James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant 268 Lake Road P.O. Box 41 Lycoming, New York 13093

315-342**-38**40



Michael J. Colomb Site Executive Officer

February 3, 2000 JAFP-00-0028

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission Attn: Document Control Desk Mail Station P1-137 Washington, D.C. 20555

Subject:

Docket No. 50-333

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT: LER-00-001 (DER-00-0056)

Missed Surveillance Requirement due to Error in Reading the Surveillance

**Test Schedule** 

Dear Sir:

This report is submitted in accordance with 10 CFR 50.73 (a) (2) (i) (B).

There are no commitments contained in this report.

Questions concerning this report may be addressed to Mr. Mark Abramski at (315) 349-6305.

Very truly yours,

MICHAEL J. COLOMB

MJC::las Enclosure

cc:

USNRC, Region 1

USNRC, Project Directorate USNRC Resident Inspector INPO Records Center

IEDD

NRC FORM 366 U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION (6-1998)										APPROVED BY OMB NO. 3150-0104 EXPIRES 06/30/200 Estimated burden per response to comply with this mandatory information collection request: 50 hrs. Reported lessons learned are incorporated into the licensist process and fed back to industry. Forward comments regarding burden estimate									
		LICE	NSEE	EVE	NT REF	PORT	· (L	.ER)			the Re	cords	Manage	ement Branch (T-6	F33), U.S.	Nuclear Regu	latory Commission		
(See reverse for required number of digits/characters for each block)											Washington, DC 20555-0001, and to the Paperwork Reduction Project (3150-010-00 Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503. If an informatic collection does not display a currently valid OMB control number, the NRC may reconduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, the informatic collection.								
FACILIT	NAN	IE (1)									DOCK	ET N	NUMBE	R (2)		P	AGE (3)		
James	A.	FitzPatricl	k <b>N</b> ucl	lear Po	wer Plar	nt					C	50	0033	33		1	OF 3		
TITLE (4)		•															·		
Misse	d Su	rveillance	Requi	iremen	nt due to	Error	in	Reading	the S	Surveil	lance	Tes	st Sc	hedule					
EVENT DATE (5)		LER NUMBER (6)				REPORT DATE (7)				OTHER FACILITIES			ITIES II	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
MONTH	DAY	YEAR	YEA	AR .	SEQUENTIAL NUMBER			MONTH	DAY	YEA	R	FACILITY NAME  N/A			O5000				
01	06	00	00	0	001	00		02	03	oc	n II	FACILITY NAME  N/A			DOCKET NUMBER 05000				
OPERA	TING	N		THIS F	REPORT IS	SUBMI	TTE	D PURSU	ANT TO	THE F	REQUIR	EME	NTS C	OF 10 CFR §:	(Check	one or mo	re) (11)		
MODE (9)		IN	20.2201(b)				20.2203(a)(2)(v)			)	X 50.73(a)(2)(i)				50.73(a)(2)(viii)				
POWER LEVEL (10)		100	20.220		20.2203(a)(1)			20.2203(a)(3)(i)				5	50.73(a)(2)(ii)			50.73(a)(2)(x)			
		100	20.2203(a)(2)(i)				20.2203(a)(3)(ii)				50.73(a)(2)(iii)				73.71				
			20.2203(a)(2)(ii)				20.2203		-					THER					
			20.2203(a)(2)(iii)					50.36(c)		50.73(a)(2)(v)				Specify in Abstract be or in NRC Form 366A					
			20.2203(a)(2)(iv)				50.36(c)(2)				50.73(a)(2)(vii)				OF III NAC FOITH 300A				
						LIC	ENS	SEE CONT	ACT FO	OR THIS									
NAME											'	ELEPI	HUNE N	UMBER (Include Are	ea Code)				
Mr. M	ark /	Abramski,	Sr. L	icensir	ng Engin	eer								315-	349-6	305			
			1		1			0000074517									DEDODTANIE		
CALISE	:	SYSTEM	1 сом	PONENT	MANUFAC	THRER	ı	REPORTABLE		CALL	ISF I	SYS	TEM	COMPONENT	MANI	FACTURER	REPORTABLE		

ABSTRACT (Limit to 1400 spaces, i.e., approximately 15 single-spaced typewritten lines) (16)

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14)

(If yes, complete EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE).

On January 6, 2000 at 0400, with reactor power at 100 percent, it was determined that Surveillance Test (ST) - 29C, "Reactor Protection System (RPS) Channel Switch Functional Test" had not been performed within the test frequency required by the plant's Technical Specifications. ST-29C had been completed successfully on January 6, 2000 at 0303. The cause of this event was an inconsistency in the way surveillance test frequency requirements were translated from a surveillance test tracking database to a work scheduling database, and reviews of reports from these databases failed to identify the discrepancy. Corrective actions include a review of all scheduled surveillance activities to verify that no other scheduled surveillance activities had exceeded their required due dates, a formal critique with lessons learned and a change to the procedure used by the Work Week Manager to provide direction regarding what data sources are to be used to check work schedule surveillance test due dates.

X NO

MONTH

EXPECTED SUBMISSION

**DATE (15)** 

DAY

YEAR

# LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER)

TEXT CONTINUATION										
FACILITY NAME (1)	DOCKET (2)	LER NUMBER (6)				PAGE (3)				
James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant	05000333	YEAR	SEQUENTIAL Number	REVISION Number	2	OF	3			
James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant		00	001	00						

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

EIIS Codes in [ ]

### Event Description

On January 6, 2000 at 0400, with reactor power at 100 percent, it was determined that Surveillance Test (ST) - 29C, "Reactor Protection System (RPS) [JC] Channel Switch Functional Test" had not been performed within the test frequency required by the plant's Technical Specifications.

The Technical Specifications require that the automatic scram contactors be exercised once every week by either using the RPS channel test switches or performing a functional test of any automatic scram function. Post event analysis determined that three of the four automatic scram contactors had been tested by other functional tests of the RPS system within the required surveillance frequency, but that the contactor associated with A-1 RPS channel had not. The A-1 RPS channel was functionally tested by successfully performing ST-29C. ST-29C had been completed successfully on January 6, 2000 at 0303. The Technical Specification required surveillance frequency (including the allowable 25% extension) for the A-1 RPS scram contactor was exceeded by two days.

#### Cause

The cause of this event was personnel error (Cause Code A). There was an inconsistency in the way surveillance test frequency requirements were translated from a surveillance test tracking database to a work scheduling database, and reviews of reports from these databases failed to identify the discrepancy.

#### Analysis

This event was not significant from a safety or operational perspective. Successful completion of ST-29C on January 6, 2000 demonstrated that the scram contactor associated with the A-1 RPS channel was capable of performing its intended safety function.

This event does did not adversely impact the ability of any plant equipment to perform it's intended function therefore none of the performance indicator cornerstones identified in NEI 99-02 (Draft Rev D.) are applicable.

## Extent of Condition

A review of all scheduled surveillance activities was conducted to verify that no other scheduled surveillance activities had exceeded their required due dates. This review determined that there were no other missed surveillance requirements. This review was completed January 6, 2000.

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

## LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER)

**TEXT CONTINUATION** 

FACILITY NAME (1)	DOCKET (2)	DOCKET (2) LER NUMBER (6)			PAGE (3)			
James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant	05000333	YEAR	SEQUENTIAL Number	REVISION Number	2	OF	3	
James A. FitzFattick Nuclear Fower Flant	05000555	00	001	00	3			

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

#### Corrective Action

- 1. A review of all scheduled surveillance activities was conducted to verify that no other scheduled surveillance activities had exceeded their required due dates. (Complete)
- A formal event critique was conducted. Lessons-learned were identified and shared with operations and work planning personnel responsible for preparing and reviewing surveillance test schedules. (Complete)
- 3. The procedure used by the Work Week Manager was revised to provide direction regarding what data sources are to be used to check work schedule surveillance test due dates. (Complete)

## Additional Information

LERs 86-001 and 86-002 identify two other instances where surveillance requirements were not performed within the required time period due to administrative control deficiencies. The administrative controls used to schedule surveillance requirements have changed significantly since that time.