

File

Distribution:  
ROAB RF  
ROAB SF  
AEOD CF  
S. Rubin, ROAB  
K. Seyfrit, ROAB ✓  
T. Ippolito, AEOD  
C. J. Heltemes, AEOD

MAY 15 1984

DCS

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 OYSTER CREEK LERs COVERING THE PERIOD  
FEBRUARY 1, 1983 TO APRIL 30, 1984

In support of the upcoming SALP review of the Jersey Central Power and Light Company, in regard to their performance as licensee of the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station, AEOD has assessed the Licensee Event Reports submitted under Docket No. 50-219 during the subject period. Our perspective is indicative of a knowledgeable BWR system safety engineer, who is not, however, intimately familiar with the detailed site-specific equipment arrangements and operations. Our review focused on the technical accuracy, completeness and intelligibility of the LERs. Our review covered a majority of the LERs submitted.

As was the case for the previous SALP assessment period, the submittals were uniformly outstanding on the above points. The LERs again typically contained very good descriptions of the events as well as excellent explanations of the consequence of the event on both the effected system performance level and the overall plant safety level. Furthermore, cause descriptions were typically very well documented, often providing both root cause information and symptomatic (or secondary) failure cause information. In most cases the corrective action generally were considered to be appropriate and well described. The attachment provides additional observations from our review of the LERs.

If you or your staff have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Stuart Rubin at 492-4436.

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

Attachment: As stated  
cc: J. Lombardo, NRR  
J. Thomas, RI

8405250248 XA  
CF/ADDOCK/50-219

A/4/43

OFFICE	RS4/ROAB	C/ROAB	D/AEOD				
USERNAME	SRubin:eh	KSeyfrit	CJHeltemes				
DATE	5/15/84	5/16/84	5/15/84				

SALP REVIEW FOR OYSTER CREEK

We reviewed a majority of the LERs submitted in the assessment period from February 3, 1983 to April 30, 1984. A total of 22 LERs were reviewed.

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 very informative regarding the description of events, their associated consequences, and the licensee's corrective actions.

- b) Were the LERs coded correctly?

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

- c) Was supplementary information provided when needed?

A considerable amount of supplementary information was provided in all of the LERs reviewed. Furthermore, the LERs provided adequate information in their narrative computer fields.

- d) Were follow-up reports promised and submitted?

Three follow-up reports were promised, LER-83-01, LER-83-13, and LER-83-22. The follow-up report for LER-83-13 was submitted. The follow-up reports for 83-09 and 83-22 were not found in the data base.

- e) Were similar occurrences properly referenced?

None of the LERs involved prior similar occurrences.

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 13 PNs during this review period. PNO-I-84-27, issued on March 23, 1984, would appear to require an LER. No LER was found in the data base. This may be due to the relatively recent issuance of the PN in which case a follow-up LER would not necessarily be yet received.

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.