U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION III

Report No. 50-329/83-16(OSC); 50-330/83-17(OSC)

Docket No. 50-329; 50-330   License No. CPPR-81; CPPR-82

Licensee: Consumers Power Company
           1945 West Parnall Road
           Jackson, MI 49201

Facility Name: Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2

Meeting At: Quality Inn, Midland, MI;

Meeting Conducted: August 25, 1983

Report Prepared By: R. N. Gardner, Project   9/28/83
                     Inspector, Midland   (Date)

Approved By: J. J. Harrison, Chief   9/29/83
              Section 2, Midland   (Date)

Meeting Summary

Meeting held on August 25, 1983 (Report No. 50-329/83-16(OSC);
50-330/83-17(OSC))
Subject: Consumers Power Company proposed third party overview; Stone and
Webster's Construction Implementation Overview Program .
Results: During the meeting between the NRC and S&W, the S&W staff presented
the methodology of the Construction Implementation Overview (CIO) Program.
Following the presentation, the NRC staff asked questions and made comments
with S&W providing responses. At the conclusion of the meeting, members of
the public were given the opportunity to also ask questions and make comments.

1. Persons in Attendance

    Stone and Webster

    D. Kelly, Corporate Manager, Quality Assurance
    R. Burns, Assistant Corporate Manager, Quality Assurance
    P. Amaruso, Project Manager
    S. Baranow, Program Manager
    F. Bearham, Program Evaluation Supervisor
    J. Thompson, Physical Verification Supervisor

    U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

    R. Warnick, Director, Office of Special Cases
    R. Novak, Assistant Director for Licensing, Division of Licensing, NRR
    S. Lewis, Region III Counsel
    R. Cook, Senior Resident Inspector
    R. Gardner, Project Inspector
    J. Harrison, Chief, Section 2, Midland
    J. Stone, Chief, Construction Program/Construction Appraisal Team Section
    R. Landsman, Reactor Inspector

2. Meeting

    The meeting between the NRC and Stone and Webster (S&W) included a
    presentation by the S&W staff on the Construction Implementation
    Overview (CIO). Subjects covered by the presentation included:

    .   Team Experience

    .   Scope

    .   Organization

    .   Document Tree

    .   Physical Verification

    .   Program Evaluation

    .   Team Monitoring

    .   Typical Areas to be Closely Monitored

    .   Nonconformances

    .   Sampling Plans

    .   Staffing Plans

During and following the presentation, the NRC staff presented questions and comments to the S&W staff. Since a representative of the Government Accountability Project (GAP) was unable to attend the meeting, GAP telephoned their questions to Region III and Region III included them with the NRC questions. A copy of the questions is attached. At the conclusion of this meeting, members of the public were given the opportunity to provide comments and ask questions.

Subsequent to this meeting on August 30, 1983, S&W submitted copies of the presentation materials to the NRC, and on September 9, 1983, S&W forwarded a summary of the presentation to the NRC (copies attached).

Attachments:

1. NRC questions for the August 25, 1983 Meeting with S&W
2. S&W letter to NRC dated August 30, 1983
3. S&W letter to NRC dated September 9, 1983

NRC, REGION III QUESTIONS
FOR AUGUST 25, 1983, MEETING WITH S&W

Questions:

1. Methodology of verification (experience, problem, history, etc.)

    a. Define

    b. Verification checklist, will any independent inspection or hardware testing be performed (actual dimensions, etc.)?

    c. Verification - a paper review or observation, or both?

    d. Should a problem be discovered on items being verified, how will this be identified - QCI 15.01 NIR?

    e. Should a problem be discovered on a PQCI that is or has been utilized, how will this be identified - NIR?

    f. How would a problem with an S&W checklist be handled for after the fact usage - NIR?

    g. Will all problems found by S&W be identified on QCIR's, NIR's?

    h. Will these problems be identified immediately or following consultation with CPCo/Bechtel?

    i. Documentation to support? How?

    j. How will attribute checklist revision controls be assured to be consonant with PQCI revision control?

2. Percentage of Work to be Reviewed

    a. What will the control for percentage of review basis be?

    -   100%

    -   Sampling Plan

    -   Provisions for tightening

    -   Reduction

    -   Confidence levels

b. Overview control will be by system or areas (module)

- Phase I

- Phase II

c. <u>Note</u>:

- Be able to justify what was done and why - confidence level

- Be able to discuss at monthly meetings

3. Project Quality Control Instructions

a. Is an attribute checklist being prepared for each PQCI?

b. If not, and a combination of disciplines are being utilized, what will be the basis for control?

c. A PQCI covers the inspection aspect only, what about ongoing work activities? What will be used for control (e.g., audits and surveillances)?

4. Interaction with CPCo/Bechtel

a. Contact points/protocol, who? Any problems?

b. Information access, problems?

c. Accessibility of S&W generated data - (PDR vs. files) Accessible to NRC?

For example:

CIO reports are in the PDR files, what about checklist, audit reports, QCIR's, NIR's?

5. Management Reviews

a. Details of findings/reports, very brief - more detail?

b. Closeout items; how is this controlled?

c Will a tracking system be utilized?

d. Scope change of program for management review, will re-reviews occur? Should a system problem warrant such?

6. Independent Inspections

a. Will S&W perform any independent inspections?

7. Will S&W QA (Boston) audit the CIO effort?

   Will audit findings be available at the site for the NRC?

8. Explain difference between -

   .   Evaluation

   .   Verification

9. S&W QA Plan excludes audits from scope, why?

10. Procedures for Sampling

   .   What is the reliability/confidence level?

   .   Will bias sampling be utilized?

11. Does S&W plan utilize a procedure for trending for both positive and negative program effects as a guide for overview effort?

12. Comment - It is key that a proper presentation with supporting data and decision basis be presented at each monthly meeting and in the weekly reports.

13. The numbers of personnel involved in the S&W CIO are of concern to the staff and to the public. Please explain your staffing plan.

14. Should you choose to sample, how will the population be defined that the sample is to be drawn from? (That is, be team, by system, by area, by PQCI, or by IR, or by a combination of all?)