



Public Service Electric and Gas Company P.O. Box 236 Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038 609 339-4800

Corbin A. McNeill Jr. Vice President — Nuclear

June 3, 1985

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region 1
631 Park Avenue
King of Prussia, PA 19406

Attention: Samuel J. Collins, Chief
Projects Branch No. 2
Division of Reactor Projects

Gentlemen:

NRC INSPECTION 50-272/85-07 AND 50-311/85-07
SALEM GENERATING STATION
UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2
DOCKET NOS. 50-272 AND 50-311

Public Service Electric and Gas Company is in receipt of your letter dated May 2, 1985, which transmitted a Notice of Violation concerning a failure to maintain procedures.

Pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR 2.201, our response to the Notice of Violation is provided in Attachment 1.

Sincerely,

8506100146 850603
PDR ADOCK 05000272
Q PDR

Attachment

C Mr. Donald C. Fischer
Licensing Project Manager

Mr. Thomas J. Kenny
Senior Resident Inspector

The Energy People

1/1
IE 01

ATTACHMENT 1

10CFR PART 2.201 INFORMATION
PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY
SALEM GENERATING STATION
RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF VIOLATION

Your letter of May 2, 1985, identified a violation of Technical Specification 6.8 which requires that written test procedures be established and maintained. Contrary to this requirement, test procedure 2 PD 8.1.002, Rod Position Indication Signal, was changed on February 11, 1983, June 2, 1984 and August 24, 1984 such that it was inconsistent with the Unit No. 2 Technical Specification.

1. PSE&G DOES NOT DISPUTE THE VIOLATION.
2. THE ROOT CAUSE OF THE VIOLATION WAS A FAILURE OF RESPONSIBLE I&C SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL TO CONSIDER THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE UNIT 1 AND UNIT 2 TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS
3. IMMEDIATE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS TAKEN

- a. A review of the Unit 1 and Unit 2 Technical Specifications was performed in order to establish the proper limiting conditions for performance of the test procedure. As a result, the Unit 1 and Unit 2 procedures, 1IC-8.1.002 and 2IC-8.1.002 respectively, were revised to limit rod withdrawal to one bank at a time and a Keff of not greater than that specified by the Technical Specification.
- b. The responsible I&C supervisory personnel were counselled.
- c. All I&C supervisory personnel were informed of the violation. The importance of verifying the applicability of on-the-spot changes to procedures for each unit due to differences in the Technical Specifications was emphasized.

4. LONG TERM CORRECTIVE ACTION

The administrative procedure which provides guidance on the initiation of on-the-spot changes is being revised. This revision is being made to incorporate the recently issued Amendments 62 and 33 to the Unit 1 and Unit 2 Technical Specifications, respectively. These amendments provide significant changes to, and overall strengthening of, the safety review process.

5. FULL COMPLIANCE WILL BE ACHIEVED BY NOVEMBER 13, 1985

6. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

With regard to the differences between the Unit 1 and Unit 2 Technical Specifications, activities have been initiated to develop a new single set of Technical Specifications, common to both units. The development of a new common set of Technical Specifications is a major undertaking with significant impact on all phases of operation. Our objective is to achieve a timely revision that is consistent with NRC and industry positions in this area.