

Dmb
IEOL

JUL 10 1985

Docket No. 50-341

The Detroit Edison Company
ATTN: Wayne H. Jens
Vice President
Nuclear Operations
6400 North Dixie Highway
Newport, MI 48166

Gentlemen:

This refers to the special operational readiness team inspection conducted by R. L. Hague, C. D. Anderson, J. C. Bjorgen, and A. D. Morrongiello of this office on June 17 - June 21, 1985, of activities at Fermi 2 authorized by Facility Operating License No. NPF-33 and to the discussion of our findings with R. S. Lenart and other members of your staff at the conclusion of the inspection.

The enclosed copy of our inspection report identifies areas examined during the inspection. Within these areas, the inspection consisted of a selective examination of procedures and representative records, observations, and interviews with personnel.

No items of noncompliance with NRC requirements were identified during the course of this inspection. 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 weak areas.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.790 of the Commission's regulations, a copy of this letter and the enclosed inspection report will be placed in the NRC's Public Document Room.

We will gladly discuss any questions you have concerning this inspection.

Sincerely,

"Original Signed by E.G. Greenman"

C. E. Norelius, Director
Division of Reactor Projects

Enclosure: Inspection Report
No. 50-341/85031(DRP)

See Attached List For Distribution

8507150484 850710
PDR ADOCK 05000341
G PDR

IEOL
11

JUL 10 1985

Distribution

cc w/enclosure:

L. P. Bregni, Licensing
Engineer

P. A. Marquardt, Corporate
Legal Department

DMB/Document Control Desk (RIDS)

Resident Inspector, RIII

Ronald Callen, Michigan

Public Service Commission

Harry H. Voigt, Esq.

Nuclear Facilities and

Environmental Monitoring

Section

RIII

RFW for
Hague/jp
07/09/85

RIII

RFW
Chrissotimos

RIII

RFW
WARRICK
Shafer

RIII

RFW
Norelius

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.

- A. Excellent communication between operations personnel both during routine operations, including shift turnover, and during accident drills at the simulator.
- B. Procedures require immediate notification of out-of-specification surveillance testing to the Nuclear Shift Supervisor.
- C. An active program to reduce nuisance annunciators is in progress.
- D. Licensee management conducts daily meetings with first line supervision. These meetings are informative and promote interdepartmental communications.
- E. Access to areas adjacent to the control boards is controlled by the Nuclear Supervising Operator.
- F. Operator's knowledge of the plant and procedures were demonstrated effectively at the simulator.
- G. The Health Physics Department is adequately staffed possesses sufficient instrumentation and has demonstrated a well thought-out program to handle power escalation and maintenance.

APPENDIX B

LICENSEE WEAKNESSES

The inspection team has identified items of concern which have been characterized as weaknesses. A weakness does not constitute a violation with regulatory requirements, rather it is related to effectiveness of a program, activity, or organization. References are to paragraphs in Inspection Report 50-341/85-031.

- A. Licensee does not maintain the out-of-specification log for a system outage. (paragraph 3)
- B. Independent verification is excluded if the expected dose would exceed 100 mrem. (paragraph 3)
- C. There is a lack of feedback on the quality of maintenance procedures used in the field. (paragraph 4)
- D. Development of a maintenance work package may require an excessive amount of time to support urgent work. (paragraph 4)
- E. The revising of prints and training of operators after a plant modification may not be timely. (paragraph 4)
- F. There appears to be difficulties in the performance and review of voluminous work packages. (paragraph 4)
- G. Establishing communications during the performance of surveillance testing is sometimes inconvenient. (paragraph 5)
- H. There is an unrealistic time imposed by the action statement of Technical Specification 3.4.2.1. (paragraph 7)