



Nuclear Group  
P.O. Box 4  
Shippingport, PA 15077-0004

Telephone (412) 393-6000

March 14, 1990  
ND3MNO:2042

Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit No. 2  
Docket No. 50-412, License No. NPF-73  
LER 90-002-00

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Document Control Desk  
Washington, DC 20555

Gentlemen:

In accordance with Appendix A, Beaver Valley Technical Specifications, the following Licensee Event Report is submitted:

LER 90-002-00, 10 CFR 50.73.a.2.i.B, "Failure to Perform Time Response Testing".

Very truly yours,

T. P. Noonan  
General Manager  
Nuclear Operations

sl

Attachment

9003210251 900314  
PDR ADOCK 05000412  
S PDC

IE22  
11

March 14, 1990  
ND3MNO:2042  
Page two

cc: Mr. William T. Russell  
Regional Administrator  
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Region 1  
475 Allendale Road  
King of Prussia, PA 19406

C. A. Roteck, Ohio Edison

Mr. Peter Tam, BVPS Licensing Project Manager  
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555  
J. Beall, Nuclear Regulatory Commission,  
BVPS Senior Resident Inspector

Dave Amerine  
Centerior Energy  
6200 Oak Tree Blvd.  
Independence, Ohio 44101

INPO Records Center  
Suite 1500  
1100 Circle 75 Parkway  
Atlanta, GA 30339

G. E. Muckle, Factory Mutual Engineering, Pittsburgh

Mr. J. N. Steinmetz, Operating Plant Projects Manager  
Mid Atlantic Area  
Westinghouse Electric Corporation  
Energy Systems Service Division  
Box 355  
Pittsburgh, PA 15230

American Nuclear Insurers  
c/o Dottie Sherman, ANI Library  
The Exchange Suite 245  
270 Farmington Avenue  
Farmington, CT 06032

Mr. Richard Janati  
Department of Environmental Resources  
P. O. Box 2063  
16th Floor, Fulton Building  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Director, Safety Evaluation & Control  
Virginia Electric & Power Co.  
P.O. Box 26666  
One James River Plaza  
Richmond, VA 23261

## LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER)

FACILITY NAME (1) Beaver Valley Power Station Unit 2										DOCKET NUMBER (2) 0 5 0 0 0 4 1 2				PAGE (3) 1 OF 0 3									
TITLE (4) Failure to Perform Time Response Testing																							
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 N/A				DOCKET NUMBER(S) 0 5 0 0 0										
0	2	1	2	9	0	9	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	1	4	9	0	0	5	0	0	0
OPERATING MODE (9) 1		THIS REPORT IS SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF 10 CFR § (Check one or more of the following) (11)																					
POWER LEVEL (10) 0 9 0		20.502(b)				20.406(c)				50.73(a)(2)(iv)				73.71(b)									
		20.406(a)(1)(i)				50.36(c)(1)				50.73(a)(2)(v)				73.71(c)									
		20.406(a)(1)(ii)				50.36(c)(2)				50.73(a)(2)(vi)				OTHER (Specify in Abstract below and in Text, NRC Form 366A)									
		20.406(a)(1)(iii)				X 50.73(a)(2)(i)				50.73(a)(2)(viii)(A)													
		20.406(a)(1)(iv)				50.73(a)(2)(ii)				50.73(a)(2)(viii)(B)													
		20.406(a)(1)(v)				50.73(a)(2)(iii)				50.73(a)(2)(ix)													
LICENSEE CONTACT FOR THIS LER (12)																							
NAME T. P. Noonan, General Manager Nuclear Operations										TELEPHONE NUMBER AREA CODE 4 1 2 6 4 3 - 1 2 5 8													
COMPLETE ONE LINE FOR EACH COMPONENT FAILURE DESCRIBED IN THIS REPORT (13)																							
CAUSE	SYSTEM	COMPONENT	MANUFACTURER	REPORTABLE TO NRRDS		CAUSE	SYSTEM	COMPONENT	MANUFACTURER	REPORTABLE TO NRRDS													
D	S	B	P	I	T	I																	
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)

On 1/17/90, the "B" Steam Generator Channel 3 Pressure Transmitter failed low and was declared inoperable. The transmitter was replaced and the channel was returned to service on 1/19/90. During supervisory review of the completed work package, it was discovered that the channel had been returned to service without completing the required time response testing on the new transmitter. The channel was immediately declared inoperable and out of service until the time response testing could be completed. This testing was performed and verified that the transmitter response was within the required specifications. The channel was declared operable and returned to service at this time. Review of the event determined that the post-maintenance testing program did not have a requirement for time response testing. The post-maintenance testing is being revised to require time response testing on required components. There were no safety implications due to this event. The time response testing verified that the channel was capable of performing its required function for the entire time when it was in service.

## LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER) TEXT CONTINUATION

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

APPROVED OMB NO. 3150-0104

EXPIRES 8/31/88

FACILITY NAME (1)	DOCKET NUMBER (2)	LER NUMBER (6)			PAGE (3)		
		YEAR	SEQUENTIAL NUMBER	REVISION NUMBER			
Beaver Valley Power Station Unit 2	0 5 0 0 0 4 1 2	9 0	— 0 0 2	— 0 0	0 2	OF	0 3

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

Description of Event

On 1/17/90, steam pressure channel 3 for the "B" Steam Generator failed low. The channel was declared inoperable and its associated bistables tripped, as required by Technical Specification 3.3.2.1. As per the requirements, operation could continue under these conditions until the channel's next functional test, which was due 1/24/90. Investigation determined that the channel had failed due to a fault in its associated steam pressure transmitter [2MSS-PT485]. The transmitter was replaced and channel recalibrated. The channel was declared operable and returned to service on 1/19/90.

On 2/12/90, during supervisory review of the completed work package, it was discovered that time response testing had not been performed on the new pressure transmitter. Technical Specification 3.3.2.1 requires time response testing as a condition of operability. The channel was immediately declared inoperable and removed from service. Time response testing was initiated and completed on 2/13/90. The results of the test showed that the transmitter had an acceptable time response. It was determined that the channel was operable and capable of performing its design function. The channel was then returned to service.

Cause of Event

The event occurred because of a failure to complete a Technical Specification required post-maintenance test (i.e. time response test). The station's post-maintenance testing program did not specifically identify the need for time response testing as a normal operability verification for transmitters. At the time the pressure transmitter was replaced, the involved supervisors did not identify the requirement to complete time response testing.

Corrective Actions

The requirement to perform time response testing is being incorporated into the post-maintenance testing procedure and formal review process. All maintenance supervisory personnel will receive training on this revised procedure.

Previous Similar Events

There has been one previous reportable event involving a missed time response surveillance (Unit 1 LER 85-009). In this previous event, a scheduling error resulted in the Train "A" Reactor Trip Response Time Test not being performed within its required frequency. There has also been one previous event (Unit 2 LER 87-012) caused by inadequate post-maintenance testing. In LER 87-012, the Rod Control System was returned to service after regulation failure without post-maintenance testing. The fault recurred, resulting in a reactor trip.

## LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER) TEXT CONTINUATION

FACILITY NAME (1)	DOCKET NUMBER (2)	LER NUMBER (6)			PAGE (3)	
		YEAR	SEQUENTIAL NUMBER	REVISION NUMBER		
Beaver Valley Power Station Unit 2	0 5 0 0 0 4 1 2	9 0	— 0 0 2	— 0 0	0 3	OF 0 3

TEXT (If more space is required, use additional NRC Form 388A's) (17)

Safety Analysis

There were no safety implications due to this event. Testing performed on 2/13/90 verified that the transmitter's response time was within the required specifications. This demonstrated that the associated channel was capable of performing its design function for the entire period when it was in service.