MEMORANDUM FOR:

R. Lee Spessard, Director

Division of Reactor Safety

Region III

FROM:

Brian K. Grimes, Director

Division of Quality Assurance, Vendor and Technical Training Center Programs Office of Inspection and Enforcement

SUBJECT:

INSPECTION TEAM'S SYSTEMATIC ASSESSMENT OF LICENSEE PERFORMANCE (SALP) INPUT FOR 10 CFR 50.49 IMPLEMENTATION INSPECTION AT ZION STATION, UNIT 2, JANUARY 14-18, 1985,

INSPECTION NO. 50-304/85-06

Enclosed you will find the inspection team's SALP evaluation for the 10 CFR 50.49 implementation inspection at Zion Station, Unit 2, January 14-18, 1985.

If you have any questions concerning the evaluation, contact U. Potapovs (492-8030) or G. Hubbard (492-9759).

Brian K. Grimes, Director
Division of Quality Assurance, Vendor
and Technical Training Center Programs
Office of Inspection and Enforcement

Distribution GHubbard UPotapovs GZech BKGrimes VPB Reading DQAVT Reading DMB-IE:09

Enclosure: As stated

VPB/IE W GHubbard: gmk 5/8/85

SC/VPB/DQAVT UPotapovs 5/8/85 BC/VPB/DQAVT GZech 5/8/85 DVD/PDAVT EKGrimes 5/8/85

8505140438 850508 PDR ADDCK 05000304 I FOO

SALP INPUT

Post Inspection SALP Performance Analysis

Facility: Zion Station, Unit 2

Functional Area: 10 CFR 50.49 Implementation Inspection

Inspection No.: 50-304/85-06

Date: January 14-18, 1985

Lead Inspector: G. T. Hubbard

Enforcement: Four Potential Enforcement/Unresolved Items

(See inspection report)

COMPARISON OF PERFORMANCE TO CRITERIA ATTRIBUTES

Criterion 1: Management Involvement and Control in Assuring Quality

Category: 1

Remarks: a. Licensee management was found to be actively involved in decision making with the majority of the administrative work performed at the corporate level.

- b. Evidence of prior planning and assignment of priorities was demonstrated by the in-depth 10 CFR 50.49 program implemented by the licensee and the completeness and detail of qualification records.
- c. Audits conducted at the plant and subcontractors were observed by the team to be both timely and thorough.
- d. Procedures and policies were considered well stated and understandable and were being strictly followed.

Criterion 2: Approach to Resolution of Technical Issues from a Safety Standpoint

Category: 1

Remarks: a. Licensee demonstrated a clear understanding of issues by the in-depth and comprehensive 10 CFR 50.49 program that was implemented.

b. Licensee's approaches to problems were considered to be timely, technically sound, and thorough in almost every case. Criterion 3: Responsiveness to NRC Initiatives

Category: 1

Remarks: Licensee's responses to NRC initiatives were considered to be

timely, technically sound, and thorough in almost all cases.

Criterion 4: Enforcement History

Category: NA

Criterion 5: Reporting and Analysis of Reportable Events

Category: NA

Criterion 6: Staffing (Including Management)

Category: 1

Remarks: Staffing was considered quite adequate as demonstrated by the

in-depth and comprehensive 10 CFR 50.49 program the licensee

has implemented.

Criterion 7: Training and Qualification Effectiveness

Category: 2

Remarks: The licensee's training program for personnel is well defined;

however, it had not been presented to a significant number of personnel at the time of the inspection. Discussions with licensee personnel during the inspection did determine that even without the formal training, personnel were aware of the

requirements associated with qualified equipment.

CONCLUSION: Category 1

Remarks: The above overall rating is given based on the remarks provided

under criteria 1, 2, 3, 6 and 7; results of the inspection as defined in the inspection report; and the team conclusion that the licensee was implementing a thorough and in-depth program to

establish qualification of equipment within the scope of

10 CFR 50.49 and maintain that equipment in a qualified status.