



**FEB 15 2001**  
LRN-01-0050

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

Gentlemen:

**MONTHLY OPERATING REPORT  
SALEM GENERATING STATION UNIT 1  
DOCKET NO. 50-272**

In compliance with Section 6.9, Reporting Requirements for the Salem Unit 1 Technical Specifications, the operating statistics for **January 2001** are being forwarded. Also being forwarded, pursuant to the requirements of 10CFR50.59(b), is a summary of changes, tests, and experiments that were implemented in **January 2001**.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "D. F. Garchow", written over the word "Sincerely,".

D. F. Garchow  
Vice President – Operations

RBK  
Attachments

C Distribution

IE24

## INDEX

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>NUMBER OF PAGES</u>
Operating Data Report .....	1
Monthly Operating Summary .....	1
Summary of Changes, Tests, and Experiments .....	3

DOCKET NO.: 50-272  
 UNIT: Salem 1  
 DATE: 2/7/01  
 COMPLETED BY: R. Knieriem  
 TELEPHONE: (856) 339-1782

Reporting Period January 2001

### 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)**

1115		
1106		
Month	Year-to-date	Cumulative
744	744	127752
744	744	123324
0	0	0
823102	823102	124397077

### 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

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

#### (2) Method

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

DOCKET NO.: 50-272  
UNIT: Salem 1  
DATE: 2/7/01  
COMPLETED BY: R. Knieriem  
TELEPHONE: (856) 339-1782

**Summary Of Monthly Operating Experience**

- Salem Unit 1 operated at full power throughout the month of January 2001.

DOCKET NO.: 50-272  
UNIT: Salem 1  
DATE: 2/2/01  
COMPLETED BY: R. Knieriem  
TELEPHONE: (856) 339-1782

**SUMMARY OF CHANGES, TESTS, AND EXPERIMENTS**  
**FOR THE SALEM GENERATING STATION – UNIT 1**

**MONTH January 2001**

The following items completed during **January 2001** 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**

There were no reportable changes in this category implemented during January 2001.

**Temporary Modifications    Summary of Safety Evaluations**

There were no reportable changes in this category implemented during January 2001.

**Procedures    Summary of Safety Evaluations**

There were no reportable changes in this category implemented during January 2001.

**SUMMARY OF CHANGES, TESTS, AND EXPERIMENTS**  
**FOR THE SALEM GENERATING STATION – UNIT 1 – Cont.**

**UFSAR Change Notices    Summary of Safety Evaluations**

**Salem UFSAR Change Notice 00-048, Auxiliary Feedwater System Hydraulic Analysis**

This change incorporated the results of Revision 2 to the Auxiliary Feedwater System Hydraulic Analysis, S-C-AF-MDC-0445. Revision 2 evaluated lower required minimum Auxiliary Feedwater flows that are used as a basis for new pump In-service Test limits. The results of the analysis demonstrated that the lower minimum flows would be adequate to support normal operation, and all accident scenarios for which the Auxiliary Feedwater System provides mitigation.

Review of this change under 10CFR50.59 was required because the change constitutes a change to the facility as described in the UFSAR. This evaluation verified that the revised In-service Test acceptance criteria for the Auxiliary Feedwater Pumps would be adequate for all accident scenarios for which the Auxiliary Feedwater System provides mitigation. 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 no changes to the Technical Specifications were required.

**Salem UFSAR Change Notice 00-050, Mode 3 Steam Line Break Analysis**

This change documented the results of a vendor analysis regarding the operability of the Main Steam Isolation Valves during Mode 3 operation. The revision to the UFSAR was based upon a Westinghouse evaluation that considered the effect of reduced steam pressure on the ability to close the Main Steam Isolation Valves in response to a Main Steam Line break occurring in Mode 3. The evaluation demonstrated that the UFSAR accident analyses remain bounding.

Review of this change under 10CFR50.59 was required because the change constitutes a change to the facility as described in the UFSAR. This change provided clarification to the UFSAR safety analysis regarding Main Steam Isolation Valve operability in Mode 3. This evaluation demonstrated that the UFSAR accident analyses remain bounding for Mode 3 Main Steam Line Breaks. 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 no changes to the Technical Specifications were required.

**SUMMARY OF CHANGES, TESTS, AND EXPERIMENTS**  
**FOR THE SALEM GENERATING STATION – UNIT 1 – Cont.**

**Other - Summary of Safety Evaluations**

There were no reportable changes in this category implemented during January 2001.