NRC Form 366
(9-83)

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
APPROVED OMB NO 3150-0104
EXPIRES 8/31/88

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER)

FACILITY NAME (1)	DOCKET NUMBER (2)	PAGE (3)
LaSalle County Station Unit 1	0 5 0 0 0 3 7 3	1 OF 0 3

TITLE (4)

Missed Surveillance Reactor Water pH Due to Personnel Error

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 1	2 5	8 6	8 6	0 0 3	0 0	0 2	2 1	8 6	NA	0 5 0 0 0
										0 5 0 0 0

OPERATING MODE (9)	5	THIS REPORT IS SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF 10 CFR §: (Check one or more of the following) (11)					
POWER LEVEL (10)	0 0 0	20.402(b)		20.405(c)		50.73(a)(2)(iv)	73.71(b)
		20.405(a)(1)(i)		50.36(c)(1)		50.73(a)(2)(v)	73.71(c)
		20.405(a)(1)(ii)		50.36(c)(2)		50.73(a)(2)(vii)	OTHER (Specify in Abstract below and in Text, NRC Form 366A)
		20.405(a)(1)(iii)	X	50.73(a)(2)(i)		50.73(a)(2)(viii)(A)	
		20.405(a)(1)(iv)		50.73(a)(2)(ii)		50.73(a)(2)(viii)(B)	
		20.405(a)(1)(v)		50.73(a)(2)(iii)		50.73(a)(2)(x)	

LICENSEE CONTACT FOR THIS LER (12)

NAME	TELEPHONE NUMBER
	AREA CODE
Cheryl Wisniewski, Chemist, extension 236	8 1 5 3 5 7 - 6 7 6 1

COMPLETE ONE LINE FOR EACH COMPONENT FAILURE DESCRIBED IN THIS REPORT (13)

CAUSE	SYSTEM	COMPONENT	MANUFACTURER	REPORTABLE TO NPRDS		CAUSE	SYSTEM	COMPONENT	MANUFACTURER	REPORTABLE TO NPRDS	
A	K N	P L		N							

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14)		EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE (15)	MONTH	DAY	YEAR
YES (If yes, complete EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE)	X NO				

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

At 0758 hours on January 22, 1986, Unit 1 reactor water was sampled for pH. The next time the surveillance was scheduled it was discovered that the sample point had no flow. Attempts to clear the line were unsuccessful and a Work Request was written. On January 25, 1986, there was still no flow: No sample was obtained. The next sample was obtained on Janaury 26, 1986, 96 hours later. This was contrary to Technical Specification 4.4.4.6.3.a. The cause of this event was a lack of communication between the Chemist and the Foreman as to what action was being taken to obtain the sample. Since pH can be calculated from conductivity, the pH was calculated from the conductivity of a sample taken on January 23, 1986, and determined to be within Technical Specification limits. Personnel involved were counseled with respect to the unacceptability of their performance. The Rad/Chem Foremen, Chemists, and Rad/Chem Technicians will be retrained with respect to their responsibilities to ensure surveillances are completed on time.

A SCHF1
A SCHM2

IE22
V1

FACILITY NAME (1)	DOCKET NUMBER (2)	LER NUMBER (6)			PAGE (3)
		YEAR	SEQUENTIAL NUMBER	REVISION NUMBER	
LaSalle County Station Unit 1	0 5 0 0 0 3 7 3	8 6	— 0 0 3	— 0 0	0 2 OF 0 3

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

I. EVENT DESCRIPTION

At 0758 hours on January 22, 1986, Unit 1 reactor water was sampled for pH. The unit was in its first refuel outage with the vessel open and no fuel in it. However, this pH sampling is required every 72 hours at all times by Technical Specification 4.4.4.6.3.a. The next time the surveillance was scheduled was January 24, 1986. On January 24, 1986, the Radiation Chemistry Technician (RCT) discovered that the sample point, the Reactor Water Cleanup (RWCU, CE) inlet on the Reactor Building sampe panel (KN), had no flow. The RCT then notified Chemistry Department supervision of this condition. An attempt was made to blow out the line. This effort was unsuccessful in reestablishing flow through the sample line. At this point Work Request #55690 was written. The Chemist assumed that the Rad/-Chem Foreman had requested the RCT to take a sample at an alternate point. Consequently, the Work Request was not processed until January 27, 1986. The Rad/-Chem Foreman assumed that the Chemist was processing the Work Request immediately. Thus flow would be established in time for the January 25, 1986, daily sampling before the Technical Specification 72-hour time limit was exceeded. On January 25, 1986, there was still no flow through the sample line when the RCT attempted to sample. Reviewing the laboratory log book the RCT determined that Chemistry supervision had been notified on January 24, 1986, therefore he did not notify Chemistry supervision again. As a result, the next sample for pH was obtained at 0811 hours on January 26, 1986, which was 96 hours after the last performance of this surveillance. This was contrary to Technical Specification 4.4.4.6.3.a.

II. CAUSE OF EVENT

There were multiple causes leading up to this event. First, the Chemist and Foreman failed to communciate clearly with one another as to what action was being taken. Second, management failed to respond to the incident in a timely manner. Finally, the Rad/Chem Foreman should have reviewed the Technical Specification required samples to insure none were missed.

III. PROBABLE CONSEQUENCES OF THE OCCURRENCE

There is a physical correlation between conductivity and pH. Due to this interaction, pH may be calculated from conductivity. The conductivity of the sample obtained on January 23, 1986, was determined to be 1.0 umhos/cm. At this value for pH, the conductivity must exist between 5.6 - 8.6. This is within the limits stated by Technical Specification 3.4.4. (5.3 - 8.6). At the time of this event the unit was defueled with the vessel open. Also, the pH calculated from a conductivity sample obtained within the Technical Specification 72 hour time limit was within Technical Specification requirements. Therefore, there were no adverse consequences attributable to this event.

IV. CORRECTIVE ACTIONS

The Chemists and the Rad/Chem Foreman involved were counseled with respect to the unacceptability of their performance in relation to this event. The Rad/Chem Foremen will be retrained on their responsibility to review the laboratory log book and review Technical Specifications surveillance requirements shiftly (AIR #373-200-86-00900). Also, the RCT's and Rad/Chem Foremen will be retrained on their responsibilities with respect to LAP-1800-6, Rad/Chem Foreman Shift Turnover (AIR #373-200-86-00901). The training will also reemphasize the Rad/Chem Technician's responsibility to notify Chemistry supervision if it appears a Technical Specification surveillance might be missed. Finally, Chemistry supervision was reminded of their responsibilities to not assume and to communicate properly.

V. PREVIOUS OCCURRENCES

373/82-011/03L-0	373/85-018-00
373/82-041/03L-0	373/85-033-00
373/84-027-00	373/85-047-01
373/84-048-00	374/85-004-00
374-84-019-00	374/85-020-00
374/84-053-00	374/85-048-00

VI. NAME AND TELEPHONE NUMBER OF PREPARER

Cheryl Wisniewski, Chemist, 815/357-6761, extension 236.

Commonwealth Edison
LaSalle County Nuclear Station
Rural Route #1, Box 220
Marseilles, Illinois 61341
Telephone 815/357-6761

February 21, 1986

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

Dear Sir:

Reportable Occurrence Report #86-003-00, Docket #050-373 is being submitted to your office in accordance with 10CFR 50.73.

for R. D. Bishop
G. J. Diederich
Station Manager
LaSalle County Station

GJD/DRR/kg

Enclosure

xc: NRC, Regional Director
INPO-Records Center
File/NRC

IE22
1/1