

Public Service  
Electric and Gas  
Company

**Steven E. Miltenberger**

Public Service Electric and Gas Company P.O. Box 236, Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038 609-339-4199

Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer

October 13, 1988

**NLR-N88167**

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Document Control Desk  
Washington, DC 20555

Gentlemen:

SALEM LICENSED OPERATOR REQUALIFICATION PROGRAM EVALUATION  
REPORT RESPONSE  
SALEM GENERATING STATION  
UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2  
DOCKET NOS. 50-272 AND 50-311

Public Service Electric and Gas Company (PSE&G) hereby submits its response to your letter dated September 1, 1988, entitled "Requalification Program Evaluation Report Nos. 50-272/88-07(OL) and 50-311/88-07(OL)". Per telecon with Mr. R. Gallo, PSE&G was granted an extension to the response due date, until October 14, 1988. PSE&G's response to the items you requested is included in the attachment.

Should you have any questions concerning this response, please contact us.

Sincerely,



Attachment

8810210500 881013  
PDR ADOCK 05000272  
V PDC

M003  
11

C Mr. J. C. Stone  
Licensing Project Manager

Mr. R. W. Borchardt  
Senior Resident Inspector

Mr. W. T. Russell, Administrator  
Region I

Ms. J. Moon, Interim Chief  
Bureau of Nuclear Engineering  
Department of Environmental Protection  
380 Scotch Road  
Trenton, NJ 08628

## ATTACHMENT

### Regualification Program Evaluation Report Nos.

50-272/88-07(OL) and 50-311/88-07(OL) requested PSE&G to reply to items specified in paragraphs 2.2 and 2.3 of the report. The following paragraphs present the NRC concerns and PSE&G's response to the each item.

### SECTION 2.2 - PROGRAMATIC DEFICIENCY

During the regualification examination development process, the NRC was informed by the facility training department that the regualification training program does not include training for reactor operators on the ability to operate in-plant portions of the auxiliary and emergency systems other than the remote shutdown panel. This training is not conducted because it is not a part of the licensed job analysis. However, the Salem Operations Department considered that the operators should know certain in-plant tasks which were therefore included in the regualification examination. Testing on the aforementioned in-plant abilities is considered to be within the scope of 10 CFR 55.59(a)(2)(ii). The absence of training on these abilities in the licensed operator regualification training program is a deficiency.

### RESPONSE

A Licensed Operator Regualification Program Task List has been developed and is in use as one of the means for determining the scope and objectives of the regualification program. This list includes 17 tasks that are normally performed by field operators under emergency or other high consequence conditions. In-plant training on these tasks has been included in the two-year (repeating) licensed operator regualification training schedule.

### SECTION 2.3 - SIMULATOR PORTION OF THE OPERATING EXAMINATION

As discussed in paragraph 1.2 during the simulator portion of the operating examination, there were two instances where two different reactor operators on two different scenario sets did not correctly determine SI system pump status. This observation led to the identification of a problem with Salem Operations Department guidance on application of the SI status decision block in the Emergency Operating Procedures and, after verifying that the response was based on equipment known to be unavailable, continue the procedure without completing the actions described. The facility took action immediately following the Salem examination to alert all shift operators to the proper method of EOP implementation and the importance of thorough SI system status checks.

## RESPONSE

PSE&G's response to this item was documented in PSE&G's letter to NRC Region 1 dated July 1, 1988. This letter included both the Actions Taken and the Long Term Actions to be taken to resolve this issue. As mentioned in section 2.3 above immediate action was taken to alert all shift operators to the proper method of implementing the EOP's and the importance of thorough SI status checks. Subsequently EOP TRIP 1 step 8 has been changed to clarify the "No" path response. The change requires the Operator to identify any available equipment that failed to start. If the response to step 8 is "Yes" the Operator is directed to reset the SEC and to attempt to start the equipment that failed to start. If the response is "No" the Operator continues on through the procedure. OD-15 has been completely revised to address the weaknesses identified during the requalification examination.