

**GPU Nuclear** 

P.O. Box 388
Forked River, New Jersey 08731
609-693-6000
Writer's Direct Dial Number:

November 11, 1982

Mr. Ronald C. Haynes, Administrator Region I U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission 631 Park Avenue King of Prussia, PA 19406

Dear Mr. Haynes:

Subject: Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station

Docket No. 50-219 Licensee Event Report

Reportable Occurrence No. 50-219/82-45/03L

This letter forwards three copies of a Licensee Event Report (LER) to report Reportable Occurrence No. 50-219/82-45/03L in compliance with paragraph 6.9.2.b.2 of the Technical Specifications. We recognize that the time limitation specified in the Technical Specifications, paragraph 6.9.2.b, for the submittal of this LER, has been exceeded. The reason for the delay is as follows:

A deviation report is the administrative mechanism which initiates management review for corrective action and the determination of reportability of an event. Deviation Report No. 82-201 was prepared for Emergency Service Water (ESW) pump 52A after it had failed an inservice test on September 9, 1982. The discharge pressure gauge on ESW pump 52A was checked and calibrated, the pump retested satisfactorily and was then declared operable. This was noted on the deviation report. Upon management review of the deviation report, it was determined that the event, which occurred on September 9, 1982, was not reportable due to the fact that the gauge was calibrated, the pump retested satisfactorily and was never removed from service, i.e., breakers and switches were not tagged out.

On the following day, September 10, 1982, the test was again performed on ESW pump 52A and it failed. The pump was subsequently declared inoperable, and was removed from service on September 11, 1982, to perform corrective maintenance. It appears that a deviation report was not written for the failure of the pump to pass the test on September 10, probably because the preparation of an additional report seemed redundant.

8211290575 821111 PDR ADOCK 05000219 S PDR

TEN

It was not until October 12, 1982, that it was realized that the event which occurred on September 10, constituted a reportable occurrence, when the Plant Operations Review Committee, during a review of the September Monthly Operating Report, noted the discrepancy. As a result, reportability of the event was not determined until a month after its occurrence.

Very truly yours,

Peter B. Fledler

Vice President and Director Oyster Creek

PBF:PFC:lse Enclosures

cc: Director (40 copies)
 Office of Inspection and Enforcement
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Director (3 copies)
Office of Management Information and
Program Control
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

NRC Resident Inspector Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station Forked River, NJ 08731

### OYSTER CREEK NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION Forked River, New Jersey 08731

Licensee Event Report
Reportable Occurrence No. 50-219/82-45/03L

# Report Date

November 11, 1982

#### Occurrence Date

September 10, 1982

#### Identification of Occurrence

It was discovered on October 12, 1982, that Emergency Service Water pump 52A had been declared inoperable on September 10, 1982, and subsequently removed from service for maintenance on September 11, 1982. This constitutes operation in a degraded mode, permitted by a limiting condition for operation, as specified in the Technical Specifications, paragraph 3.4.C.4.

This event is considered to be a reportable occurrence as defined in the Technical Specifications, paragraph 6.9.2.b.2.

## Conditions Prior to Occurrence

The plant was operating at steady state power.

Major Plant Parameters:

Reactor Power - 1280 MWt Generator Load - 414 MWe

#### Description of Occurrence

During performance of the Containment Spray and Emergency Service Water (ESW) inservice test on September 9, 1982, ESW pump 52A was found to have a discharge pressure below the acceptable limit. The pump was declared inoperable and the redundant ESW pump (52B) tested satisfactorily.

The discharge pressure gauge for ESW pump 52A was checked and calibrated, and the pump was retested. During the retest, discharge pressure was above the acceptable limit, and ESW pump 52A was declared operable.

On September 10, 1982, the test on ESW pump 52A was performed again at the request of operations management. The pump discharge pressure was again below the acceptable limit, and the pump was subsequently declared inoperable. The following day, ESW pump 52A was removed from service and rendered inoperable in order to perform maintenance. The pump suction was cleaned and impeller clearance was adjusted. The pump was retested and was returned to service on September 13, 1982. During this time, the redundant ESW pump (52B) was demonstrated operable on a daily basis as required by the Technical Specifications.

Licensee Event Report
Reportable Occurrence No. 50-219/82-45/03L

## Apparent Cause of Occurrence

The cause of the occurrence was attributed to improper impeller clearance adjustment after previous maintenance work on the pump. The procedure steps for impeller clearance adjustments were ambiguous.

## Analysis of Occurrence

The Containment Spray and Emergency Service Water Systems are engineered safety systems designed to remove fission product decay heat from the primary containment in the event of a loss of coolant accident. There are two independent systems used to accomplish this, with each system having redundant pumps, each capable of performing the safety function. The systems are designed so that a single containment spray pump and a single emergency service water pump can provide the necessary cooling.

In this case, the safety significance is minimal, due to the fact that the redundant ESW pump in the system (52B) was operable. Based on this, the system would have performed its design function in the event of a LOCA.

#### Corrective Action

As required by the Technical Specifications, the redundant pump was demonstrated to be operable on a daily basis. The pump suction on ESW pump 52A was cleaned, the impeller clearance was adjusted, and the pump was tested satisfactorily and returned to service. In addition, the remaining three (3) ESW pumps will have their impeller clearances checked and adjusted, if required. Procedure 708.1.002 was revised to more clearly detail how to adjust impeller clearance.