

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT

CONTROL BLOCK: 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE ALL REQUIRED INFORMATION)

0 1 G A E I H 2 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 4 5
7 8 9 14 15 25 26 30 37 CAT 58

CON'T
0 1 L 6 0 5 0 0 0 3 6 6 7 0 7 1 1 6 7 9 8 0 8 0 8 7 9 9
7 8 60 61 68 69 74 75 80

EVENT DESCRIPTION AND PROBABLE CONSEQUENCES (10)

0 2 While performing rod maneuvers to increase reactor power, a computer calculation indic
0 3 ated a CMPF of 3.046, with the limit at 2.38. Action to correct the peaking problem
0 4 was initiated within the 15 minutes required by Tech Specs but the CMPF had not been
0 5 reduced to an acceptable level within the 2 hours time limit. Shallow rods were in-
0 6 serted and the APRMs adjusted for the new lower CMPF. This is a repetitive occurrence
0 7 (LER-79-58), but no consequences were realized.

0 8 _____ 80

0 9 I I A X Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z 0 7 1 5 0 3 L 0
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32

17 LER NO. 7 9 — 0 7 1 5 — 0 3 L 0
REPORT NUMBER 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32

X Z Z Z 0 0 0 0 Y N Z Z 9 9 9
ACTION TAKEN 33 FUTURE ACTION 34 EFFECT ON PLANT 35 SHUTDOWN METHOD 36 HOURS 37 ATTACHMENT SUBMITTED 40 NPD-4 FORM SUB. 42 PRIME COMP. SUPPLIER 43 COMPONENT MANUFACTURER 44 45 46 47 48

CAUSE DESCRIPTION AND CORRECTIVE ACTIONS (27)

1 0 Immediate action was taken to reduce the CMPF and partial reduction was achieved with-
1 1 in the 2 hours limit, but the close proximity of the APRMs to their trip setpoints
1 2 prevented the required adjustment. The control rod withdrawal sequence has been al-
1 3 tered to avoid such peaking problems in the future.

1 4 _____ 80

1 5 C 0 6 6 N/A A Observation of computer printout
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32

1 6 Z Z N/A N/A
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32

1 7 0 0 0 Z N/A
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32

1 8 0 0 0 N/A
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32

1 9 Z N/A 7808140837
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32

2 0 N N/A 649 137 NRC USE ONLY
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32

NAME OF PREPARER C. L. Coggin, Supt. Plt. Eng. Serv. PHONE 912-367-7781

Supplement to LER 79-075
Cocket No. 50-366

This supplement is offered as an explanation for the repeated violations that the plant has had on linear heat generation rate limits and time limits for adjusting APRMs for high peaking factors. The plant staff has been disturbed by the repeated instances of these violations, but it is believed that the largest contributing factor has been eliminated.

Subsequent to LERs 2-79-55, 58, 60, and 75 it has been determined that the Unit 2 feedwater instrumentation was calibrated 5% conservative and therefore process computer calculations of thermal power have been ~5% too high. Because peak LHGR is also closely related to calculated reactor power it is evident that nodal powers have been calculated ~5% high since the calibration error occurred. Removing this 5% conservatism from the power calculation negates the violation on LER 2-74-60 and significantly reduces the violation on LER 2-79-55.

The calibration error has also contributed to the problems that have been experienced with peaking factor. Because the 5% error resulted in the APRMs being set 5% high, load line problems were experienced earlier than necessary. This greatly hindered rod movements that would have helped lower the CMPF and prevented the adjustment of the APRMs to comply with Tech Spec 3.2.2.

Since the calibration error has been corrected LHGR margin has significantly improved and the rod withdrawal sequence has been successfully refined to reduce the peaking problems that usually occur at low powers. It is believed that these actions will significantly reduce the possibility of further recurrence of these type events in the future.