON OF T	MARKET STREET, SQUARE,		
FACILITY NAME (1)	DOCKET NUMBER (2)	LER NUMBER (6)	PAGE (3)		
		YEAR SECUENTIAL MEVISION NUMBER			
Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1	0 5 0 0 0 4 4 0	911-0118-011	013 00 0 15		
YEXT Iff more space is required, use additional NAC Form 3664'si (17)					

time limits. On October 6, 1991, at 1150, control rod 42-19 also exceeded its maximum scram insertion time to position 43. The time to notch position 43 for control rod 42-19 was 0.32 seconds which resulted in this control rod being classified as "slow". Because control rods 46-23 and 42-19 are adjacent rods, the plant was required by Technical Specification 3.1.3.2 Action a.4 to be in at least Hot Shutdown within 12 hours. The failure of the three hydraulic control units (HCUs) associated with the "slow" control rods was considered to be a common mode failure and was reported to the NRC via the Emergency Notification System (ENS) at 1313. On October 6, 1991, at 1436, operators commenced the plant shutdown, and at 1443, notified the NRC via the ENS. Operational Condition 3 (Hot Shutdown) was entered on October 6, 1991, at 2334.

III. Cause of Event

The cause of the "slow" control rods is attributed to component failure. The Automatic Switch Company (ASCO) Model Number RVA176-816-1 SSPV for each HCU of the affected control rods was determined to be the cause of the "slow" control rods. All four of the SSPVs were from the same lot number (184010001) ordered October 15, 1990 and remanufactured by ASCO exclusively for the Perry Plant on November 9, 1990. Initial examination of the internals of the SSPVs for control rod HCUs 42-19 and 46-23 did not reveal a specific reason for the malfunctions. The valves operated but not fast enough to meet requirements; therefore, physical evidence of the cause of the malfunction was not readily apparent.

On April 1, 1992, General Electric (GE) completed a failure analysis of the affected SSPVs, using infrared measurement techniques on contaminant samples found inside the valves. The valve disk and seats were found to be contaminated with slight traces of a chlorinated or chlorofluorinated solvent, silicone lubricant, alcohol, Dioctyl Phthalate (a plasticizer found in Buna-N material), nylon (an embedded fiber in the Buna-N diaphragm) and a polymethacrylate ester (threadlocker). The combination of these chemicals can form two types of adhesives (migrating and non-migrating) which could bind the valve seat and cause slow shifting.

IV. Analysis of Event

The control rod system is designed to bring the reactor subcritical at a rate fast enough to prevent the Minimum Critical Power Ratio (MPCR) from becoming less than 1.07 during the limiting power transient analyzed in Chapter 15 of the USAR. This analysis shows that the negative reactivity rates resulting from the scram with the average response of all the drives as given in the specifications, provide the required protection and MPCR remains greater than 1.07. The occurrence of scram times longer than those specified should be viewed as an indication of a systematic problem with the rod drives.

NRC FORM 366A

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

APPROVED OMB NO 3150-0104. EXPIRES 4/30/92

TEXT CONTINUATION

ESTIMATED BURDEN PER RESPONSE TO COMPLY WITH THIS INFURMATION COLLECTION REQUEST SOULHES, FORWARD COMMENTS REGARDING BURDEN ESTIMATE TO THE RECORDS AND REPORTS MANAGEMENT BRANCH (FS30): U.S. FULLSAR REQULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON DC 20556. AND TO THE PAPERWORK REQUICTION PROJECT (2150-0104) OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET WASHINGTON. DC 20503.

FACILITY NAME (1)	DOCKET NUMBER (2)	LER NUMBER (6)	PAGE (3)	
		TEAR SEQUENTIAL REVISION NUMBER		
Perry Nuclear Power Flant, Unit	0 5 0 0 0 4 4 0	911 - 01 118 - 011	014 05 015	

Control rods 26-19, 42-19, and 46-23 did not meet the most stringent scram insertion time testing requirements to position 43 due to problems with the associated SSPVs; however, all three control rods met the requirements to positions 29 and 13 and as such were declared "slow operable". Even with the three "slow" control rods, the negative reactivity rates resulting from a scram with the average response of all the drives would have provided the required protection and the MPCR would have remained greater than 1.07; therefore, this event is not considered to be safety significant. Additionally, during this event, all action requirements of Technical Specification 3.1.3.2 were satisfied within the prescribed time limits and the plant was successfully shut down for repairs.

A previous similar event occurred as documented by LER 89-030. On November 25, 1989, the malfunction of two SSPVs due to improper seating material resulted in a violation of Technical Specifications. The causes for the November, 1989 event were inadequate implementation of the Nonconformance Control Program and personnel error in the assessment of test results. An event that occurred on October 1, 1990 resulted in the discovery of malfunctioning SSPVs from a single lot installed in the plant during the refueling outage, and resulted in a 10CFR21 notification on December 11, 1990. Because neither of these events involved contamination of the SSPVs disk and seat, none of the corrective actions from LER 89-030 or the October 1990 event could have prevented the October 6, 1991 event.

A review of the contaminants analyzed by GE determined the silicone lubricant and the threadlocker could have been introduced at Perry. Silicone grease was used during the rework of the Hydraulic Control Unit Scram Air Header Isolation Valve and the threadlocker was used on the fittings directly upstream of the SSPVs. Based on restrictions of the chemical control program at Perry, site work practices, and valve design, it is highly unlikely the chlorinated or chlorofluorinated solvent, alcohol, Dioctyl Phthalate, or nylon would have been introduced at Perry.

The GE analysis determined that a combination of adhesive effects were required to cause the sticking or slow valve performance. Valves subjected to one effect and not another would show no evidence of sticking. If contaminants introduced by installation or maintenance practices were solely responsible, it would be expected that valve failure would be independent of manufacturing lot and would increase with time in service. The failed SSPVs had been in service for a relatively short time period when compared with those from other lots. Additionally, during a rapid plant shutdown in December, 1991, all control rods scrammed within the required times to all positions. Due to these factors, it has been determined that the problems experienced were related specifically to lot 184010001, remanufactured by ASCO on November 9, 1990.

NRC FORM 366A

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

APPROVED OMB NO 3150-0104 EXPIRES: 1/30/92

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER) TEXT CONTINUATION

ESTIMATED BURDEN PER RESPONSE TO COMPLY WITH THIS INFORMATION COLLECTION REQUEST 500 HRS FORWARD COMMENTS REGARDING BURDEN ESTIMATE TO THE RECORDS AND REPORTS MANAGEMENT BRANCH (F-530). U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON DC 20555 AND TO THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION PROJECT (3150-0104) DFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET WASHINGTON OU 20503.

Ì	FACILITY NAME (1)	DOCKET NUMBER (2)	LER NUMBER (6)	PAGE (3)	
-			PEAR SEQUENTIAL REVISION NUMBER		
Constitution	Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1	0 5 0 0 0 4 4 0	9 1 - 0 1 8 - 0 1	015 000 15	

TEXT III more space is required, use additional NRC Form 366A's/ (17)

V. Corrective Actions

After shutdown of the plant, all 49 of the SSPVs from lot number 184010001 were removed from their associated BCUs and replaced with now (not remanufactured) valves from two other lots and the associated control rods were successfully tested for maximum scram insertion times. Generic Maintenance Instruction (GMI-122) "Hydraulic Control Unit Equipment Qualification Maintenance" will be revised to specify the use of Teflon tape to seal the threads rather than a liquid threadlocker and will specify the use of only approved aqueous cleaning agents. With regards to the contaminants possibly introduced at the manufacturer, GE has stated they are addressing the entire issue of valve contaminants with ASCO and will be taking appropriate action as required. This GE investigation would include a close look at both the possible introduction of Freon based degreasers and/or alcohol. As part of the established requalification training program, all pla licensed operators have been instructed on the lessons learned from this event.

Energy Industry Identification System Codes are identified in the text as [XX].