UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION II
101 MARIETTA ST., N.W., SUITE 3100
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

Report Nos. 50-269/80-34, 50-270/80-30, 50-287/80-27, 50-369/80-30, 50-370/80-16, 50-413/80-30, 50-414/80-30, 50-491/80-6 50-492/80-9, and 50-493/80-9

Licensee: Duke Power Company
P. O. Box 2178
Charlotte, NC 28242

Facility Name: Oconee 1, 2&3; McGuire 1&2; Catawba 1&2; and Cherokee 1, 2&3

Docket Nos. 50-269, 50-270, 50-287, 50-369, 50-370, 50-413, 50-414, 50-491, 50-492, and 50-493

License Nos. DPR-38, DPR-47, DPR-55, CPPR-83, CPPR-84, CPPR-116, CPPR-117, CPPR-167, CPPR-168, and CPPR-169

Meeting at Duke Corporate Offices, Charlotte, NC

Attending Personnel: See Details

Approved by: R. C. Lewis — 2/4/81
R. C. Lewis, Acting Chief, RONS Branch — Date Signed

SUMMARY

Meeting conducted October 24, 1980

This special, announced management meeting was conducted to discuss the results of NRC's evaluation of Duke's regulatory performance as concluded in the Systematic Assessment of Licensee Performance (SALP) program.

Results

A summary of the licensee performance evaluation was presented. Areas of concern were discussed with corporate management. Duke's performance is considered to be acceptable although three areas were identified for increased inspection emphasis.

DETAILS

1. Personnel Attending Meeting

Duke Power Company

D. B. Blackmon, Design Engineer
K. S. Canady, Manager, Licensing and Projects
J. W. Cox, Licensing and Projects Engineering, Catawba
L. C. Dail, Vice President Design Engineering, Engineering and Construction
R. L. Dick, Vice President, Construction
J. W. Hampton, Station Manager, Catawba
W. O. Henry, Quality Assurance Manager, Construction
M. D. McIntosh, Station Manager, McGuire
W. H. Owen, Senior Vice President, Engineering and Construction
W. O. Parker, Jr., Vice President, Steam Production
N. A. Rutherford, Systems Engineer, Licensing
W. M. Sample, Licensing and Project Engineer, McGuire
J. E. Smith, Station Manager, Oconee
A. C. Thies, Senior Vice President, Production and Transmission
H. B. Tucker, Manager, Nuclear Production Division
M. S. Tuckman, Superintendent, Technical Services, Catawba
G. Vaughn, Assistant Station Manager, Oconee
J. R. Wells, Corporate Quality Assurance Manager

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

J. P. O'Reilly, Director, Region II
R. C. Lewis, Acting Chief, RONS Branch
C. E. Murphy, Chief, RC&ES Branch
J. C. Bryant, Section Chief, RC&ES Branch
R. D. Martin, Section Chief, RONS Branch
J. M. Taylor, Deputy Director, Program Development and Appraisal, IE:HQ

NRC Resident Inspector

T. J. Donat, Senior Resident Inspector, McGuire
F. Jape, Senior Resident Inspector, Oconee
D. O. Myers, Resident Inspector, Oconee
W. T. Orders, Resident Inspector, Oconee

2. Areas Discussed

a. A brief summary of the Systematic Assessment of Licensee Performance (SALP) was presented to include the basis for the evaluation and its purpose.

b. The results of the SALP evaluation of the licensee's performance were discussed. Duke's performance to date is considered acceptable; although three areas were identified for increased inspection emphasis by the NRC. The SALP evaluations are contained in Enclosures 1 through 6 to this report.

c. Items of concern were discussed with corporate management to include those areas where the NRC considers additional licensee management attention may be warranted.

Enclosure 1

SYSTEMATIC ASSESSMENT OF LICENSEE PERFORMANCE

FOR

DUKE POWER COMPANY

Region II

UTILITY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Utility: Duke Power Company

Units: Oconee 1, 2, 3 (Operating)
McGuire 1 (Preoperational) 2 (Construction)
Catawba 1, 2, (Construction)
Cherokee 1, 2, 3 (Construction)

Appraisal Period: May 1, 1979 - April 30, 1980.

Review Board Members:
R. C. Lewis, Acting Chief, RONS Branch
R. D. Martin, Chief, Reactor Projects Section 2
C. M. Upright, Acting Chief, Nuclear Support Section 2
M. Fairtile, Licensing Project Manager NRR*
R. Birkel, Licensing Project Manager NRR*
C. Moon, Licensing Project Manager, NRR*

*By Telephone

Background

SALP evaluations for each site were generated as prerequisites to the NRC identifying the general performance level of each utility with NRC license. These evaluations are forwarded to an interoffice review board formed of senior members from all Offices of the NRC involved in licensed activities. The board will, by virtue of receiving all SALP evaluations, form a national perspective of licensee performance. Additionally, the evaluations will provide a means of highlighting areas of NRC program that may require changes or redirection.

In developing the site evaluations it was determined that an overall evaluation of the utility's performance in its nuclear activities was desirable. Additional enclosures document the individual site evaluations.

The utility and site evaluations were presented in a meeting with senior corporate management in order to provide the decision makers of each utility with the NRC's evaluation of its overall performance in nuclear activities.

A. Areas of Good Performance

Duke is generally responsive to NRC regulations and to findings of noncompliance. Their health physics program is above average. Their licensee event input submittals contain above average event descriptions.

B. Areas Where Improved Performance is Warranted

The poor performance of Duke sites under construction clearly reflects the need for improved corporate control of safety related functions. This will involve upgrading of the quality assurance programs.

The operating units exhibit a higher than average personnel error rate. There are recurring problems of missed or late surveillance.

These matters need prompt management attention.

C. Overall Evaluation

Duke is, in general, responsive to NRC requirements, findings of noncompliance, and information requests from the NRC. Improvement is anticipated in the areas of the corporate quality assurance program as related to construction sites. Corporate involvement at the operating sites is needed to improve the rate of personnel errors.

ENCLOSURE 2

SYSTEMATIC ASSESSMENT OF LICENSEE PERFORMANCE

FOR

OCONEE NUCLEAR STATION

REGION II

LICENSEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION (OPERATIONS)

Facility: Oconee Nuclear Station

Licensee: Duke Power Company

Unit Identification:

Docket No.	License No./Date of Issuance	Unit No.
50-269	DPR-38 2/6/73	1
50-270	DPR-47 10/6/73	2
50-287	DPR-55 7/19/74	3

Reactor Information:	Unit 1	Unit 2	Unit 3
NSSS	B&W	B&W	B&W
MWt	2568	2568	2568

Appraisal Period: May 1, 1979 through April 30, 1980. These dates were used to provide a comparable basis for all operating reactors in Region II. Significant events or enforcement items occuring after these dates were considered in arriving at the indicated conclusions.

Appraisal Completion Date: October 9 1980

Review Board Members:

R. C. Lewis, Acting Chief, RONS Branch
R. D. Martin, Chief, Reactor Projects Section 2
F. Jape, Senior Resident Inspector
M. Fairtile, Licensing Project Manager (contacted by telephone 10/6/80)

A. Number and Nature of Noncompliance Items

Noncompliance category:	Unit 1	Unit 2	Unit 3
Violations	0	0	0
Infractions	13	11	15
Deficiencies	4	4	4

Areas of Noncompliance: (List Areas as Required)	Unit 1 (Points)	Unit 2 (Points)	Unit 3 (Points)
Security	44	44	22
Radiation Protection	30	10	62
Administrative	30	40	50
Procedure	44	24	24
Total Points	148	118	158

Deviations	Unit 1	Unit 2	Unit 3
	4	4	4

Evaluation of the above tabulation:

Throughout the report period, DPC has responded to each item of noncompliance and deviation as requested. On several occasions, due to misunderstandings, resolution required additional review and contact with licensee personnel. On these occasions satisfactory resolution resulted.

B. Number and Nature of Licensee Event Reports (LERs)

Type of Events:	Unit 1	Unit 2	Unit 3
Mechanical	25	6	5
Personnel	4	2	6
Design	4	1	0
Total	33	9	11

Personnel errors noted above resulted in the immediate action letter discussed in paragraph C.

The other LER's were attributed to equipment malfunctions or failure. One chronic problem has been identified concerning the High Pressure Service water pump. This equipment has been declared out of service five times during the report period due to motor cooler leaks. The long term fix is to replace the coolers. Original design coolers are no longer available so a modification is underway for new coolers. The modification was completed in August 1980.

C. Escalated Enforcement Actions

Civil Penalties

None

Orders

TMI related orders. Short term item completed.

Immediate Action Letters

Two immediate action letters were issued during the report period. These are discussed below.

An immediate action letter concerning personnel errors leading to incorrectly positioned valves was issued October 25, 1979. A meeting with DPC corporate management was held November 30, 1979 in Region II to review and discuss the concerns expressed by NRC. DPC presented their corrective action program and results of the audit requested by NRC.

During an inspection on January 23-30, 1980, a problem with the integrated leak rate testing program being performed on Unit 2 was identified by the inspectors. A Confirmation of Action Letter followed on February 1, 1980, summarizing NRC's understandings regarding resolution of the matter.

D. Management Conferences Held During Past Twelve Months

No enforcement conferences were held during the report period.

E. Justification of Evaluations of Functional Areas Categorized as Requiring an Increase in Inspection Frequency/Scope

Surveillance Testing

Actual performance of the surveillance tests has been generally good. However, several problems have arisen involving scheduling, including missed and late surveillances. Therefore, increased attention to the management controls of the surveillance program is recommended.

Fire Protection

Recent modifications to the Oconee fire protection system do not appear to comply with the National Fire Protection Association standards or with the NRC guidelines. Inspectors have conferred with NRR, and an increased effort will be necessary in this area to rectify the discrepancies between the Oconee systems and industry codes.

F. Comparison of Units to Each Other

A comparison of Unit 1, 2 and 3 did not indicate any appreciable differences between those units in the areas evaluated.

G. Overall Evaluation

The licensee performance is judged to be acceptable and above average during this assessment period. The number of noncompliances identified were below the regional average. LER frequency was below average and descriptive content was above average. No increase in the scope or frequency of inspections is necessary. The routine inspection program will include increased emphasis in the areas of surveillance program control and fire protection. Good communications exist between the licensee and the NRC.

APPENDIX A

2-A-1

FUNCTIONAL AREAS (Operations)

	FUNCTIONAL AREA	Inspection Frequency and/or Scope		
		Increase	No Change	Decrease
1.	Management Control		X	
2.	Plant Operations		X	
3.	Refueling Operations and Activities		X	
4.	Maintenance		X	
5.	Surveillance and Preoperational Testing		X*	
6.	Training		X	
7.	Radiation Protection		X	
8.	Environmental Protection		X	
9.	Emergency Planning		X	
10.	Fire Protection		X*	
11.	Security and Safeguards		X	
12.	Design Changes and Modifications		X	
13.	Reporting		X	
14.	QA Audits		X	
15.	Committee Activities		X	
16.	Quality Control		X	
17.	Procurement		X	

*Increased emphasis

R. C. Lewis
BRANCH CHIEF

1/26/81
DATE

ENCLOSURE 3

SYSTEMATIC ASSESSMENT OF LICENSEE PERFORMANCE

FOR

MCGUIRE NUCLEAR STATION UNIT 1

REGION II

LICENSEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION (OPERATIONS)

Facility: McGuire Nuclear Station

Licensee: Duke Power Company

Unit Identification:

Docket No.	License No./Date of Issuance	Unit No.
50-369	NA	1

Reactor Information:	Unit 1
NSSS	Westinghouse
MWt	4311

Appraisal Period: May 1, 1979 through April 30, 1980. These dates were used to provide a comparable basis for all operating reactors in Region II. Significant events or enforcement items occuring after these dates were considered in arriving at the indicated conclusions.

Appraisal Completion Date: October 9, 1980

Review Board Members:

R. C. Lewis, Acting Chief, RONS Branch
R. D. Martin, Chief, Reactor Projects Section 2
F. Jape, Acting Project Coordinator
T. Donat, Senior Resident Inspector at McGuire (contacted by telephone on October 6, 1980)
R. Birkel, Licensing Project Manager (contacted by telephone October 7, 1980)

A. Number and Nature of Noncompliance Items

Noncompliance category:	Unit 1
Violations	0
Infractions	1
Deficiencies	1

Areas of Noncompliance: (List Areas as Required)	Unit 1 (Points)
Procedure Compliance	10
Quality Assurance	2
Total Points	12

Evaluation of the above tabulation indicates that procedure compliance might be a problem area. However, increased inspections in this area have not resulted in additional citations.

B. Number and Nature of Licensee Deficiency Reports

Type of Events:	Unit 1
Personnel Error	2
Design Defect	5
Improper Installation	2
Vendor Supplied Item	7
Miscellaneous	2
Vendor Analysis Error	1

Licensee Significant Deficiency Reports SD-369/79-01 through SD-369/80-06

Evaluation of above tabulation: Adequate corrective action appears to have been taken in all instances.

C. Escalated Enforcement Actions

Civil Penalties

None

Orders

None

Immediate Action Letters

None

D. Management Conferences Held During Past Twelve Months

None

E. Justification of Evaluations of Functional Areas Categorized as Requiring an Increase in Inspection Frequency/Scope

The facility is in preoperational testing phase. Fuel loading is scheduled for January 1981. The normal program for a plant in this phase is considered to be sufficient.

F. Comparison of Unit 1 with Unit 2

A comparison of Unit 1 (in pre-operational testing) with Unit 2 (in construction) is not useful for the period of this evaluation. As Unit 2 progresses through construction an appropriate comparison for similar periods may be valuable. However, the offset in time between the completion phases may render such comparisons invalid. This will have to be reviewed when such a comparison is attempted.

G. Overall Evaluation

Licensee performance for this assessment period is acceptable. The pre-operational testing program for this plant has been protracted but no adverse results have been observed. The licensee is responsive to NRC concerns.

APPENDIX A

3-A-1

FUNCTIONAL AREAS (Operations)

		Inspection Frequency and/or Scope		
	FUNCTIONAL AREA	Increase	No Change	Decrease
1.	Management Control		X	
2.	Plant Operations		X	
3.	Refueling Operations and Activities		X	
4.	Maintenance		X	
5.	Surveillance and Preoperational Testing		X	
6.	Training		X	
7.	Radiation Protection		X	
8.	Environmental Protection		X	
9.	Emergency Planning		X	
10.	Fire Protection		X	
11.	Security and Safeguards		X	
12.	Design Changes and Modifications		X	
13.	Reporting		X	
14.	QA Audits		X	
15.	Committee Activities		X	
16.	Quality Control		X	
17.	Procurement		X	

R.C. Lewis

BRANCH CHIEF

1/26/81

DATE

ENCLOSURE 4

SYSTEMATIC ASSESSMENT OF LICENSEE PERFORMANCE

FOR

MCGUIRE NUCLEAR STATION UNIT 2

REGION II

LICENSEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION (CONSTRUCTION)

Facility: McGuire Nuclear Station, Unit 2

Licensee: Duke Power Company

Unit Identification:

Docket No.	License No./Date of Issuance	Unit No.
50-370	CPPR-84/February 28, 1973	2

Reactor Information: Unit 2

NSSS	Westinghouse
MWt	3411

Appraisal Period: September 1, 1979 through August 31, 1980

Appraisal Completion Date: October 9, 1980

Review Board Members:

C. E. Murphy, Chief, RC&ES Branch
J. C. Bryant, Chief, Projects Section #1
T. E. Conlon, Chief, Engineering Support Section #1
C. R. McFarland, Project Inspector
R. A. Birkel, Licensing Project Manager (By Telephone)

A. Number and Nature of Noncompliance Items

Noncompliance category:	Unit 2
Violations	0
Infractions	14
Deficiencies	2

Areas of Noncompliance: (List Areas as Required)	Unit 2 (Points)
Design Control	10
Instructions, Procedures, & Drawings	114
Test Control	10
Audits	10
*Total Points	144

*50 points common to McGuire 2, Catawba and Cherokee. These 50 points represent noncompliance generic to Duke design and QA work.

The board in its delibration of noncompliance items considered that the timing of the noncompliances did not indicate a trend that would indicate any major breakdown in the licensee's QA program. The licensee's responses to the noncompliances has been found to be adequate and timely.

B. Number and Nature of Licensee Deficiency Reports (CDR)

7 - Electrical
8 - Mechanical
2 - Welding

Only one (welding) related to site work. Other CDRs related to design and component manufacturing problems. The licensee has exercised care in evaluating the CDRs and the reports have been acceptable.

C. Escalated Enforcement Actions

None during this audit period.

D. Management Conferences Held During Past Twelve Months

None

E. Justification of Evaluations of Functional Areas Categorized as Requiring an Increase in Inspection Frequency/Scope (See evaluation sheet)

The licensee's performance does not warrant an increase in the inspection frequency. The construction activities have increased to the point that within the next twelve months, windows of opportunities should open for all modules. A backlog of outstanding items for the electrical and mechanical inspectors is noted in the following tabulation of the numbers of items for each discipline:

	Noncompliance(s)	IEBs	55(e)	URI	IFI
Electrical	3	8	12	1	4
Mechanical	0	6	12	0	0

F. Comparison of Unit 1 with Unit 2

A comparison of Unit 2 (in construction) with Unit 1 (in pre-operational testing) is not useful for the period of this evaluation. As Unit 2 progresses through construction an appropriate comparison for similar periods may be valuable. However, the offset in time between the completion phases may render such comparison invalid. This will have to be reviewed when such a comparison is attempted.

G. Overall Evaluation

Licensee performance for this assessment period is adequate but below average for the region. Most noncompliances are due to inadequate procedures or failure to follow procedures. No increase in inspection frequency is warranted at this time. The licensee is responsive to NRC concerns.

APPENDIX A

4-A-1

FUNCTIONAL AREAS (CONSTRUCTION)

	FUNCTIONAL AREA	Inspection Frequency and/or Scope: Increase	No Change	Decrease
1.	Quality Assurance, Management & Training		X	
2.	Substructure and Foundations		X	
3.	Concrete		X	
4.	Liner (Containment and Others)		X	
5.	Safety-Related Structures		X	
6.	Piping & Hangers (Reactor Coolant & Others)		X	
7.	Safety-Related Components (Vessel, Internals and HVAC)		X	
8.	Electrical Equipment		X	
9.	Electrical (Tray and Wire)		X	
10.	Instrumentation		X	
11.	Fire Protection		X	
12.	Preservice Inspection		X	
13.	Reporting		X	

C. E. Murphy

Branch Chief

1/26/81

Date

ENCLOSURE 5

SYSTEMATIC ASSESSMENT OF LICENSEE PERFORMANCE

FOR

CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION

REGION II

LICENSEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION (CONSTRUCTION)

Facility: Catawba Nuclear Station

Licensee: Duke Power Company

Unit Identification:

Docket No.	License No./Date of Issuance	Unit No(s).
50-413	CPPR-116/8/7/75	1
50-414	CPPR-117/8/7/75	2

Reactor Information:	Unit 1	Unit 2
NSSS	Westinghouse	Westinghouse
MWt	3425	3425

Appraisal Period: September 1, 1979 through August 31, 1980

Appraisal Completion Date: October 9, 1980

Review Board Members:

C. E. Murphy, Chief, RC&ES Branch
J. C. Bryant, Chief, Projects Section #1
T. E. Conlon, Chief, Engineering Support Section #1
C. R. McFarland, Project Inspector
J. Matore, Licensing Project Manager (By Telephone)

A. Number and Nature of Noncompliance Items

Noncompliance category:	Unit 1	Unit 2
Violations	0	0
Infractions	14	12
Deficiencies	13	12

Areas of Noncompliance:	Unit 1 (Points)	Unit 2 (Points
Control of Procedures, Drawings	108	96
Handling, Storage	22	12
Design	22	22
Corrective Action	10	10
Records	4	2
Nonconforming Materials	0	2
*Total Points	166	144

*50 points common to McGuire 2, Catawba and Cherokee. These 50 points represent noncompliance generic to Duke design and QA work. The licensee's response to the noncompliances have been found to be adequate and timely.

B. Number and Nature of Licensee Deficiency Reports (CDR)

	Unit 1	Unit 2
Design	5	5
Vendor Error	6	6
Component Failure	2	2
Radiography	3	0

The licensee has exercised care in evaluating CDRs and reports have been acceptable.

C. Escalated Enforcement Actions

None during this audit period.

D. Management Conferences Held During Past Twelve Months

A management meeting was held on October 24, 1980 to discuss with the licensee to results of this evaluation.

E. Justification of Evaluations of Functional Areas Categorized as Requiring an Increase in Inspection Frequency/Scope (See evaluation sheet)

Item No. 1 - An increase in inspection frequency is recommended for this area due to the number and nature of noncompliances. A trend analysis indicates that a closer control of quality assurance, management and training is needed in order to reduce the number of noncompliances.

F. Comparison of Units to Each Other

A comparison of Units 1 and 2 did not indicate that appreciable differences exist between units.

G. Overall Evaluation

The licensee's performance is adequate but below average for the region. Catawba has been responsive in taking corrective action on identified noncompliances. Most noncompliances, though found at the site, are of design or corporate origin and corrective action is needed in this area. An increase in inspection frequency in the areas of quality assurance is needed.

APPENDIX A

5-A-1

FUNCTIONAL AREAS (CONSTRUCTION)

	FUNCTIONAL AREA	Inspection Frequency and/or Scope: Increase	No Change	Decrease
1.	Quality Assurance, Management & Training	X		
2.	Substructure and Foundations		X	
3.	Concrete		X	
4.	Liner (Containment and Others)		X	
5.	Safety-Related Structures		X	
6.	Piping & Hangers (Reactor Coolant & Others)		X	
7.	Safety-Related Components (Vessel, Internals and HVAC)		X	
8.	Electrical Equipment		X	
9.	Electrical (Tray and Wire)		X	
10.	Instrumentation		X	
11.	Fire Protection		X	
12.	Preservice Inspection		X	
13.	Reporting		X	

Branch Chief

1/26/81

Date

ENCLOSURE 6

SYSTEMATIC ASSESSMENT OF LICENSEE PERFORMANCE

FOR

CHEROKEE NUCLEAR STATION

REGION II

LICENSEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION (OPERATIONS)

Facility: Cherokee Nuclear Station

Licensee: Duke Power Company

Unit Identification:

Docket No(s).	CP No(s)./Date of Issuance	Unit No(s).
50-491	CPPR-167/12/30/77	1
50-492	CPPR-168/12/30/77	2
50-493	CPPR-169/12/30/77	3

Reactor Information:	Unit 1	Unit 2	Unit 3
NSSS	Combustion Engineering	CE	CE
MWt	3800	3800	3800

Appraisal Period: September 1, 1979 through August 31, 1980.

Appraisal Completion Date: October 9, 1980

Review Board Members:

C. E. Murphy, Chief, RC&ES Branch
J. C. Bryant, Chief, Projects Section #1
T. E. Conlon, Chief, Engineering Support Section #1
C. R. McFarland, Project Inspector
C. W. Moon, Licensing Project Manager (By Telephone)

A. Number and Nature of Noncompliance Items

Noncompliance category:	Unit 1	Unit 2	Unit 3
Violations	0	0	0
Infractions	6	6	6
Deficiencies	4	2	2

(Units 2 and 3 noncompliances applied to all 3 units.)

Areas of Noncompliance: (List Areas as Required)	Unit 1 (Points)	Unit 2 (Points)	Unit 3 (Points)
Design Control	20	20	20
Instructions Procedures and Drawings	36	34	34
QA Records	2		
Audits	10	10	10
*Total Points	68	64	64

* 50 points common to McGuire 2, Catawba and Cherokee. These 50 points represent noncompliances generic to Duke Design and QA work.

The board in its delibration of Noncompliance Items considered that the timing of the noncompliances did not indicate a trend that would indicate any major breakdown in the licensee's QA program. The licensee's responses to the noncompliances has been found to be adequate and timely.

B. Number and Nature of Construction Deficiency Reports (CDRs)

None during this appraisal period.

C. Escalated Enforcement Actions

None during this appraisal period.

D. Management Conferences Held During Past Twelve Months

A management conference was held on October 24, 1980 to discuss with the licensee the results of the evaluation.

E. Justification of Evaluations of Functional Areas Categorized as Requiring an Increase in Inspection Frequency/Scope

No change in frequency or scope. Work on site limited to Unit 1 only. Work has been restricted to structural concrete and steel for the containment vessel and nuclear service water system, welding piping for underground and embeded lines, and installing electrical cable trenches.

F. Comparison of Units 1, 2 and 3

A comparison of Unit 1, 2 and 3 is not useful for the period of this evaluation as construction has been halted on Units 2 and 3.

G. Overall Evaluation

Licensee performance for this assessment period has been adequate and average for the region. No increase in inspection frequency is warranted at this time.

APPENDIX A

6-A-1

FUNCTIONAL AREAS (CONSTRUCTION)

	FUNCTIONAL AREA	Inspection Frequency and/or Scope		
		Increase	No Change	Decrease
1.	Quality Assurance, Management & Training		X	
2.	Substructure and Foundations		X	
3.	Concrete		X	
4.	Liner (Containment and Others)		X	
5.	Safety-Related Structures		X	
6.	Piping & Hangers (Reactor Coolant & Others)		X	
7.	Safety-Related Components (Vessel, Internals and HVAC)		X	
8.	Electrical Equipment		X	
9.	Electrical (Tray and Wire)		X	
10.	Instrumentation		X	
11.	Fire Protection		X	
12.	Preservice Inspection		X	
13.	Reporting		X	

Branch Chief

1/22/81

Date