



PSEG

Public Service Electric and Gas Company P.O. Box 236 Hancocks Bridge, New Jersey 08038-0236

Nuclear Business Unit

AUG 13 1999

LR-N99-0379

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

Attn: Document Control Desk

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

Gentlemen:

In compliance with Section 6.9.1.6, Reporting Requirements for the Salem Technical Specifications, the original Monthly Operating report for July 1999 is attached.

Sincerely,

M. B. Bezilla
Vice President, Operations

11
IE24

/rbk
Enclosures

C Mr. H. J. Miller
Regional Administrator USNRC, Region 1
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, PA 19046

9908240101 990731
PDR ADOCK 05000272
R PDR

The power is in your hands.

DOCKET NO.: 50-272
 UNIT: Salem 1
 DATE: 8/15/99
 COMPLETED BY: R. Knieriem
 TELEPHONE: (609) 339-1782

Reporting Period: July 1999

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	4947	115767
744	4914	111502
0	0	0
797425	5233805	111845968

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

(2) Method

- 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

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

Summary:

Salem Unit 1 operated at full power throughout the month of July 1999.

DOCKET NO.: 50-272
UNIT: Salem 1
DATE: 8/15/99
COMPLETED BY: R. B. Knieriem
TELEPHONE: (609) 339-1782

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

MONTH: July 1999

The following items completed during **July 1999** 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 changes in this category implemented during July 1999.

Temporary Modifications - Summary of Safety Evaluations

Temporary Modification 99-015, Installation Of Temporary Blank Plate For #12 Control Rod Drive Mechanism (CRDM) Ventilation Fan, 1VHE2

This temporary modification installed a blank plate in place of the #12 CRDM Ventilation Fan to prevent the short circuiting of flow by the other CRDM Ventilation Fans while the #12 CRDM Ventilation Fan was removed for corrective maintenance. Upon completion of the corrective maintenance, the blank plate was removed and the #12 CRDM Ventilation Fan was reinstalled. The CRDM Ventilation system is a non-safety-related system.

Review of this temporary modification under 10CFR50.59 was required because the installation of the blank plate constituted a change to the facility as described in the UFSAR. During the time that the #12 CRDM Ventilation fan was removed and the blank plate was installed, the remaining fan capacity was adequate. 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 the Technical Specification Bases were not affected and no changes to the Technical Specifications were required.

Procedures - Summary of Safety Evaluations

There were no changes in this category implemented during July 1999.

UFSAR Change Notices - Summary of Safety Evaluations

UFSAR Change Notice 99-046, Nuclear Business Unit Organization Change

This change to the Salem UFSAR incorporated changes to the Nuclear Business Unit (NBU) organizational structure and reporting relationships that establish a single vice-president responsible for station operations at both Hope Creek and Salem, along with new vice-president positions for technical support, maintenance, and plant support.

Review of this UFSAR change under 10CFR50.59 was required because the changes to the organizational structure affect NBU upper tier administrative procedures described in the UFSAR. This change did not constitute an Unreviewed Safety Question (USQ) because the change was administrative in nature. It did not increase the consequence or probability of an accident previously analyzed. The 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 and failure modes are applicable. In addition the Technical Specification Bases were not affected and no changes to the Technical Specifications were required.

UFSAR Change Notice 99-043, Salem Units 1 and 2 125VDC Battery Load Profile Revision

This change to the Salem UFSAR incorporated changes to the 125VDC load profile based upon the results of calculation revisions. The revised battery load profiles include an increase of Loss Of Coolant Accident (LOCA) /Loss Of Offsite Power (LOOP) battery loading design margin from 5% to 7.5%. This change corrected a discrepancy between the Safety Analysis Report (SAR) and the UFSAR.

Review of this UFSAR change under 10CFR50.59 was required because the changes to the 125VDC load profile constituted changes to the facility as described in the UFSAR. The conclusions of the revised load calculations indicated that all safety related components would have adequate voltage for operation during a four hour LOCA/LOOP event. Therefore the change would not increase the consequence or probability of an accident previously analyzed. 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 the Technical Specification Bases were not affected and no changes to the Technical Specifications were required.

Deficiency Reports - Summary of Safety Evaluations

There were no changes in this category implemented during July 1999.

Other - Summary of Safety Evaluations

There were no changes in this category implemented during July 1999.