Docket No. 50-263 Northern States Power Company ATTN: Mr. L. R. Eliason Generation. 414 Nicollet Mall Minneapolis, MN 55401

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

> REGION III 799 RODSEVELT ROAD GLEN ELLYN, ILLINOIS \$0137

> > FI 07 1972

Vice President, Nuclear

Dear Mr. Eliason:

Enclos\_J for your review, prior to our scheduled meeting of February 20, 1991, is the Initial SALP 10 Report for the Monticello Nuclear Plant, covering the period July 1, 1990, through November 30, 1991.

In accordance with NRC policy, I have reviewed the SALP Board Assessment and concur with its ratings. It is my view that your conduct of nuclear activities in connection with the Monticello Nuclear facility was good and showed an appropriate concern for nuclear safety.

You received four Category 1 ratings and three Category 2 ratings. Two areas improved from the previous SALP report and one declined. Specific areas I would like to highlight are:

- Significantly, Plant Operations, Safety Assessment and Quality Verification, and Emergency Preparedness areas again received Category 1 ratings because of their sustained high level of performance. These were exemplified by proactive management and good communications in Plant Operations; and by effective management of the program activities in Safety Assessment and Quality Verification, and in Emergency Preparedness,
- The two functional areas in which performance improved during this assessment period were Security which received a Category 1 rating and Radiological Controls which received a Category 2 Improving rating. Previously both areas had received Category 2 ratings. The Security rating was indicative of the effectiveness of your improvement program. The Radiological Controls rating reflects on your strong ALARA and source term reduction measures, and the chemistry staff laboratory proficiency.
- The Maintenance/Surveillance (M/S) functional area was rated Category 2 by the SALP board for this SALP period. This is a decline from the previous Category 1 rating. Some members of my staff believe the rating should have remained Category 1, since performance has not changed significantly I concur with the SALP board rating. Although the implementation of your maintenance activities generally continues to be very good, a Category 2 rating appropriately reflects your overall maintenance performance because of weaknesses in your preventive maintenance program, the quality of your maintenance procedures, and personnel errors in this area.

At the SALP meeting, you should be prepared to discuss our assessments. The meeting is intended to be a candid dialogue wherein any comments you may have regarding our report are discussed. Additionally, you may provide written comments within 30 days after the meeting. Your comments, a summary of our meeting, and my disposition of your comments will be issued as the Final SALP Report.

In accordance with Section 2.79D of the NRC's "Rules of Practice," Part 2, Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, a copy of this letter and the Initial SALP Report will be placed in the NRC's Public Document Room.

Should you have any questions concerning the Initial SALP Report, we would be pleased to discuss them with you.

Sincerely,

A. Bert Davis

Regional Administrator

Carly Paperullo for

Enclosure: Initial SALP 10 Report No. 50-263/91001

cc w/enclosure:
D. D. Antony, General Manager
W. Hill, Plant Manager
DCD/DCB (RIDS)
OC/LFDCB
Resident Inspector, RIII Monticello
Resident Inspector, RIII Prairie
Island
John W. Ferman, Ph.D.,
Nuclear Engineer, MPCA
State Liaison Officer, State
of Minnesota
INPO
See Continued Distribution

## Distribution (continued)

or w/enclosure: The Chairman K. C. Rogers, Commissioner J. R. Curtiss, Commissioner
F. J. Remick, Commissioner
E. G. de nque, Commissioner
J. H. Sniezek, DEDR T. E. Murley, Director, NRR NRR/LPEB (2 copies) L. B. Marsh, NRR Director, Project Directorate III-1
J. Lieberman, Director, Office of Enforcement
L. R. Greger, RIII
SRI
M. J. Pearson, RIII L. L. Cox, RIII TSS, RIII RIII Files RIII PRR