



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

*Marnick*  
SALP

July 12, 1982

MEMORANDUM FOR: Those on Attached List

FROM: T. N. Tambling, Chief, Operational Support Section

SUBJECT: SALP III INPUTS

Input for Monticello, Prairie Island, LACBWR, Palisades, Big Rock Point, and Midland Nuclear Plants for the SALP III evaluation period, July 1, 1981, to June 30, 1982, will be due July 30. Provide input in all areas you or your group has inspected. As in SALP II, Resident Inspectors at operating plants provide the largest single input and generally provided the primary inputs to Plant Operations, Maintenance, Surveillance and Inservice Testing, Housekeeping, Refueling and the Supporting Data Sections. This should continue. Where several inputs are provided, they will be blended by the report preparer to develop a single evaluation. Functional area evaluations using inspection reports should include consideration of the associated "Inspector Evaluation" forms filled out per Region III Procedure 1206. Other information should be used as appropriate in evaluating the licensees, as done in SALP II, such as material from PAS or INPO inspection reports, informal observation, investigations, etc.

For SALP III inputs, inspection report numbers applicable to a functional area evaluation should be identified and each non-compliance addressed should be related to its associated inspection report by number. Licensee Event Reports (LERs) used to support an evaluation should be identified by LER number. This information will help the preparer of the integrated report.

Refueling has been a difficult area to evaluate for operating sites because it was not clear what to include. For consistency during SALP III, include actual maintenance and modification work in the "Maintenance" evaluation. Include the planning, scheduling, and handling of these activities as part of "Refueling" and include all other activities from cooldown to startup physics testing as "Refueling". Any performance area within "Refueling" notably different from the overall categorization of this area can be addressed in the analysis part of the write-up.

By nature of our looking for problems, our evaluations have frequently overlooked licensee strengths. An improved effort is needed to identify the licensees' strengths in the reports. Characterize both strengths and weaknesses, particularly non-compliances, using the criteria and guidance provided in NRC Manual Chapter 0516 to support whatever performance category is chosen.

July 12, 1982

Remember that this is a performance evaluation for a year, not the last months of the period. Changes in performance over the period should be averaged. Note in the "Analysis" either particularly improved or degraded performance trends observed either during the period or since the previous one. Additional guidance is provided in the Attachment.

Please be prompt with your input; send it to Tom Tambling, Chief, Operational Support Section, for distribution to the report preparers. Be ready to support the preparer in blending your input into the report format and to provide support during both the Board and licensee meetings.

*T. N. Tambling*

T. N. Tambling, Chief  
Operational Support Section

Attachment: Input Guidance

Attachment

Input Guidance

- I. Indicate the basis for the evaluation:
  - A. Number of inspections.
  - B. Depth of inspections.
  - C. What was inspected.
  - D. Other observations, LER reviews, etc.
  - E. Enforcement history.
  
- II. Indicate findings:
  - A. Non-compliances.
  - B. Strengths and weaknesses.
  - C. Pertinent LERs.
  - D. Enforcement actions, citations, etc.
  
- III. Indicate what the findings show or reflect in terms of licensee performance:
  - A. Put finding in perspective such as:
    1. Major problem, continuing for long term.
    2. Minor problem, isolated case.
    3. Major or minor safety significance, etc.
  
  - B. Indicate trends if they are evident.
  
- IV. Indicate actions taken and general licensee responsiveness to correct identified problems. (The resident inspectors can be particularly helpful in this area, particularly when problems are identified early in the inspection period and not subsequently addressed by formal inspection. The licensee responsiveness can have considerable impact on the performance category assigned.)

Addressees - Memorandum dated 7/12/82

Keppler  
Davis  
Hind  
Spessard  
Norelius

Brown  
Feierabend  
Branch  
Jorgensen  
Wright  
Cook

Streeter  
Knop  
Jackiw  
Shafer  
Creed  
Greger  
Axelson  
Schumacher  
Little  
Paperiello  
Warnick  
Reyes  
Boyd

H. Nicolarius, NRR Project Manager  
D. DiIanni, NRR Project Manager  
R. Dudley, NRR Project Manager  
T. Wambach, NRR Project Manager  
R. Emch, NRR Project Manager  
D. Hood, NRR Project Manager