

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER)

Facility Name (1) SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNIT 2		Docket Number (2) 0 5 0 0 0 3 6 1	Page (3) 1 of 0 1
Title (4) Typographical Error in Containment Air Lock Surveillance Requirement			

EVENT DATE (5)				LER NUMBER (6)				REPORT DATE (7)				OTHER FACILITIES INVOLVED (8)						
Month	Day	Year	Year	///	Sequential Number	///	Revision Number	Month	Day	Year	Year	Facility Names		Docket Number(s)				
0	7	0	7	9	5	9	5	0	1	2	0	0	0	7	3	1	9	5

OPERATING MODE (9) 1		THIS REPORT IS SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF 10CFR (Check one or more of the following) (11)											
POWER LEVEL (10) 0 9 9	20.402(b)		20.405(c)		50.73(a)(2)(iv)		73.71(b)						
	20.405(a)(1)(i)		50.36(c)(1)		50.73(a)(2)(v)		73.71(c)						
	20.405(a)(1)(ii)		50.36(c)(2)		50.73(a)(2)(vii)		Other (Specify in						
	20.405(a)(1)(iii)		50.73(a)(2)(i)		50.73(a)(2)(viii)(A)		Abstract below and						
	20.405(a)(1)(iv)		50.73(a)(2)(ii)		50.73(a)(2)(viii)(B)		in text)						
	20.405(a)(1)(v)		50.73(a)(2)(iii)		50.73(a)(2)(x)								

LICENSEE CONTACT FOR THIS LER (12)											
Name R. W. Krieger, Vice President, Nuclear Generation								TELEPHONE NUMBER 7 1 4 3 6 8 1 6 2 5 5			

COMPLETE ONE LINE FOR EACH COMPONENT FAILURE DESCRIBED IN THIS REPORT (13)											
CAUSE	SYSTEM	COMPONENT	MANUFAC-	REPORTABLE	////////	CAUSE	SYSTEM	COMPONENT	MANUFAC-	REPORTABLE	////////
			TURER	TO NPRDS	////////				TURER	TO NPRDS	////////
					////////						////////
					////////						////////

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14)								Expected Submission Date (15)	Month	Day	Year
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (If yes, complete EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO											

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

On 7/7/95, with Unit 2 operating in Mode 1 at 99% reactor power, during a review of a Unit 3 containment [NH] air lock [AL] door [DR] seal [SEAL] test, it was identified that the common procedure used for testing both Unit 2 and 3 containment air lock door seals did not match Unit 2 Technical Specifications (TS) Surveillance Requirement 4.6.1.3a. The procedure specified a test pressure of 9.5 +/- 0.5 psig; the Unit 2 TS specifies 9.5 + 0.5 psig. On 7/14/95, a review of past test data verified that some air lock door seal tests at Unit 2 were accepted with pressures between 9.0 and 9.5 psig. Therefore, Edison is reporting this occurrence in accordance with 10 CFR 50.73 (a) (2) (i).

This occurrence was caused by an Edison typographical error in a Unit 2 TS change request. As originally issued by the NRC, the Unit 2 TS was "greater than or equal to 10 psig;" the Unit 3 TS was "9.5 +/- 0.5 psig." In 1982 and 1983, Edison submitted two TS amendment requests to change the Unit 2 TS to match the Unit 3 TS. However, due to an Edison typographical error, the requests did not include the minus sign, and this omission remained in the TS when issued as Amendment 16 by the NRC. Because the same containment air lock seal test procedure is used at both units, some Unit 2 tests were conducted within the 9.5 +/- 0.5 psig intended value, but not within the literal TS requirement.

Edison has revised the containment air lock seal test procedure to ensure compliance with the literal wording of the TS for both Units. Upon final implementation of the Technical Specification Improvement Project (TSIP), the Unit 2 and 3 containment air lock TS will be the same. The Unit 2 testing always complied with the NRC approved Unit 3 TS test pressure; therefore, there was no safety significance to this occurrence.

LERs 2-94-002 and 2-94-003 also reported missed TS surveillances due to TS/procedure mismatch. Because the error reported herein preceded the earlier events, previous corrective actions could not have prevented this occurrence.