

JUN 14 1985

Docket No. 50-277

Philadelphia Electric Company
ATTN: Mr. S. L. Daltroff
Vice President
Electric Production
2301 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19101

Gentlemen:

Subject: Inspection Number 50-277/85-15

This refers to the operational readiness assessment team inspection conducted by a team led by Mr. J. R. Johnson of this office on April 10-19, 1985, at Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Delta, Pennsylvania and your corporate office at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, of activities authorized by NRC License No. DPR-44 and to the discussions of our findings held by Mr. Johnson with Mr. R. Fleischmann of your staff at the conclusion of the inspection.

Areas examined during this inspection are described in the NRC Region I Inspection Report which is enclosed with this letter. The purpose of this inspection was to verify the establishment and implementation of programs to restore the reactor plant to its design configuration following extensive modifications and to revise reactor operating information accordingly. Overall, we have concluded that, when planned testing and closeout activities are completed, Peach Bottom Unit 2 can be safely returned to power operation.

Within the scope of this inspection, no violations were observed. Certain inspection team findings have been characterized as program strengths, or weaknesses, as appropriate, and are documented in Appendices A and B, respectively, to this letter. You are requested to respond to Appendix B within thirty (30) days of the receipt of this letter, stating actions taken or planned to improve the areas identified as weaknesses.

The responses requested by this letter are not subject to the clearance procedures of the Office of Management and Budget as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, PL 96-511.

Your cooperation with us in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely,

8506210267 850614
PDR ADOCK 05000277
Q PDR

Original Signed By:

Richard W. Starostecki, Director
Division of Reactor Projects

Enclosures:

1. Appendix A, Licensee Strengths
2. Appendix B, Licensee Weaknesses
3. NRC Region I Inspection Report Number 50-277/85-15 w/Attachment 1

cc w/encls:

- ✓ R. S. Fleischmann, II, Station Superintendent
- ✓ Troy B. Conner, Jr., Esquire
- ✓ Eugene J. Bradley, Esquire, Assistant General Counsel
- ✓ Raymond L. Hovis, Esquire
- ✓ Michael J. Scibinico, II, Assistant Attorney General
- Public Document Room (PDR)
- Local Public Document Room (LPDR)
- Nuclear Safety Information Center (NSIC)
- ✓ NRC Resident Inspector
- ✓ Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

bcc w/encls:

- ✓ Region I Docket Room (with concurrences)
- ✓ Senior Operations Officer (w/o encls)
- ✓ R. Gallo, Section Chief, DRP
- ✓ Director, DRS

*Jab*RI:DRP
Beall/mjd

5/23/85

RI:DRP
Gallo

6/1/85

RI:DRP
Collins

6/1/85

disposed with
Keller & Kistner
to public licensing weakness
RI:DRP
Starostecki
6/1/85

APPENDIX A

LICENSEE STRENGTHS

The inspection team noted specific features of the licensee's programs and activities which have been characterized as strengths. A strength is a positive attribute or feature which exceeds regulatory requirements, or an innovative feature, which contributes to the safety or effectiveness of plant activities. References are to sections in Inspection Report 50-277/85-15.

1. The Major Outage Recovery Effort (MORE) team was established to coordinate the restoration activities in the primary containment and to implement preoperational and system startup testing. The team appeared to be well administered with experienced and competent personnel. Hardware deficiencies identified by the inspection team had already been identified and were being tracked by the MORE team. (5.)
2. The Plant Operating Review Committee's (PORC) involvement in the oversight of work associated with the outage is strong. In addition to review and approval prior to implementation, the PORC reviews the results of the Modification Acceptance Tests and evaluates any problems identified. (5.)
3. Daily PECO outage meetings were continuing with operational milestone checklists being reviewed by both plant staff and construction division staff. (4.)
4. Lesson plans prepared by the Training Section for licensed operator requalification were well written, and presented by highly qualified instructors. The oral walkthrough examination guide prepared for the requalification examination was of high quality. (11.)

APPENDIX B

LICENSEE WEAKNESSES

The inspection team identified items of concern which have been characterized as weaknesses. An item of weakness does not constitute noncompliance with regulatory requirements, rather it is related to effectiveness of a program, activity or organization. References are to paragraphs in Inspection Report 50-277/85-15.

1. No provision was made to perform a final systematic review of open problem reports (quality assurance findings, quality control nonconformance and noncompliance reports) to ensure disposition prior to plant restart. (4.).
2. The licensee's requalification program does not ensure that those staff member(s) preparing the annual written requalification exam are periodically administered an exam themselves. One staff member has not taken a written exam for four years. (11.)