U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION I

Report No.	50-311/84-25			
Docket No.	50-311			
License No.	DPR-75	Priority		Category C
80 P	ic Service Elec ark Plaza rk, New Jersey		Company	
Facility Name:	Salem Nuclear	Generating S	tation - Unit	2
Meeting at:	USNRC Region I	I, King of Pr	ussia, Pennsyl	vania
Meeting Conduc	ted: June 27,	1984		
Inspectors:	. C. Linvhile, Inspector	Senior Resid	ent	7.6.34 date
for R	. J. Summers, R Inspector	esident Reac	tor	7.6.84 date
Approved by:	. J. Norrholm, Projects Secti Projects Brand	on No. 2B,		7/6/89 date

Meeting Summary: Enforcement Conference, June 27, 1984 (Meeting Report No. 50-311/84-25)

An Enforcement Conference was held in the NRC Region I office on June 27, 1984, to discuss: the inoperability of the Containment Ventilation Isolation - Gaseous Activity Channel at Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 2, on May 28, 1984; the proper use of the "on-the-spot change" process; and, the degree of management oversight, through the safety review process, of plant operations. The meeting was attended by senior NRC Region I management and licensee management.

DETAILS

1. Attendees

Public Service Electric and Gas Company

J. Boettger, General Manager, Nuclear Support

L. Fry, Operations Manager

C. Johnson, Manager, Nuclear Operations Quality Assurance

E. Liden, Manager, Licensing and Regulation L. Reiter, Manager, Nuclear Systems Engineering

R. Uderitz, Vice President, Nuclear Department

J. Zupko, General Manager, Salem Operations

USNRC

J. Allan, Deputy Regional Administrator

D. Holody, Enforcement Coordinator

H. Kister, Chief, Projects Branch 2

D. Limroth, Project Engineer

J. Linville, Senior Resident Inspector, Salem L. Norrholm, Chief, Reactor Projects Section 2B

R. Starostecki, Director, Division of Project and Resident Programs

R. Summers, Resident Inspector, Salem

2. Discussion and Results

The NRC stated that a trend appears to be developing in that the licensee's safety review process is not clearly involved in some matters which should be subject to review. These items include the on-the-spot change process and the post trip review process and, in addition, resulted in violations detailed in NRC Inspection Reports 50-272/84-08; 50-311/84-08, 50-272/84-15; 50-311/84-15 and 50-311/84-22. Formal responses to most of these violations have not yet been received by the NRC; however, the licensee presented the following as corrective action already taken or planned as a result of these findings.

The licensee categorized the inoperability of the Containment Ventilation Isolation - Gaseous Activity Channel as a personnel error. The use of the "on-the-spot change" was inappropriate in that the Senior Shift Supervisor did not realize that by taking this action a Technical Specification violation would result when making a subsequent pressure relief with the isolation channel inoperable. Due to mitigating factors, such as diverse and redundant monitors that would have provided automatic isolation and the controlling actions by the operators during the pressure relief, the safety significance of the event was minimal.

The licensee discussed the on-the-spot change process, taking the position that the current guidelines available for the Senior Shift Supervisor are appropriate. No changes to these guidelines are necessary at this time;

however, there appears to be a need to enforce their proper use to avoid future similar occurrences. In addition, the licensee stated that guidelines recently have been established in the Engineering Department for use in making Engineering and Safety Evaluations. These guidelines will be made available to Salem Operations and, where appropriate, this guidance would also be used in the on-the-spot change process. The licensee stated that this program will be reviewed to determine if any additional changes are warranted.

In response to additional NRC concerns with management oversight as documented in NRC Inspection Reports 50-272/84-08; 50-311/84-08 and 50-272/84-15; 50-311/84-15, the licensee management proposed the following corrective actions:

The Post Trip Review Process will be changed to require a formal SORC review prior to restart. In addition, the General (or Assistant General) Manager will authorize unit restart. Within 48 hours of the review a "trip report" will be generated as a result of the SORC review.

The licensee is currently reviewing a proposed license change to the SORC review process that would relieve SORC of some administrative burdens, which would allow SORC to focus its attention on operating events on a real time basis.

Additional actions were discussed, however formal documentation of the corrective actions will be provided in responses to the Notice of Violation as provided in the subject NRC Inspection Reports.

Finally, in response to the NRC question of the ability of the licensee's Action Plan to prevent violations like these, the licensee stated that the Action Plan is still in the developmental stage and that they wouldn't expect results to be effective yet.

The NRC stated that the licensee's input would be considered in making a decision on enforcement action in this matter.