DISTRIBUTION
TERA
MRogovin
~~GFrampton~~
~~KCornell~~
RDeYoung
~~PNorry~~
WParler
DEvans

July 30, 1979

In reply refer to:
NTFTM 790730-03

Mr. Clarke Williams
200 South Country Road
Bellport, Long Island, N.Y. 11713

Dear Mr. Williams:

One of the tasks of the NRC/TMI Special Inquiry Group is to assess the effectiveness of the NRC's licensing and review process in connection with the licensing of TMI-2.

You can greatly assist us in this effort by your willingness to respond to the attached questionnaire, which is being sent to key individuals in the NRC licensing process, including licensing and appeal board members, and selected staff. In order to minimize the inconvenience of this request, we have tried to limit the questions to the absolute minimum necesary to obtain what we believe will be useful information, and we are therefore hoping for a nearly 100 percent response.

If you have any questions regarding the request, please contact Special Inquiry Group member David Evans at 492-8947. Completed questionnaires should be returned to him at mailstop AR-400 as soon as practicably possible.

I appreciate your cooperation.

Sincerely,

S/

Mitchell Rogovin, Director
NRC/TMI Special Inquiry Group

Enclosure:
Questionnaire

2373 343

8001210 469

NRC/TMI
WParler
7/31/79

OFFICE ▶	NRC/TMI	NRC/TMI	NRC/TMI	NRC/TMI	NRC/TMI	NRC/TMI
SURNAME ▶	DEvans:mc:kr	PNorry	RDeYoung	KCornell	GFrampton	MRogovin
DATE ▶	7/30/79	7/31/79	7/31/79	7/31/79	7/31/79	7/30/79

NRC FORM 318 (9-76) NRCM 0240 ★ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1976 - 265 - 769

NRC/TMI Special Inquiry

Please answer the following questions to the best of your current recollection:

A. PERSONAL BACKGROUND

1. Your name, official title, office address and office phone number.

2. How long have you been in your present position? What prior positions have you held which involved nuclear licensing?

B. INVOLVEMENT WITH LICENSING OF B&W PLANTS

1. In what proceedings have you been involved in which a Babcock & Wilcox design was at issue? (Oconee 1, 2, and 3; Three Mile Island 1 and 2; Midland 1 and 2; Bellefonte 1 and 2; North Anna 3 and 4; WPPSS 1 and 4; Davis Besse 2 and 3; Greenwood 2 and 3; Pebble Springs 1 and 2; Erie 1 and 2.)

2. At what level (Staff, Licensing Board, Appeal Board, Commission) and stage (Staff review, CP, OL, post-OL) were you involved in B&W proceedings?

3. What are the significant issues you recall having been raised in these proceedings?

4. Who raised these issues, what were the positions and responses of the other parties, and how were the issues resolved?

5. Do you recall any proceeding at which B&W presented testimony or was present for questioning? Please describe the circumstances.

6. Based upon your experience with B&W issues, have any issues been raised more often than others? Which one(s)?

C. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

1. How would you rate the performance of the Staff in the licensing process? Specifically, how do you assess:

   a. The role of the staff outside of the adjudicatory process, e.g., in review of designs and plans, and in contacts with the utility and vendors;

   b. The staff's role in adjudication;

   c. Staff documentation of its positions;

   d. Post-licensing staff action and its impact on the process.

2373 344

2. How would you rate the licensing and review process in general? Do you have any views on that process with respect to:

   a. Its consistency?

   b. Its effectiveness in implementing the statutory standards?

   c. Its control over vendors, architect-engineers, and constructors?

   d. Its effectiveness in ensuring safe design and operation of plants?

3. Do you believe the regulatory system needs reform? If so, what major step or steps need to be taken?

4. Do you believe the current system inhibits innovation on the part of applicants and vendors? If so, how could that be changed?

5. Please provide any comment you may have on the following specific matters:

   a. Technical qualifications of licensees
   b. Quality assurance
   c. Emergency plans
   d. Backfitting and "ratcheting"
   e. The concept of the "design basis accident"
   f. "Safety-grade" vs. "nonsafety-grade" equipment
   g. Residual risk

D. ISSUES FOR FURTHER SCRUTINY

1. Are there special areas of importance which you believe this Inquiry should examine with regard to TMI-2, B&W units or the regulatory system, in general?

2. Please explain any contact you have had with "precursor events" in PWRs, i.e., with an issue or incident that was a component of the accident at TMI-2 on March 28, 1979. An example would be the Pilot Operated Relief Valve (PORV) which stuck open at TMI-2.

3. Are there particular people with information or knowledge, in the above areas that you believe the Special Inquiry Group should contact? Please list. (Name, organization, and address)

E. COMMENTS

1. Do you have any additional comments you believe would assist the Inquiry in assessing the accident and its implications for the regulatory system?