		, processor and	1.66	-	14.	-	7	VF-11-149-16						-02-250									
THE TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY TELEPHONE CALL DOCUMENTATION EC 6650		DATE		1/24/2		11.80						I		FIL	1	Г	1						7
ORIGINATOR John Streeter	NRC OIE R	gion	114	111	Ī,	5								1.	UT.	T.Q	l	Ī					1
Terry Nurray	Toledo Ed			1		7	1					Ì		2.	1		1	Ĺ			Ħ		1
CONFERENCE CALUPARTIES V 15/0		-	1	1		1	+				ŀ			3.	1		1	ŀ		1		1	1
- pomeo en		Z D S	JES	RVB	WHS	9	SES	SCJ	HLD	CLM	BB	723	SM	Hall	CS	VST	MM	HOH	MAK	W.F.	CMG	WK	TME
STATION/UNIT Davis-Besse Unit #1	Septemb	er 13	19	, 78		1	THE	17	00	et anno		D. 77		5.	wateria	atomic of a					and to the same	and the same of	_
SUBJECT: Operation of High Pressure	Injection	Durin	g Se	pte	mbe	r 2	4,	19	77	Ev	ent					1							

John had previously talked to Fred Miller on the subject of Operator turning off HPI part way into this event. John's basic question to me was would I agree that different action would be required in the future on the part of the Operator specifically should they be instructed not to turn off HPI until much later in the event when actual conditions of the system had been verified. If I did agree, what steps had been performed to get this information to the operators. My reply to John to the first question was that I iell that the action taken during that event was proper and correct. I had been present in the Control Room at the time. There was no question in my mind that the Operator did act properly by turning off the HPI Pumps at the time he had. John then pointed out that they were not trying to point fingers about the action that was taken on the September 24th Event. They were only trying to point out that there may be a lesson that can be learned from that. His basic point about lesson to be learned is that knowing what we know about that event, the September 24th Event, leaving the HPI Pumps on would have actually helped our recovery. If we were to have a similar instance where HPI is required, we should look at the pros and cons of leaving HPI run until the actual plant conditions have been evaluated. For instance, had we left the pump run on the 9/24 Event could there have been any problems from that. The shutoff head on the pump is low enough we could not have overpressurized the system. There definitely would have been some gains by leaving it on. With this information perhaps we need to change our procedures to require the HPI Pumps to be left on until stable conditions are established

I agreed with John that we would evaluate the situation and take whatever action is indicated J. S. Grant, L. E. Roe, J. G. Evans, E. C. Novak, C. R. Domeck, J. D. Lenardson, J. C. Buck ection Heads, M. J. Derivan, W. H. Green

PREPARE

8001160778 Pr/14/78

ELEPHONE CALL DOCUMENTATION ohn Streeter to Terry Murray September 13, 1978, 1700 hours age 2

From that evaluation. If in fact, we agree to change our procedures, we will follow up with instructions to the Operators explaining to them why this is to be done. I indicated to John that I would try to have this resolved and call him back on Friday.

'DM/daw

Tom and I discussed this

or 9/18. SRB reviewed

the matter on Friday, 9/15.

They dicipled to change

proclare to rend that

on, wholese it was slear

on, wholese it was slear

that there was leakinge through

pressuring refref values, etc.

Tom we agreed.