

OCT 4 1983

Distribution

Document Control No.: 50-423

NRC PDR

PRC System

Docket No.: 50-423

MRushbrook

LB#1 Rdg.

ELDoolittle

MEMORANDUM FOR: D. G. Eisenhut, Director, Division of Licensing  
R. J. Mattson, Director, Division of Systems Integration  
R. H. Vollmer, Director, Division of Engineering

THRU: B. J. Youngblood, Chief, Licensing Branch No. 1, DL  
T. M. Novak, Assistant Director for Licensing, DL

FROM: E. L. Doolittle, Project Manager, Licensing Branch  
No. 1, DL

SUBJECT: SALP REPORT - MILLSTONE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT 3

Attached is a draft of NRR's SALP input for Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, applicant for Millstone-3. This draft report is based upon Division of Licensing, Division of Engineering and Division of Systems Integration input. Please review the draft evaluation and provide any comments you feel are appropriate. All comments received by October 6, 1983 will be considered in the final report.



E. L. Doolittle, Project Manager  
Licensing Branch No. 1  
Division of Licensing

Attachment:  
As stated

Concurrences: DL:LB#1 DL:LB#1  
ELDoolittle:es BJYoungblood  
10/3/83 10/7/83

NRR INPUT TO SALP EVALUATION FOR MILLSTONE, UNIT 3  
(CONSTRUCTION PHASE) COVERING THE PERIOD FROM 9/1/82  
THROUGH 8/31/83

## I. Introduction

This report presents the results of NRR's SALP evaluation of Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (NNECO) in the area of Licensing Activities. The evaluation covers the period from September 1, 1982 through August 31, 1983.

The primary licensing activities which took place for Millstone 3 during this period were tendering and docketing of the Operating License application and subsequent initiation of NRC staff review of the FSAR and ER. Since more than forty staff reviewers were involved in the review of these documents a representative group of fourteen were selected to provide their evaluations for five of the seven attributes used for assessing licensee performance. The evaluations were assembled in a matrix and combined with the Division of Licensing evaluation to determine an overall rating of the applicants performance in the area of licensing activities.

## II. Summary of Results

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company is rated Category 2 in the area of licensing activities. Although the applicant was rated Category 1 in this area for SALP period 2, this was prior to tendering of the OL application and therefore involved a relatively low level of NRR licensing activity. As reflected in the following discussions it is felt that NRC attention should be maintained at normal levels through SALP period 4 which will cover most of the operating license review.

## III. Performance Evaluation

The applicants performance evaluation for this SALP period is based largely on the Millstone 3 OL review which began in November, 1982. Specifically, NRR staff and applicant interactions relating to the staffs review of the FSAR and ER were examined with respect to the seven attributes listed in NRC Manual Chapter 0516.

### A. Management Involvement and Control in Assuring Quality

Evidence of prior planning and assignment of priorities continues to be consistently demonstrated by NNECO in the following licensing activities: 1) tendering and docketing of the OL application and 2) responding to the staffs safety and environmental review questions resulting from its detailed review. NNECOs procedures for control of activities appear to be well stated and controlled as reflected by routine visits to the Stone & Webster Architect Engineering offices and the construction site to oversee licensing and construction activities.

Discussions with Northeast Nuclear Energy Company continue to indicate that its management is well aware of the above licensing activities including details of the staffs specific technical concerns.

Category 1

B. Approach to Resolution of Technical Issues

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company demonstrates a clear understanding of issues and generally exhibits conservatism where the potential for safety significance exists.

Resolutions to technical issues are generally timely, although the staff noted that in some cases inadequate attention was given to resolution of issues. In these cases the staff felt that an easy approach to resolution was chosen instead of a sound and thorough one. Additional NRC effort has been necessary to obtain acceptable resolutions thereby delaying completion of its review. Examples of delayed resolutions are in the area of the Seismology Review and the Geotechnical Review.

Category 2

C. Responsiveness to NRC Initiatives

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company places a high priority on meeting deadlines within the licensing schedule as demonstrated by prompt submittal of its responses to the staffs OL Review questions, and submittal of its Probabilistic Safety Study as scheduled. Additionally NNECO has requested periodic meetings with the NRC licensing staff to review upcoming licensing priorities.

NNECOs responsiveness to other initiatives not detailed in the licensing schedule is generally timely and thorough. Some delays, for which NNECO has been responsible, have been experienced by the staff in scheduling technical meetings; typically a part of the OL review process used to expedite the review. The staff perceives that these delays are related to the time necessary for NNECO to prepare its technical positions and consult with its architect engineer. Occasionally delays have resulted from other priorities related to construction of Unit 3.

Category 2

D. Enforcement History

Not applicable to licensing review in NRR during construction phase.

E. Reporting and Analysis of Reportable Events

Not applicable to licensing review in NRR during construction phase.

F. Staffing

Staffing appears to be ample as indicated by the applicants ability to meet licensing schedule deadlines.

Positions within the applicants organization are well defined. The division of authority and responsibility for technical decisions and commitments has occasionally be unclear as observed during discussions with the NRC staff and NNECO Generic & Nuclear Construction Licensing and Project Management Personnel.

Category 2

Discussions with NRR staff members who have interacted with Northeast Nuclear Energy Company staff have indicated that training and qualification appears to be effective as judged by NNECOs understanding of work and adherence to procedures.

Category 2

Overall Rating Category 2