

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of Public Affairs, Region I
475 Allendale Road King of Prussia, PA 19401
Phone: 610/337-5330 Fax: 610/337-5241
Internet: dps@nrc.gov or nas@nrc.gov

I-97-53

Contact: Diane Screnci
Neil A. Sheehan

May 12, 1997

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

LIMERICK RATED "SUPERIOR" IN THREE AREAS,
"GOOD" IN FOURTH AREA OF LATEST NRC ASSESSMENT

Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2, received performance ratings of "superior" in the areas of plant operations, maintenance and plant support and "good" in the area of engineering in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's latest Systematic Assessment of Licensee Performance (SALP) of the facility.

The SALP report was sent Friday (May 9) to PECO Energy Company, which operates the plant in Limerick, Pa. It evaluates the plant's performance from April 2, 1995, through March 29, 1997.

NRC staff will meet with PECO officials at the facility at 10 a.m. on May 27 to discuss the report. The session will be open for public observation.

SALP reports rate licensee performance in four functional areas - plant operations, maintenance, engineering and plant support -- and assign ratings of Category 1 (superior), 2 (good) or 3 (acceptable). Limerick had received "superior" ratings in all four categories in its previous SALP.

In a letter to PECO, NRC Region I Administrator Hubert J. Miller said, "the overall performance of Limerick Generating Station remained excellent."

Mr. Miller said, "The areas of plant Operations and Maintenance were rated Category 1 as a result of effective programs and procedures, excellent personnel performance, strong management oversight and support, and very good planning and work control. Additionally, equipment work backlogs were well managed and material condition of the plant was good overall."

On plant support, he said, "While there were some problems in fire protection, strengths were noted in radiation protection, emergency planning and security."

"While strengths were noted in design, analysis and modifications, earlier engineering intervention could have prevented equipment problems that challenged the plant and resulted in a number of plant trips and forced shutdowns. Management recognized this performance weakness and initiated remedial actions, said Mr. Miller."

#