

## LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER)

FACILITY NAME (1) D.C. COOK NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT 1	DOCKET NUMBER (2) 0 5 0 0 0 3 1 5	PAGE (3) 1 OF 0 2
--	--------------------------------------	----------------------

TITLE (4) POTENTIAL FOR RESIDUAL HEAT REMOVAL SYSTEM OPERATION BELOW ALLOWABLE FLOW LIMITS									
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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	8	0	7	8	5	0	4	0	D.C. COOK, UNIT 2		0 5 0 0 0 3 1 6
0	8	0	7	8	5	0	0	0			0 5 0 0 0

THIS REPORT IS SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF 10 CFR § (Check one or more of the following) (11)												
OPERATING MODE (9) 5		20.402(b)			20.405(c)			50.73(a)(2)(iv)			73.71(b)	
POWER LEVEL (10) 0 0 0		20.405(a)(1)(i)			50.38(c)(1)			50.73(a)(2)(iv)			73.71(c)	
		20.405(a)(1)(ii)			50.38(c)(2)			50.73(a)(2)(vii)			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OTHER (Specify in Abstract below and in Text, NRC Form 306A)	
		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 A.A. BLIND - ASSISTANT PLANT MANAGER								TELEPHONE NUMBER 6 1 6 4 6 5 - 5 9 0 1	

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)						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)

THIS IS A SPECIAL REPORT CONCERNING A CONDITION DISCOVERED DURING THE INVESTIGATION OF THE EVENT REPORTED IN LER 50-315/85-031.

ON AUGUST 7, 1985, AT 1800 HOURS WITH BOTH UNITS 1 AND 2 IN MODE 5 (COLD SHUTDOWN), IT WAS DETERMINED THAT THE RESIDUAL HEAT REMOVAL (RHR) LOW-FLOW ALARM IS BYPASSED WHEN AN ALTERNATE (ECCS) FLOW PATH IS USED. THE LOW-FLOW ALARM WAS INSTALLED IN THE NORMAL COOLDOWN RETURN LINE TO SATISFY A UNIT 2 LICENSE CONDITION. THIS LICENSE CONDITION, WHICH WAS IMPOSED DUE TO CONCERN OVER INADVERTENT ISOLATION VALVE CLOSURE, REQUIRED THAT THE FLOW INDICATORS BE CONTINUOUSLY MONITORED DURING RHR OPERATION. UPON INSTALLATION OF THE RHR LOW-FLOW ALARM, THE LICENSE CONDITION WAS REMOVED. HOWEVER, THE OCCASIONAL USE OF AN ALTERNATE FLOW PATH, WHICH HAS NO LOW-FLOW ALARM, HAS RESULTED IN THE SITUATION THAT PROMPTED THE ORIGINAL LICENSE CONDITION.

TO INSURE THAT A LOSS OF RHR FLOW IS DETECTED, APPROPRIATE CONTROLS HAVE BEEN IMPLEMENTED REQUIRING THE CONTROL ROOM OPERATORS TO MONITOR RHR FLOW INSTRUMENTATION WHEN USING THE ALTERNATE FLOW PATH.

8509160244 850906  
PDR ADOCK 05000315  
S PDR

## LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER) TEXT CONTINUATION

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			
D.C. COOK NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT 1	0 5 0 0 0 3 1 5	8 5	— 0 4 0	— 0 0	0 2	OF	0 2

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

THIS IS A SPECIAL REPORT CONCERNING A CONDITION DISCOVERED DURING THE INVESTIGATION OF THE EVENT REPORTED IN LER 50-315/85-031.

ON AUGUST 7, 1985, AT 1800 HOURS WITH BOTH UNITS 1 AND 2 IN MODE 5 (COLD SHUTDOWN), IT WAS DETERMINED THAT THE RESIDUAL HEAT REMOVAL (RHR) LOW-FLOW ALARM IS BYPASSED WHEN AN ALTERNATE (ECCS) FLOW PATH IS USED. THE LOW-FLOW ALARM WAS INSTALLED IN THE NORMAL COOLDOWN RETURN LINE TO SATISFY A UNIT 2 LICENSE CONDITION. THIS LICENSE CONDITION, WHICH WAS IMPOSED DUE TO CONCERN OVER INADVERTENT ISOLATION VALVE CLOSURE, REQUIRED THAT THE FLOW INDICATORS BE CONTINUOUSLY MONITORED DURING RHR OPERATION. UPON INSTALLATION OF THE RHR LOW-FLOW ALARM, THE LICENSE CONDITION WAS REMOVED. HOWEVER, THE OCCASIONAL USE OF AN ALTERNATE FLOW PATH, WHICH HAS NO LOW-FLOW ALARM, HAS RESULTED IN THE SITUATION THAT PROMPTED THE ORIGINAL LICENSE CONDITION.

INADVERTENT CLOSURE OF THE RHR ISOLATION VALVES IS NOT CONSIDERED TO BE A LIKELY EVENT. ONCE THE VALVES HAVE BEEN OPENED, POWER IS REMOVED FROM THE VALVE OPERATORS. THUS, THE RESTORATION OF POWER TO THE VALVES IS A PREREQUISITE TO CLOSURE OF THE VALVES.

WHEN THE ALTERNATE FLOW PATH IS USED, THE INDICATIONS AVAILABLE TO THE OPERATOR TO WARN OF A LOW-FLOW CONDITION ARE:

1. PUMP ABNORMAL OR LOCKOUT ALARM
2. PUMP MOTOR INSTANT TRIP ALARM
3. FLOW METERS (NO ALARM)
4. PUMP AMMETER (NO ALARM)

ANY OF THESE COULD ALERT THE OPERATOR TO THE LOSS OF RHR FLOW. THE LOSS OF RHR FLOW HAS BEEN EVALUATED, AND UNDER THE WORST ASSUMED CONDITIONS, 100 MINUTES ARE AVAILABLE BEFORE THE CORE WOULD BECOME UNCOVERED. THUS, IT IS JUDGED THAT THERE WAS TIME FOR THE OPERATOR TO DETECT THAT A PROBLEM EXISTED AND TAKE ACTION TO RESTORE RHR COOLING.

BASED ON THE FACTS THAT THERE IS INSTRUMENTATION WHICH WOULD ALLOW THE OPERATOR TO DETECT A LOSS OF RHR FLOW AND THAT THERE WOULD BE TIME TO RESTORE RHR COOLING, IT IS CONSIDERED THAT THIS CONDITION DID NOT CONSTITUTE AN UNREVIEWED SAFETY QUESTION AS DEFINED IN 10 CFR 50.59 NOR DOES IT ADVERSELY AFFECT THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY.

TO INSURE THAT A LOSS OF RHR FLOW IS DETECTED, APPROPRIATE CONTROLS HAVE BEEN IMPLEMENTED REQUIRING THE CONTROL ROOM OPERATORS TO MONITOR RHR FLOW INSTRUMENTATION WHEN USING THE ALTERNATE FLOW PATH.