Rec'd 5-7

MAY 10 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR: Richard W. Starostecki, Director
Division of Project and Resident Programs
Region I

FROM: Karl V. Seyfrit, Chief
Reactor Operations Analysis Branch
Office for Analysis and Evaluation
of Operational Data

SUBJECT: EVALUATION OF NINE MILE POINT UNIT 1
LICENSEE EVENT REPORTS FOR THE PERIOD
MAY 31, 1983 TO APRIL 20, 1984

The Office for Analysis and Evaluation of Operational Data has assessed the Licensee Event Reports (LERs) submitted under Docket No. 50-220 during the subject period. This has been done in support of the ongoing Systematic Assessment of Licensee Performance (SALP) of the Niagara Mohawk Corporation, with regard to their performance as licensee of the Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station Unit 1. Our perspective would be indicative of that of a BWR system safety engineer who, although knowledgeable, is not intimately familiar with the detailed site-specific equipment arrangements and operations. Our review focused on the technical accuracy, completeness, and intelligibility of LERs. Our review covered a majority of the LERs submitted during the assessment period.

The LERs reviewed were adequate in all important respects. The LERs typically provided clear descriptions of the cause and nature of the events as well as adequate explanations of the effects on both system function and public safety. No supplemental information was provided in the LERs reviewed. In most cases the described corrective actions taken or planned by the licensee were considered to be commensurate with the nature, seriousness and frequency of the problems found. The enclosure provides additional observations from our review of the LERs.

8405210129 XA
CF/ROOCK/50-220

A/4/42

OFFICE ▶							
SURNAME ▶							
DATE ▶							

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY ★ US GPO 1983-409-960

In summary, our review of the licensee's LERs indicates that in all cases the licensee provided adequate descriptions of the events. In general none of the LERs we reviewed involved what we would consider to be an especially significant event or serious challenge to plant safety.

If you have any questions please contact either myself or Peter Lam (492-4438) of my staff.

Karl V. Seyfrit, Chief
Reactor Operations Analysis Branch
Office for Analysis and Evaluation
of Operational Data

Attachments:
As stated

cc w/attachment:
S. Collins, R-I
R. Hermann, NRR.
S. Hudson, R-I
H. Kister, R-I

Distribution:
DCS
ROAB CF
ROAB SF
PLam, ROAB
SRubin, ROAB
KSeyfrit, ROAB
TIppolito, AEOD
CJHeltemes,AEOD

OFFICE	ROAB	ROAB	ROAB				
SURNAME	PLam:all	SRubin	KVSeyfrit				
DATE	5/9/84	5/9/84	5/10/84				

SALP REVIEW FOR NINE MILE POINT UNIT 1

The licensee submitted 36 LERs in the assessment period from May 31, 1983 to April 20, 1984. We reviewed 32 of these 36 LERs.

The LER review covered the following subjects and the general instructions of NUREG-0161. This SALP review is presented with the topic reviewed followed by the comments on that topic.

1. Review of LER for Completeness

   a) Is the information sufficient to provide a good understanding of the event?

      We found the information in the narrative sections to be adequately informative regarding the description of events, their associated consequences, and the licensee's corrective actions.

   b) Were the LERs coded correctly?

      All coded entries appeared to be correct. The codes selected by the licensee agreed well with the narrative descriptions.

   c) Was supplementary information provided when needed?

      No supplementary information was provided in any one of the 32 LERs reviewed. However, these LERs provided adequate information in their narrative sections without any supplementary information.

   d) Were follow-up reports promised and submitted?

      Two follow-up reports were promised, respectively, in LER-83-20 and LER-83-44. The follow-up report for LER-83-20 had been submitted as LER-83-20 revision 1. The one for LER-83-44 is pending because of additional licensee actions.

e) Were similar occurrences properly referenced?

The licensee appropriately referenced similar occurrences. Specifically, the following similar events were reported:

LERs Reviewed	Similiar Occurences
83-11	80-14
83-26	81-52, 83-15
83-28	83-33
83-29	83-04
83-39	83-15
83-40	83-16
83-41	83-36, 83-43
83-46	81-45, 83-45

2. Multiple event reporting in a single LER

The licensee did not report any multiple events in a single LER.

3. Relationship between PNs and LERs

The region issued two PNs during this review period. Neither of these PNs needed to be followed by a LER.

In summary, our review indicates that based on the stated criteria, the licensee provided adequate descriptions of reportable events during the assessment period. No significant deficiencies were found in the LERs reviewed.