



Entergy  
Operations

Ref: 10CFR50.73(a)(2)(i)

Entergy Operations, Inc.

PO Box 11

Springfield, MA 01103

TEL: 413-733-4600

W3B5-91-0212

A4.05

QA

July 22, 1991

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

Subject: Waterford 3 SES  
Docket No. 50-382  
License No. NPF-38  
Reporting of Licensee Event Report

Gentlemen:

Attached is Licensee Event Report Number LER-91-012-00 for Waterford Steam Electric Station Unit 3. This Licensee Event Report is submitted pursuant to 10CFR50.73(a)(2)(i).

Very truly yours,

D.F. Packer  
General Manager - Plant Operations

DFP/HIC/jrr  
Attachment

cc: Messrs. R.D. Martin  
G.L. Florreich  
J.T. Wheelock - INPO Records Center  
E.L. Blake  
D.L. Wigginton  
N.S. Reynolds  
NRC Resident Inspectors Office

9107240144 910722  
PDR ADOCK 05000382  
S PDR

IF22  
11

## LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER)

ESTIMATED BURDEN PER RESPONSE TO COMPLY WITH THIS INFORMATION COLLECTION REQUEST: 600 HRS. FORWARD COMMENTS REGARDING BURDEN ESTIMATE TO THE RECORDS AND REPORTS MANAGEMENT BRANCH (P-530), U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION, WASHINGTON, DC 20555, AND TO THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION PROJECT (3150-0104), OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, WASHINGTON, DC 20503.

FACILITY NAME (1):

Waterford Steam Electric Station Unit 3

DOCKET NUMBER (2):

0 5 0 0 0 3 8 2 1 OF 0 3

PAGE (3):

TITLE (4):

Failure to Perform Emergency Diesel Generator Surveillance due to Inadequate Attention to Detail

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 (9)				
0	6	2	1	9	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	5	0	0	0
0	6	2	1	9	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	5	0	0	0
OPERATING MODE (10)			THIS REPORT IS SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF 10 CFR 50. (Check one or more of the following) (11)												
1			20.402(b)			20.405(c)			50.73(a)(2)(iv)			79.71(b)			
POWER LEVEL (10)			20.405(a)(1)(i)			50.36(c)(1)			50.73(a)(2)(v)			79.71(c)			
1			20.405(a)(1)(ii)			50.36(c)(2)			50.73(a)(2)(vi)			OTHER (Specify in Abstract below and in Text, NRC Form 306A)			
			20.405(a)(1)(iii)			50.73(a)(2)(ii)			50.73(a)(2)(vii)(A)						
			20.405(a)(1)(iv)			50.73(a)(2)(iii)			50.73(a)(2)(viii)(B)						
			20.405(a)(1)(v)			50.73(a)(2)(iii)			50.73(a)(2)(ix)						

LICENSEE CONTACT FOR THIS LER (12)

NAME

D.W. Vinci, Operations Superintendent

TELEPHONE NUMBER

AREA CODE

5 0 4 4 6 4 - 3 1 3 4

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

CAUSE	SYSTEM	COMPONENT	MANUFACTURER	REPORTABLE TO NRC	CAUSE	SYSTEM	COMPONENT	MANUFACTURER	REPORTABLE TO NRC

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14)

YES (If yes, complete EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE)		NO		EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE (15)	MONTH	DAY	YEAR
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>					

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

On June 21, 1991, Waterford Steam Electric Station Unit 3 was operating at 100% power with the 'A' Emergency Diesel Generator (EDG) inoperable. The 'A' EDG had been declared inoperable due to Essential Service Chiller 'A' being secured for maintenance at 1638 hours on June 21, 1991. Technical Specification (TS) 3.8.1.1 was entered, requiring verification of offsite AC power availability within one hour of declaring the 'A' EDG inoperable and every eight hours thereafter. A review of the control room logs revealed that the one hour requirement was not complied with until 2223 hours on June 21, 1991. Similar conditions existed on June 20, 1991, from 0855 hours to 1122 hours, and from 1306 hours to 2101 hours. Therefore, the plant operated in a condition prohibited by TSs.

The root cause of this event is inadequate attention to detail. The Control Room Supervisor (CRS) failed to perform the action requirements of TS 3.8.1.1, resulting in a failure to perform the required surveillance. The CRS involved was debriefed on this event and a procedure will be issued to provide additional guidance on TS compliance.

Because offsite AC electrical power was verified available at 2223 hours on June 21, 1991, and existed throughout the event, no threat to the health & safety of the public or plant personnel existed.

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER)  
TEXT CONTINUATION

ESTIMATED BURDEN PER RESPONSE TO COMPLY WITH THIS INFORMATION COLLECTION REQUEST: 600 HRS. FORWARD COMMENTS REGARDING BURDEN ESTIMATE TO THE RECORDS AND REPORTS MANAGEMENT BRANCH (F-630), U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION, WASHINGTON, DC 20555, AND TO THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION PROJECT (3150-0104), OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, WASHINGTON, DC 20503.

FACILITY NAME (1)  Waterford Steam Electric Station Unit 3	DOCKET NUMBER (2)  0 5 0 0 0 3 8 2 9 1	LER NUMBER (6)			PAGE (3)		
		YEAR	SEQUENTIAL NUMBER	REVISION NUMBER			
		0 1 2	0 0	0 2	OF	0 3	

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

On June 21, 1991, Waterford Steam Electric Station Unit 3 was operating at 100% power with the 'A' Emergency Diesel Generator (EDG) (EIIIS Identifier EK-DG) inoperable. The 'A' EDG was declared inoperable and Technical Specification (TS) 3.8.1.1 entered at 1638 hours on June 21, 1991, due to Essential Services Chiller 'A' (EIIIS Identifier KM) being secured for maintenance. Because the Essential Chillers are the source of cooling water to the Component Cooling Water Pump (CCW) (EIIIS Identifier CC-P) room coolers (EIIIS Identifier VF-CLR), and the CCW pumps supply EDG cooling water, it was necessary to declare the 'A' EDG inoperable.

Technical Specification (TS) 3.8.1.1 action requirement b specifies verifying the Electrical Breaker Alignment check, Operational Procedure OP-903-066, within one hour of declaring an EDG inoperable and every eight hours thereafter. Although TS 3.8.1.1 was entered when the 'A' EDG was declared inoperable, the offsite AC power availability check was not completed until 2223 hours on June 21, 1991, contrary to TS 3.8.1.1 action requirement b. This condition was discovered at approximately 2220 hours on June 21, 1991, during a review of the control logs. Further review of the control room logs revealed that similar conditions existed on June 20, 1991 from 1306 hours to 2101 hours and June 21, 1991 from 0855 hours to 1122 hours.

The root cause of this event is inadequate attention to detail. The Control Room Supervisor (CRS) properly entered TS 3.8.1.1, but did not initiate the electrical breaker alignment check in order to satisfy the action requirements of TS 3.8.1.1.

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER)  
TEXT CONTINUATION

ESTIMATED BURDEN PER RESPONSE TO COMPLY WITH THIS INFORMATION COLLECTION REQUEST: 600 HRS. FORWARD COMMENTS REGARDING BURDEN ESTIMATE TO THE RECORDS AND REPORTS MANAGEMENT BRANCH (PC-301), U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION, WASHINGTON, DC 20555, AND TO THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION PROJECT (3150-0104), OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, WASHINGTON, DC 20503.

FACILITY NAME (1)  Waterford Steam Electric Station Unit 3	DOCKET NUMBER (2)  0 5 0 0 0 3 8 2	LER NUMBER (6)			PAGE (3)		
		YEAR	SEQUENTIAL NUMBER	REVISION NUMBER			
		9 1	0 1	2	0 0	0 3	OF 0 3

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

The CRS involved was debriefed on this event. As an action to prevent recurrence, a new operating procedure, "Technical Specification Compliance," OP-100-014, will be issued to provide additional clarification and guidance on entering cascading Technical Specifications. A caution will be added to OP-002-003, Component Cooling Water System, and OP-002-004, Chilled Water System, that will ensure the TS requirements are properly implemented when cascading Technical Specification are entered. This report and OP-100-014 will be entered into the Operations Department required reading program.

Because offsite AC electrical power was verified available at 2223 hour on June 21, 1991, and was known to be available throughout this event, no threat to the health and safety of the general public or plant personnel existed.

SIMILAR EVENTS

LER-89-021 and 89-022 reported similar events in which the action requirements of TS 3.8.1.1 were not performed. In LER-89-021 the electrical breaker verification was missed while the control room staff was engaged in reactor startup procedures. In LER 89-022, improper interpretation of the action requirements of TS 3.8.1.1 resulted in a failure to run the 'B' EDG within the prescribed time limit.

PLANT CONTACT

D.W. Vinci, Operations Superintendent, 504/464-3134