



PSEG

Public Service Electric and Gas Company P.O. Box 236 Hancocks Bridge, New Jersey 08038-0236

Nuclear Business Unit

MAY 14 1999

LR-N99-0225

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Document Control Desk
Washington, DC 20555

Attn: Document Control Desk

**MONTHLY OPERATING REPORT
SALEM UNIT NO. 1
DOCKET NO. 50-272**

Gentlemen:

In compliance with Section 6.9.1.6, Reporting Requirements for the Salem Technical Specifications, the original Monthly Operating report for April 1999 is attached.

Sincerely

D. F. Garchow
General Manager -
Salem Operations

9905250095 990430
PDR ADOCK 05000272
R PDR

/rbk
Enclosures

C Mr. H. J. Miller
Regional Administrator USNRC, Region 1
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, PA 19046

50044

IE241

The power is in your hands.

DOCKET NO.: 50-272
 UNIT: Salem 1
 DATE: 5/15/99
 COMPLETED BY: R. Knieriem
 TELEPHONE: (609) 339-1782

Reporting Period: April 1999

OPERATING DATA REPORT

Design Electrical Rating (MWe-Net)
 Maximum Dependable Capacity (MWe-Net)

No. of hours reactor was critical
 No. of hours generator was on line (service hours)
 Unit reserve shutdown hours
 Net Electrical Energy (MWH)

1115		
1106		
Month	Year-to-date	Cumulative
719	2802	113623
719	2703	109371
0	0	0
790312	2986904	109599067

UNIT SHUTDOWNS

NO.	DATE	TYPE F=FORCED S=SCHEDULED	DURATION (HOURS)	REASON (1)	METHOD OF SHUTTING DOWN THE REACTOR (2)	CORRECTIVE ACTION/COMMENT

(1) Reason

- A - Equipment Failure (Explain)
- B - Maintenance or Test
- C - Refueling
- D - Regulatory Restriction
- E - Operator Training/License Examination
- F - Administrative
- G - Operational Error (Explain)
- H - Other

(2) Method

- 1 - Manual
- 2 - Manual Trip/Scram
- 3 - Automatic Trip/Scram
- 4 - Continuation
- 5 - Other (Explain)

Summary:

Salem Unit 1 operated at full power throughout the month of April 1999.

DOCKET NO.: 50-272
UNIT: Salem 1
DATE: 5/15/99
COMPLETED BY: R. B. Knieriem
TELEPHONE: (609) 339-1782

**SUMMARY OF CHANGES, TESTS, AND EXPERIMENTS
FOR THE SALEM UNIT 1 GENERATING STATION**

MONTH: April 1999

The following items completed during **April 1999** have been evaluated to determine:

1. If the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the safety analysis report may be increased; or
2. If a possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the safety analysis report may be created; or
3. If the margin of safety as defined in the basis for any technical specification is reduced.

The 10CFR50.59 Safety Evaluations showed that these items did not create a new safety hazard to the plant; nor did they affect the safe shutdown of the reactor. These items did not change the plant effluent releases and did not alter the existing environmental impact. The 10CFR50.59 Safety Evaluations determined that no unreviewed safety or environmental questions are involved.

Design Changes - Summary of Safety Evaluations

Design Change Package (DCP) 1EE-0034, Circulating Water Standpipe Sample Pump Replacement

This modification replaced the Circulating Water Standpipe Sample pumps with a design that will enhance the reliability and maintainability of the chlorination sample system. The Circulating Water Standpipe Sample pumps serve to provide sample flow from the Circulating Water system outlet to the chlorine analyzers.

Review of this modification under 10CFR50.59 was required because the improvements to the Circulating Water Standpipe Sample pumps constituted a change to the facility as described in the Safety Analysis Report (SAR). This modification did not constitute an Unreviewed Safety Question (USQ) because the modification did not increase the consequence or probability of an accident previously analyzed. The modification did not increase the probability or consequences of a malfunction of equipment important to safety. This modification would not create any new accidents or malfunctions since no new failure modes were introduced and failure modes considered applicable to this modification are within the existing design basis. In addition the Technical

Specification Bases were not affected and no changes to the Technical Specifications were required.

Temporary Modifications - Summary of Safety Evaluations

There were no changes in this category implemented during April 1999.

Procedures - Summary of Safety Evaluations

There were no changes in this category implemented during April 1999.

UFSAR Change Notices - Summary of Safety Evaluations

UFSAR Change Notice S98-039, Engineering Evaluation Of The Spent Fuel Pool Cooling (SFPC) System

This UFSAR change incorporated the results of the above referenced engineering evaluation. This evaluation demonstrated that the Salem SFPC system is seismic class I, its components have been seismically evaluated under Seismic Qualification Utility Group, Generic Implementation Procedure (SQUG GIP) methodology. Therefore the SFPC system possesses reliability and hazards protection to the extent that pool temperature will be maintained at or below 180°F and boiling can be eliminated as a credible event.

Review of this evaluation under 10CFR50.59 was required because the previous licensing basis of SFPC did not preclude SFPC boiling. Because sustained loss of SFPC has been eliminated as a credible event, the review determined that the change did not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated in the SAR. The change did not increase the probability or consequences of a malfunction of equipment important to safety, and did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type from any previously evaluated. Because the change did not affect the existing analysis that forms the basis for the Technical Specifications, and did not violate Technical Specification and Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) requirements, the change did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the basis for the Technical Specifications.

UFSAR Change Notice S99-009, 500 kV Hope Creek-Red Lion Line Trip-A-Unit

This UFSAR Change Notice incorporated changes to the off-site power distribution system and the affect of those changes on features used to protect grid stability during off-site power distribution line outages.

Review of this change under 10CFR50.59 was required because the changes to the offsite power distribution system constituted a change to the facility as described in the Safety Analysis Report (SAR). This change did not affect the original design function of the off-site distribution system or the features used to protect grid stability. Therefore, the review determined that the change did not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated in the SAR. The change also did not increase the probability or consequences of a malfunction of equipment important to safety and did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type from any previously evaluated. Because the change did not affect the existing analysis that forms the basis for the Technical Specifications, and did not violate Technical Specification and Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) requirements, the change did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the basis for the Technical Specifications.

Deficiency Reports - Summary of Safety Evaluations

There were no changes in this category implemented during April 1999.

Other - Summary of Safety Evaluations

Calculations ES-13.005, Revision 6 and ES-13.010(Q), Revision 4, Electrical Penetration Overcurrent Protection

This change revised Calculations ES-13.005(Q), Revision 6 and ES-13.010(Q), Revision 4, Electrical Penetration Overcurrent Protection. These calculations contain the controlled list of electrical penetration protection devices that was originally a part of the Technical Specifications and the UFSAR. The list was deleted from those documents and is now controlled by Attachment 3 of the above referenced calculations. This Safety Evaluation evaluates changes made to the list contained in Attachment 3.

Review of this modification under 10CFR50.59 was required because this change constituted a change to the facility as described in the Safety Analysis Report (SAR). The revised calculation concluded that the penetration conductors are electrically loaded within their continuous ratings and are protected against the maximum available short circuit current by the required primary and backup protection devices. No physical changes to the plant were identified by the subject revisions to these calculations. These calculation revisions do not require physical changes to the plant or changes to existing protection devices. The function of the electrical penetrations in providing part of the Containment boundary is not affected by this proposal. No new accidents or malfunctions are created, and the margin of safety as defined in plant Technical

Specifications for affected equipment is not reduced. Therefore, this change did not represent an Unreviewed Safety Question.