



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

DEC 18 1981

SSINS 8230

MEMORANDUM FOR: N. C. Moseley, Chairman, SALP
Review Group

FROM: R. H. Wessman

SUBJECT: MIDLAND HEARINGS AND DISCUSSION OF SALP ASSIGNMENT

In response to a hearing board request I testified at the Midland Hearings on December 15, 1981. I was asked to respond to questions regarding the SALP program in general and the Midland assessment in particular.

The applicant was particularly interested in what he considered as errors in the Midland assessment in NUREG 0834. In preparing for the hearing I identified several corrections to the Midland Performance Element Summary as shown on the attached copy of the summary. During the Hearing I was specifically asked whether I would recommend a change to the SALP Review Group Assessment. I committed to provide a copy of my suggested changes to the Midland Performance Element Summary for Review Group consideration but stated that any change to the Midland assessment could only be made by the SALP Review Group.

R. H. Wessman
Office of Inspection and Enforcement

Encl: Midland Performance Element
Summary

cc: C. Michelson, AEOD
J. Sniezek, IE
D. Eisenhut, NRR
J. Keppler, RIII
W. Paton, ELD
D. Allison, IE

A231

(5)

YA

8203040538

MIDLAND PERFORMANCE ELEMENT SUMMARY

Midland 1 & 2

Evaluation Period: 7/1/79 - 6/30/80

The Midland facility displayed evidence of weaknesses in three functional areas. These areas were quality assurance (including management and training), substructures and foundations, and safety-related components.

In the area of quality assurance there were numerous items of noncompliance, instances of unqualified QC inspectors, and instances of inadequate control of contractor activities. Earlier Most quality assurance problems associated with materials and placement of soils and backfills were identified during prior to the evaluation period. The licensee was slow in responding to NRC concerns regarding soil placement. An NRC Order modifying the construction permit was issued to assure corrective action to the soil problems. Major deficiencies were identified in quality assurance controls over the installation of safety-related heating, ventilating, and air-conditioning components. These deficiencies resulted in the issuance of an NRC Immediate Action Letter confirming the licensee's stop work order and the imposition of civil penalties to assure corrective action. Technical responses to NRR were occasionally inadequate but have shown improvement during the evaluation period.

Midland received a relatively large number of items of noncompliance when compared with other power reactor facilities under construction. During the evaluation the licensee initiated action that allowed a reorganization to be implemented in August 1980.

Deleted material -----

New material _____