

50-322 04-4 SC LP-19

SALP

DOCKETED
USNRC

I-SC-LP-19
8/1/84

NRR Performance Evaluation

'85 JAN -8 A10:31

Facility: Shoreham Nuclear Power Station
Applicant: Long Island Lighting Company
Appraisal Period: July 1, 1980 - June 30, 1981
Project Manager: Jerry N. Wilson

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

1. Performance Elements

a. Quality of response and submittals

The applicant's responses and submittals are below average. The FSAR and amendments provide insufficient information to provide a clear understanding of plant design. The applicant's answers to generic letters and requests for additional information are usually not responsive to staff concerns.

b. Efforts required to obtain an acceptable response

During the latter portion of this appraisal period, the applicant put in a great deal of effort in responding to open items in the Shoreham SER and the responses usually met our time schedules. However, the applicant's responses were frequently inadequate. Therefore, each open item required several meetings, phone conversations, and letters to achieve resolution.

c. Working knowledge of Regulations, guides, standards and generic issues

The applicant's knowledge in this area is above average.

d. Technical competence

The applicant is above average in engineering and licensing matters. However, the applicant has virtually no BWR operating experience.

8501140388 840801
PDR ADOCK 05000322
PDR
Q

KRILEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Docket No. 50-322-02-4 Power
Official Ex. No. 4 Power ✓
IDENTIFIED ✓
RECEIVED _____
REJECTED _____
In the matter of FILCO - Low
Staff _____
Applicant _____
Interview _____
Conf. 3 Conf. _____
Contractor _____
Owner _____
Witness W. Cassady

DATE 8/1/84



e. Conduct of Meetings with NRR

The applicant takes an active role in meetings although they are frequently recalcitrant.

f. Long - standing open items

The applicant had many long-standing open items throughout this appraisal period. Because the applicant had not neared completion of construction, they opposed many staff positions in the hope that the staff would back off.

g. Organization and management capabilities

Many concerns were raised in this area during the appraisal period as a result of review by Licensee Qualification Branch. Subsequently, the applicant has made changes to resolve staff concerns.

h. Results of operator licensing examinations

Not applicable

i. Performance on specific issues

The applicant has not kept the FSAR up-to-date and representative of the actual plant. There is poor control of construction activities resulting in ever increasing discrepancies between the plant, the design, and the FSAR. The applicant continues to generate E&DCRs on the construction of the Shoreham facility, which now total 35,000. This is causing the potential for an ever widening gap between the actual plant and the analysed and approved design. I doubt that either Stone & Webster or LILCO fully understand the capability of the facility with such a large discrepancy between the plant and the AE approved design.

2. Observed trends in performance

No noticeable change since Cycle 1.

3. Notable strengths and weaknesses

This is an active and technically knowledgeable applicant however, they lack BWR operating experience and they are frequently recalcitrant.

4. Overall summary

Below average