

MAR 01 2004
LR-N04-0077



U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Document Control Desk
Washington, DC 20555-0001

**REVISION 1 TO 180-DAY RESPONSE TO GENERIC LETTER 2003-01
CONTROL ROOM HABITABILITY
SALEM UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2
FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NOS. DPR-70 AND DPR-75
DOCKET NOS. 50-272 AND 50-311**

On December 9, 2003, PSEG Nuclear LLC submitted the 180-Day response to Generic Letter (GL) 2003-01, "Control Room Habitability." In our 180-day response we made the following statement in the response to item 1(a) for Salem Units 1 & 2: "A license change request to convert the dose analysis to AST is currently planned to be submitted by the end of February 2004." Please be advised that the Alternate Source Term (AST) submittal for Salem Units 1 and 2 has been delayed. We now expect to make the AST submittal by the end of April 2004.

Should you have any questions regarding this submittal, please contact Mr. Courtney Smyth at 856-339-5298.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David F. Garchow".

David F. Garchow
Vice President – Engineering and
Technical Support

A102

MAR 01 2004

Document Control Desk
LR-N03-0077

2

C Mr. H. J. Miller, Administrator - Region I
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, PA 19406

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
ATTN: Mr. R. Fretz, Licensing Project Manager - Salem
Mail Stop 08B2
Washington, DC 20555-0001

USNRC Senior Resident Inspector - Salem (X24)

Mr. K. Tosch, Manager IV
Bureau of Nuclear Engineering
PO Box 415
Trenton, NJ 08625

FORM 1
COMMITMENT EVALUATION SUMMARY

Commitment Tracking Number:	80056801-91	
Source Document:	GI2003-01 180 Day Response (LRN-03-0471).	Date: 2/25/04
Existing Commitment Description:		
<p>In our 180-day response to GL 2003-01 (CONTROL ROOM HABITABILITY) we made the following statement in the response to item 1(a) for Salem Units 1 & 2:</p> <p>"A license change request to convert the dose analysis to AST is currently planned to be submitted by the end of February 2004."</p> <p>The AST submittal has been delayed for additional justification and we now expect to make the submittal by the end of April 2004.</p>		
Revised Commitment Description:		
<p>Please be advised that the Alternate Source Term (AST) submittal for Salem Units 1 and 2 has been delayed. We now expect to make the AST submittal by the end of April 2004.</p>		
Summarize Justification for Revising Commitment :		
<p>The AST Project has not completed the calculations necessary to make the LCR submittal.</p>		
(Attach additional sheets, as necessary)		
Refer to Exhibit I for a flow diagram that outlines the commitment evaluation process.		
PART I		
1.1	<p>Is a codified (10CFR) commitment revision process applicable and completed (e.g., 10CFR50.59 or 10CFR50.54)?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes EXIT PROCESS*. Use the process described in the applicable 10CFR section to make revision.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Go to Part II.</p>	
PART II		
2.1	<p>Could the change negatively impact the ability of a system, structure or component (SSC) to perform its safety function or negatively impact the ability of licensee personnel to ensure the SSC is capable of performing its intended safety function?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Continue with Part III. Briefly describe rationale: The existing source term requirements and CROD will continue to apply until the AST submittal is approved.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes Go to Question 2.2</p>	
2.2	<p>Perform a safety evaluation using the following 10 CFR 50.92 criteria to determine if a significant hazards consideration exists:</p> <p>Does the revised commitment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Basis:</p>	
(Attach additional information, as necessary.)		

FORM 1

COMMITMENT EVALUATION FORM	
<p>Does the revised commitment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Basis:</p> <p>Does the revised commitment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Basis:</p> <p>If any of the above questions are answered Yes, STOP. Do not proceed with the revision, OR discuss change with NRC and obtain any necessary approvals prior to implementation of the proposed change. If all three questions are answered No, go to Part III.</p> <p>(Attach additional sheets as necessary.)</p>	
PART III	
3.1	<p>Was the original commitment (e.g., response to NOV, etc.) to restore an OBLIGATION (i.e., rule, regulation, order, or license condition)?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes Go to Question 3.2.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Go to Part IV.</p>
3.2	<p>Is the proposed revised commitment date necessary and justified?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes Briefly describe rationale (attach additional sheets as necessary) and notify NRC of revised commitment date prior to the original commitment date.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No STOP. Do not proceed with the revision, OR apply for appropriate regulatory relief.</p>
PART IV	
4.1	<p>Was the original commitment: (1) explicitly credited as the basis for a safety decision in an NRC SER, (2) made in response to an NRC Bulletin or Generic Letter, or (3) made in response to a request for information under 10 CFR 50.54(f) or 10 CFR 2.204?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Go to Question 4.2.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No Go to Part V.</p>

COMMITMENT EVALUATION FORM

4.2 Has the original commitment been implemented?
 Yes STOP. You have completed this evaluation. Revise the commitment and notify NRC of revised commitment in summary report.
 No Go to Question 5.1.

PART V

5.1 Was the original commitment made to minimize recurrence of a condition adverse to quality (e.g., a long-term corrective action stated in an LER)?
 Yes Go to Question 5.2.
 No STOP. You have completed this evaluation. Revise the commitment. No NRC notification required.

5.2 Is the revised commitment necessary to minimize recurrence of the condition adverse to quality?
 Yes Revise the commitment and notify NRC of revised commitment in next annual/RFO interval summary report.
 No Revise commitment; no NRC notification is required.

REFERENCES

List documents (e.g., procedures, NRC submittals, etc.) affected by this change.

<u>Description</u>	<u>Document Number</u>
GL 2003-01	LR-N03-0471

Prepared by: 

APPROVALS

Signature	_____	_____
	Implementing Organization Department Manager	Date
Signature	_____	_____
	Commitment Signatory	Date
Signature	_____	_____
	Sponsor Organization Manager	Date
Signature	_____	_____
	Nuclear Licensing	Date