

OCT 24 1980

Docket No.: 50-311

MEMO

APPLICANT: PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY

FACILITY: SALEM NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION

SUBJECT: MEETING WITH LOWER ALLOWAYS CREEK FIRE DEPARTMENT (LACFD)

On October 7, 1980, the following NRC staff members met with the LACFD to discuss the LACFD role in the Salem Fire Protection Plan: J. Kerrigan (Project Manager, Unit 2), B. Ross (Project Manager, Unit 1), L. Norrholm (OIE Resident Inspector) and G. Harrison (Fire Protection Engineer). The LACFD felt that their concerns were not being adequately addressed by PSE&G.

The discussions were very frank and open and involved fire protection and emergency preparedness. Many of the LACFD questions were in areas which are not under the jurisdiction of NRC. In response to those questions, we offered personal opinions and advice, but stressed the fact that our responses were not official NRC positions.

The major points that came out of this meeting were the following:

1. The LACFD has no understanding of their role in the event that they are called on site, and in particular, expressed concern about radiation protection matters.
2. We pointed out that the NRC requirements on fire protection are concerned only with the safe shutdown of the plant and the prevention of any release of radioactive materials. The LACFD was under the impression that NRC fire protection requirements (e.g., Fire Suppression Systems) were applicable to all areas of the plant site.
3. The LACFD was interested in the actions that NRC would take in the event that the LACFD membership refuses to sign a letter of agreement with the utility. We stated that both the Fire Protection and Emergency Planning Groups at NRC would be involved in arriving at a position which could result in additional requirements being placed on the utility. We stressed however, that it would be in the best interest of all parties concerned (i.e., LAC Township, utility, LACFD) to resolve any differences between the utility and the LACFD, if possible.
4. The LACFD indicated that most of their members have never been involved in utility-sponsored training or drills. The few members that have been involved in a drill expressed concern about the adequacy of the drill.

8011040619

F

GP

OFFICE ▶					
SURNAME ▶					
DATE ▶					

5. The Township Mayor and Council appear to share some of the LACFD concerns and have written to PSE&G about those concerns.
6. The LACFD is not satisfied with the 1976 letter of agreement that was signed with the utility. A turnover of personnel has occurred since 1976 and the new membership is more knowledgeable about nuclear power. The LACFD is interested in signing a letter of agreement that more explicitly defines utility and LACFD responsibilities.
7. The utility appears to be responsive to the LACFD concerns. For example, the utility met with the LACFD on September 18, 1980 and responded to the Mayor's letter of September 29 within two days. The problem appears to be that the LACFD has a problem expressing their concern and the utility is not sensitive to the problem. As an example, the LACFD asked the utility what training they would be given and the utility responded by stating that they would sponsor any training that the LACFD asked for. The LACFD was very frustrated with this response because they do not know what type of training they need. For this particular question, we gave the LACFD a generic letter which describes the NRC requirements for training of the utility fire brigade.

We indicated to the LACFD that we would:

1. Relay their concerns to FEMA, the utility and the NRC Emergency Preparedness Group.
2. Verify, through OIE, that Salem is fulfilling their commitments to NRC on training of offsite and onsite fire brigade members (documented in the Salem Fire Protection Program).

13/

J. Kerrigan, Project Manager
Licensing Branch No. 3
Division of Licensing

OFFICE	LB 3:DL	LB 3:DL			
SURNAME	JKerrigan/mrf	Fraglia			
DATE	10/21/80	10/21/80			

MEETING SUMMARY DISTRIBUTION

Docket File
NRC PDR
Local PDR
TIC/NSIC/Tera
NRR Reading
LB#3 Reading
H. Denton
E. Case
D. Eisenhut
R. Purple
B. J. Youngblood
A. Schwencer
F. Miraglia
J. Miller
G. Lainas
R. Vollmer
J. P. Knight
R. Bosnak
F. Schauer
R. E. Jackson
Project Manager
Attorney, OELD
J. Lee
OIE (3)
ACRS (16)
R. Tedesco

J. Kerrigan

NRC Participants:

B. Ross
L. Norrholm

G. Lear
V. Noonan
S. Pawlicki
V. Benaroya
Z. Rosztoczy
W. Haass
D. Muller
R. Ballard
W. Regan
D. Ross
P. Check
R. Satterfield
O. Parr
F. Rosa
W. Butler
W. Kreger
R. Houston
T. Murphy
L. Rubenstein
T. Speis
W. Johnston
J. Stolz
S. Hanauer
W. Gamill

F. Schroeder
D. Skovholt
M. Ernst
R. Baer
C. Berlinger
K. Kniel
G. Knighton
A. Thadani
D. Tondi
J. Kramer
D. Vassallo
P. Collins
D. Ziemann

bcc: Applicant & Service List



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

OCT 24 1980

Docket No.: 50-311

APPLICANT: PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY
FACILITY: SALEM NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION
SUBJECT: MEETING WITH LOWER ALLOWAYS CREEK FIRE DEPARTMENT (LACFD)

On October 7, 1980, the following NRC staff members met with the LACFD to discuss the LACFD role in the Salem Fire Protection Plan: J. Kerrigan (Project Manager, Unit 2), B. Ross (Project Manager, Unit 1), L. Norrholm (OIE Resident Inspector) and G. Harrison (Fire Protection Engineer). The LACFD felt that their concerns were not being adequately addressed by PSE&G.

The discussions were very frank and open and involved fire protection and emergency preparedness. Many of the LACFD questions were in areas which are not under the jurisdiction of NRC. In response to those questions, we offered personal opinions and advice, but stressed the fact that our responses were not official NRC positions.

The major points that came out of this meeting were the following:

1. The LACFD has no understanding of their role in the event that they are called on site, and in particular, expressed concern about radiation protection matters.
2. We pointed out that the NRC requirements on fire protection are concerned only with the safe shutdown of the plant and the prevention of any release of radioactive materials. The LACFD was under the impression that NRC fire protection requirements (e.g., Fire Suppression Systems) were applicable to all areas of the plant site.
3. The LACFD was interested in the actions that NRC would take in the event that the LACFD membership refuses to sign a letter of agreement with the utility. We stated that both the Fire Protection and Emergency Planning Groups at NRC would be involved in arriving at a position which could result in additional requirements being placed on the utility. We stressed however, that it would be in the best interest of all parties concerned (i.e., LAC Township, utility, LACFD) to resolve any differences between the utility and the LACFD, if possible.
4. The LACFD indicated that most of their members have never been involved in utility-sponsored training or drills. The few members that have been involved in a drill expressed concern about the adequacy of the drill.

5. The Township Mayor and Council appear to share some of the LACFD concerns and have written to PSE&G about those concerns.
6. The LACFD is not satisfied with the 1976 letter of agreement that was signed with the utility. A turnover of personnel has occurred since 1976 and the new membership is more knowledgeable about nuclear power. The LACFD is interested in signing a letter of agreement that more explicitly defines utility and LACFD responsibilities.
7. The utility appears to be responsive to the LACFD concerns. For example, the utility met with the LACFD on September 18, 1980 and responded to the Mayor's letter of September 29 within two days. The problem appears to be that the LACFD has a problem expressing their concern and the utility is not sensitive to the problem. As an example, the LACFD asked the utility what training they would be given and the utility responded by stating that they would sponsor any training that the LACFD asked for. The LACFD was very frustrated with this response because they do not know what type of training they need. For this particular question, we gave the LACFD a generic letter which describes the NRC requirements for training of the utility fire brigade.

We indicated to the LACFD that we would:

1. Relay their concerns to FEMA, the utility and the NRC Emergency Preparedness Group.
2. Verify, through OIE, that Salem is fulfilling their commitments to NRC on training of offsite and onsite fire brigade members (documented in the Salem Fire Protection Program).


J. Kerrigan, Project Manager
Licensing Branch No. 3
Division of Licensing

Mr. R. L. Mittl, General Manager
Licensing & Environment
Engineering & Construction Department
Public Service Electric & Gas Company
80 Park Place
Newark, New Jersey 07101

cc: Richard Fryling, Jr., Esq.
Assistant General Counsel
Public Service Electric & Gas Company
80 Park Place
Newark, New Jersey 07100

Mark Wetterhahn, Esq.
Conner, Moore & Cober
Suite 1050
1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Mr. Leif J. Norholm
c/o U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Drawer I
Hancocks Bridge, New Jersey 08038