



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

FEB 9 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: D. Skovholt, Assistant Director for Quality Assurance, DPM
K. Goller, Assistant Director for Operating Reactors, DOR
J. P. O'Reilly, Region 1

FROM: S. A. Varga, Chief, Light Water Reactors Branch No. 4, DPM

SUBJECT: TMI-2 HEARING TESTIMONY

At the TMI-2 prehearing conference of January 28, 1977, the ASLB requested that the staff present testimony at the hearing on the following items. For your guidance, copies of appropriate pages of the prehearing conference transcript are enclosed. Please provide draft testimony by February 25, 1977. Organizations which would appear to be involved are indicated in parentheses. If you feel any further clarification or discussion is required, please contact the LPM, Harley Silver, on extension 27831.

1. What has been done and what is being done to assure that quality of construction and reliability of operation will not be compromised by the construction slowdown and schedule stretchout which has been experienced at TMI-2? Reference page 137 of the transcript. (I&E, QA, Financial Analysis)
2. What has been the operating experience on Unit 1? Reference page 138 of the transcript (I&E, DOR)
3. What has the staff (and the applicant) done to assure themselves that the financial considerations which caused the construction delay discussed above will not impact on the safety and qualified performance of the plant? Reference page 147 of the transcript. (Financial Analysis, QA)

Steven A. Varga, Chief
Light Water Reactors Branch No. 4
Division of Project Management

cc: H. Silver
D. Vassallo
J. McGurran
C. Heltemes
A. Meltz

7905040172

19 121

3 CHAIRMAN LUTON: There is a question -- there is one
4 following board's treatment of the matter in the previous
5 board session. The questioner suggests that it not be
6 done in the same administrative than any other cases
7 by a licensing board.

8 MR. Mc GIBBON: It is also the board's understanding
9 that that treatment is required.

10 CHAIRMAN LUTON: Thank you.

11 DR. HERRICK: Intervenor welcome a full Board NDA
12 review.

13 (Laughter.)

14 MR. LINDENBERGER: By way of adding more detail to the
15 Chairman's comment, there are matters that the Board might be
16 interested in coming before the evidentiary session.

17 There is of course, in the Board's view, the possibility
18 of a delay in completion of construction of any project resulting
19 in things not being accomplished quite the way they will orig-
20 inally be viewed as intended to be accomplished.

21 Specifically, the Board would like to request both
22 staff and Applicant to address themselves to the considerations
23 of what has been done and is being done to assure that the
24 quality of construction and the reliability of operation,
25 assuming an operating license issues, will not be compromised by an
26 slow down and the construction stretch out of construction

POOR ORIGINAL

1 In this same context, I think it would be helpful for
 2 the Applicant to clarify just exactly what the operating ex-
 3 penses are seen with ^{only} unity, and of course, the Board would be
 4 free to correct on that to any extent they wish. This leads
 5 me to another question.

6 The letter from the Board has with respect to the
 7 evidentiary evaluation request is that there is a supplement desired to
 8 be made by the end of this month. I should like to inquire, is
 9 that schedule still current?

10 MR. MC GURRYN: Let me give you an update. The schedule
 11 is such that the first supplement, we are talking of first that
 12 one supplement is -- would not be ready at the end of this month.

13 Our present schedule contemplates the issuance of a
 14 first supplement in the mid-February range and we also contem-
 15 plate another supplement to be issued within a couple of months
 16 after that date.

17 MR. LINDBERGER: Mid-April you are saying, approxi-
 18 mately.

19 MR. MC GURRYN: That is correct.

20 MR. LINDBERGER: Would you comment, sir, as to the
 21 relevance of the contents of these supplements to the scheduling
 22 of initiation of the evidentiary hearing?

23 MR. MC GURRYN: It is clear from the correspondence that
 24 have been admitted that any matters addressed in the second

POOR ORIGINAL

1 ...
2 ...
3 ...
4 ...
5 ...
6 ...
7 ...
8 ...
9 ...
10 ...
11 ...
12 ...
13 ...
14 ...
15 ...
16 ...
17 ...
18 ...
19 ...
20 ...
21 ...
22 ...
23 ...
24 ...
25 ...
26 ...
27 ...
28 ...
29 ...
30 ...
31 ...
32 ...
33 ...
34 ...
35 ...
36 ...
37 ...
38 ...
39 ...
40 ...
41 ...
42 ...
43 ...
44 ...
45 ...
46 ...
47 ...
48 ...
49 ...
50 ...
51 ...
52 ...
53 ...
54 ...
55 ...
56 ...
57 ...
58 ...
59 ...
60 ...
61 ...
62 ...
63 ...
64 ...
65 ...
66 ...
67 ...
68 ...
69 ...
70 ...
71 ...
72 ...
73 ...
74 ...
75 ...
76 ...
77 ...
78 ...
79 ...
80 ...
81 ...
82 ...
83 ...
84 ...
85 ...
86 ...
87 ...
88 ...
89 ...
90 ...
91 ...
92 ...
93 ...
94 ...
95 ...
96 ...
97 ...
98 ...
99 ...
100 ...