

2 Encls

Term
100 FR 9.7

(Signature)

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF:

PUBLIC MEETING

DISCUSSION OF LICENSING SCHEDULES AND STAFF IMPACT

Place - Washington, D. C.

Date - Thursday, 12 July 1977

Pages 1 - 31

Telephone:
(202) 347-3700

ACE - FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Official Reporters

444 North Capitol Street
Washington, D.C. 20001

NATIONWIDE COVERAGE - DAILY

538177

790 81 00524

DISCLAIMER

This is an unofficial transcript of a meeting of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission held on Thursday, July 12, 1979 in the Commission's offices at 1717 H Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. The meeting was open to public attendance and observation. This transcript has not been reviewed, corrected, or edited, and it may contain inaccuracies.

The transcript is intended solely for general informational purposes. As provided by 10 CFR 9.103, it is not part of the formal or informal record of decision of the matters discussed. Expressions of opinion in this transcript do not necessarily reflect final determinations or beliefs. No pleading or other paper may be filed with the Commission in any proceeding as the result of or addressed to any statement or argument contained herein, except as the Commission may authorize.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DISCUSSION OF LICENSING SCHEDULES AND STAFF IMPACT

- - -

PUBLIC MEETING

Room 1130
1717 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C.

Thursday, 12 July 1979

The Commission Meeting was convened, pursuant to notice,
at 9:50 a.m.

PRESENT:

DR. JOSEPH M. HENDRIE, Chairman
VICTOR GILINSKY, Commissioner
RICHARD T. KENNEDY, Commissioner
PETER A. BRADFORD, Commissioner
JOHN F. AHEARNE, Commissioner

ALSO PRESENT:

Messrs. Lazo, Gossick, Vassallo, Knight, Hoyle, Bickwit,
and Cunningham.

MELTZER/mm1
t1 5875

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: If we could come to order,
3 please.

4 The Commission meets this morning for a discussion
5 of licensing schedules and staff impacts associated with those
6 efforts.

7 I am glad to see the assembled staff. Please go
8 ahead, Lee.

9 MR. GOSSICK: Let me ask if Harold has anything
10 that he would introduce in the briefing.

11 MR. DENTON: We have a two-part presentation this
12 morning. The first part will be given by Dom Vassallo
13 talking about the schedule we foresee for the near term.
14 These are schedules that we can meet largely with existing
15 resources.

16 The second part will bring you up to date on our
17 efforts to regain the schedules by gaining assistance from
18 other agencies in our internal reprogramming.

19 I would like to mention two of the "Lessons
20 Learned" reports. A draft is being circulated this week within
21 NRR staff. We hope to have a report back from the press
22 next week to the Commission for them to see.

23 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Yes. We have scheduled a continua-
24 tion for this discussion to pick up on that, for next week,
25 Thursday afternoon.

mm2

1 MR. DENTON: We briefed the ACRS Subcommittee
2 yesterday on the results of the data in the "Lessons Learned"
3 group.

4 So, Dom, why don't you discuss the near-term
5 discussion.

6 MR. VASSALLO: Yes.

7 If I can have the near-term OL slide.

8 (Slide)

9 If you recall, the last time we had indicated these
10 were the so-called near-term projected OLs, and since the
11 last time, we have gotten our resources together; those that
12 are remaining in the review branches, we have identified
13 for at least the first five applications what the remaining
14 outstanding issues are not counting TMI-related issues.

15 And we have established a schedule for cleaning
16 up these issues and have the branches committed to do this.
17 And what you see is what we feel we can accomplish in making
18 a complete licensing effort by the dates shown.

19 One of the problems is this only accounts for these
20 normal -- results of normal review and those outstanding
21 issues that have resulted from it. Superimposed on this you
22 will have to take into account the TMI-related issues; that
23 is the "Lessons Learned" coming from that effort, and also
24 the results of Denny Ross's efforts on Bulletins and Orders.

25 Salem No. 2 as you can see, is complete. In other

mm

1 words it is ready for fuel loading.

2 We have approximately 20 or so outstanding issues
3 which we feel we can clean up and be ready for making a
4 decision on those matters by September. The question there is
5 whether we will be ready to have the TMI-related matters factored
6 in, and the appropriate actions taken by the utility by this
7 time.

8 MR. DENTON: I might mention what my thought is
9 on the TMI-related issues.

10 We have had several meetings with the Salem
11 Applicant on the TMI-related issues. I will probably have the
12 "Lessons Learned" task force do the review of the Salem's
13 instrumentation of the "Lessons Learned" items in order to set
14 the pattern. Once we have gotten several reviews done by that
15 organization, we will probably fold the "lessons Learned" back
16 into the normal staff review.

17 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: You are implying here, Harold,
18 if I am reading you correctly, that as lessons are in fact
19 being learned, the concerns spelled out, they are being conveyed
20 to the Applicants rather than waiting until there is a report?

21 MR. DENTON: Yes, sir.

22 We met with Salem at least once and maybe more
23 between them and the "Lessons Learned" task force so that they
24 know what is coming out. And we have now gotten at least two
25 reports from Applicants on what they intend to do as a

599182

mm4

1 result of the TMI accident on their own initiative.

2 The Public Service for Salem has submitted what
3 they believe they are doing as a result of TMI-Lessons Learned
4 on their own.

5 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: When you say licensing effort
6 complete, does that involve any Board action?

7 MR. VASSALLO: No. In Salem 2 there isn't any
8 Board, so there is no --

9 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Whatabout the others?

10 MR. VASSALLO: All right.

11 Diablo Canyon, there is a Board involved. Let
12 me go down the line. North Anna 2, there isn't any Board. On
13 Diablo Canyon, there is. The hearing was closed, but there were
14 several motions made to reopen the hearings or stay the
15 hearings -- I'll let Bob Lazo speak on that one.

16 MR. LAZO: That's correct. The record is closed.
17 All of the filings are in.

18 There has been a motion to reopen based on TMI,
19 and the Board has deferred ruling on that motion while they
20 are awaiting a Staff report on TMI.

21 MR. CUNNINGHAM: I might add at that point, if I
22 may, the Staff has generally taken the position in every
23 case where there has been a motion to reopen on the basis of
24 TMI, that it is appropriate to defer ruling on that motion
25 until we have a report from the "Lessons Learned" group.

599183

mm5

1 MR. VASSALLO: On Sequoyah there isn't any Board.
2 On McGuire there was a hearing. Again that record was closed.

3 MR. LAZO: Well I will add to that that in April the
4 Licensing Board at McGuire did issue an initial decision, but
5 they stayed the decision at that time, awaiting the Staff's
6 generic unresolved safety issues report.

7 So the record is closed, but it very well might be
8 reopened.

9 MR. VASSALLO: On Zimmer there is a hearing and
10 it is in progress, or will be in July.

11 MR. LAZO: They have had several sessions. The
12 next session is scheduled to begin on August 7 and it is
13 anticipated by that Board that all of the non-TMI-related
14 issues will be completed at that time.

15 The Board will then await the Staff's evaluation of
16 TMI.

17 Those are the only three of OLs. Diablo Canyon,
18 McGuire and as Dom has said, Zimmer, where there have been
19 Boards. The others were uncontested, or dismissed early on.

20 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: At this stage is it then --
21 let's take North Anna 2, for example. No Board?

22 MR. LAZO: No Board.

23 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Is there a possibility
24 someone may come in and ask for a hearing based upon TMI?

25 MR. LAZO: There is always that possibility, yes,

593184

mm6

1 sir, that would be a possibility in any of these proceedings.

2 MR. VASSALLO: Just to round out, you can concentrate
3 on Salem 2, what we would hope is that by August we would be
4 able to send to the utility our positions on "Lessons Learned,"
5 and the issues that arise from the Bulletins and Orders. And
6 then it would depend on how quickly the Applicant will be able
7 to respond and for us to review that so we can make a final
8 decision on an OL.

9 So the September date is a little bit optimistic,
10 but we are working towards that.

11 We had geared up the Staff on all the non-TMI
12 issues to try to meet this date. And we are making every
13 effort to do so.

14 And the same goes for North Anna. There are less
15 outstanding issues there.

16 The reason for the estimated completion date of
17 August to October, is due to the Applicant's considerations.
18 They have a design deficiency in an overload system, an electrical
19 overload on some transformers. And in order to correct it on
20 unit 2, which they have corrected on unit 1 already, they
21 would have to shut down unit 1. So, of course they don't
22 want to do that right now, so that is why they have this date
23 of August 15 to October.

24 If it should be shut down for some other reason,
25 they would go ahead and make that correction.

mm7

1 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Otherwise they will wait for
2 Labor Day and a little cooler weather, maybe in turning off
3 some air conditioning, I assume.

4 MR. VASSALLO: But that is the reason for that
5 spread in there.

6 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Yes.

7 MR. VASSALLO: And I think the others are relatively
8 self-explanatory.

9 McGuire, of course, is almost completed but they
10 have some problems with snubbers, and they have indicated
11 they may not be ready until December or maybe even later.

12 Unless there are any other questions on this, I
13 would like to just turn --

14 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: On LaSalle there is no Board,
15 you said?

16 MR. VASSALLO: No, there isn't.

17 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: And, Bob, you said there is
18 always a possibility that someone might file a request? I
19 guess I didn't finish the question.

20 If the possibility exists, they might file it --
21 if they file it, then what would happen?

22 MR. LAZO: In a case like LaSalle, for example,
23 where a notice for opportunity for hearing was published, the
24 Board was not established because no petitions were filed. So
25 no Board for the operating license proceeding has ever been

mm8

1 in existence.

2 If now at this time a request came in, it would be
3 treated as a show-cause petition by the Staff. If they
4 offered a hearing on it, then we would establish a Board.

5 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I see.

6 So it would really be up to -- who would the person
7 be making that determination?

8 MR. LAZO: Harold Denton, NRR.

9 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: All right.

10 And you have received none so far?

11 MR. DENTON: No.

12 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: As to Salem and North Anna,
13 I would like to be sure that before an OL was issued we had
14 a session in which the Commission was told how it was issued,
15 how the "Lessons Learned" -- how the TMI-related issues have
16 been dealt with as to those plants.

17 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I totally agree, Peter. These
18 will be the first post-TMI, and I think it certainly is important
19 that we be briefed on the way the Staff is dealing with those
20 things.

21 I am sure there will be a variety of things, some
22 of which are important to do, you know, before fuel loading,
23 and some before you go past some low power level in the startup,
24 and others completed on down the line as appropriate.

25 I think we certainly are interested in those and

599187

mm9

1 will want to hear about them.

2 MR. BICKWIT: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say at
3 this point that the Commission has asked our office for a paper
4 recommending a procedure for Commission action with respect to
5 the licenses.

6 That paper will be up shortly.

7 MR. DENTON: There are so many ongoing issues. We
8 are giving a lot of thought to sorting out what is really
9 required for Salem 2 versus what can be deferred.

10 There was a plan by states, for example, thoughts
11 for operator training, a lot of new issues coming. And our
12 main effort, what we are putting out in September, one of the
13 things that must be done as condition for startup, and what
14 would be deferred, and we would be happy to work with the
15 Commission on that.

16 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I think it is quite clear that
17 presuming we do eventually come for a license for Salem 2 with
18 appropriate conditions, that that in no way is going to
19 relieve them from things which are likely to be done across
20 the board as a result of TMI. So there are several succeeding
21 waves or layers of these things to be implemented in the
22 appropriate timeframes.

23 MR. VASSALLO: I would just like to add that the
24 ACRS has also indicated that they would like to be briefed on
25 how we intend to implement TMI Lessons Learned before we
make a decision on issuing the OLs.

599188

CR5875.02

RMG 1

1 MR. VASSALLO: So we have to factor this as well
2 into this, and as Harold said, there are a number of layers
3 here that we have to go through, so we all have to work very
4 hard to make these dates. But we try to establish this
5 schedule and hope that we can at least work toward achieving
6 it.

7 May I have the next chart, please, on the CPs.

8 (Slide.0

9 On this one we have listed all of those CPs which
10 are in a hearing status and are close to completion, and the
11 estimated receipt of construction permit.

12 The asterisk indicates that the Board has made some
13 request of the Staff to notify them how we intend to take
14 into account the TMI lessons learned. That's on Perkins,
15 on Allen's Creek, and on Black Fox.

16 Maybe Bob might go over those particular cases.

17 MR. LAZO: Well, in Perkins, the record has been
18 closed. A decision is in preparation, but of course the
19 release status is uncertain. The Intervenor moved to reopen
20 and defer issuing the initial decision.

21 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Based on TMI?

22 MR. LAZO: Based on TMI. And on June 26, the
23 Staff also asked the Board to defer issuing the initial decision
24 until the TMI technical information had been reviewed. That's
25 where that one stands.

RMG 2

1 What was the next one you mentioned?

2 MR. VASSALLO: Allen's Creek.

3 MR. LAZO: That's another case where the record has
4 been closed. The State of Oklahoma filed a motion --

5 MR. VASSALLO: One moment,

6 MR. LAZO: Oh, Allen's Creek.

7 The Board granted a petition by the State and five
8 others, and has issued a supplemental notice of intervention
9 procedures. That case is still really in the early stages,
10 as all of the parties have not been identified as yet.

11 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: The March '80 date on Allen's
12 Creek, what does that mean?

13 MR. LAZO: Well, that is when NRR is estimating
14 SCP to be issued?

15 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That's NRR's estimate?

16 MR. VASSALLO: Well, it is an estimate taking into
17 account the contentions and the hearing sessions that have to
18 be held, and the time for the Board to make their initial
19 decision and so on.

20 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: But is that with or without
21 TMI?

22 MR. VASSALLO: I don't think TMI would really
23 impact that, because it is further down the line.

24 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I was just wondering if in
25 your calculation you had folded in --

RMG 3

1 MR. VASSALLO: Well, one thing we envision at this
2 point is that for CPs, I think taking into account the TMI
3 lessons, could be handled mostly by commitments, and they
4 would be somewhat easier than you would have with operating
5 licenses, especially those that are in the near term.

6 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: We had some discussion along
7 this line, you may remember, at an earlier time, talking about
8 CPs and LWAs and it seems to me somebody, I think it was
9 probably -- I think, I remember it was you, Peter, noted that
10 one of the things clearly that one would want to know about a
11 new site was whether the Staff could make a reasonable judgment
12 that the sorts of improved emergency planning measures that
13 are likely to be required --

14 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Thank you for reminding me,
15 because the last time we had a meeting --

16 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: -- to be carried out.

17 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I requested a list of the
18 sites, the densities around them. And that was for that reason --

19 MR. VASSALLO: On the others, Palo Verde, that is
20 another where I guess there is a request for a TMI. Do you
21 have anything to say on that, Bob?

22 MR. LAZO: No, I don't think we have had a request
23 for TMI impact on that.

24 What happened was that the ACRS just last week,
25 I think -- July 5th -- wrote a letter --

RMG 4

1 MR. VASSALLO: Oh, that's right.

2 MR. LAZO: -- wrote a letter to the Commission
3 indicating they were going to defer their review until they
4 received information from the Staff regarding possible design
5 changes.

6 So I would think that the Palo Verde schedule would
7 be stretched out somewhat because of the ACRS action.

8 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Is that the only one that the
9 ACRS has --

10 MR. VASSALLO: Well, Sequoia also. They have not
11 written a letter either on Sequoia, because they want to know
12 about the TMI impacts.

13 On the others, Pebble Springs -- I guess the
14 hearing is mostly complete, and that the only thing we have
15 outstanding there is the generic issues.

16 MR. LAZO: The Board is also awaiting a Staff report
17 on alternative sites, as well as the generic issues.

18 So those would be the subjects of the next session
19 of the hearing.

20 MR. VASSALLO: And on Skagit, the hearing has been
21 ongoing. The main point there is -- the main issue is the
22 geology seismology. We are awaiting a report from the USGS
23 which we expect around September.

24 So the session -- the hearing session will go on
25 with environmental matters and the nongeology matters. But then

RMG 5

1 we will have to pick up after we get the USGS report and the
2 Staff makes its own findings, and then go into hearing with
3 that.

4 So that is what the estimated CP is for listed there.

5 However, the applicant is seeking an LWA, or would
6 like one, I understand, before the end of the year.

7 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: My recollection is that there
8 is some arrangement there with regard to covenants on the
9 purchase of the property --

10 MR. VASSALLO: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: -- that require at least a nominal
12 start of construction by the first of January.

13 And it would seem to me that if the substantive
14 matters can be dealt with in a timely way to meet that date,
15 it would be desirable to let that case stand or fall on the
16 merits, rather than on having by procedural stretchout, just
17 run past some deadline unassociated with the intrinsic matters
18 that we regulate.

19 So I encourage reasonable efforts to deal with the
20 substance there in a timely way.

21 MR. DENTON: It is going to be very tight, but we
22 have assigned that case on high priority, and we will try to
23 complete the review to be considered this year.

end #2

24

Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

25

599193

T3 mml

1 MR. VASSALLO: Let's see. Allen's Creek is in the
2 early stages of hearing, and FNP we have down -- this is
3 floating nuclear plant. We had a subcommittee meeting
4 with the ACRS concerning the core ladle, and at this session
5 of the ACRS -- I guess it is tomorrow or Friday --

6 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Let's see, the terminology is
7 now "ladle"?

8 I guess the rest of the Commissioners will not
9 recall the great days of Indian Point 2 and the core-catcher
10 which came and went at various stages of that design review.

11 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: "Ladle" is a new term for
12 "core-catcher"?

13 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Well, I think the Staff wisely
14 looked for some different shorthand nomenclature to use. It
15 is a rather different thing.

16 MR. DENTON: It is a core-catcher under the
17 environmental framework, without having to be single failure-
18 proof.

19 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Ladle normally is something
20 used to take something from one place to another.

21 This is something that ladles it into something?

22 MR. DENTON: It is the terminology in the steel
23 mills. I guess they call the sort of stack of bricks, a ladle.

24 MR. KNIGHT: But, in fact, when the Staff turned to
25 take a very hard look at this matter, they found that much of

mm2

1 the technology necessary was there in the steel industry in
2 the design of ladles.

3 So it was appropriate.

4 MR. VASSALLO: In any case, we are trying to
5 wrap this up, and the Subcommittee will recommend -- or the
6 Subcommittee Chairman plans to recommend to the full
7 Committee in this session to hear this aspect of the FNP.
8 That is whether --

9 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: When would they hope to do that?

10 MR. VASSALLO: In August, if the full Committee
11 agrees.

12 The issue really is somewhat narrow, and that is
13 whether -- or what impact this core ladle would have on the
14 safety aspect of the plant as designed.

15 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Do you have a large amount
16 of staff devoted to this?

17 MR. VASSALLO: To FNP?

18 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes.

19 MR. VASSALLO: Not at this point.

20 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: What was wrong with the
21 phrase "core-catcher"?

22 MR. VASSALLO: Well, I think core-catcher --

23 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: It became a cropper.

24 The problem was Indian Point 2 was one of the first
25 big machines to come along. Indian Point 2 and the Dresden 2,3

mm3

1 application it seemed to me were sort of frontrunners in terms
2 of what I would call modern treatment. Core-catcher, I guess,
3 was thrown into the breach by the applicant to overcome what
4 seemed to be flagging enthusiasm on the regulatory side at
5 one point in the CP review. And it stayed nominally in the
6 design for a while.

7 The more they looked at it, and the more the
8 Staff looked at it, the more it became clear, as I recall it,
9 that it was going to be very hard to demonstrate satisfactorily
10 that the thing would have all of the requirements of a safety
11 system that you could establish, that it would operate as
12 designed with conservatisms, you know, that single failures
13 couldn't happen and so on.

14 As I recall it, eventually -- I don't know. Ed,
15 it seems to me that both sides sort of ran down eventually,
16 and they finally came in for the OL without it in the design.
17 People hadn't been keeping up said, "That's funny, isn't there
18 another page here?"

19 "No, no, we took that out."

20 As I recall, the Committee bought off on its
21 removal on a series of long meetings and discussions.

22 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: It was the phrase that was
23 intriguing me more than the technology.

24 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: It is a somewhat more apt phrase,
25 but it has an unfortunate history, I think is the reason.

593186

1 MR. DENTON: In this application we don't think
2 it will hold the core forever. We think it will provide substan-
3 tial delay in penetration of the bottom of the part, and
4 that's why it is being required, being recommended.

5 So it is not a catcher in the sense that it will be
6 permanent.

7 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: What I am really after is this:

8 We do, from time to time, sort of seem to hedge the
9 language a bit. Accidents become incidents, catchers become
10 ladles. And I don't think that by and large we do ourselves
11 much of a favor that way. The public tends very quickly to
12 see that an energetic disassembly was, in fact, an explosion
13 and it just seems to add a notion that these changes in
14 language are an effort to paper over a problem.

15 And by and large I think that the most directly
16 descriptive terminology tends to be the best.

17 (Commissioner: Gilinsky arrived at 10:20 a.m.)

18 MR. VASSALLO: I think in this particular case,
19 as Mr. Denton said, it is not really intended to hold or
20 retain the melt if it did occur. It was really just a delay.

21 MR. DENTON: I guess we thought we were changing
22 it to a more descriptive term.

23 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: Ladles don't really work
24 that way.

25 MR. DENTON: We understand the point. We were trying

599157

mm5

1 to improve our terminology here.

2 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I'm sorry I brought the whole
3 thing up, actually.

4 (Laughter.)

5 MR. VASSALLO: I don't think I have anything more
6 to say on CPs, unless there are any other questions.

7 MR. DENTON: Let me turn to the next slide.

8 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: May I ask Bob a question.
9 Black Fox -- the record is closed?

10 MR. DENTON: Black Fox. Yes, the record was closed
11 in February.

12 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That's another one where
13 there was this delay?

14 MR. LAZO: Yes.

15 MR. DENTON: Black Fox I anticipate would be the first
16 CP which we incorporate the "Lessons Learned." They have been
17 very active and following TMI's development have sent out a
18 report of their own, changes they are making in the plant
19 design and operations. We have had several meetings with them.

20 So I expect them to be the leading CP --

21 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Do they have an outstanding
22 petition to reopen?

23 MR. LAZO: Oh, yes. The Board has deferred ruling
24 on that.

25 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: How many of those petitions

599198

mm6

1 now exist in which Boards have deferred ruling?

2 MR. LAZO: As far as the CPs we are talking about,
3 I think it is Black Fox and Perkins.

4 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Okay, Harold.

6 MR. DENTON: Let me return now to our efforts to
7 beef up our completed staff in the casework area.

8 The first slide brings you up to speed to the
9 fact that OMB did write letters to the other agencies.

10 (Slide)

11 The first letters did not include the Secretary
12 of Navy. We went back and subsequently had OMB include the Navy
13 because we wanted to get some help from the Navy ship develop-
14 ment area, the vibration ship qualifications, these sorts of
15 things at the Carderock area.

16 DOE could not be more cooperative. We have had
17 several meetings with their representatives. We have had
18 letters that went from George to all the program officers.
19 They sent resumes of people, individual laboratories have
20 come in and talked to our staffs, and I will go into the
21 type of help we anticipate getting on that side in a little
22 more detail.

23 I anticipate we are going to get excellent help
24 from the Corps of Engineers, foundation engineers. There is
25 no doubt of their capabilities and their willingness to assign

mm7

1 priorities.

2 The Survey has put an awful lot of people into
3 the critical reviews, and I think they are doing what they can
4 to respond.

5 We have not actually farmed any work out to
6 DOE yet. The status is shown somewhat on the next slide.

7 (Slide)

8 We have identified the laboratories that have the
9 most potential for helping in the various areas. We have
10 given some of the laboratories standard review plans, or have
11 active meetings going on this week with them to try to
12 decide where it would make the most sense to get certain
13 reviews done.

14 What we intend to do is to establish sort of a
15 center of excellence. For example, at Oak Ridge for instrumenta-
16 tion and control, and that would be sort of a section or a
17 branch. We are trying to get a sufficient staff that we can
18 return to the schedules that we had in March, pre-TMI.

19 So we are not just staffing up to where we will
20 take a 6-month delay in all the plants. We are trying to put
21 enough staff in these areas so that we can pick up plants that
22 would otherwise be delayed, to get back on their original
23 schedules to the extent we can.

24 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: But that always has that
25 asterisk?

mm8

1

MR. DENTON: Well, we would --

2

3

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: You can get on to the schedule,
but there is that asterisk of "pending resolution of TMI
issues"?

4

5

end T3

MR. DENTON: Yes, sir.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CR5875.04

RMG1

1 MR. DENTON: I think we have not been able to
2 ascertain the exact impacts of the TMI lesson, but surely it
3 is going to be a 10 to 20 percent increase in near-term effort
4 on some plants.

5 Mr. Chairman, I can go into more detail on some
6 of these areas, if you like, but I thought I would just show
7 you the laboratories that we have kind of identified as the
8 most likely ones to pick up in the various parts of the reviews.

9 I have asked that we complete this effort within
10 a month, and I have established that if we can within a month
11 from now, active working groups that we intend to get to assign
12 these areas that these labs --

13 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: What kind of supervision
14 would you be giving one of these centers of excellence?

15 MR. DENTON: We would assign someone from the
16 branch that ordinarily does the review to be out there with
17 them, possibly full time or part time, to be sure it is done
18 in the way it would be done if it were done here.

19 I think in a few instances -- there may be people
20 coming in at the Headquarters fairly frequently to assist also.

21 We found after the '73 experience in which we brought
22 a lot of people in, everyone felt like it would be better to
23 keep a center out in the lab. We could get more people, better
24 people, and they could call on the resources that they normally
25 have available in the infrastructure for calculations and that

599202

RMG 2

1 sort of thing.

2 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: That gets to my question.
3 How many people are we talking about?

4 MR. DENTON: On the order of 75 people that we are
5 able to get everyone.

6 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Good.

7 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: My concern would be to
8 assure that we do have some super -- direct supervision
9 from your people to carry at least the line of responsibility.

10 MR. DENTON: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Yes. Because the work products --
12 the agency, in effect, assumes responsibility for the validity
13 of those work products in the use in a licensing process --
14 as is always the case in technical assistance work by the
15 contractors, while you have that as an ever-present condition.

16 MR. DENTON: We have had the experience of the
17 environmental reviews being done in the labs under our super-
18 vision, and in fact some of these areas, the labs are presently
19 working right now -- I have forgotten which areas, but there
20 are a few labs which are doing some work.

21 We would intend to pay these people whatever it
22 costs us to get the dollars, and I am not sure where this money
23 comes from in the budget, but actually people are fairly
24 inexpensive, and I think we estimate less than \$5 million
25 to fund this kind of thing.

RMG3

1 But it would have to come out of our '80 budget,
2 and we didn't anticipate this effort into somehow. We have to
3 find some way to pay for it.

4 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Well, once we -- the Congress,
5 I hope, is not all that far from completing the appropriations
6 actions. The Senate Appropriations -- the House is complete,
7 of course -- the Senate Full Appropriations Committee, I
8 believe, marked up the bill, which includes us along with an
9 assortment of other things in the last couple of days. And
10 hopefully that bill will get onto the floor.

11 And once we see what the appropriated fiscal '80
12 levels are, we can then begin to work on how to set an
13 expenditure rate which allows these forces to go to work, and
14 in turn what that means in terms of what is almost inevitably
15 going to be a supplemental request for fiscal year '80 that we
16 will process here, be processing pretty soon, in fact, in
17 in connection with the '81 budget review, and go through the
18 process.

19 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Do you have any difficulty
20 in getting funds to cover the end of '79?

21 MR. GOSSICK: We can handle that.

22 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Yes. Remember the previous
23 discussion. Just because there was so little to '79 left,
24 by the time these forces come into being, you are left with,
25 I don't know, a mean three weeks.

RMG 4

1 Jim, before we leave this slide, I wanted to ask
2 Dan on the geotechnical review versus geology and seismology,
3 you have got the Corps foundation, engineering, and the
4 Geological Survey. -- on the earthquake and so on?

5 Is it the Corps, then, that is dealing with
6 establishing the response spectra for the plant?

7 MR. KNIGHT: No. The work done by the Corps of
8 Engineers for the great part, what those of us who came a
9 little bit early would call soil effects; soils, foundation,
10 settlement, this type of thing.

11 The establishment of the spectra per se would
12 still be in Reg Guide 160 spectra. The work done by USGS
13 would be to help us determine through examining the geology
14 of the area what would be the appropriate --

15 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: What would be the appropriate
16 normalization for the Reg Guide 160 spectra.

17 MR. DENTON: We have assigned a geology branch
18 to Jim so we would have some closer coverage between its
19 structural and geological areas.

20 MR. KNIGHT: If I may --

21 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: If we ever completely redo that,
22 why, I am going to recommend that we hire no foundation
23 structural engineers who don't have geology credentials,
24 and no seismologists who don't have degrees in structural
25 engineering.

RMG 5 1 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Is that an attempt to keep
2 the Staff size down?

3 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: No, it deals with another
4 problem.

5 MR. KNIGHT: What we call interfaces.

6 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: An interface problem.

7 MR. DENTON: It is an unusual professional
8 technical meeting to attend.

9 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes, I read those.

10 (Laughter.)

11 MR. KNIGHT: If I may, for a moment, Commissioner
12 Ahearne, your comment on the management operation.

13 It is a real management problem. From our look to
14 date we can foresee -- we are starting with a depleted branch
15 in the first place, in many of these areas.

16 We will really have to change the modus operandi
17 on the branch of the individual reviewer. It really can't be
18 a matter of his doing the review and getting a little help from
19 a large number of sources to cover that. He has really got to
20 start to be a technical manager of these resources.

21 That is the only way that I can see that you are
22 going to have this centralization of technical problems, which
23 you have got to have so that the endproducts are consistent
24 from plant to plant.

25 We have got our first step in the power systems area

1 where we are able to readily identify groups. There is a
2 group -- in other words, there are people at Argonne as of
3 yesterday -- that's a fact in the matter. The people exist
4 and are qualified to receive individual resumes. They are
5 not just a group of people.

6 And transmitted to them a work statement which
7 lists plants, specific plants.

8 There is a burden now as to sheer volume of paper
9 that has to be transmitted -- new plants and reg guides, and
10 we are on the way to doing that.

11 So it is a very real start in this process.

12 MR. DENTON: The next slide indicates the status
13 of internal reallocation of manpower | the Commission approved
14 some time ago. The Commission approved reassignment of 13
15 individuals from Standards. 10 are now working -- at least
16 10 have been working for 2 or 3 weeks.

17 We were trying to obtain three specialists in the
18 electrical area. All three of these were doing fairly important
19 tasks somewhat related to the lessons learned.

20 I think we have agreed on one more, so that now we
21 have agreement on 11 of those individuals. Two of the electricals
22 probably are needed in Standards to work with the Standards
23 group to make the changes that we foresee.

24 There is still two of our individuals to be settled.

25 With regard to Research, we have assigned Research

RMG 7 1 three of the unresolved safety additions that were being
2 worked inside NRR, and this permitted four people to return to
3 casework who were experienced in this area.

4 We have had a number of discussions, a number of
5 people have been interviewed. We are still attempting to close
6 the remaining five people in that area.

7 We do have two people from MPA that have been
8 assigned to casework-related effort. So we have about 16 or
9 18 of the 24 individuals identified working, and hope to close
end #4 10 on the others fairly soon.

11 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Good.

12 MR. DENTON: That completes our review.

13 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Very good.

14 And as I noted, we have scheduled in effect a
15 continuation of this discussion next Thursday when you will
16 have some more things, presumably, to report?

17 You can let the secretary know if for some reason
18 it looks like it would not be a useful and productive discussion.

19 It seems to me that it may be on the other matters
20 that you want to talk about, that it would be useful to keep
21 it on the schedule.

22 Thank you very much.

23 (Whereupon, at 10:35 a.m., the hearing was adjourned.)

24

25

NEAR TERM O.L.

<u>PLANT</u>	<u>EST. COMP. CONST.</u>	<u>LIC. EFFORT COMPLETE*</u>
SALEM-2	COMPLETE	SEPT.
NORTH ANNA-2	AUG 15 - OCT.	SEPT.
DIABLO CANYON-1	AUG.	OCT.
SEQUOYAH-1	OCT.	OCT.
MCGUIRE-1	DEC.	NOV.
ZIMMER	DEC.	NOV.
LASALLE-1	JUN. 80	JAN. 80

* NON-TMI RELATED ISSUES.

NEAR TERM CP

<u>PLANT</u>	<u>EST. CP</u>
PERKINS 1-3	BOARD*
PEBBLE SPRINGS 1 & 2	JAN. 80
SKAGIT 1 & 2	MAY 80
PILGRIM 2	JAN. 80
ALLENS CREEK 1	MAR. 80*
BLACK FOX 1 & 2	BOARD*
PALO VERDE 4 & 5	ACRS* (DEC. 79)
FNP	NOV. 79

* REQUEST FOR TMI IMPACT

ACTIONS TO OBTAIN HELP FROM OTHER AGENCIES

OMB LETTERS TO

SECRETARY OF ENERGY
SECRETARY OF ARMY
SECRETARY OF INTERIOR
SECRETARY OF NAVY

DOE

TWX TO DOE FIELD OFFICES
MEMO - DEUTCH TO DOE ASSIST SECRETARIES AND MAJOR PROJECT OFFICES
PRELIMINARY DISCUSSIONS W/ORNL, INEL, ANL, SRL AND RICHLAND
RESUMES FROM BMW, UNC, VITRO AND ANL
LLL - INCREASED DOR ASSISTANCE TO FREE DSS CASE REVIEW PERSONNEL

INTERIOR

INCREASED EFFORT FROM USGS

ARMY

INCREASED EFFORT FROM CORPS OF ENG.

NAVY

PRELIMINARY TALK WITH NAVAL SHIP COMMAND
(EQUIPMENT QUALIFICATION)

599211

IDENTIFIED SOURCES

REACTOR SYSTEMS REVIEW	- INEL, SRL, ANL
INSTRUMENTATION AND CONTROL REVIEW	- ORNL*, ANL, SRL
POWER SYSTEMS REVIEW	- ANL*, SRL, ORNL*
COMPUTER CODE VERIFICATION	- BNL, ANL
EQUIPMENT SEISMIC QUALIFICATION REVIEW	- ANL, NSC
GEOTECHNICAL REVIEW	- CORPS ENG.
GEOLOGY, SEISMOLOGY	- USGS

*WORKING GROUP ESTABLISHED AND FIRST INFORMATION PACKAGES TRANSMITTED.

STATUS OF ATTEMPTS TO OBTAIN ADDITIONAL MANPOWER FOR CASE REVIEWS 7/12/79

INTERNAL REPROGRAMMING

OSD 10 ENGINEERS DETAILED TO DSS AND DOR 5 TO DOR, 4 TO DSS, 1 TO LLTF

3 ELECTRICALS REQUESTED - NO AGREEMENT YET.

RES ASSIGNMENT OF 3 UNRESOLVED SAFETY ISSUES TO RES, RESULTING IN EQUIVALENT OF

4 PEOPLE RETURNED TO CASE WORK. - NRR PRIORITIES BEING REVIEWED
FOR FURTHER DETAIL OF PEOPLE

MPA 1 DETAILED TO DOR

1 DETAILED TO DPM - OPERATOR LICENSING