

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION III

Report No. 50-409/82-10(DPRP)

Docket No. 50-409

License No. DPR-45

Licensee: Dairyland Power Cooperative
2615 East Avenue - South
La Crosse, WI 54601

Facility Name: La Crosse Boiling Water Reactor (LACBWR)
Genoa, WI

Management Meeting At: Region III Office,
Glen Ellyn, IL

Meeting Conducted: July 23, 1982

Report Prepared By: *M. W. Branch*
M. W. Branch, Senior Resident
Inspector, LACBWR

8-3-82

Report Reviewed By: *A. Bert Davis*
for James G. Keppler,
Regional Administrator

8/12/82

Management Meeting Summary

Management Meeting on July 23, 1982 (Report No. 50-409/82-10(DPRP))

Areas Discussed: (1) measures the licensee has taken to improve the overall regulatory performance of the La Crosse facility including the status of their regulatory improvement plan, and (2) concerns about plant operations that were expressed by LACBWR personnel. The meeting lasted two hours and was attended by seven NRC personnel.

DETAILS

1. Attendance

Dairyland Power Cooperative

F. Linder, General Manager
J. Taylor, Assistant General Manager for Power
J. Parkyn, Plant Superintendent

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

J. Keppler, Regional Administrator
A. Davis, Deputy Regional Administrator
R. Spessard, Director, Division of Project & Resident Programs
J. Streeter, Chief, Projects Branch 2
L. Reyes, Chief, Projects Section 2C
M. Branch, SRI, LACBWR
R. Dudley, Project Manager, NRR

2. Matters Discussed

a. Opening Remarks

Mr. Keppler opened the meeting by stating that the meeting was originally requested as a followup to the management meeting conducted on April 1, 1982. He continued by stating that due to recent events the meeting was expanded to include a discussion of concerns expressed by LACBWR personnel to the Senior Resident Inspector and his Branch Chief. Mr. Keppler went on to say that there would also be an enforcement conference immediately following the management meeting for the purpose of dealing with problems associated with meeting the Emergency Preparedness Rule.

Mr. Taylor indicated that the utility would attempt to answer all questions about their status of emergency preparedness, but that the short notice of the enforcement conference may present some problems in providing their position.

b. Regulatory Improvement Program

Mr. Taylor indicated that the June 29, 1982 draft of their Regulatory Improvement Program did not contain milestone dates and other implemental details. He went on to state that the utility was requesting assistance from the NRC in developing this detail.

Mr. Keppler reflected back to the April 1, 1982, management meeting in LaCrosse, Wisconsin, when the Region III staff originally suggested the licensee develop a Regulatory Improvement Program. Mr. Keppler indicated that it was his intent that the improvement program be based on a self-assessment of facility operations which would include an analysis of findings from NRC, INPO and facility audits.

After a great deal of discussion it was agreed that the licensee has taken steps to improve their performance, but the details of these improvements were not contained in the improvement program. Mr. Taylor indicated that he had a better understanding of what should be contained in the program and that they would revise their program by October 1, 1982 to include the necessary details.

c. Concerns Expressed by Management Personnel

Mr. Streeter summarized the following concerns about plant operations that had been expressed to NRC Region III by the former plant superintendent.

1. Lack of depth in organization - numbers and expertise inadequate to cope with workload.
2. Drowning in paperwork - prevents supervisors from properly overseeing (surveilling) plant activities.
3. Financial resources inadequate.
4. Continuously getting further behind - e.g., preventive maintenance records can't be kept up.
5. Lack of proper work ethic - people don't have adequate appreciation and awareness of significance of matters. This especially applies to supervisors and procedure writers.
6. Organization too imbred and financial restrictions and hiring policy promotes this.
7. Superintendent continually tested by subordinates.
8. Corporate shelved proposal to have consultant do independent audit of organization.

Mr. Taylor responded to these concerns and stated that most of the concerns were corrected by organizational changes to effect better utilization of available resources. He went on to state that he believed the change in superintendents along with the establishment of a new corporate position of Director of Special Nuclear Projects were positive steps in improving regulatory performance. Mr. Shimshak, the former plant superintendent will fill this new position which will enhance the nuclear experience level of the corporate staff and the quality and quantity of corporate support to the plant. Mr. Taylor and Mr. Linder indicated that DPC is dedicated to continue operations of LACBWR as long as it is economically feasible.

Mr. Parkyn, the new plant superintendent was asked if he had any concerns with operating LACBWR with the present corporate support of the facility. Mr. Parkyn indicated that he had no reservations with continued plant operations and he discussed several programs he plans to implement to improve plant operations and better utilize resources.

d. Enforcement Conference

The enforcement conference that immediately followed the management meeting is beyond the scope of this report and will be documented in a subsequent report.