

December 14, 1971



Dr. Peter A. Morris, Director
Division of Reactor Licensing
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission
7920 Norfolk Avenue
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Re: Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation
Docket No. 40 - 244

50-

Subject: Failure of "C" Safety Injection Pump
to Start on Test
R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant Unit No. 1

Dear Dr. Morris:

At about 1100 hours on December 5, 1971, during the performance of the routine monthly surveillance test, No. PT-2.1 Safety Injection System, the "C" Safety Injection Pump motor tripped automatically when nearly up to speed. This was a manual start with the electric feed coming from 480 volt Bus No. 16. The "A" and "B" Safety Injection Pumps had been successfully tested preceding the failure of the "C" to start.

A second attempt produced the same result. The investigation which followed revealed that the "B" phase series overcurrent tripping device, which has a long time delay and instantaneous element, was tripping out the motor on starting current because of leakage in the time delay dashpot.

The electric feed to this pump motor was then transferred to the alternate source, 480 volt Bus No. 14, which also has a three phase protection. The motor was turned by hand and the leads from Bus No. 14 were megged before the motor was energized. The "C" injection pump start was successful and the surveillance test was completed.

As a recheck, the faulty relay was reinstalled and again the injection pump motor tripped as before. Removal of the "B" phase protection but leaving the other two phases with overcurrent protection permitted the proper function of the breaker during motor startup.

The Plant Operations Review Committee reviewed the occurrence and agreed that overcurrent protection on two phases of the breaker from Bus No. 16 was adequate.

A replacement overcurrent device with the same type long time delay and instantaneous overcurrent element was installed on the "C" Injection Pump Motor primary breaker of Bus No. 16 on December 10, 1971. The Safety Injection Pump was tested and operated successfully with this new unit.

8304200099 711214
PDR ADOCK 05000244
S PDR

December 14,
Dr. Peter A. Morris

HEET NO. 2

This type of failure of a protective device appears to be relatively rare as we have only had one previous experience some years ago at one of our fossil plants.

An inspection of these devices is made annually in addition to the routine monthly surveillance test of this system.

Very truly yours,

Keith W. Amish
Keith W. Amish