



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
REGION III  
799 ROOSEVELT ROAD  
GLEN ELLYN, ILLINOIS 60137

Enclosure 1

January 25, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR: D. G. Eisenhut, Director, Division of Licensing,  
FROM: R. F. Warnick, Director, Office of Special Cases  
SUBJECT: RECOMMENDATION FOR NOTIFICATION OF LICENSING BOARD

In accordance with present NRC procedures regarding Board Notifications, the following information is being provided as constituting new information relevant and material to the Midland OM/OL proceedings. This information deals with the licensee's January 19, 1984, lifting of the soils remedial stop work order; the licensee's December 14, 1983 reporting of a potential 50.55(e) condition involving differential settlement between the diesel pedestals and the diesel building itself; and a followup of the crack monitoring issue.

A. The pertinent facts that relate to the lifting of the soils stop work are as follows:

1. On October 22, 1983, the licensee issued stop work number FSW-38 on all remedial soils work because of problems with referencing of drawings and specifications in the Bechtel FCR/FCN process. This created an indeterminate condition with respect to work that has been or could be performed.
2. This stop work was one of nine stop work orders which halted all safety-related activities at the Midland site. They were issued as the result of a quality assurance audit of the design document control system (Board Notification dated October 25, 1983).
3. The licensee reviewed potential impact of hardware and plant equipment to ensure it was built to the proper drawings. No significant construction problems were found in the review and the drawing change and review process has been changed to improve the processing of the engineering documents.
4. Project corrective actions were reviewed by Stone & Webster, the independent assessment organization, and were found to be acceptable.
5. Stop work was lifted in the soils area on January 19, 1984.
6. Mergentine and Spencer, White & Prentis will begin rehire of construction workers as work resumes.
7. The Region III staff plans to follow up on this issue as a matter of routine inspection.

B. The pertinent facts that relate to the 50.55(e) are as follows:

1. On October 14, 1983, RIII received an allegation by the way of a GAP affidavit that Bechtel had not taken into account the effect that the anticipated differential settlement between the diesel pedestals and the diesel building itself would have on associated connecting equipment.
2. On November 3, 1983, RIII requested NRR assistance in pursuing this allegation.
3. On December 2, 1983, CPCo was notified of the allegation for the purposes of obtaining design information for NRR's review of the allegation.
4. On December 14, 1983, CPCo notified RIII of a potential 50.55(e) on this matter.
5. On January 13, 1984, the licensee issued the official 50.55(e) report to the NRC.
6. The 50.55(e) report states that Bechtel discovered this deficiency during a system review of the diesel generator on November 21, 1983.
7. A meeting is tentatively scheduled for February, 1984, to pursue this issue.
8. Furthermore, the licensee's 50.54(f) response to Question 18, Revision 5, dated February 2, 1980, states, "Piping will be designed to accomodate the expected future differential settlement", between the diesel pedestals and the building structure. In the 50.55(e) report the licensee states, "requirements for differential settlement between the Diesel Generator Building Structure and Diesel Generator Pedestals were not accounted for in the design of the piping equipment conduits, and pipe supports."
9. The Region III staff plans to follow up on this matter as a routine inspection item.

C. The pertinent facts that relate to the crack monitoring issue are as follows:

1. The NRC staff during the Stone & Webster public meeting on November 10, 1983, imposed a hold point on resuming soils remedial underpinning until the crack monitoring issue was resolved. This resulted from the NRC's review of Stone & Webster's weekly reports which indicated some problems in the crack monitoring area.

January 25, 1984

2. On November 30, 1983, the licensee provided RIII with an update of the crack monitoring issue. In summary, the licensee indicated that QA/QC inspections and overviews were incomplete for crack mapping. This resulted in the issuance of 59 NCR's and 11 QAR's that included a magnitude of problems for example:
  - a. Inadequate specification, procedures and Project Quality Control Instructions (PQCI's)
  - b. Some cracks were not being monitored
  - c. Some cracks were not identified
  - d. QA/QC inspection functions not completed
  - e. Crack mapping issues were not being resolved in a timely manner
3. During an ASLB hearing session on December 3, 1983, Mr. D. Hood, NRR Project Manager, verbally notified the ASLB of this condition.
4. On December 6, 1983, RIII documented this as a formal hold point in a letter to CPCo.
5. On December 23, 1983, corrective actions taken on crack mapping were reviewed by Stone & Webster and were found to be acceptable.
6. On December 29, 1983, a letter to CPCo from RIII documented the completion of the review of the corrective actions taken, found them to be acceptable, and released the NRC hold point.
7. The NRC Hold Point was released prior the licensee releasing its stop work of October 22, 1983, and therefore, the NRC hold point had no impact on the licensee's schedule.

If you have any questions or desire further information regarding this matter, please call me.

*R F Warnick*

R. F. Warnick, Director  
Office of Special Cases