

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|--|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------------|---|--|-------|------------------|--|--|
| FACILITY NAME (1) Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 1 | | | | | | | | | | DOCKET NUMBER (2) 0 5 0 0 0 4 1 3 | | | | PAGE (3) 1 OF 0 3 | |
| TITLE (4) Failure to Leak Test Valve 1FW4 After Replacement | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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(S) | | |
| 0 9 | 2 8 | 8 4 | 8 4 | 0 1 5 | 0 0 1 | 1 1 | 6 8 | 4 | | | | | 0 5 0 0 0 | | |
| OPERATING MODE (9) 4 | | THIS REPORT IS SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF 10 CFR §: (Check one or more of the following) (11) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| POWER LEVEL (10) 0 1 0 1 0 | | 20.402(b) | | | | 20.405(c) | | | | 50.73(a)(2)(iv) | | | | 73.71(b) | |
| | | 20.405(a)(1)(i) | | | | 50.38(a)(1) | | | | 50.73(a)(2)(v) | | | | 73.71(c) | |
| | | 20.405(a)(1)(ii) | | | | 50.38(a)(2) | | | | 50.73(a)(2)(vii) | | | | OTHER (Specify in Abstract below and in Text, NRC Form 366A) | |
| | | 20.405(a)(1)(iii) | | | | 50.73(a)(2)(i) | | | | 50.73(a)(2)(viii)(A) | | | | | |
| | | 20.405(a)(1)(iv) | | | | 50.73(a)(2)(ii) | | | | 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 Roger W. Ouellette, Assistant Engineer - Licensing | | | | | | | | | | TELEPHONE NUMBER 7 0 4 3 7 3 - 7 5 3 0 | | | | | |
| COMPLETE ONE LINE FOR EACH COMPONENT FAILURE DESCRIBED IN THIS REPORT (13) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CAUSE | SYSTEM | COMPONENT | MANUFACTURER | REPORTABLE TO NPDOS | CAUSE | SYSTEM | COMPONENT | MANUFACTURER | REPORTABLE TO NPDOS | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 September 9, 1984, work was completed on replacement of valve 1FW4, Refueling Water Containment Isolation Valve. At that time, the valve was not tested for leakage. Tech Spec 3.6.1.2 requires that each possible leakage path from containment be identified and tested; this Tech Spec is applicable in Modes 1, 2, 3 and 4.

On September 28, 1984, Catawba Unit 1 entered Mode 4, Hot Shutdown, without having leak rate tested 1FW4. The valve was leak rate tested on 10-19-84, and the violation was discovered during a review of the work request.

The Maintenance Job Supervisor did not pursue retesting on valve 1FW4 as stated on the work request and as required by Maintenance Management Procedure 1.0. Therefore, this incident is classified as a Personnel Error.

8411290128 841116
PDR ADDCK 05000413
S PDR

IE 22
1/1

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER) TEXT CONTINUATION

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

APPROVED OMB NO. 3150-0104

EXPIRES 8/31/85

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|------------|--|
| FACILITY NAME (1) | DOCKET NUMBER (2) | LER NUMBER (6) | | | PAGE (3) | | |
| | | YEAR | SEQUENTIAL NUMBER | REVISION NUMBER | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 1 | 0 5 0 0 0 4 1 3 8 4 | — | 0 1 5 | — | 0 0 | 0 2 OF 0 3 | |

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

Nuclear Station Modification (NSM) Work Request NSM466 was written on 8-16-84. The purpose of the NSM was to replace valve 1FW4, a 6 inch Containment Isolation Gate Valve. The original valve body was cracked and needed to be replaced by a same type valve but with a different item number, requiring an NSM. The work request was planned on 8-28-84, and at that time the Planner correctly determined and indicated that a retest was required. The replacement of 1FW4 was completed on 9-4-84. It was determined that the system status would not allow an inservice leak test (Weld Leak Test) at the time. However, the Maintenance Supervisor did not pursue retesting as required by Work Request NSM466, Section 2.

On 9-26-84, the Maintenance Supervisor signed the "Job Supervisor" block in Section 9 of the work request. Per Maintenance Management Procedure 1.0, Section 4.9.1, the Job Supervisor's signature certifies that all of the required work has been performed, including retesting and/or functional verifications. Therefore, the Job Supervisor's signature on 9-26-84 was in violation of Maintenance Management Procedure 1.0. After signing the work request, the Maintenance Supervisor sent the work request back to the Planner and indicated that the Weld Leak Test could not be performed at the present time.

On 9-28-84, Catawba Unit 1 entered Mode 4, Hot Shutdown. Tech Spec 3.6.1.2 requires that all possible containment leakage paths be identified and their leakages be within acceptable limits. When Catawba Unit 1 entered Mode 4, Valve 1FW4 (Replacement Valve) had not been leak rate tested, thereby constituting a violation.

The Weld Leak Test was performed on 10-19-84, and then the Maintenance Supervisor gave the work request for the Leak Rate Test. The Leak Rate Test was then performed with acceptable results. During a review of the work request after testing, it was discovered that there was a violation.

The Maintenance Supervisor responsible for the job did not understand that a retest had to be performed on 1FW4 prior to his signing it off. Per Maintenance Management Procedure 1.0, the Job Supervisor is responsible for ensuring retests and/or functional verifications are performed. The Job Supervisor should have pursued retesting before giving the work request back to Planning. This Job Supervisor has received training in Maintenance Management Procedure 1.0, but he will be given re-training.

A contributing cause to this incident was the failure to identify this NSM as a Mode 4 requirement on the NSM Schedule. The NSM Schedule showed the NSM on 1FW4 as required for Mode 3. It is not known how this incorrect information got on the schedule. As a corrective action, a more thorough initial review of all NSM Work Requests, including scheduling concerns is to be conducted.

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER) TEXT CONTINUATION

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

APPROVED OMB NO. 3150-0104

EXPIRES: 8/31/85

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|----------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------|----|-----|
| FACILITY NAME (1) Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 1 | DOCKET NUMBER (2) 0 5 0 0 0 4 1 3 | LER NUMBER (6) | | | PAGE (3) | | |
| | | YEAR | SEQUENTIAL NUMBER | REVISION NUMBER | | | |
| | | 8 4 | — 0 1 5 | — 0 0 | 0 3 | OF | 0 3 |

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

CORRECTIVE ACTION

A Leak Rate Test (PT/1/A/4200/01C) was conducted by the Performance Group.

Mode requirements are being placed on all NSM Work Requests to alert the Planning and Scheduling group to Mode applicability.

A more thorough initial review of all NSM Work Requests is being conducted, including:

- (a) Requirement for each accountable Projects Engineer to utilize Entry and Update Forms to maintain an up-to-date NSM schedule.
- (b) Meetings to review retest and/or functional verification requirements.

The Job Supervisor responsible for NSM466 will receive further training in Maintenance Management Procedure 1.0.

The Immediate Corrective Action verified that acceptable Leak Test data was obtained prior to re-entering Mode 4.

The Subsequent Corrective Action assures the proper identification of mode requirements and retest and/or functional verifications associated with NSM Work Requests.

SAFETY ANALYSIS

Catawba Unit 1 remained in Mode 4 for approximately 14 days without 1FW4 being Leak Rate tested. However, when 1FW4 was Leak Rate tested on 10-19-84, a leakage of 28 SCCM (Standard Cubic Centimeters per Minute) was obtained, well within the allowable 885 SCCM for a 6 inch Gate Valve. The health and safety of the public was not affected by this incident.

DUKE POWER COMPANY

P.O. BOX 33189
CHARLOTTE, N.C. 28242

HAL B. TUCKER
VICE PRESIDENT
NUCLEAR PRODUCTION

TELEPHONE
(704) 373-4531

November 16, 1984

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

Subject: Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 1
Docket No. 50-413

Gentlemen:

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.73 Section (a) (1) and (d), attached is Licensee Event Report 413/84-15 concerning failure to leak test valve 1FW4 after replacement. This event was considered to be of no significance with respect to the health and safety of the public.

Very truly yours,

H.B. Tucker / BT

Hal B. Tucker

RWO:slb

Attachment

cc: Mr. James P. O'Reilly, Regional Administrator
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region II
101 Marietta Street, NW, Suite 2900
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

INPO Records Center
Suite 1500
100 Circle 75 Parkway
Atlanta, Georgia 30339

NRC Resident Inspector
Catawba Nuclear Station

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

Palmetto Alliance
2135 1/2 Devine Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29205

IE 22
41

Document Control Desk
November 16, 1984
Page Two

cc: Robert Guild, Esq.
P. O. Box 12097
Charleston, S. C. 29412

Mr. Jesse L. Riley
Carolina Environmental Study Group
854 Henley Place
Charlotte, North Carolina 28207

Mr. James L. Kelley, Chairman
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Dr. Paul W. Purdom
235 Columbia Drive
Decatur, Georgia 30030

Dr. Richard F. Foster
P. O. Box 4263
Sunriver, Oregon 97702