

MAR 28 1983

Docket No. 50-329

Docket No. 50-330

Consumers Power Company
ATTN: Mr. James W. Cook
Vice President
Midland Project
1945 West Parnall Road
Jackson, MI 49201

Gentlemen:

By letter dated January 10, 1983, Consumers Power Company described its proposed Construction Completion Program (CCP) for the Midland nuclear facility. This submittal was followed by a public meeting in Midland on February 8, 1983 for the NRC to obtain a better understanding of your proposed program and to obtain public input on the CCP. As a result of our review of the CCP to date, we find we need the following additional information.

- A. Please provide a more detailed description of the scope of the CCP and how it is going to function. Your discussions should address the following subjects or concerns:
1. Because of problems identified by the NRC during the special inspection of the diesel generator building and because similar problems were found in other areas of the plant during subsequent inspections by CPCo, we believe that 100% reinspection of accessible safety related structures, systems, and components is warranted. Should you intend doing less than 100% reinspection, please provide the details of your proposed program and the technical rationale for accepting a sampling approach.
 2. A description of the reinspection program for accessible systems and components important to safety.
 3. A description of the measures you intend to institute to assure that QC reinspection will be sufficiently independent of team controls.

1801

Consumers Power Company

2

MAR 28 1983

4. A description of the training that will be provided to all personnel including craftpersons. Concerning QC inspector recertification training, describe the actions you have recently taken to address the adequacy of the review of PQCI's prior to training being initiated on the PQCI's. In addition, describe the steps you have taken to ensure that all questions raised during PQCI training sessions will be resolved prior to certification to affected PQCI's.
 5. As a result of the diesel generator building inspection, hold points were established by the NRC for the purpose of determining that you adequately performed all of the actions to which you have committed before allowing the work to proceed beyond the hold point. In view of the total CPP effort, the NRC does not wish to remain in the approval chain; therefore, you are requested to develop measures that will ensure that key hold points are honored and that critical parameters of your program are in place before proceeding to the next step.
 6. A description of the controls you will use to ensure all problems have been identified during reinspection of a system or area prior to start of repair work or new work on that system or in that area.
 7. A description of the controls you will use to ensure that no new work will be performed that would cause a known nonconformance to be inaccessible.
 8. A description of your proposed program for in-process QC surveillance (inspection) of rework and new work.
 9. A description of the CPCo management review process for changes to CCP and how CPCo intends to keep the NRC informed of such changes.
- B. Please provide a more detailed description of the third party installation implementation overview mentioned in your January 10, 1983 letter. Your description should address the following subjects or concerns:

Consumers Power Company

3

MAR 28 1983i

1. The installation implementation overview appears to focus solely on future construction and rework. We believe the overview should also encompass all aspects of the CCP, including the reinspection work. Please expand the installation implementation overview to include other aspects of the CCP and provide us with additional details of the overview.
 2. Weekly reports, similar to those issued by Stone and Webster to inform the NRC of the results of the soils overview, are needed. Please provide your commitment to have the third party CCP over-viewer prepare weekly reports similar to the soils overview weekly reports.
 3. The CCP overview should continue until CPCo and the NRC have confidence in the adequacy of the CPCo quality assurance program.
- C. Please propose a candidate organization that Consumers Power Company considers acceptable for the installation implementation overview together with your rationale for selecting that organization. The NRC will also need the following:
1. Sworn statements from the candidate corporation and all personnel who will be involved in the third party installation implementation overview, addressing the independence factors described in Chairman Palladino's letter of February 1, 1982 to Congressmen Ottinger and Dingell.
 2. The resumes of the key personnel to be involved in the third party overview.
 3. A description of the experience of the candidate corporation that qualifies the corporation to perform an independent third party overview.

The NRC will determine the acceptability of the candidate corporation and will notify CPCo. Our present view is that the installation implementation overviewer would not be acceptable to also perform the independent design and construction verification program.

MAR 28 1983

In order to ensure adequate communications between the NRC, CPCo, the independent third party proposed or selected to conduct the independent design/construction verification program, and the public, the protocol in Enclosure 1 should be adhered to. This protocol does not apply to the third party overview of the remedial soils work or the third party overview of the CCP.

Should you have any questions regarding this letter please contact Mr. R. F. Warnick of my staff.

Sincerely,

Original signed by
A. Bert Davis

James G. Keppler
Regional Administrator

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl:

DMB/Document Control Desk (RIDS)

Resident Inspector, RIII

The Honorable Charles Bechhoefer, ASLB

The Honorable Jerry Harbour, ASLB

The Honorable Frederick P. Cowan, ASLB

The Honorable Ralph S. Decker, ASLB

William Paton, ELD

Michael Miller

Ronald Callen, Michigan

Public Service Commission

Myron M. Cherry

Barbara Stamiris

Mary Sinclair

Wendell Marshall

Colonel Steve J. Gadler (P.E.)

RIII

AKG
Gardner/jp
3/25/83

RIII

Shafer

RIII

RFW
Warnick

RIII

LH2
Lewis

RIII

D
Davis

RIII

J
Keppler

*Discussed with
IE & NRR. Most
Comments from
Stone & Hood
included.
RW
IE/NRR*

3/25

3/25

for 3/28

PROTOCOL GOVERNING COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN CONSUMERS

POWER COMPANY AND THE ORGANIZATION CONDUCTING THE INDEPENDENT DESIGN/

CONSTRUCTION VERIFICATION PROGRAM

1. Recommendations, findings, evaluations and all exchanges of correspondence, including drafts, between the independent reviewer and CPCo will be submitted to the Regional Administrator at the same time as they are submitted to CPCo. For purposes of this protocol, the independent reviewer includes the independent reviewer and any of its subcontractors and Consumers Power Company (CPCo) means CPCo, Babcock and Wilcox, Bechtel, Management Analysis Corporation, S&W, and all of their subcontractors.
2. The independent reviewer has a clear need for prompt access to whatever information is required to fulfill its role. To this end, the independent reviewer may request documentary material, meet with and interview individuals, conduct telephone conversations, or visit the site to obtain information without prior notification to the NRC. All communications and transmittals of information shall, however, be documented and such documentation shall be maintained in a location accessible for NRC examination.
3. If the independent reviewer wishes to discuss with CPCo substantive matters related to information obtained, to provide an interim report to CPCo, or to discuss its findings or conclusions with CPCo in advance of completing its report, or if CPCo desires such communication, such discussions shall be accomplished in meetings open to public observation. In this regard, CPCo shall provide a minimum of five days advance notice to the Regional Administrator of any such meeting. The Regional Administrator shall make reasonable efforts to notify representatives of interested members of the public of the meeting, but the inability of any person to attend shall not be cause of delay or postponement of the meeting. Transcripts or written minutes of all such meetings should be prepared by the organization requesting the meeting and provided to the NRC in a timely manner. Any portion of such meetings which deals with proprietary information may be closed to the public.
4. All meetings between the Staff and CPCo and/or the independent reviewer will be open to public observation, except where the Staff determines that it is appropriate to conduct a meeting(s) in private with CPCo and/or the independent reviewer.
5. All documents submitted to, or transmitted by, the NRC subject to this Protocol, unless exempt from mandatory public disclosure, will be placed in the NRC Public Document Rooms in Midland, Michigan and Washington, D. C., and will be available there for public examination and copying.