



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

PDR-016  
cross reference  
50-498/499

July 19, 1982

Mr. William D. McCann, Jr.  
Energy Reporter  
THE AUSTIN AMERICAN STATESMAN  
Box 670  
Austin, TX 78767


IN RESPONSE REFER  
TO FOIA-82-266

Dear Mr. McCann:

This is in further response to your letter dated June 8, 1982, in which you requested, pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, copies of any Standard Assessment of Licensee Performance conducted between the years 1977 and 1982 for the South Texas Nuclear Project.

For your use we are providing you with a copy of the enclosed document which was the subject of a previous FOIA request, designated as FOIA-81-392 (UDELL). This document is a memorandum for D. G. Eisenhut, et. al. from: R. H. Wessman, Subject: SYSTEMATIC ASSESSMENT OF LICENSEE PERFORMANCE REVIEW GROUP MEETING MINUTES - MEETING 81-09, dated June 17, 1981 (7 pages).

Sincerely,



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

Enclosure: As stated

# Austin American-Statesman

June 8, 1982

Freedom of Information Officer  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Region IV  
611 Ryan Plaza Drive  
Suite 1000  
Arlington, TX 76012

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION  
ACT REQUEST

FOIA-82-266

Rec'd 6-15-82


Dear Sir or Madam:

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, I hereby request copies of any Standard Assessment of Licensee Performance conducted between the years 1977 and 1982 for the South Texas Nuclear Project.

Since the information sought will primarily benefit the general public, I request a waiver of any fees for this material.


If you do not grant my request within 10 working days, I will deem my request denied.

Sincerely yours,



William D. McCann, Jr.  
Energy Reporter  
The Austin American-Statesman  
Box 670  
Austin, TX 78767

Tel. 512-445-3671



*Dupe PDR*

8206130087



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

SSINS 8230

JUN 17 1981


MEMORANDUM FOR: Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director, Division of Licensing,  
NRR  
James H. Sniezek, Director, Division of Resident and  
Regional Reactor Inspection, IE  
Carlyle Michelson, Director, AEOD  
Norman C. Moseley, Director, Division of Program  
Development and Appraisal, IE

FROM: R. H. Wessman, SALP Staff

SUBJECT: SYSTEMATIC ASSESSMENT OF LICENSEE PERFORMANCE  
REVIEW GROUP MEETING MINUTES - MEETING 81-09

The SALP Review Group met on June 16, 1981. The enclosure lists attendees and provides the minutes of that meeting. These minutes are embargoed until the completion of first-round SALP reviews for all facilities.

The next meeting is scheduled for June 23, 1981 at 9:30 a.m. in the Air Rights Conference Room (5033).

  
R. H. Wessman  
SALP Staff

Enclosure: Meeting Minutes

cc: R. A. Purple, NRR  
J. M. Taylor, IE

Dupe PDR  
~~6304160219~~

MINUTES - SALP MEETING 81-09  
June 16, 1981

The SALP Review Group convened at 9:30 a.m. on June 16, 1981 for meeting 81-09 in the Air Rights Building Conference Room 5033. Attendees were:

N. C. Moseley, IE  
R. A. Purple, NRR  
C. Michelson, AEOD  
J. H. Sniezek, IE  
R. H. Wessman, IE

1. R. H. Wessman briefed the SALP Review Group on facility reviews. Conclusions reached are as follows:
  - a. Diablo Canyon. Regional actions approved. All Review Group members concurred that this facility was tentatively considered to be "average."
  - b. Nine Mile Point 1. Regional actions approved. Sniezek, Purple, and Michelson concurred that this facility was tentatively considered to be "average-candidate for poor." Moseley considers this facility to tentatively be "poor."
  - c. Nine Mile Point 2. Regional actions approved. Moseley, Purple and Michelson concurred that this facility was tentatively considered to be "average." Sniezek considers this facility to tentatively be "average-candidate for good."
  - d. South Texas Project 1, 2. Regional actions approved. All Review Group members concurred that this facility was tentatively considered to be "poor."
  - e. Susquehanna 1, 2. Regional actions approved. Moseley, Purple, and Michelson concurred that this facility was tentatively considered to be "poor." Sniezek considers this facility to tentatively be "average."
2. The Review Group re-examined the one facility (Nine Mile Point 1) rated as "average-candidate for poor." It was tentatively considered to be "poor."
3. The Review Group re-examined all operating facilities tentatively considered as "below average" or "poor." All were considered to be "below average." The attached list identifies these facilities.
4. The Review Group re-examined all construction reactors tentatively considered as "below average" or "poor." Michelson abstained on Watts Bar vote. Sniezek voted that WNP 1/4 and Catawba be considered as "average." Based on majority vote, the construction reactors that were re-examined were rated as "below average." The attached list identifies these facilities.

5. The latest revision to NRC Manual Chapter 0516 was discussed. SALP Board ratings for functional areas and the facility overall will be withheld from publication until the SALP Review Group report is published. These recommended ratings are predecisional ratings pending Review Group approval. The revised Manual Chapter is considered ready for implementation in draft form for Cycle 2 reviews.
6. Draft 3 of the final report was discussed. Extensive comments were made and will be incorporated in Draft 4. This will be discussed at the next meeting.
7. The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, June 23, 1981 at 9:30 a.m. in the Air Rights Conference Room (5033). Draft 4 of the final report will be discussed.

Operating Reactors

	<u>Above Average</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Below Average</u>
Region I	Yankee Rowe Vermont Yankee Millstone 1, 2	Ginna Maine Yankee Haddam Neck Indian Point 3 Calvert Cliffs *TMI-1	Peach Bottom Salem Beaver Valley 1 Oyster Creek Pilgrim FitzPatrick Indian Point 2 Nine Mile Point 1
Region II	Oconee Farley	North Anna *McGuire 1 Robinson Sequoyah 1 Turkey Point St. Lucie 1 Hatch	Surry Brunswick Crystal River 3 Browns Ferry
Region III	Prairie Island Point Beach	Zion Quad Cities Dresden Monticello Big Rock Point Kewaunee Duane Arnold La Crosse DC Cook	Palisades Davis-Besse

\*Evaluated with operating reactors

Operating Reactors  
(Continued)

Above Average

Average

Below Average

Region IV

Cooper

Ft. St. Vrain

Arkansas

Fort Calhoun

Region V

Trojan

Rancho Seco

San Onofre 1

Totals:

9

25

16

Construction Reactors

Above Average

Average

Below Average

Region I

Hope Creek  
Seabrook  
Limerick  
Shoreham  
Millstone 3  
Beaver Valley 2  
Nine Mile Point 2

Susquehanna 1, 2

Region II

Summer  
Shearon Harris  
McGuire 2  
Grand Gulf  
Cherokee  
Sequoyah 2  
Yellow Creek  
Phipps Bend  
Hartsville  
Bellefonte  
Vogtle

Catawba  
Watts Bar

Region III

Perry  
Fermi  
LaSalle  
Braidwood  
Byron  
Callaway  
Clinton

Midland  
Marble Hill  
Zimmer



Construction Reactors  
(Continued)

	<u>Above Average</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Below Average</u>
Region IV		Wolf Creek River Bend Commanche Peak Waterford 3	South Texas Project
Region V		WNP-3/5 San Onofre 2,3 Palo Verde Diablo Canyon	WNP-2 WNP-1/4
Totals:	0	33	9