



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

November 1, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR: Regional Administrators
Director, Office of Inspection and
Enforcement
Director, Office of the Executive Legal
Director
Director, Office of Nuclear Material
Safety and Safeguards
NRR Division Directors

FROM: Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director
Division of Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: OL REVIEW MANAGEMENT REPORT

Enclosed is the OL Review Management Report for the month of September 1984. For the most part, the information in this report reflects the status of the subject plants as of mid-October 1984. All the inputs for this report were reviewed by the applicable DL Project Manager. Therefore, if warranted and the information were readily available, some portions of the report were updated beyond the mid-October 1984 cutoff date. The Callaway report has been deleted because a full-power license was issued on October 18, 1984.

Please provide your markup of this report to me by COB November 15, 1984, the cutoff date for the next report.

Frank J. Mrazek
for Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director
Division of Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosure: As stated

cc: H. Denton
T. Novak
Licensing Branches #1-4

8506180112 850401
PDR FOIA
SUGARMAB5-103 PDR

B2

IDVP Review

The applicant's letter of May 8, 1984 submitted a program plan for the IDVP. The staff and the applicant met on May 9, to discuss the plan. The staff's letter of May 15, 1984 stated that the staff finds the program plan acceptable subject to certain programmatic modifications. Revision A of the Program Plan was submitted by the applicant's letter of June 6, 1984. A letter of acceptance of Revision A has been issued. Subsequently, on August 8-9, 1984, the staff communicated problems it had with the depth of the review being performed. The IDVP performer, Torrey Pines Technology, agreed to changes to meet the staff's concerns. The staff issuance of an SSER on the results of the IDVP is not expected to be completed before fuel loading, since the final IDVP report is not expected to be issued by Torrey Pines until October 19, 1984. By letter dated September 12, 1984, the staff requested PECO and Torrey Pines each to submit their independent assessment as to whether the findings identified to date, either individually or in aggregate, should delay granting of the low-power operating license. Torrey Pines, by letter dated September 21, 1984, and PECO, by letter dated September 25, 1984, both concluded that fuel loading and ascent to 5% power should not be delayed. On September 25 and 26, 1984, the staff reviewed the findings identified to date and made a similar finding that the low-power operating license should be granted. Review of Torrey Pines' final report and implementation of all associated corrective action plans is expected before granting a full-power operating license.

OI Investigations

Presently there is one OI investigation involving the Limerick facility.

Other Potential Problems

PECO intends to use water from the Delaware River for make-up for condenser cooling evaporative loss when the Schuylkill River is not available based on flow and/or temperature restrictions. Power production would be possible only part of the year without the supplemental water. Construction of the Point Pleasant Station by the local water resource authority, which would divert Delaware River water for several uses, including Limerick, has been delayed by opposition of local county officials. The work will not be completed until well into 1985. Resolution of this issue involves the two affected counties, Local Water Resources Commission, as well as the applicant and other governmental agencies.



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

June 20, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR: Regional Administrators
Director, Office of Inspection & Enforcement
Director, Office of the Executive Legal Director
Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and
Safeguards
NRR Division Directors

FROM: Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director
Division of Licensing, NRR

SUBJECT: OL REVIEW MANAGEMENT REPORT

In a memorandum dated February 13, 1984, Harold R. Denton described the monthly report on licensing status to be issued by the Division of Licensing, NRR. This report was to cover plants within six months of the staff's estimate of the plant's construction completion date (CCD). Over the last two to three months the staff has also developed, in narrative form, detailed licensing status reports for each plant within 12 months of the applicant's CCD. Since the purpose of these documents is similar, we have decided to combine them into a single report which will continue to be issued on a monthly basis. Enclosure 2 is the first of such reports. Enclosure 1 provides some additional guidance concerning the distribution and updating of this report.

In its final form the report for each plant will consist of the following four parts:

- 1) a narrative summary of licensing status;
- 2) a table of open FSAR issues;
- 3) a table of open allegations; and
- 4) an integrated schedule of NRC activities to be completed before licensing.

This first report does not contain each of the four parts listed above. In particular, you will find that there are no integrated schedules and few allegation tables. A draft table of allegations has been included for Catawba as an example of what we expect to develop for these plants in the near future.

The integrated schedules for Waterford, Comanche Peak, Fermi 1, Wolf Creek, Diablo Canyon 1/2, Byron 1, and Limerick 1 are being developed in accordance with the EDO's memorandum of May 25, 1984. When finalized and approved, these schedules will become part of this monthly report. The plans for developing schedules on the remaining plants are under review.

8407260378
3R
B3

I believe this report will provide the broadest exposure of NRC issues to be solved prior to licensing and assure appropriate management attention consistent with meeting schedular commitments.

Frank J. Miraglia
for Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director
Division of Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosure:
As stated

OI Investigations

Presently there are no OI investigations involving the Limerick facility.

Other Potential Problems

PECo intends to use water from the Delaware River for make-up for condenser cooling evaporative loss when the Schuylkill River is not available based on flow and/or temperature restrictions. Power production would be possible only part of the year without the supplemental water. Construction of the Point Pleasant Station by the local water resource authority, which would divert Delaware River water for several uses, including Limerick, has been delayed by opposition of local county officials. It is possible that the work will not be completed until early 1985, if at all. Last fall the Public Utility Commission ruled that Delaware River Diversion will be limited to 10 million GPD until an analysis using actual data is performed which shows that there are no unacceptable environmental effects. Limerick 1 could require up to 23 million GPD, depending on power levels and the availability of Schuylkill River water. Resolution of this issue involves the two affected counties, Local Water Resources Commission, as well as the applicant and other governmental agencies. Alternative arrangements for supplemental cooling can be pursued by the applicant independent of the Point Pleasant project.