

84\$8270526XA

(9.)

SALP INPUT EVALUATION

DIABLO CANYON SAFEGUARDS REVIEW

Criteria		Category
1.	Management Involvement and Control in Assuring Quality	1
	The applicant has provided consistent evidence of prior planning and assignment of priorities. Decision making is consistently at a level that ensures adequate management review.	
2.	Approach to Resolution of Technical Issues from a Safety Standpoint	-1
	The applicant has provided technically sound, timely, and thorough approaches in a almost all cases.	
3.	Responsiveness to NRC Initiatives	1
	The applicant provides timely, acceptable resolutions of issues initially in most cases.	
4.	Enforcement History	N/A
5.	Reporting of Reportable Events	N/A
6.	Staffing (Including Management)	1
	Positions are identified, authorities and responsibilities are well defined.	
7.	Training and Qualification Effectiveness	1
	The safeguards training and qualification plan and pro-	

ADDRESSEES:

J. P. Knight

P. T. Kuo

H. Polk

M. Hartzman

J. Wermiel

H. Walker

D. Lasher

F. Coffman

F. Witt

J. Pulsipher

T. Marsh

C. Liang

R. Bosnak

K. Manoli

T. Sullivan

L. Reiter

L. Crocker

F. Anderson

R. Heischman

D. Kubicki

B. Buckley

S. Brocoum

9/10/84

Hours ander was not done
and July was he wanted
until July de evaluate
artinta during the evaluate
activity applications

Med mults from
Wollow

Hishrafiel W.O. and.

affailed w.O. and.



UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON D. C. 20555

September 10, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Richard H. Vollmer. Director

Division of Engineering

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM:

Robert F. Heishman, Chief

Reactor Construction Programs Branch

Division of Quality Assurance, Safeguards,

and Inspection Programs

Office of Inspection and Enforcement

SUBJECT:

COMPLETION OF PIPING REVIEW ACTIVITIES FOR DIABLO CANYON

As described in my memo to you dated July 11, 1984, a team composed of myself, D. Allison (IE), A. DuBouchet (consultant) and J. Crews (RV) performed a review of the implementation of commitments made to the NRC in Enclosure 3 to PG&E Letter No. DCL-84-238 dated June 26, 1984 (Attachment 1). This review was performed during the period July 17-21, 1984 at the Diablo Canyon Project offices in San Francisco and at the plant site.

Specifically, this review looked at programmatic provisions for current and future work. Based on the inspection sample it appears that:

- (1) Training programs are up to date and are being kept current.
- (2) Engineering procedures are adequate and are being implemented.
- (3) Audits, responses and corrective actions are adequate and timely.
- (4) Cancellation of the tolerance clarification program has effectively addressed concerns about the controls in this area.
- (5) The transfer of design responsibility to the home office has been effectively carried out.

Attachments 2, 3 and 4 address the detailed results of the review conducted in the Corporate Offices as they relate to the previously identified deficiencies. It should be noted that the original deficiencies were identified in the Onsite Project Engineering Group organization, however, due to the transfer of the design engineering responsibility to the home office, the team reviewed the implementation in the current organization.

840918\$390

Richard H. Vollmer - 2 -September 10, 1984 Attachment 5 addresses the onsite review of current activities of OPEC which are related to the previously identified deficiencies. Robert F. Heishman, Chief Reactor Construction Programs Branch Division of Quality Assurance, Safeguards, and Inspection Programs Office of Inspection and Enforcement Attachments: As stated cc w/attachments: R. DeYoung J. Taylor H. Denton J. N. Grace D. Eisenhut G. Knighton J. Crews, Region V A. DuBochet I. Yin, Region III