



# STONE & WEBSTER MICHIGAN, INC.

P.O. Box 2325, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02107

PRINCIPAL STAFF	
RA	ENF
D/RA	SCS
A/RA	PAO
DPRP	SLO
DRMA	RC
DRMSP	
DE	
ML	
OL	FILE

orig  
13

Mr. J. G. Keppler, Administrator, Region III  
Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
799 Roosevelt Road  
Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

June 30, 1983  
J.O. No. 14509  
NRC File #83-06-30

SUBJECT: MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE REVIEW (June 23, 1983)

A copy of observations noted by CIO of the Management Review Committee of the discussions relating to the Bulk Hanger Organization (BHO) is attached for your review and consideration. CIO has commented upon three subjects and have indicated conditional approval of BHO.

If you have any questions with respect to this report, please contact me at (517) 631-4286, extension 486.

Very truly yours,

S. W. Baranow  
Program Manager

Enclosure

SWB/ka

cc: JHarrison, NRC Glen Ellyn, IL  
RCook, NRC Midland (site)  
DBMiller, CPCo Midland (site)  
RBKelly, S&W  
APamaruso, S&W

DESIGNATED ORIGINAL

Certified By L. E. Spader

8307110305 830630  
PDR ADDCK 05000329  
A PDR

JUL 5 1983

IEO1

CIO OBSERVATIONS OF MANAGEMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (MRC)

MEETING SUBJECT: BULK HANGER ORGANIZATION

A meeting was convened by MRC on June 23, 1983 for discussion of the Release of Area and System Teams to start statusing. An agenda was distributed prior to the meeting.

All the members of the MRC were in attendance and actively participated in the proceedings. Key team members of CPCo, MPQAD and Bechtel were present. The handouts and the presentation covered the subject of discussion in definitive and understandable detail.

CIO reports the following observations:

1). Audit responses, once addressed should not be readdressed unless responses are inadequate. In particular the question of all training requiring an examination or qualifying test was raised at an earlier MRC meeting and again, at this session.

There appears to be two schools of thought on requirements for examinations. The audit group (CPCo) is taking the position that examinations are all encompassing while SMO favors examinations only for those personnel having accept/reject responsibilities. The position of across the board examinations or for the accept/reject responsibility only should be clearly established.

2). Observations by the Review team should be presented to MRC, in one document, several days prior to meeting date. This would enable MRC to respond in full at the meeting and avoid "conditional" approval of the review subject.

3). Restraints require expeditious resolution. The restraints presented to MRC at this session were of a minor nature and should have been cleared prior to the meeting or the meeting postponed until restraints are removed. As in (2) this would allow approval to be considered at the meeting. At present "conditional" approval by MRC is discussed.

CIO considers that preparation for Status Assessment is essentially ready for implementation. Training all personnel to all procedures and waiting for all procedures to be issued is an unnecessary restraint. If sufficient material is available, then a team should start implementation so that the results of that effort may be evaluated and fine tuned as necessary.