

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
Region I

Report No. 85-07  
Docket Nos. 50-277; 50-278  
License No. DPR-44; DPR-56 Priority -- Category C  
Licensee: Philadelphia Electric Company  
2301 Market Street  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19101

Facility Name: Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3

Meeting At: NRC Region I, King of Prussia, PA

Meeting Conducted: February 8, 1985

Prepared By: Robert M. Gallo FOR  
T. P. Johnson, Sr. Resident Inspector

7/8/85  
date

Approved By: Robert M. Gallo  
R. M. Gallo, Chief, Reactor Projects Section 2A

7/8/85  
date

Meeting Summary: Enforcement Conference at NRC Region I, King of Prussia, Pennsylvania, on February 8, 1985, to discuss the findings of Inspection 50-277/85-07; 50-278/85-07. The topics discussed at the meeting were: the simultaneous inoperability of one diesel generator and one loop of containment cooling, and the potential for the complete loss of both loops of containment cooling.

The meeting was attended by NRC and licensee management and lasted about 1½ hours.

8507150471 850709  
PDR ADOCK 05000277  
G PDR

## ENFORCEMENT CONFERENCE MEETING SUMMARY

### 1. Attendees

#### Philadelphia Electric Company

V. S. Boyer, Senior Vice President, Nuclear Power  
M. J. Cooney, Manager, Nuclear Production  
W. T. Ullrich, Superintendent, Nuclear Generation Division  
R. S. Fleischmann, Station Superintendent, Peach Bottom  
J. E. Winzenried, Technical Engineer, Peach Bottom  
A. L. Fulvio, ISEG Engineer, Peach Bottom

#### U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

T. E. Murley, Regional Administrator  
R. W. Starostecki, Director, Division of Reactor Projects  
S. J. Collins, Chief, Reactor Projects Branch No. 2  
R. M. Gallo, Chief, Reactor Projects Section No. 2A  
T. P. Johnson, Sr. Resident Inspector  
J. H. Williams, Resident Inspector

### 2. Meeting Purpose

The purpose of this enforcement conference was to discuss the events and to review the causes for the simultaneous inoperability at Peach Bottom Unit 3 of one diesel generator (DG) and one loop of the containment cooling (torus spray and cooling portion) subsystem and to review the potential for the complete loss of both loops of containment cooling. Inspection Report No. 50-277/85-07; 50-278/85-07 documents the NRC review of this event.

### 3. Licensee Discussions

#### 3.1 Peach Bottom Containment Cooling

The licensee provided a discussion of the Peach Bottom Units 2 and 3 loss of coolant accident. As analyzed in the updated FSAR, the containment cooling subsystem is not required to mitigate (prevent exceeding containment design limits) the consequences of the accident. FSAR section 14.6.3 and figures 14.6.10 and 14.6.12 discuss this accident and conclude that the long term containment response is independent of the number of containment cooling loops operating, thus, the Peach Bottom containment response with or without containment cooling is similar. The licensee stated that Peach Bottom Unit 3 was operating within the design basis, since the High Pressure Service Water (HPSW) system was operable. HPSW provides cooling water to the RHR heat exchangers, and during a loss of coolant accident, the HPSW system would have been available to remove containment heat via the RHR heat exchangers.

### 3.2 Licensee Initiated Corrective Actions

Regarding the items discussed in Inspection Report No. 85-07 the licensee has:

- Issued interim technical specifications regarding the containment cooling subsystems.
- Issued a letter to Shift Supervision ensuring that availability of power supplies and redundant equipment be considered for safety equipment out of service.
- Indicated that the Independent Safety and Engineering Group (ISEG) will review daily any safety equipment out of service and the affect on plant safety operations.
- Revised surveillance tests to include daily testing of containment cooling subsystem MOVs when redundant equipment is out of service and routine monthly testing of MOVs.

### 4. Conclusion

The NRC thanked the licensee for his presentation and input regarding corrective actions. Based on the material presented by the licensee during the meeting, the NRC stated that no enforcement action would be taken, but that a review would be conducted by the NRC to assess the adequacy of current and interim Technical Specifications (278/85-07-01).