

JUN 25 1984

Docket No.: 50-400

DISTRIBUTION  
Docket File 50-400  
PRC System  
LB#3 Reading  
BBuckley  
Attorney, OELD  
JLee  
DVassalo  
MGrotenhuis  
GRequa  
PBemis, Region II

MEMORANDUM FOR: Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director  
Division of Licensing, NRR

FROM: B. C. Buckley, Project Manager  
Licensing Branch No. 3  
Division of Licensing

THRU: Thomas M. Novak, Assistant Director  
for Licensing  
Division of Licensing

George W. Knighton, Chief  
Licensing Branch No. 3  
Division of Licensing

SUBJECT: NRR SALP INPUT FOR SHEARON HARRIS

Enclosed please find our assessment of Carolina Power & Light Company's performance in the functional area of Licensing Activities for the review period February 1, 1983 through April 20, 1984. The report is based upon input solicited from selected staff personnel who have had substantial contact and involvement with Carolina Power & Light Company regarding licensing procedures for Shearon Harris, Unit 1.

We recommend an overall rating of Category 2 for the functional area of Licensing Activities.

**ORIGINAL SIGNED BY**

B. C. Buckley, Project Manager  
Licensing Branch No. 3  
Division of Licensing

Enclosure: As stated

cc: S. Varga

DL 3  
BBuckley/yt  
6/18/84

DL 3  
GWKnighton  
6/19/84

DL 30/L  
TMNovak  
6/21/84

8407090291 XA  
CF

Facility Name: Shearon Harris, Unit 1  
Applicant: Carolina Power and Light Company  
NRR Project Manager: Bart C. Buckley

## I. Introduction

This report presents the results of an evaluation of the applicant, Carolina Power & Light Company, in the functional area of Licensing Activities for Shearon Harris, Unit 1. It is intended to provide NRR's input to the SALP review process as described in NRC Manual Chapter 0516 and NRR Office Letter No. 44. The review covers the period from February 1, 1983 to April 30, 1984.

The approach used for this evaluation was to first solicit comments from selected staff personnel who have had substantial contact and involvement with the applicant. The staff applied the evaluation criteria for the performance attributes based on their interface with the applicant. This information was then compiled in a matrix which allowed the applicant's overall performance to be evaluated. This evaluation is based on staff input from twelve branches in four NRR divisions.

## II. Summary of Results

NRC Manual Chapter 0516 and NRR Office Letter No. 44 specify that each functional area evaluated be assigned a performance category based on a composite of a number of attributes. The single final rating is tempered with judgement as to the significance of the individual elements.

Based on this approach, the performance of CP&L in the functional area of Licensing Activities is rated Category 2.

## III. Criteria

Evaluation criteria, as given in NRC Manual Chapter Appendix 0516, Table 1, were used for this evaluation.

## IV. Performance Analysis

The applicant's performance evaluation is based on a consideration of seven attributes as given in the NRC Manual Chapter. For most of the licensing actions considered in this evaluation, only four of the attributes were significant. Therefore, the composite rating is based on the following attributes:

- A. Management Involvement
- B. Approach to Resolution of Technical Issues
- C. Responsiveness to NRC Initiatives
- D. Staffing (Including Management)

There was no NRR evaluation basis at this time for Enforcement History, Reportable Events or Training and Qualification Effectiveness in the licensing review effort.

The primary basis for this evaluation was the interaction between the staff and CP&L associated with generating the Shearon Harris SER. Communication was heavily devoted to staff questions and responses. In addition to the safety aspects of licensing activities, the Final Environmental Statement (FES) was issued during this review period.

A. Management Involvement in Assuring Quality

Throughout the review process, CP&L's activities exhibited evidence of prior planning and proper assignment of priorities. Decisions which were made were usually at a level that ensured adequate management review. An example of management involvement was their allocation of resources to resolve the approximately 400 open items identified in the February 1983 draft SER to less than the 20 identified in the SER issued in November 1983.

Rating: Category 2.

B. Approach to Resolution of Technical Issues from a Safety Standpoint

The applicant has shown a clear understanding of the safety issues. ~~Conservatism was routinely exhibited in areas of safety significance.~~ The applicant provided generally timely responses and the approaches were usually sound, viable, thorough and acceptable.

Rating: Category 2.

C. Responsiveness to NRC Initiatives

Resolutions to questions were generally technically sound and thorough. The applicant has been responsive in meeting deadlines for submittals which usually resulted in timely resolution of issues. An example of CP&L responsiveness to NRC initiative was its rapid response to generic concerns raised by the ACRS on essential chilled water systems.

Rating: Category 2.

D. Staffing (Including Management)

Positions of contact personnel, including their authorities and responsibilities, are well defined. Adequate technical personnel have participated in review meetings resulting in a timely resolution of open items.

Rating: Category 2.

V. Conclusions

Based on the evaluation of Carolina Power and Light Company's performance during the February 1, 1983 through April 30, 1984 review period, in the functional area of Licensing Activities, and overall rating of Category 2 is determined. The primary basis of the evaluation is the interaction associated with the issuance of a SER and FES.