

DISTRIBUTION:

Document Control (50-445/50-446)
NRC PDR
PRC System
LB#1 Rdg
BJYoungblood
MRushbrook
SBurwell
TNovak

NOV 02 1982

Docket Nos.: 50-445
and 50-446

MEMORANDUM FOR: Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director, Division of Licensing
Roger J. Mattson, Director, Division of Systems
Integration
Richard H. Vollmer, Director, Division of Engineering
Hugh L. Thompson, Director, Division of Human Factors
Safety
Brian K. Grimes, Director, Division of Emergency
Preparedness, IE

THRU: B. J. Youngblood, Chief
Licensing Branch No. 1
Division of Licensing

FROM: S. B. Burwell, Project Manager
Licensing Branch No. 1
Division of Licensing

SUBJECT: SALP - COMANCHE PEAK

Attached is a draft of the NRR input for the SALP for the Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2. This draft report is based partly upon input solicited from selected staff personnel who have had contact and involvement with the applicant. Please review the draft evaluation and provide any comments you feel appropriate. All comments received by November 9, 1982 will be considered in the final report.

To assist you with review and comment, the following persons were contacted for input: G. Bagchi, EQB; H. Garg, EQB; L. Crocker, LQG; K. Dempsey, AEB; D. Rohrer, EPLB/IE.

151

S. B. Burwell, Project Manager
Licensing Branch No. 1
Division of Licensing

8211160110 821102
PDR ADOCK 05000445
Q PDR

Enclosure:
1. Input for SALP Report

cc w/enclosure:
G. Bagchi
H. Garg
L. Crocker

OFFICE	K. Dempsey	DL LB#1	DL LB#1			
SURNAME	D. Rohrer	SBurwell:cw	BJYoungblood			
DATE		11/02/82	11/02/82			

Facility Name: Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station
 Licensee: Texas Utilities Generating Company
 NRR Project Manager: S. B. Burwell

I. Introduction

This report presents the results of an evaluation of the licensee, Texas Utilities Generating Company, in the functional area of licensing activities. It is intended to provide NRR's input to the SALP review process as described in NRC Manual Chapter 0516. The review covers the period October 1, 1981 to September 30, 1982.

Comments were solicited from the staff for this evaluation. In most cases the staff applied the evaluation criteria for the performance attributes based on their experience with the licensee or his products. This evaluation is based on staff input from five branches in four NRR divisions and IE.

II. Summary of Results

NRC Manual Chapter 0516 specifies that each functional area evaluated will be assigned a performance category based on a composite of a number of attributes. The single final rating to be tempered with judgment as to the significance of the individual elements.

Based on this approach, the performance of Texas Utilities Generating Company in the functional area - Licensing Activities - is rated category 1.

III. Criteria

Evaluation criteria, as given in NRC Manual Chapter Appendix 0516 Table 1, were used for this evaluation.

IV. Performance Analysis

The licensee's performance evaluation is based on a consideration of seven attributes as given in the NRC Manual Chapter. For this evaluation, only four of the attributes were of significance. Therefore, the composite rating is based on the following attributes:

- Management involvement
- Approach to resolution of technical issues
- Responsiveness
- Staffing

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶

A. Management Involvement in Assuring Quality

The audit team on organization structure and qualifications concluded that overall, the corporate management officers are knowledgeable and dedicated to the safe, reliable operation of the station. Management involvement has been further demonstrated during their participation in the meetings with the ACRS and during the hearings. Staff discussions with the utility management show a thorough knowledge of licensing activities. (Rating: Category 1)

B. Approach to Resolution of Technical Issues from a Safety Standpoint

The applicant generally has a good understanding of technical issues relating to safety. When issues are in doubt, the applicant aggressively seeks discussions and meetings with the staff to resolve any questions. Responses to issues are technically sound and the documentation is thorough in almost all cases. (Rating: Category 1)

C. Responsiveness to NRC Initiatives

The applicant rates superior on this attribute. The applicant was very responsive in working with the staff to complete the review of the Emergency Plan on an expedited schedule. The applicant was also responsive to staff requests during the seismic qualification review team audit and the equipment environmental qualification team audit. (Rating: Category 1)

D. Enforcement History

Not applicable to NRR licensing review during construction phase.

E. Reporting and Analysis of Reportable Events

Not applicable to NRR licensing review during construction phase.

F. Staffing (Including Management)

The audit team on organization structure and qualifications found the staffing in the corporate, plant support and plant operations offices adequate and qualified with one exception relating to "hands on" experience of the station operators at the time of fuel loading. TUGCO has committed to additional advisory staff to assist the operators during startup and for one year after fuel load, satisfactorily resolving this concern. (Rating: Category 2)

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶

G. Training and Qualification Effectiveness

Not applicable to NRR licensing reviews during this phase of construction.

OVERALL RATING: Category 1

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶