Capiton

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

LUM : 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR: Harold R. Denton, Director Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Hugh L. Thompson. Jr., Director Division of Human Factors Safety

SUBJECT: PROPOSED ACTIONS REGARDING TMI-1 RESTART

The purpose of this memorandum is to outline a program that will enable the staff to respond to the June 2, 1983, Staff Requirement Memorandum to complete the review of the BETA and RHR reports and to evaluate the GPU corporate institution as outlined in the EDO's June 7, 1983, memorandum to the Commission on Completion of TMI-1 Restart Review.

# Background

IE inspection Report 50-289/83-10, a joint product of Region I and NRR, was designed specifically to address issues raised by the Hartman allegations regarding leak rate testing and improper start up procedures as these allegations impact on management integrity and competence. The conclusion of the report was that changes and improvements in organization, procedural adherence and personnel at TMI-1 that have occurred since the Hartman allegation allegations provide assurance that the allegations do not present health and safety concerns that require resolution prior to Unit 1 restart.

However, during the course of the inspection effort leading to the report, the inspection team became aware of two reports prepared by consultants to the licensee (RHR and BETA reports) that contained statements that could be interpreted as casting doubt on the management capability of TMI-1. Also, during the same time frame, several other matters came to light which also called into question the competence and integrity of the TMI-1 management. These were itemized in the memorandum of May 19, 1983, from the EDC which forwarded copies of IE Inspection Report 50-289/83-10 to the Commission.

On the basis of the RHR and BETA reports and the May 19, 1983, memorandum, at least two of the TMI-1 Restart intervenors (the Aamoots and TMIA) have filed motions to reopen the hearing.

Further perusal of the GPU vs. 8&W trial transcript could result in other matters being identified which will require resolution.

8306170119 XA

Harold R. Denton

## Discussion

At this Lime, NRR and Region I cannot resolve the issues relating Lo:

a. The veracity of the Hartman allegations. This is still being addressed by the Department of Justice.

-2-

- b. Other issues which might be uncovered in the GPU vs. B&W trial transcript and exhibits.
- c. The Parks and King allegations. These are being addressed by OI.
- d. Whether the licensee should have notified the Commission or the Appeal Board of relevant and material information. OELD is handling this item.

Resolution of these issues will have to await the outcome of each and it may be that there is nothing further that the staff can do or needs to do. If actions are needed, we will have to handle these as they are identified.

What the staff can do now, however, is to set up a program to address the RHR and SETA reports in detail to determine the impact of these on the TMI-1 restart decision. In the course of this effort, we would also be responding to much of the material in the intervences' motions to reopen the hearing.

The product of the new staff effort should be a Supplement to the TMI-1 Restart Safety Evaluation Report, since the essence of the matters to be addressed were considered previously in the SER or the earlier supplements.

I do not perceive a need to perform a <u>de novo</u> review of the TML-1 organization and management. What is needed is sufficient additional work such that, in combination with other available data (e.g., IE Inspection Report 50-289/83-10, other IE inspection reports, PAT team evaluations, SALP evaluations, and INPO evaluations) the staff can prepare an SER supplement which adequately addresses the various issues that have been raised in the RHR and BETA reports. At the same time, however, the effort should not be so narrowly focused that it cannot be used to respond to even newer, similar issues which may be raised as a result of the other activities noted above.

#### Review Approach

Our intent is to establish a review team to be charged with the specific mission of examining the comments, findings and recommendations contained in the RHR and BETA reports, evaluating the impact of these identified matters on plant safety and on management competence. The team will also review the current assignment of individuals at TMI-1, evaluate the need for recossignments of individuals identified by various allegations, reviews, and investigations in order to assure the integrity of the corporate institution, and evaluate competence of any proposed replicements. A Supplement to the SEP which addresses these issues will be prepared.

# Harold R. Denton

The team will be composed of both Region 1 and NRR personnel. To the extent practicable, I would like to use the same team members that prepared IE Inspection Report 50-289/83-10, but with NRR in the lead role since the product will be a supplement to the SER. In addition, the NRR support will also include personnel from the Personnel Qualifications Section of LQB, from the Procedures and Systems Review Branch and the Operator Licensing Branch of UNFS, and perhaps from the Radiological Assessment Branch of DSI.

## Schedule

I believe we can complete the planning for this effort during the early part of the week of June 6, such that members of the review team could visit the TMI-1 site or the RHR and BETA consultants, as necessary, during the remainder of that week and the week of June 13. I estimate that the team could complete its review efforts by June 17 and that we could then have a draft SER Supplement available by about the end of the first week in July. It likely would take another two weeks to obtain ELD and management review.

My staff has been coordinating this matter informally with Region I staff members, although formal coordination has not been completed. I do not anticipate problems in obtaining Region I cooperation and support.

dugh Shomp ?? Hugh L. Thompson Jr., Director

Division of Human Factors Safety

- cc: E. Case T. Murley, Region I R. Starostecki, Region I R. Keimig, Region I D. Caphton, Region I J. Goldberg, ELD D. Eisenhut, DL G. Lainas, DL J. Stolz, DL
  - J. VanVliet, DL

..