



Public Service Electric and Gas Company P.O. Box 236 Hancocks Bridge, New Jersey 08038-0236

**Nuclear Business Unit**

LRN-00-0083

**MAR 14 2000**

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

Attn: Document Control Desk

**MONTHLY OPERATING REPORT  
SALEM UNIT NO. 2  
DOCKET NO. 50-311**

Gentlemen:

In compliance with Section 6.9.1.6, Reporting Requirements for the Salem Technical Specifications, the original Monthly Operating report for February 2000 is attached.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "M. B. Bezilla".

M. B. Bezilla  
Vice President - Operations

/rbk  
Enclosures

C Mr. H. J. Miller  
Regional Administrator USNRC, Region 1  
475 Allendale Road  
King of Prussia, PA 19046

DOCKET NO.: 50-311  
 UNIT: Salem 2  
 DATE: 3/15/00  
 COMPLETED BY: R. Knieriem  
 TELEPHONE: (856) 339-1782

Reporting Period: February 2000

**OPERATING DATA REPORT**

**Design Electrical Rating (MWe-Net)**  
**Maximum Dependable Capacity (MWe-Net)**  
**No. of hours reactor was critical**  
**No. of hours generator was on line (service hours)**  
**Unit reserve shutdown hours**  
**Net Electrical Energy (MWH)**

<b>1115</b>		
<b>1106</b>		
<b>Month</b>	<b>Year-to-date</b>	<b>Cumulative</b>
<b>696</b>	<b>1440</b>	<b>97545</b>
<b>696</b>	<b>1440</b>	<b>94222</b>
<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>752717</b>	<b>1570128</b>	<b>94492346</b>

**UNIT SHUTDOWNS**

NO.	DATE	TYPE F=FORCED S=SCHEDULED	DURATION (HOURS)	REASON (1)	METHOD OF SHUTTING DOWN THE REACTOR (2)	CORRECTIVE ACTION/COMMENT

(1) Reason

(2) Method

- A - Equipment Failure (Explain)
- B - Maintenance or Test
- C - Refueling
- D - Regulatory Restriction
- E - Operator Training/License Examination
- F - Administrative
- G - Operational Error (Explain)
- H - Other

- 1 - Manual
- 2 - Manual Trip/Scram
- 3 - Automatic Trip/Scram
- 4 - Continuation
- 5 - Other (Explain)

**Summary:**

Salem Unit 2 began the month of February 2000, operating at full power. On February 5, power was reduced to 45% to perform turbine control valve testing and to perform maintenance on the 21B Circulating Pump. The unit returned to full power on the following day and operated at full power for the remainder of the month.

DOCKET NO.: 50-311  
UNIT: Salem 2  
DATE: 3/15/00  
COMPLETED BY: R. B. Knieriem  
TELEPHONE: (856) 339-1782

**SUMMARY OF CHANGES, TESTS, AND EXPERIMENTS**  
**FOR THE SALEM UNIT 2 GENERATING STATION**

**MONTH: February 2000**

The following items completed during **February 2000** have been evaluated to determine:

1. If the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the safety analysis report may be increased; or
2. If a possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the safety analysis report may be created; or
3. If the margin of safety as defined in the basis for any technical specification is reduced.

The 10CFR50.59 Safety Evaluations showed that these items did not create a new safety hazard to the plant; nor did they affect the safe shutdown of the reactor. These items did not change the plant effluent releases and did not alter the existing environmental impact. The 10CFR50.59 Safety Evaluations determined that no unreviewed safety or environmental questions are involved.

**Design Changes - Summary of Safety Evaluations**

**Modification 80003117, Addition of Micro-Metering Valves to the Condensate System**

This modification installed micro-metering valves to admit air to the Condensate System to assist the formation of magnetite, a protective oxide layer, on the inner surface of the condensate and feed systems. This oxide layer mitigates corrosion in the plant's secondary piping system, thus reducing iron transport to the steam generators.

Review of this modification under 10CFR50.59 was required because the installation of micro-metering valves in the Condensate System constituted a change to the facility as described in the SAR. This upgrade will reduce the transport of iron to the steam generators, which can contribute to degradation of steam generator tube integrity. Therefore, this change would not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously analyzed. Additionally, this change did not increase the probability or consequences of a malfunction of equipment important to safety. This change would not create any new accidents

or malfunctions since no new failure modes were introduced. In addition the Technical Specification Bases were not affected and no changes to the Technical Specifications were required.

### **Temporary Modifications - Summary of Safety Evaluations**

There were no changes in this category implemented during February 2000.

### **Procedures - Summary of Safety Evaluations**

There were no changes in this category implemented during February 2000.

### **UFSAR Change Notices - Summary of Safety Evaluations**

**Salem UFSAR Change Notice SCN 00-008, PSEG Nuclear Organization Change, Transition of the Supervisor – Corrective Action Group from the Manager – Corrective Action, Emergency Preparedness, and Instructional Technology to the Director – Quality, Nuclear Training, and Emergency Preparedness.**

This change to the Nuclear Business Unit organization revised the reporting relationship of the Supervisor – Corrective Action and the Corrective Action Group, from the Manager – Corrective Action, Emergency Preparedness, and Instructional Technology to the Director – Quality, Nuclear Training, and Emergency Preparedness. In addition, the title Manager – Corrective Action, Emergency Preparedness, and Instructional Technology was changed to Manager Emergency Preparedness and Instructional Technology, and the title Nuclear Training Manager was added to the SAR.

Review of this UFSAR Change Notice under 10CFR50.59 was required because the organizational changes it described constituted a change to the procedures as described in the SAR. This change did not affect any structures, systems, or components. This change would not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously analyzed. Additionally, this change did not increase the probability or consequences of a malfunction of equipment important to safety. This change would not create any new accidents or malfunctions since no new failure modes were introduced. In addition the Technical Specification Bases were not affected and no changes to the Technical Specifications were required.

### **Deficiency Reports - Summary of Safety Evaluations**

There were no changes in this category implemented during February 2000.

### **Other - Summary of Safety Evaluations**

There were no changes in this category implemented during February 2000.