



STONE & WEBSTER MICHIGAN, INC.

P.O. Box 2325, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02107

PRINCIPAL STAFF			
RA	SCS	ENF	
D/RA	SCS		
A/RA	PAO		
DRP	SLO		
DRMA	RC		
DRMSF			
DE			
ML			
OL	FILE		

ED-329
SD-330

Mr. J.G. Keppler, Administrator, Region III
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
799 Roosevelt Road
Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

June 17, 1983
J.O. No. 14509
NRC File #83-06-17

SUBJECT: MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE REVIEW (June 1, 1983)

A copy of observations noted by CIO of the Management Review Committee of the discussions relating to the Quality Verification Program is attached for your review and consideration. CIO has commented upon three subjects and have indicated conditional approval of QPV.

If you have any questions with respect to this report, please contact me at (517) 631-4286, extension 486.

Very truly yours,

S.W. Baranow
Program Manager

Enclosure

SWB/ka

cc: JHarrison, NRC Glen Ellyn, IL
RCook, NRC Midland (site)
DBMiller, CPCo Midland (site)
RBKelly, S&W
APamaruso, S&W

JUN 22 1983

8306270262 830617
PDR ADOCK 05000329
A PDR

1/1 I EOI

MANAGEMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE CONSTRUCTION IMPLEMENTATION OVERVIEW OBSERVATIONS

REFERENCES - MEMO - R. Wells to J. Cook June 7, 1983
Meeting Agenda June 1, 1983

The agenda (copy attached) consisted of 7 items the first 4 of which were satisfactorily dispositioned at the April 29 meeting.

Item 5 - (Management Review Audit Team) identified 23 observations and the validity of these observations was accepted. Responsibility and target dates were assigned to each observations.

Item 6 - (Constraints) addressed the 23 observations and their impact on the Quality Verification Program (QVP) (see memo attached). Subsequent correspondence indicates that MPQAD categorizes these observations as "constraints" to QVP or "Desirable as soon as possible," 14 observations falling into the first category and 8 into the latter. The remaining observations, which concerns the development of a matrix of commitments made by CPCo to NRC is considered as a constraint by the Management Review Audit Team and "Desirable ASAP" by MPQAD.

CIO agrees with these determinations and considers that the development of a matrix indicating commitments to the NRC, responsibility and target date is a constraint to QVP.

Item 7 - (Recommendations) addresses 23 observations in subsequent correspondence. MPQAD recommends that the QVP is accepted. The recommendation is based upon the fact that the 14 "constraint" observations relate to procedures that are in draft or review and that issue of the procedures will remove constraints. The committee is expected to take appropriate action on the "constraint" issue. All items on the agenda were satisfactorily dispositioned.

During subsequent discussion CPCo indicated that trend analysis of NCRs would be performed by a consultant and in response to a question by CIO stated that procedures and job descriptions for that consultant would be available. CIO also questioned if job descriptions were available for MPQAD personnel implementing the QVP and was advised that the descriptions are available. CIO considers the QVP acceptable with the following conditions.

- (a) Copies of Job descriptions of MPQAD personnel assigned QVP duties is requested
- (b) The matrix of CPCo commitment to NRC should be complete
- (c) The 14 required to resolve Management Review Team Observations should be approved and issued

To JWCook
DBMiller

FROM RAWells *Ray Wells*

DATE June 7, 1983

SUBJECT MIDLAND ENERGY CENTER PROJECT
QVP MANAGEMENT REVIEW OPEN ITEMS
FILE 23.0 SERIAL 22848

CC BPalmer
SBaranow (S&W) w/Reference

**Consumers
Power
Company**

INTERNAL
CORRESPONDENCE

Reference: CPCo Serial 22834 dated 6/3/83 - Midland Energy Center Project
Quality Verification Program Management Review

On June 3, 1983, you were copied on a letter to J A Rutgers from Brien Palmer for me which provided minutes of the June 1, 1983, QVP Management Review and a final punchlist of open items pertaining to implementation of the QVP. The punchlist of open items was included as Attachment C to the minutes and to the best of my knowledge, captures all of the open issues covered by Reference A through F as noted on the cover sheet to Attachment C. It should, therefore, be a complete list. The task of our management team is to identify which of the open issues are truly constraints to implementing the QVP. In order to help us reach a conclusion, I am recommending below which of the items on Attachment C that I see as a constraint and which are desirable but not a constraint:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Forecast Completion Date</u>
1. Constraints	
4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 and 23 - All of these relate to resolution of comments on and approval/issue of procedures	6/13/83 - Issue Date
2. Desirable As Soon As Possible	
1 - PQCI Improvements	6/9/83
2, 3 - IR Data Base Improvements	7/31/83
5 - Material Traceability (Advise Mgmt)	6/10/83
6 - Inspection Process Control System	8/5/83
10 - Topical Report Organization Changes	6/22/83
13* - Commitment Matrix	6/10/83
14 - Issue QVP	Closed
15 - Inspection Safety on T/O Systems	No Date Yet

(*The Management Review Team recommends this as a constraint)

My analysis of the above indicates that when the procedures now in draft stage are issued, that there will be no constraints to QVP implementation and I recommend this position to the Management Review Group.

I am requesting that J W Cook take action as he feels appropriate as chairman of the Management Review Group to confirm or modify my recommendation to establish the Management Review Group's position.

jln

AGENDA FOR MANAGEMENT REVIEW OF QUALITY VERIFICATION PROGRAM (6-1-83)

- | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| ✓ I. Activity Scope and Purpose | Palmer |
| ✓ II. Organization | Palmer |
| ✓ III. Procedures | Palmer |
| ✓ IV. Training and Schedule | Palmer |
| V. Management Review Audit | Slade |
| VI. Constraints <i>limits</i> | Palmer |
| VII. Recommendations | Wells |