

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER)													
Facility Name (1)						Docket Number (2)				Page (3)			
San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station Unit 2						0 5 0 0 0 3 6 1				1 of 0 1			
Title (4)													
Charging Subsystem Check Valve Failure													
EVENT DATE (5)			LER NUMBER (6)				REPORT DATE (7)			OTHER FACILITIES INVOLVED (8)			
MONTH	DAY	YEAR	YEAR	SEQUENTIAL NUMBER	REVISION NUMBER	MONTH	DAY	YEAR	FACILITY NAMES		DOCKET NUMBER(S)		
0	6	2	6	9	7	9	7		0	1	0		
OPERATING MODE (9)			THIS REPORT IS SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF 10 CFR §: (CHECK ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING) (11)										
1													
POWER LEVEL (10)			20.402 (b)		20.405 (c)		50.73 (a) (2) (iv)		73.71 (d)				
1 0 0			20.405 (a) (1) (i)		50.36 (a) (1)		50.73 (a) (2) (v)		73.71 (c)				
			20.405 (a) (1) (ii)		50.36 (a) (2)		X 50.73 (a) (2) (vii)		X other (Specify in				
			20.405 (a) (1) (iii)		X 50.73 (a) (2) (i)		50.73 (a) (2) (viii) (A)		Abstract below and				
			20.405 (a) (1) (iv)		50.73 (a) (2) (ii)		50.73 (a) (2) (viii) (B)		in text)				
			20.405 (a) (1) (v)		50.73 (a) (2) (iii)		50.73 (a) (2) (x)		Part 21				
LICENSEE CONTACT FOR THIS LER (12)													
NAME						TELEPHONE NUMBER							
R. W. Krieger, Vice President, Nuclear Generation						AREA CODE							
						7 1 4 3 6 8		- 6 2 5 5					
COMPLETE ONE LINE FOR EACH COMPONENT FAILURE DESCRIBED IN THIS REPORT (13)													
CAUSE	SYSTEM	COMPONENT	MANUFACTURER	REPORTABLE TO NFRDS	CAUSE	SYSTEM	COMPONENT	MANUFACTURER	REPORTABLE TO NFRDS				
B	C	V	V K 0 8 5										
SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14)						EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE (15)		MONTH	DAY	YEAR			
X Yes (If yes, complete EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE)						No		0	8	1	1	9	7

ABSTRACT (Limit to 1400 spaces, i.e., approximately fifteen single space typewritten lines.) (16)

On 6/26/97 while Unit 3 was shutdown for refueling, Edison found a check valve in the Charging Subsystem that would not open completely. This would cause the charging flow distribution to the Reactor Coolant System to be different than that assumed in the safety analysis. Because of the similarity of the Unit 2 Charging Subsystem, Edison immediately entered the Technical Specification action statement. As a conservative action, Edison also reduced Unit 2's power to about 90 percent, where charging flow is not required for accident mitigation. On 6/28/97, Edison tested Unit 2 and found that a similar check valve also would not open completely. As required by the Technical Specifications, Edison shutdown Unit 2 to repair the valve. Completion of that shutdown is being reported as required by 10CFR50.73(a)(2)(i). Edison believes this valve failure was caused by a design defect and is including 10CFR21 information in this report.

Edison replaced the faulty design valves in the charging injection lines and auxiliary spray line in each LER unit with another type valve. Edison's evaluation of the cause(s) is on-going. This LER will be revised.

Using an EPRI analysis program and actual, allowed, plant parameters, Edison concluded that the condition resulted in a negligible increase in plant risk and had no actual safety significance.