

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

March 5, 1982

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY & LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of:

HOUSTON LIGHTING & POWER CO.  
(Allens Creek Nuclear Generating  
Station, Unit 1)

Docket No. 50-466 CP

'82 MAR -8 P3:39

*emp*

INTERVENOR DOHERTY'S MOTION FOR "BECHTEL POWER COMPANY(BPC)  
QUADREX REPORT REVIEW"

John F. Doherty, Intervenor, now files the above motion to obtain an Order from the Board directing Applicant to provide a copy of the forth-coming (mid-March) review being conducted by Bechtel Power Company for Applicant to all parties, to be sent to them. The attached two-page "Meeting Summary" dated Jan. 26, 1982, signed by Donald Sells, NRC project manager for the South Texas Nuclear Project explains the projected task force report.

Intervenor moves for this report because of its pertinence to the issue remaining in this hearing. The report is highly likely to be extremely helpful to the Board and parties in understanding the nature of the Quadrex Report and its significance to the issue of Applicant Technical Qualifications, an issue in these proceedings.

In a telephone conversation with Applicant's Counsel Copeland, he indicated he thought the report would be out later than mid-March, and that he would need a few days to locate information on it. As the call was placed in the Friday, P. M., this Intervenor decided that in fairness to all parties (particularly Staff) the Motion would be most expeditiously handled by going out as soon as possible.

-----  
SERVICE OF PROCESS

Copies of the above: INTERVENOR DOHERTY'S MOTION FOR "BECHTEL POWER COMPANY (BPC) QUADREX REPORT REVIEW, and INTERVENOR DOHERTY'S THIRD SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO APPLICANT WITH REGARD TO TEXPIRG CONTENTION 31 AND QUADREX MATTERS were served on the Parties below, this 5<sup>th</sup> (5th) of March 1982.

Sheldon Wolfe, Esq., Gustave A. Linenberger, Dr. E. Leonard Cheatum, Administrative Judges; Richard Black, Esq. Staff; J. Gregory Copeland, Esq., Jack R. Newman, Esq., Applicant; the Several Intervening Parties; NRC Docketing and Service; Atomic Safety Licensing & Appeal Board.

Respectfully, *John F. Doherty*



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

JAN 26 1982

Docket Nos.: 50-498/499

APPLICANT: Houston Lighting and Power Company  
FACILITY: South Texas Project  
SUBJECT: MEETING SUMMARY

On Monday, January 18, 1982 meetings were held with Houston Lighting and Power Company (HL&P). The morning meeting was held at the offices of Brown and Root (B&R). The afternoon meeting was held in the offices of Bechtel Power Corporation (BPC).

J. Blau spent a few minutes discussing the status of the B&R effort concerning the transmittal of information to BPC. B&R is not developing the work packages, that have been identified in previous meetings, as originally planned. Instead, B&R is pulling together units of information, i.e., material relating to a single purchase order, material related to pipe supports in the containment building, etc. These are then transmitted and BPC assembles them into appropriate work packages. The total number of units to be transmitted is about 1400. As of Monday, January 18, 453 have been transmitted. Of these, some 100 plus, were transmitted on the previous Friday. The bulk of the transfer of information will be accomplished over the next two months. Final transfer is scheduled for April 30, 1982. Several bulk transmittals have occurred. In particular the drawings have been transferred to BPC in a bulk transfer rather than on a piece meal basis. Schedules for the delivery of units of information to BPC were provided in the form of 35 large sheets. I had an opportunity to look at several of the units that were ready to be sent to BPC. Each package contained a transmittal letter, check lists that indicate the documents included in the package, documents previously supplied (i.e., drawings) and documents which still need to be supplied if such is the case, and finally the included documents.

Following the discussion of the B&R transfer schedule, I met with Mr. White (HL&P) and Mr. Hurley (BPC) to briefly review the status of the BPC Quadrex Report review. This review is being conducted by an independent BPC task force operating principally out of San Francisco. This task force is to provide a report that will address each item contained in the Quadrex Report and disposition each item in one of a number of ways. Although not clear what these categories will be, certainly it can be expected that one category will include items that can be eliminated from further consideration and another would be one that recommends more detailed analysis during the transition analysis. It now appears that most of the items will require final dispositioning by the project office conducting the transition analysis. Originally, it was planned to provide an interim report listing those items that can be eliminated


820209046

JAN 26 1982

from further consideration with appropriate justification. It now appears that there will be only one report from the BPC task force and that it will be midMarch before that report will become available. I was assured that HL&P will not see the report prior to receipt and that upon receipt, copies will be immediately transmitted to the NRC as received.

In the afternoon meeting with BPC the records maintained that reflect receipt of information from B&R were reviewed. The BPC review schedules were discussed and provided. These schedules identify work packages. I was told that there are approximately 160 work packages. The BPC professional engineering staff now stands at about 150 and review of information is initiated as soon as the material is received and has been properly logged and associated with the appropriate work package. Three work packages were reviewed, one a compliance package that covers aspects of a number of the more discipline specific packages. No work package is complete either in terms of all material being available or; obviously, analysis. I indicated that where Region IV desired Headquarters assistance in monitoring the transition activities, NRR was prepared to provide such assistance and that such requests are expected. I also indicated that NRR personnel may want to review a complete work package and that I felt such a review should be conducted in Houston and that the package would probably be identified in advance of the review. When asked, I stated that I would recommend to my management that the assigned reviewers from NRR have design engineering experience to the maximum extent possible. Both HL&P and BPC expressed concern that review at this level of detail could cause problems unless the reviewer is familiar with design engineering practices.

In addition a meeting was held in the evening with C. Robertson (HL&P), J. Hurley (BPC) and J. Ghromley (BPC) to discuss transition activities in general. This meeting was designed to more fully explore and understand the HL&P/BPC interface and the future relationship between the two as well as the impact of this transition on the licensing process.

  
Donald E. Selts, Project Manager  
Licensing Branch No. 3  
Division of Licensing

Enclosure:  
As stated

cc: See next page.