



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION III
799 ROOSEVELT ROAD
GLEN ELLYN, ILLINOIS 60137

OCT 1 1984

Docket No. 50-275

MEMORANDUM FOR: Hans Schierling, Project Manager, Licensing Branch No. 3,
Division of Licensing

FROM: I. T. Yin, Senior Mechanical Engineer, Engineering Branch,
Division of Reactor Safety, RIII

SUBJECT: SALP INPUT FOR DIABLO CANYON

Per your memo dated September 20, 1984, please find attached assessment
for the SALP Board meeting for Diablo Canyon Units 1 and 2 currently scheduled
on October 17, 1984.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "I. T. Yin".

I. T. Yin,
Senior Mechanical Engineer

Enclosure: As Stated

cc: J. G. Keppler

A handwritten file number "9/28" with a checkmark or "X" drawn through it.

8607280079 860723
PDR FOIA
HALE86-489 PDR

(13)

SALP Evaluation Diablo Canyon Unit 1, January 1, 1983 - June 30, 1984
NRR Activity: Piping and Support Review Effort
Prepared By: I. T. Yin, Engineering Branch, RIII
Overall Performance Category: 3

1. Management Involvement in Assuring Quality

Performance Category

3

Basis

The lack of licensee management concern of QA provision and implementation resulted in violation of just about all the NRC regulations applicable to piping design control including 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criteria 2, 16, 5, 3, 18, and 17.

2. Approach to Resolution of Technical Issues from Safety Standpoint

Performance Category

3

Basis

The approach to resolution of NRC identified significant technical issues resulted from its QA breakdown has been: (1) analyzing it away rather than improving the component design, (2) minimum in review and evaluation coverage, and (3) ignoring the possibility that similar problems could exist in other areas.

3. Responsiveness to NRC Initiatives

Performance Category

3

Basis

The licensee has not been responsive to the inspection findings. The common approach was to negotiate with the staff management rather than to resolve the noncompliance and issues with the inspector. Some of the corrective actions had been lacking in depth or unjustifiably compromised.

4. Enforcement History

Performance Category

Basis

No inspection or evaluation conducted.

5. Reporting and Analysis of Reportable Events

Performance Category

-
Basis

No inspection or evaluation conducted.

6. Staffing (Including Management)

Performance Category

3

Basis

There has been a severe shortage of site QA/QC personnel to ensure that piping design activities are in compliance with the NRC regulations and the established program provisions. The head of the Onsite Project Engineering Group, himself the former licensee site QA supervisor, ignored or bypassed many QA program requirements.

7. Training Effectiveness and Qualification

Performance Category

3

Basis

The general and special technical/QA training programs were inadequate. Procedure requirements had continuously been ignored. Site contractor design personnel had been working months without indoctrination or training using unapproved methods and reference materials.



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

October 3, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR: G. W. Knighton, Chief
Licensing Branch No. 3
Division of Licensing

FROM: W. R. Butler, Chief
Containment Systems Branch
Division of Systems Integration

SUBJECT: SALP INPUT FOR DIABLO CANYON

The memorandum from H. Schierling of your branch, dated September 20, 1984, requested that we provide a SALP input for Diablo Canyon, specifically for the effort related to the allegations concerning debris from unqualified paints inside containment. The appropriate SALP input was attached to the memorandum transmitting our SER on this subject (Houston to Novak, dated June 29, 1984). A copy of that input is attached.

WR Butler

W. R. Butler, Chief
Containment Systems Branch
Division of Systems Integration

Attachment:
As stated

cc: R. Houston
T. Novak
H. Schierling

CONTACT: J. Pulsipher, CSB: DSI
x29483

8410160720

(14)

ENCLOSURE 2

SALP

prepared by the Containment Systems Branch

| Evaluation Criteria | Category | Diablo Canyon, Units 1 and 2 Narrative Description |
|---|----------|--|
| 1. Management Involvement | | N/A |
| 2. Approach to Resolution of Technical Issues | 2 | The licensee has generally demonstrated understanding of the issues. Their approach was viable and sound from a safety standpoint. |
| 3. Responsiveness | 2 | The licensee responded to NRC concerns in a positive and timely manner. |
| 4. Enforcement History | | N/A |
| 5. Reportable Events | | N/A |
| 6. Staffing | | N/A |
| 7. Training | | N/A |

NRR Activity: Technical SpecificationsPrepared by: Fredric Anderson Branch: SSPBOverall Performance Category: 2⁺

| Evaluation Criterion | Performance Category | Basis |
|--|----------------------|--|
| 1. Management Involvement in Assuring Quality | 2 | Licensor management has been involved in the resolution of technical specification issues and has anticipated possible problem areas that would need resolution. |
| 2. Approach to Resolution of Technical Issues from Safety Standpoint | 1 | Licensor has demonstrated a complete understanding for technical specification issues and has provided the requested information promptly. |
| 3. Responsiveness to NRC Initiatives | 1 | Licensor has demonstrated exceptional cooperativeness and promptness in responding to technical specification issues and requests for additional information. |
| 4. Enforcement History | N. A. | |
| 5. Reporting and Analysis of Reportable Events | N. A. | |
| 6. Staffing (Including Management) | 2 | Licensor's key positions are identified and responsibilities are well-defined. Technical specification discussions between licensor and NRC are directed through several people which causes some confusion as to primary responsibility for licensee. |
| 7. Training Effectiveness and Qualification | 1 | Licensor staff appears to have a superior knowledge of technical specifications and bases. |

SALP Evaluation Diablo Canyon Unit 1, January 1, 1983 - June 30, 1984

NRR Activity: SEISMIC ASPECTS IN CIVIL/STRUCTURAL AREA

Enclosure 3

Prepared by: H. PONK Branch: SGEB/DEOverall Performance Category: 2

| Evaluation Criterion | Performance Category | Basis |
|--|----------------------|---|
| 1. Management Involvement in Assuring Quality | <u>2</u> | Management seemed to be knowledgeable to a very detailed level of the workings of the analysis under review or discussion during the many meetings held during the relicensing of Unit 1 |
| 2. Approach to Resolution of Technical Issues from Safety Standpoint | <u>2</u> | Management directed that resolutions meet the design criteria established for the project and seemed to be conscientious about addressing technical issues so that the safety margins of the plant were maintained. |
| 3. Responsiveness to NRC Initiatives | <u>2</u> | Management responded quickly to request for information during audits and reviews. Seemed to be interested in providing information to answer staff questions. |
| 4. Enforcement History | | No basis for evaluating |
| 5. Reporting and Analysis of Reportable Events | | No basis for evaluating |
| 6. Staffing (Including Management) | <u>2</u> | Organization and manpower levels seemed to be adequate for the particular job to be done. |
| 7. Training Effectiveness and Qualification | | NO BASIS FOR EVALUATING |

Prepared by: M. Harriman, R. Busnach Branch: MESTDVPOverall Performance Category: 2

| Evaluation Criterion | Performance Category | Basis |
|--|----------------------|---|
| 1. Management Involvement in Assuring Quality | 2 | Management responded satisfactorily when addressing safety issues by recognizing and remedying various defective design practices and insuring and supervising that proper procedures were carried out by design personnel. |
| 2. Approach to Resolution of Technical Issues from Safety Standpoint | 2 | Licensee technical personnel addressed and resolved satisfactorily all technical concerns raised by the staff. |
| 3. Responsiveness to NRC Initiatives | 1 | Licensee responded promptly to requests for information and resolution of issues. |
| 4. Enforcement History | N/A | |
| 5. Reporting and Analysis of Reportable Events | N/A | |
| 6. Staffing (Including Management) | 2 | Staffing appeared to be adequate |
| 7. Training Effectiveness and Qualification | 2 | Technical staff appeared to have adequate technical information and training for the performance of their work |

Prepared by: H. WalkerBranch: EQBOverall Performance Category: 2

| Evaluation Criterion | Performance Category | Basis |
|--|----------------------|---|
| 1. Management Involvement in Assuring Quality | <u>2</u> | management involvement were evident, records generally complete, procurements generally well controlled and documented and reviews generally technically sound. |
| 2. Approach to Resolution of Technical Issues from Safety Standpoint | <u>2</u> | While the approach to resolving technical issues are generally sound, there appeared to have been some difficulty in understanding some issues. However, from a safety standpoint the overall rating should be 2. |
| 3. Responsiveness to NRC Initiatives | <u>2</u> | Generally, timely responses and acceptable resolutions were proposed; however there were one longstanding technical issue (Electro-Hydraulic actuator) that were finally resolved. |
| 4. Enforcement History | | cannot make a judgment here. |
| 5. Reporting and Analysis of Reportable Events | <u>2</u> | Events were accurately identified and corrective action taken. |
| 6. Staffing (Including Management) | | Cannot make a judgment here. |
| 7. Training Effectiveness and Qualification | | Cannot make a judgment. |

NRR Activity: IDVP (nonsismic design issues) and Component Cooling Water System Design Allegations
 Prepared by: J. Wermiel Branch: ASB

Enclosure 3

Note:
double input

Overall Performance Category: 2

| Evaluation Criterion | Performance Category | Basis | IDVP & Alleg |
|--|----------------------|---|--------------|
| 1. Management Involvement in Assuring Quality | <u>2</u> | Management involvement was strong initially in the IDVP and allegations reviews, but some degradation in quality of responses and licensee effort was noted later on. | |
| 2. Approach to Resolution of Technical Issues from Safety Standpoint | <u>2</u> | The licensee generally demonstrated an approach to resolution of technical concerns which indicated a knowledge of staff criteria and safety. | |
| 3. Responsiveness to NRC Initiatives | <u>2</u> | Responsiveness to staff concerns varied throughout the review process, but the licensee usually provided timely inputs. | |
| 4. Enforcement History | <u>N/A</u> | | |
| 5. Reporting and Analysis of Reportable Events | <u>N/A</u> | | |
| 6. Staffing (Including Management) | <u>2</u> | Reasonable not licensee manpower including the necessary management oversight was provided for resolution of IDVP and allegation concerns. | |
| 7. Training Effectiveness and Qualification | <u>N/A</u> | | |

Prepared by: D.R. Hashem Branch: RRAB

Overall Performance Category: 1

| Evaluation Criterion | Performance Category | Basis |
|--|----------------------|--|
| 1. Management Involvement in Assuring Quality | 1 | Direct communication with the SISP Project Engineer and his Vice President which allowed the assessment of the allegations relative to the program to proceed effectively. |
| 2. Approach to Resolution of Technical Issues from Safety Standpoint | 1 | Approach and organization of the issues involved was demonstrated. Resolution of those were based on a conservative ie - fire or modify the items within their specified time and money available. |
| 3. Responsiveness to NRC Initiatives | 2 | Technically sound and usually thorough, but not always timely responses made to NRC initiatives, however the decisional basis often times may have resulted from the lack number of items and other programs being handled by this division at the time. |
| 4. Enforcement History | N.A. | No basis for assessment. |
| 5. Reporting and Analysis of Reportable Events | N.A. | No basis for assessment. |
| 6. Staffing (Including Management) | N.A. | No basis for assessment. |
| 7. Training Effectiveness and Qualification | N/A. | No basis for assessment. |

NRR Activity: BOLTED CONNECTIONSPrepared by: H. POLK Branch: SGEB / DEOverall Performance Category: 2

| Evaluation Criterion | Performance Category | Basis |
|--|----------------------|--|
| 1. Management Involvement in Assuring Quality | 2 | During meetings management at the plant site and the engineering office were prepared, involved and concerned that the bolts were shown adequate. |
| 2. Approach to Resolution of Technical Issues from Safety Standpoint | 2 | The technical assessments of the bolting issues were adequately addressed as evidenced by the documentation and the prevailing standards used as well as the currently available literature and testing results. |
| 3. Responsiveness to NRC Initiatives | 2 | The management was willing and eager to furnish material requested by the staff and to provide access into the plant which were subject to the allegations on bolting. |
| 4. Enforcement History | | No Basis for EVALUATING |
| 5. Reporting and Analysis of Reportable Events | | No Basis for evaluating |
| 6. Staffing (Including Management) | 2 | The level of staffing including necessary management was adequate and evident during meetings and plant tours. |
| 7. Training Effectiveness and Qualification | | No Basis for evaluating |

SALP Evaluation Diablo Canyon Unit 1, January 1, 1983 - June 30, 1984

NRR Activity: UNQUALIFIED PAINT AND POST ACCIDENT SAMPLING SYSTEM

Enclosure 3

Prepared by: FRANK J. WITT Branch: CHEMICAL ENGINEERINGOverall Performance Category: 1

| Evaluation Criterion | Performance Category | Basis |
|--|----------------------|---|
| 1. Management Involvement in Assuring Quality | 1 | During the review there was consistent evidence of prior planning and assignment of priorities |
| 2. Approach to Resolution of Technical Issues from Safety Standpoint | 1 | The licensee exhibited technically sound and thorough approaches and resolved issues timely in almost all cases |
| 3. Responsiveness to NRC Initiatives | 1 | The licensee met deadlines and presented technically sound responses in almost all cases |
| 4. Enforcement History | NA | <i>Note: Dennis Kubicki provided SALP input with fire protection SER.</i> |
| 5. Reporting and Analysis of Reportable Events | NA | |
| 6. Staffing (Including Management) | NA | |
| 7. Training Effectiveness and Qualification | NA | |

ANNUAL EVALUATION Diablo Canyon Unit 1, January 1, 1983 - June 30, 1984

RRR Activity: PIPING & SUPPORT REVIEW EFFORT (LICENSING COD. #167 Enclosure 3 AND IDUP REVIEW)

Prepared by: KAMAL MANOLY Branch: DEV. OF ENG.&TECH. PROG., REGION I

Overall Performance Category: 2

| Evaluation Criterion | Performance Category | Basis |
|--|----------------------|--|
| 1. Management Involvement in Assuring Quality | 2 | PG&E MANAGEMENT EXHIBITED AN EVIDENCE OF PRIOR PLANNING IN ADDRESSING THIS ACTIVITY; THE DECISION MAKING WAS USUALLY AT A LEVEL THAT INSURED ADEQUATE MNGT. REVIEWS; PROCEDURES WERE GENERALLY WELL CONTROLLED; REVIEWS WERE TIMELY; COMMITTEES WHICH INTERFACED WITH NRC STAFF WERE PROPERLY STAFFED AND FUNCTIONING. |
| 2. Approach to Resolution of Technical Issues From Safety Standpoint | 1 | CLEAR UNDERSTANDING OF TECHNICAL ISSUES WAS EVIDENT; CONSERVATISM ROUTINELY EXHIBITED IN DESIGN ACTIVITIES; VABLE AND GENERALLY SOUND AND THOROUGH APPROACHES; AND, TIMELY SOLUTIONS, IN ALMOST ALL CASES. NOTE: THE OVERLAPPING FACTOR IN MAKING THIS ASSESSMENT IS SAFETY. |
| 3. Responsiveness to NRC Initiatives | 1 | THE LICENSEE'S STAFF WAS VERY RESPONSIVE TO NRC INITIATIVES REGARDING ABOVE ACTIVITY. RESPONSES PROVIDED TO THE NRC STAFF WERE GENERALLY ACCEPTABLE. |
| 4. Enforcement History | N/A | CAN NOT DRAW A CONCLUSION REGARDING ENFORCEMENT HISTORY ON BASIS OF FOUR MONTH INVOLVEMENT IN DIABLO CANYON #1 LICENSING. |
| 5. Reporting and Analysis of Reportable Events | 1 | THE LICENSEE WAS PROMPT IN REPORTING ANY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE WHILE ADDRESSING THESE LICENSING CONDITIONS, FINDINGS WERE FURNISHED IDENTIFIED. |
| 6. Staffing (including Management) | 2 | THE PERFORMANCE RATING IS BASED ON OBSERVATION OF STAFFING BEFORE AND AFTER THE LICENSING CONDITIONS. THERE WAS AN EVIDENCE OF IMPROVEMENT IN STAFFING DURING THE LAST FOUR MONTHS BEFORE THE FULL POWER HEARING IN AUG. 84. |
| Training Effectiveness and Qualification | 2 | TRAINING AND QUALIFICATION EFFECTIVENESS WERE MORE EVIDENT IN THE LATTER STAGE. ADEQUATE UNDERSTANDING AND FAIR ADHERANCE TO PROCEDURES WAS EVIDENT WITH MODEST NUMBER OF ERRORS. IN ADDITION, DEFINED PROGRAMS WERE IMPLEMENTED FOR IN-PLACE TRAINING OF STAFF. |

Prepared by: Mr. HARTZMAN Branch: MEB

Overall Performance Category: 3

| Evaluation Criterion | Performance Category | Basis and deficiency <i>high error rate of pipe supports and its audits indicates that management did not adequately supervise the quality of the designs done by the design groups.</i> | <i>(found during piping and support audits)</i> |
|--|----------------------|--|---|
| 1. Management Involvement in Assuring Quality | 3 | <i>The error rate of pipe supports and its audits indicates that management did not adequately supervise the quality of the designs done by the design groups.</i> | |
| 2. Approach to Resolution of Technical Issues from Safety Standpoint | 3 | <i>Management disregarded or did not consider as necessary certain technical design procedures important for safety design of piping and supports.</i> | |
| 3. Responsiveness to NRC Initiatives | 1 | <i>Licensee responded promptly to requests for information and resolution of issues.</i> | |
| 4. Enforcement History | N/A | <i>Not applicable</i> | |
| 5. Reporting and Analysis of Reportable Events | N/A | <i>Not applicable</i> | |
| 6. Staffing (Including Management) | 2 | <i>Staffing appeared to be adequate.</i> | |
| 7. Training Effectiveness and Qualification | 2 | <i>Technical staff appeared to have adequate technical information and training for the performance of their work.</i> | |

NRR Activity: Piping and Supports Review EffortPrepared by: E. Sullivan Branch: TA / DE

Overall Performance Category: _____

| Evaluation Criterion | Performance Category | Basis |
|--|----------------------|--|
| 1. Management Involvement in Assuring Quality | 3 | Although engineering design and construction was virtually always found adequate in our reviews, lack of PG&E management involvement resulted in frequent misuses of the "quick fix" and "Diablo Problem" programs and a high rate of minor design errors. |
| 2. Approach to Resolution of Technical Issues from Safety Standpoint | 1 | PG&E exhibited a clear understanding of the technical issues and their safety significance. Responses were timely, sound and thorough in most cases. A typical example was the resolution of license condition 2.c.(II) item 4 on Thermal Gaps. |
| 3. Responsiveness to NRC Initiatives | 1 | PG&E was responsive in providing timely information at various stages in the resolution of the license conditions. PG&E was notably responsive in arranging well timed additional hot functional testing for NRC observation in connection with 2.c.(II) item 4. |
| 4. Enforcement History | — | No basis to rank |
| 5. Reporting and Analysis of Reportable Events | — | No basis to rank |
| 6. Staffing (Including Management) | — | No basis to rank |
| 7. Training Effectiveness and Qualification | — | No basis to rank |