

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

MAR 1 5 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR: Richard C. Lewis, Director

Division of Project and Resident Programs

Region II

FROM:

Karl V. Seyfrit, Chief

Reactor Operations Analysis Branch Office for Analysis and Evaluation

of Operational Data

SUBJECT: EVALUATION OF LER'S FOR BROWNS FERRY UNITS 1, 2, AND 3 FROM JANUARY 1, 1983 TO FEBRUARY 29, 1984 - AEOD INPUT TO SALP REVIEW

In support of the ongoing SALP reviews, AEOD has reviewed the LERs for the Browns Ferry Units 1, 2, and 3 plants during the subject period. AEOD's review focused on the clarity and adequacy of the descriptions provided in the individual LERs.

The licensee submitted 74 LERs for Unit 1, 74 LERs for Unit 2, and 53 LERs for Unit 3 during the assessed period. For this review, we have randomly selected 30 LERs for each unit in order to provide a statistically significant base for our assessment while limiting the number of LERs reviewed.

In general, the LERs were acceptable and reasonably detailed to permit understanding of the events. The enclosure provides additional observations from our review of the LERs.

If you have any questions, please contact either myself or Medhat El-Zeftawy of my staff on FTS-492-4434.

Karl V. Seyfrit / Chief

Reactor Operations Analysis Branch Office for Analysis and Evaluation

of Operational Data

Enclosure As stated

cc: w/enclosure R. Clark, NRR

8404110511 XA)

A 4 38

MAR 1 5 1984

DISTRIBUTION: DCS ROAB CF ROAB RF KVSeyfrit HOrnstein ME1-Zeftawy TAIppolito CJHeltemes

MEMORANDUM FOR: Richard C. Lewis, Director

Division of Project and Resident Programs

Region II

FROM:

Karl V. Seyfrit, Chief

Reactor Operations Analysis Branch Office for Analysis and Evaluation

of Operational Data

SUBJECT: EVALUATION OF LER'S FOR BROWNS FERRY UNITS 1, 2, AND 3 FROM JANUARY 1, 1983 TO FEBRUARY 29, 1984 - AEOD INPUT TO SALP REVIEW

In support of the ongoing SALP reviews, AEOD has reviewed the LERs for the Browns Ferry Units 1, 2, and 3 plants during the subject period. AEOD's review focused on the clarity and adequacy of the descriptions provided in the individual LERs.

The licensee submitted 74 LERs for Unit 1, 74 LERs for Unit 2, and 53 LERs for Unit 3 during the assessed period. For this review, we have randomly selected 30 LERs for each unit in order to provide a statistically significant base for our assessment while limiting the number of LERs reviewed.

In general, the LERs were acceptable and reasonably detailed to permit understanding of the events. The enclosure provides additional observations from our review of the LERs.

If you have any questions, please contact either myself or Medhat El-Zeftawy of my staff on FTS-492-4434.

> Karl V. Seyfrit, Chief Reactor Operations Analysis Branch Office for Analysis and Evaluation of Operational Data

Enclosure As stated

cc: w/enclosure R. Clark, NRR

OFFICE	RAOB M.V.	ROAB met	ROAB:CE	AEOD:DO	
URNAME	ME1-Zeftawy/	cj HOrnstein	KVSeyfrit	TAxppolito	
DATE	3/15/84	3//5/84	3/15/84	3/ 784	

SALP REVIEW FOR BROWNS FERRY 1, 2, AND 3

The licensee submitted 74 LERs for Browns Ferry Unit 1, 74 LERs for Unit 2, and 53 LERs for Unit 3 in the assessment period from January 1, 1983 to February 29, 1984. For each of the three units we reviewed 30 randomly selected LERs submitted by the licensee. Based on our review, we have made the following observations and conclusions:

- The information in the narrative sections was generally sufficient to provide the reader with a good understanding of the event.
- There are no significant problems with the coded information provided by the licensee.
- 3. A total of 201 LERs were retrieved (not including the updated LERs) from our data base for all three units with event dates from January 1, 1983 to February 29, 1984. The descriptions of events were clear and adequate. The apparent cause of the occurrences was well explained and documented, including the circumstances which led to the occurrences. Immediate and long term corrective actions were also mentioned. For the sample reviewed, the largest percentage (60%) of LERs submitted were attributed to component failures. "Personnel errors or lack of administrative control" accounted for 7% of the events. 3% of the events were caused by crack-like conditions detected on welds. Also, about 4% of the events were attributed to Xenon-transients which caused the power density ratio (percent power/core max. power) to be less than the Technical Specification limits. The remaining events were attributed to "others" category.
- In all instances when the licensee promised to submit an update report, it was submitted.
- 5. In many cases the licensee referenced LERs pertaining to previous events of a similar nature. For example, in LER 83-033 (Unit 2), other previous similar events (BFRO 50-259/80-053, 80-056, 80-078, BFRO 50-260/81-005, 81-006, 81-007, and BFRO 50-296/79-003, 81-018) were referenced. In addition, the licensee stated when there have been no similar previous occurrences.
- 6. Regarding multiple event reporting in a single LER, the events generally were combined correctly in accordance with the guidelines of NUREG-0161 (General Instruction #7).
- 7. Fourteen Preliminary Notifications (PNs) were issued in the SALP assessment period (Unit 1-PNO-II-83-008, 83-053, 83-063, 84-002, 84-013; Unit 2-PNO-II-83-010, 83-047, 83-063, 84-002; Unit 3-PNO-II-83-002, 83-047, 83-063, 84-002, 84-003). Based on our review, PNO-II-84-002 which was issued for all three units should have been further documented by an LER.



UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

MAR 1 9 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR: Richard W. Starostecki, Director

Division of Projects and Resident Programs

Region I

FROM:

Karl V. Seyfrit, Chief

Reactor Operations Analysis Branch Office for Analysis and Evaluation

of Operational Data

SUBJECT:

EVALUATION OF SUSQUEHANNA STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, UNIT 1 FOR THE PERIOD FEBRUARY 1, 1983 TO JANUARY 31, 1984

The Office for Analysis and Evaluation of Operational Data has assessed the Licensee Event Reports (LERs) submitted under Docket No. 50-387 during the subject period. This has been done in support of the ongoing SALP review of the Pennsylvania Power and Light Company, with regard to their performance as licensee of the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station Unit 1. Our perspective would be indicative of that of a BWR system safety engineer who, although knowledgeable, is not intimately familiar with the detailed site-specific equipment arrangements and operations. Our review focused on the technical accuracy, completeness, and intelligibility of the LERs. Our review covered all of the LERs submitted during the assessment period.

In general all of the LERs submitted were adequate in each important respect with few exceptions. The LERs typically provided clear descriptions of the cause and nature of the events as well as adequate explanations of the effects on both system function and public safety. In some LERs supplemental information was provided in attachments to the LER forms. This enabled the LER reviewer to better understand the nature of the events encountered, thereby facilitating evaluation of the safety significance of the event. In most cases the described corrective actions taken or planned by the licensee were considered to be commensurate with the nature, seriousness, and frequency of the problems found. The enclosure provides additional observations from our review of the LERs.

In summary, our review of the licensee's LERs indicates that in most cases the licensee provided adequate descriptions of the events. In general, none of the LERs we reviewed involved what we would consider to be an especially significant event or serious challenge to plant safety.

If you have any questions please contact either myself or Sal Salah of my staff on FTS-492-4432.

84041903460-387 Reactor Operations Analysis Branch Office for Analysis and Evaluation of Operational Data

A 4/39

Enclosure:

Robert L. Perch, NRR Gary G. Rhoads, SRI John McCann, RI