L. Wheeler

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

JUN 23 1981

Docket Nos. 50-508
50-509

MEMORANDUM FOR: F. J. Miraglia, Acting Chief
Licensing Branch No. 3, DL

FROM: R. E. Jackson, Chief
Geosciences Branch, DE

SUBJECT: GSB INPUT TO WNP 3 AND 5 SALP REVIEW BOARD

Per your request (memorandum of June 18, 1981) attached is the Geosciences Branch input for use by the WNP 3 and 5 SALP Review Board. The comments were prepared by H. E. Lefevre, Geologist.

R. E. Jackson, Chief
Geosciences Branch
Division of Engineering

Attachment:
As stated

cc: w/attachment
J. Knight
S. Brocoum
L. Reiter
H. Lefevre
L. Wheeler

XA Copy Has Been Sent to PDR

8107140182 810623
ADOCK 05000508
XA

Facility: WNP 3 and 5

Appraisal Period: July 31, 1980 - Oct. 6, 1980

1. Performance Elements

a. Quality of responses to requests for additional information.

Acceptable

b. Efforts required to obtain an acceptable response or submittal including:

(1) Timeliness — (1) Barely acceptable - all information submitted to NRC was available to WPPSS at the time of our three requests (July 3 1980). WPPSS responses were not provided until October 6.

* (2) Effort

(3) Responsiveness to staff requests - Average

* (4) Anticipates or reacts to NRC needs

* c. Working knowledge of regulations, guides, standards and generic issues.

d. Technical competence. Acceptable

* e. Conduct of meetings with NRR.

* f. Long-standing open items.

* g. Organization and management capabilities.

* h. Results of operator licensing examinations conducted during the appraisal period.

* i. Performance on specific issues (as selected by the Project Manager).

* 2. Observed trends in performance.

* 3. Notable Strengths and Weaknesses

* a. Strengths

* b. Weaknesses

* 4. Overall Summary

(Shall include overall rating - above average, average, below average).

*GSB has no bases for comment on this item because of the short term nature of our RAI's.

NRR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Facility: WNP 3/5 Project Manager: L. Wheeler

Appraisal Period: 9-1-80 thru 6-30-81

1. Performance Elements

a. Quality of responses and submittals (such as SAR amendments, technical specification changes, generic letter response, and responses to requests for additional information).
Satisfactory. No major shortcomings noted.

b. Efforts required to obtain an acceptable response or submittal including:
Fair. Rating will become unsatisfactory if no improvement is made.
(1) Timeliness
(2) Effort
(3) Responsiveness to staff requests
(4) Anticipates or reacts to NRC needs

WNP 3/5 management attention should focus on improving these areas. Major prob are likely to develop during the OL review present standards of performanre are no improved.

c. Working knowledge of regulations, guides, standards and generic issues. Satisfactory

d. Technical competence. Satisfactory

e. Conduct of meetings with NRR. Not evaluated.

f. Long-standing open items. Not evaluated.

g. Organization and management capabilities. See 1i below.

h. Results of operator licensing examinations conducted during the appraisal period. Not evaluated

i. Performance on specific issues (as selected by the Project Manager).
Processing of correspondence (routing for signatures and concurrences) is too sl causing delays. Staff preparation of correspondence is satisfactory.

2. Observed trends in performance.
Not evaluated.

3. Notable Strengths and Weaknesses
None observed that are considered "notable."

a. Strengths

b. Weaknesses

4. Overall Summary - The licensee's performance in the very limited interaction with the NRC has been average. However, when the level of interaction increases, the licensee's quality of performance may change significantly. Areas identified during this appraisal period as having significant potential for causing problems in the future are the routing and review procedures for documents that have been completed by the staff and are awaiting approval. Overall rating