



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

*Duplicate copy on
microfiche*

April 24, 1981



Mr. Steven C. Sholly
Union of Concerned Scientists
1725 I Street, N.W.
Suite 601
Washington, DC 20006

IN RESPONSE REFER
TO FOIA-81-149

Dear Mr. Sholly:

This is in response to your letter dated April 13, 1981, in which you requested, pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, a draft report prepared by the Instrumentation and Controls Division of Oak Ridge National Laboratory concerning a review of BAW-1564, a Babcock and Wilcox Company report entitled "Reliability Analysis of the Integrated Control System."

The enclosed document is from the working files of Dale F. Thatcher and, to the best of our knowledge, is the document which you are seeking.

If we can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

J. M. Felton, Director
Division of Rules and Records
Office of Administration

Enclosure: As stated

8105120 604

● Union of
**CONCERNED
SCIENTISTS**

13 April 1981

Mr. Joseph M. Felton
Director, Division of Rules and Records
Office of Administration
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

**FREEDOM OF INFORMATION
ACT REQUEST**

FOIA-81-149
Rec'd 4-14-81

RE: FOIA REQUEST

Dear Mr. Felton:

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, I am requesting the following document:

A draft report prepared by the Instrumentation and Controls Division of Oak Ridge National Laboratory concerning a review of BAW-1564, a Babcock and Wilcox Company report entitled Reliability Analysis of the Integrated Control System. According to the testimony of NRC Staff witness Dale F. Thatcher in the TMI-1 Restart proceeding (Docket No. 50-289 RESTART), the draft document was produced by ORNL in December 1979 (Transcript pages attached). The draft report is believed to be located in the files of Mr Thatcher, or in the files of his branch chief which used to be Mr. Rodney M. Satterfield, who has since left the Commission.

Your cooperation in this matter will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

Steven C. Sholly
Steven C. Sholly

8105120 608

1 At that time I knew that the questions were
2 somewhat beyond a "FMEA," but the staff was trying to elicit
3 from the Oak Ridge expertise what could be done with regard
4 to control systems and what maybe should be done in the
5 future with regard to control systems. So based on that, I
6 felt we should ask all the questions and see what B&W had to
7 say about them and see what conclusions we could draw from
8 that.

9 So, in the same timeframe that this was going on
10 -- I referenced in my testimony a November 7 letter to all
11 licensees of B&W plants asking them to address the
12 recommendations of the B&W report 1564. Now, that was done
13 prior to Oak Ridge coming up with their conclusions, and
14 really the basis for that was on the discussions between Oak
15 Ridge and the staff, myself, my branch chief, the
16 discussions on the merits of those recommendations.

17 Again the staff decided that we do not need to
18 wait for Oak Ridge's conclusions. Those recommendations out
19 of that report are important enough to get on with
20 addressing them, you know, prior to waiting for the Oak
21 Ridge report.

22 Somewhere in early December, I believe, Oak Ridge
23 produced a draft of the report, and I believe that is what
24 was referred to in the cover letter that was read before. I
25 cannot remember clearly my commenting on that draft. I

1 of performing the emergency feedwater function. In my
2 opinion, this particular aspect of the restart of TMI-1 was
3 sufficient to address that concern.

4 I do not know if I discussed enough about the Oak
5 Ridge report. I got off on a specific there and maybe you
6 want to hear more specifics.

7 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Well, your specific understanding
8 of the findings of the authors will be developed by Mr.
9 Sholly, I would imagine, on further cross examination.

10 THE WITNESS: I think so, too, yes.

11 DR. LITTLE: I have some general questions which
12 actually relate to the transmittal letter on the ORNL
13 report. First of all, it indicates that the final review
14 incorporates revisions and recommendations made by your
15 staff, and this is addressed to Mr. Satterfield. Were these
16 revisions and recommendations extensive or minor? Were they
17 editing or substantive?

18 THE WITNESS: That is the one thing I cannot
19 recall. What I really should do is go back and get the copy
20 of the draft. I would imagine that I have it somewhere
21 around in my office. Then I should be able to tell whether
22 they were editorial or substantive. I tend to think that
23 they may have been more along the editorial line.

24 DR. LITTLE: Do you recall whether or not the ORNL
25 people accepted the revisions readily or whether there was