

Entergy Operations, Inc. River Bend Station 5485 U. S. Highway 61N St. Francisville, LA 70775 Tel 225 381 4374 Fax 225 381 4872 eolson@entergy.com

Eric W. Olson Site Vice President

RBG-47495

August 11, 2014

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission ATTN: Document Control Desk Washington, DC 20555

Subject: Licensee Event Report 50-458 / 2014-003-00 River Bend Station – Unit 1 Docket No. 50-458 License No. NPF-47

RBF1-14-0122

Dear Sir or Madam:

In accordance with 10 CFR 50.73, enclosed is the subject Licensee Event Report. This document contains no commitments. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Joseph Clark at 225-381-4177.

Sincerely,

Six M. Open

EWO/dhw

Enclosure

I EZC

Licensee Event Report 50-458 / 2014-003-00 August 11, 2014 RBG-47495 Page 2 of 2

cc: U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Region IV 1600 East Lamar Blvd. Arlington, TX 76011-4511

> NRC Sr. Resident Inspector P. O. Box 1050 St. Francisville, LA 70775

INPO (via ICES reporting)

Central Records Clerk Public Utility Commission of Texas 1701 N. Congress Ave. Austin, TX 78711-3326

Department of Environmental Quality Office of Environmental Compliance Radiological Emergency Planning and Response Section JiYoung Wiley P.O. Box 4312 Baton Rouge, LA 70821-4312

NRC FORM 366 U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION							APPROV	ED BY OMB: NO.	3150-0104		E	XPIRES:	01/31/2017			
LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER) (See Page 2 for required number of digits/characters for each block)								Estimated burden per response to comply with this mandatory collection request 80 hours. Reported lessons learned are incorporated into the licensing process and fed back to industry. Send comments regarding burden estimate to the FOIA, Privacy and Information Collections Branch (T-5 F53), U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, or by internet e-mail to Infocollects. Resource@nrc.gov, and to the Desk Officer, Office of Information DC 20503. If a means used to impose an information collection does not display a currently valid OMB control number, the NRC may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, the information collection.								
1. FACI	1. FACILITY NAME								2. DOCKET NUMBER 3. PAGE							
River E	River Bend Station - Unit 1							05000	05000 458			1 0	DF	3		
4. TITLE						-			<u> </u>						···	
Operations Prohibited by Technical Specifications Due to Concurrent Inoperability of Reactor Protection System Channels																
5. EVENT DATE 6. LER NUMBER 7. REPORT					DATE 8. OTHER FACILITIES INVOLVED											
MONTH	DAY	YEAR	YEAR	SEQU NUN	ENTIAL MBER	REV NO.	MONTH	DAY	YEAR	FACILITY NAME		DOC) 05000			KET NUMBER D	
06	10	2014	2014	- 0	03 -	00	08	11	2014	FACILITY NAME DOCKET NUMBE				KET NUMBER		
9. OPI	ERATIN	G MODE	<u>11. T</u>	HIS R	EPORT IS		NITTED P	URSUAN		E REQUIREMEN	TS OF 10 C	CFR §:	(Check	all that	apply)	
				20.2201(b)				203(a)(3))(i)	50.73(a)(2)(i)(C)			✓ 50.73(a)(2)(vii)			
1			20.2201(d)				20.2203(a)(3)			50.73(a)		50.73(a)(2)(viii)(A)				
			20.2)(1)	ĺ	20.2203(a)(4)			50.73(a)		50.73(a)(2)(viii)(B)					
			20.2203(a)(2)(i)				50.36(c)(1)(i)			50.73(a)		50.73(a)(2)(ix)(A)				
10. POV	10. POWER LEVEL			20.2203(a)(2)(ii)			50.36(c)(1)(ii)			50.73(a)(2)(iv)(A)			50.73(a)(2)(x)			
			20.2)(2)(iii)		50.36(c)(2)			50.73(a)(2)(v)(A)			73.71(a)(4)				
	100		20.2203(a)(2)(iv)				50.46(a)(3)(ii)			50.73(a)(2)(v)(B)			73.71(a)(5)			
	100			20.2203(a)(2)(v)			50.73(a)(2)(i)(50.73(a)(2)(v)(C)						
			20.2203(a)(2)(vi)				✓ 50.73(a)(2)(i)(3) 50.73(a)(2)(v)(D)			Specify in Abstract below or in NRC Form 366A			
· · · · · ·						12. LIC	ENSEE	CONTAC	T FOR TH				NACE NO.	0007	·	
LICENSEE Joseph A	CONTACT	Manager -	Regulator	v Assu	rance							TELEPI	HONE NUME	381-41	le Area Code) 77	
			3. COMP			FOR E	EACH CO	MPONE		RE DESCRIBED	IN THIS R	EPOR'	() т			
CAUS	ε	SYSTEM	COMPONENT MANU-			REPORTABLE		CAUSE	SYSTEM COMPONE		INT MANU-		R	REPORTABLE		
n/a					TAOTOM.		TOLIN	_					TAGTORE			
44 6110				OTED									NONTH		VEAD	
								SUBMISSION			⊦	04	15	2015		
	() •	to 1400 oper		mvimo	oby 15 cincle		d troowritte				DATE		04	15	2015	
On June	e 10, 20	14, with th	ie plant o	perati	ng at 100	perce	ent powe	r, techni	cians per	rforming a sche	duled surv	veillar	nce test f	ound th	at one	
instrument channel in the reactor protection system failed its time response acceptance criterion. This was the second of two such tests																
that failed in similar fashion. Since it is conceivable that the second tested channel was out of specifications at the time the first channel was tested, this condition caused independent redundent channels in the same trip system to be increased by the same time.																
actions required by the applicable Limiting Condition for Operation were not taken since the operators were not aware of the latent																
condition at the time of the first surveillance test failure. An engineering evaluation of this condition was performed, and the RPS																
system was declared operable with compensatory measures. Until this issue is resolved, the frequency of the calibration tests in the																
(b) as operations prohibited by Technical Specifications, as well as 10CFR50.73(a)(2)(vii), a potential common-cause inoperability of																
independent trip channels. Due to the design redundancy of the independent channels of the RPS system, this condition would likely																
have not prevented the system from performing its safety function. Had an actual full MSIV isolation occurred with the channel response times in their as-found condition, the reactor scram signal would likely have still occurred within the specified instrument																
response time.																

2

NRC FORM 366A (02-2014)	U.S. NUCLEAR	APPROVED BY OMB: NO. 3150-0104 EXPIRES: 01/31/2017 Estimated burden per response to comply with this mandatory collection request 80 hours. Reported lessons learned are incorporated into the licensing process and fed back to industry. Send comments regarding burden estimate to the FOIA, Privacy and Information Collections Branch (T-5 F53), U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, or by intermet e-mail to Infocollects.Resource@nrc.gov, and to the Desk Officer, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, NEOB-10202, (3150-0104), Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503. If a means used to impose an information collection does not display a currently valid OMB control number, the NRC may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to. the information collection.							
1. FA		2. DOCKET	6. LER NUMBER				3. PAGE		
River Bend Station -	Unit 1		YEAR	SEQUENTIAL NUMBER	REV NO.				
		05000 458	2014	- 003 -	00	2	OF	3	

NARRATIVE

REPORTED CONDITION

On June 10, 2014, with the plant operating at 100 percent power, technicians performing a scheduled surveillance test found that one instrument channel in the reactor protection system (JC) failed its time response acceptance criterion. This was the second of two such tests that failed in similar fashion. Since it is conceivable that the second tested channel was out of specifications at the time the first channel was tested, this condition caused independent redundant channels in the same trip system to be inoperable at the same time. The actions required by the applicable Limiting Condition for Operation were not taken since the operators were not aware of the latent condition at the time of the first surveillance test failure. This condition is reportable in accordance with 10CFR50.73(a)(2)(i)(b) as operations prohibited by Technical Specifications, as well as 10CFR50.73(a)(2)(vii), a potential common-cause inoperability of independent trip channels.

BACKGROUND

One of the functions in the reactor protection system is the initiation of a reactor scram in the event of a closure of the main steam isolation valves (MSIVs). Limit switches on each of the eight MSIV actuators provide input to the individual, redundant RPS trip channels if the valve moves to a nominal 12 percent of stroke length in the "close" direction. The design of the RPS system requires that a channel respond to an input from its MSIV limit switch and generate a trip signal. The maximum response time specified by the Technical Requirements Manual is 90 milliseconds. The calibration frequency is four years (24 months on a staggered test basis).

The arrangement of the instrumentation includes 16 individual channels. Inboard and outboard MSIVs in each of the four main steam line are instrumented with redundant limit switches monitored by independent trip channels of the RPS system.

IMMEDIATE ACTIONS

In the calibrations performed in 2010, a degrading trend in the response times was noted in the four channels containing the Agastat relays (**94**). In the 2010 tests, the response time of each of the four channels was 89 milliseconds. The as-found response times found in the recent tests ranged from 90 to 102 milliseconds. In each case, the Agastat relay was replaced and the response time was then verified to be within specifications. The response times for the channels with no Agastat relays ranged from 41 to 51 milliseconds.

An engineering evaluation of this condition was performed, and the RPS system was declared operable with compensatory measures. Until this issue is resolved, the frequency of the calibration tests in the channels with Agastat relays has been increased to once per year. This action is being tracked in the station's corrective action program.

CAUSAL ANALYSIS

The cause of this event remains under investigation. Corrective actions to prevent recurrence will be developed following the evaluation of future test results. These will be reported in a future supplement to this LER.

NRC FORM 366A (02-2014)

NRC FORM 366A **U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION** LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER) (02-2014) **CONTINUATION SHEET** 2. DOCKET **1. FACILITY NAME** 6. LER NUMBER 3. PAGE **River Bend Station - Unit 1** SEQUENTIAL REV YEAR NUMBER NO. 05000 3 3 458 OF 2014 003 00 --NARRATIVE SAFETY SIGNIFICANCE Due to the design redundancy of the independent channels of the RPS system, it is unlikely that this condition would not have prevented the system from performing its safety function. Had an actual full MSIV isolation occurred with the channel response times in their as-found condition, the reactor scram signal would have likely have still occurred within the specified instrument response

(NOTE: Energy Industry Component Identification codes are annotated as (**XX**).)

time. This will be confirmed in the completion of the event investigation.