

## UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555



SEP 4 1981

Docket Nos.: STN 50-546 and STN 50-547

> MEMORANDUM FOR: Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director, Division of Licensing, NRR THRU: Robert L. Tedesco, Assistant Director for Licensing, DL B. J. Youngblood, Chief, Licensing Branch No. 1, DL FROM: K. L. Kiper, Project Manager, Licensing Branch No. 1, DL SUBJECT: SALP - CYCLE 2 FOR

Enclosed is the SALP information from NRR for Marble Hill, Units 1 and 2.

Kenneth L. Kiper, Project Manager Licensing Branch No. 1 Division of Licensing

FOIA-84-293

K182

Enclosure: As stated

5pp

Utility: Public Service of Indiana Facility: Marble Hill, Units 1 and 2 Appraisal Period: July 1, 1980 to June 30, 1981 Project Manager: Kenneth L. Kiper

1. Performance Elements

- <u>Quality of Response and Submittals</u>
  Insufficient information to make a judgement.
- b. Efforts Required to Obtain an Acceptable Response or Submittal Insufficient information.
- c. <u>Working Knowledge of Regulations, Guides</u> Standards and Generic Issues Average.
- d. <u>Technical Competence</u> Average.
- e. <u>Conduct of Meetings with NRR</u> Not Applicable.
- f. Long Standing Open Items None.
- g. Organizational and Management Capabilities

Insufficient information.

h. <u>Results of Operator Licensing Examinations Conducted During the</u> <u>Appraisal Period</u>

Not Applicable.

i. Performance on Specific Issues

We have been working with the applicant on the mitigation of an archeological find. The applicant was knowledgeable as how to proceed with the various steps to accomplish this and submitted adequate documentation.

- Observed Trends in Performance Insufficient data
- 3. Notable Strengths and Weaknesses

Insufficient data to make a judgement.

4. Overall Summary

or . .

Since Marble Hill is in the post-CP stage, the contact with NRR is minimal. The applicant has been cooperative and responsive when observed.

Kenneth L. Kiper, Project Manager Licensing Branch No. 1 Division of Licensing

# SALP-1

Details on "Below Aurage" Facilities in NUREG 0834 Prepared for EDO & Commission Briefing in Sept. 81 Based on in puts from Regions

I. Operating Facilities

Arkansas 1&2
 Beaver Valley 1
 Browns Ferry 1, 2&3
 Brunswick 1&2
 Crystal River 3
 Davis Besse
 Fitzpatrick
 Indian Point 2
 Nine Mile Point 1
 Oyster Creek
 Palisades
 Pilgrim
 Rancho Seco
 Salem 1&2
 Surry 1&2

II. Facilities Under Construction

4	Catawba	
<b>Q</b>	Marble Hill 182 Midland 182	
4.	South Texas 182 WNP-2	
6. 7.	Watts Bar 1&2 Zimmer	

FO1A-84-293 K/83 9/29/81

### MARBLE HILL

### I GENERAL

During the SALP-1 appraisal period the licensee has developed and implemented a formal program specifically designed to improve the regulatory performance. These included staffing and organizational changes, quality assurance program development, and the identification and resolution of problems. Incremental resumption of srfetyrelated construction, subject to the approval of the NRC, commenced subsequent to the evaluation period as described below.

The Director of IE authorized the following activities:

PSIs resumption of	of receipt inspection.	07-07-80
PSIs contractors (CCC) and Commony to resume receipt	, Cherne Contracting Corp. wealth-Lord J. V. (CLJV) t inspection.	11-13-80
CCC and CLJV to r and electrical wo	resume mechancial, piping ork.	12-05-80
Resumption of all cluding concrete	safety-related work in- placement.	03-27-81

The Order remains in place.

# II SPECIFIC

- A. <u>CONTENTION:</u> "The licensee's activities prior to and during the early part of the evaluation period displayed evidence of Project Engineering, Quality Assurance, and Construction Management weaknesses."
  - 1. Basis

During inspections conducted in April 3-6 and April 30-May 3, 1979, problems were identified relative to the placement and repair of concrete. A Management meeting with PSI was held on May 15, 1979, to discuss these findings. On June 12, 1979, the NRC received information that a former worker of the Marble Hill site had alleged improper repairs of honeycomb areas in concrete. The allegations were contained in a sworn statements submitted to the office of Nuclear Reactor Regulations (NRR) through an attorney representing an Indiana intervener group. Subsequently, Region III received a copy and initiated an investigation on June 22, 1979.

IE Inspection Reports No. 50-546 and 547/79-03, 79-04, 79-05, 79-08