

October 29, 1996

NOTE TO: Jim Taylor, EDO
FROM: Frank Miraglia, Acting Director, NRR (Original signed by)
SUBJECT: RATIONALE FOR SELECTING PLANTS FOR DESIGN INSPECTIONS

In July 1996, NRR provided interim guidance to the regions for selecting candidate plants for design inspections based upon the SALP rating in engineering, watch list status, and currently scheduled engineering team inspections. This guidance was developed to be consistent with the plan to have AE contracts in place by September 30 (goal met) and to initiate three inspections in November 1996. Once the candidate plants were provided by the regions, NRR developed a schedule based on licensee conflicts, the type of contractor teams available, and conflict of interest restrictions.

Attached is the original list of plants as identified by the regions and a rationale for the initial three design inspections starting in November: TMI, St. Lucie, and WNP. Additional plants are being considered for inspections in the second quarter of FY 97. The plants being considered are: Perry, Farley, and either ANO 2 or Beaver Valley. The rationale for those plants is also attached.

The recent 10 CFR 50.54(f) letters, dated October 9, 1996, requested information regarding the adequacy and availability of design basis information. NRR is currently evaluating the interim plant selection criteria and will incorporate the responses to the 50.54(f) letters in making future plant selections.

Attachments: As stated

Distribution:

FMiraglia, NRR
FPGillespie, NRR
RMGallo, NRR
DPNorkin, NRR
RZimmerman, NRR
JRoe, NRR
SVarga, NRR
TMartin, NRR
BSheron, NRR

PSIB R/F
Central Files
Glenn Tracy

TO: R-5 Facility
license
X IDSR-12

~~10/29~~
11/1
6/19

*Previously concurred

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\PLT.SEL

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without enclosures "E" = Copy with enclosures "N" = No copy

OFFICE	DISP:NRR	DISP:NRR	DISP:NRR	DISP:NRR	DISP:NRR
NAME	DPNorkin	RMGallo	FPGillespie	FMiraglia	
DATE	10/24/96*	10/24/96*	10/24/96*	10/24/96	

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

211-97

5pb

☆

Noted
Change 5 to
Attach. 1

9611040178

5pb

XA

96-138

NOTE TO: Jim Taylor, EDO
 FROM: Frank Miraglia, Acting Director, NRR
 SUBJECT: RATIONALE FOR SELECTING PLANTS FOR DESIGN INSPECTIONS

In July 1996, NRR requested that regions identify candidate plants to allow three AE teams to each perform one design inspection per quarter over the next year, a total of 12 inspections. This request was based on the plan to have AE contracts in place by September 30 (goal met) and to initiate three inspections in November 1996. Attached is the original list of plants as identified by the regions. Due to conflict of interest concerns, we have eliminated Monticello and Brunswick and moved WNP earlier in the schedule with Region IV concurrence. Region II has subsequently identified Farley for a design inspection and that plant is being considered for early inspection. Attached is a rationale for the initial three design inspections starting in November: TMI, St. Lucie, and WNP.

Your recent 10 CFR 50.54(f) letters, dated October 9, 1996, requested information regarding the adequacy and availability of design basis information. NRR's July 1996 request to the regions had stated that plant selection and prioritization should consider SALP rating in engineering, watch list status, and currently scheduled major team inspections. NRR will review its plant selection and prioritization criteria and request that the regions revisit their plant selections when the responses to the 50.54(f) letter are received.

Attachments: As stated

Distribution:
 PSIB R/F

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\PTL.SEL

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without enclosures "E" = Copy with enclosures "M" = No copy

OFFICE	DISP:NRR	E	DISP:NRR	E	DISP:NRR		D:NRR		
NAME	DPNork1R		AMGallo		FPGINesple		FJMiraglia		
DATE	10/17/96		10/14/96		10/14/96		10/ /96		

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Architect Engineer Design Inspection ScheduleCANDIDATE SITES SUGGESTED BY THE REGIONS

	<u>PWR 1</u>	<u>PWR 2</u>	<u>BWR</u>
FY 97-1	TMI (Gilbert) (L) (W) Diablo (PG&E) (L) (W)	St. Lucie (Ebasco)(L)	Monticello (Bechtel) (L)
FY 97-2	ANO Unit 2 (Bechtel) (L)		Perry (Gilbert) (L) (W) Brunswick (UE&C) (L)
FY 97-3	DC Cook (AEP) (L) (W) Diablo (PG&E) (L) (W)	Waterford (Ebasco)(L)	Nine Mile (S&W)(L) Hope Creek (Bechtel) VY (Ebasco)(L) (W) Hatch (Bechtel)(L)(W)
FY 97-4	Indian Pt. 3 (UE&C) (L) Sequoyah (TVA) (L)	Point Beach (Bechtel)(W)	WNP (Burns & Roe) (L)(W)
FY 98-1	San Onofre (Bechtel)(L) (W)		

(L) - Sargent & Lundy has no conflict at this site (not original AE and no retrofit work exceeding \$10 M))

(W) - Stone & Webster has no conflict at this site (not original AE and no retrofit work exceeding \$10 M))

At Hope Creek both S&L and S&W have performed or performing significant work

RATIONALE FOR INITIAL PLANTS SELECTED FOR DESIGN INSPECTIONS

IMI

Region has expressed concerns regarding GPUN engineering. In past year, there was an RCS drain line support issue leading to escalated enforcement and weak engineering management oversight of MOV program, e.g., significant valve factor justification inadequacies.

St. Lucie

Severity Level III violation for operator over-dilution of RCS indicated engineering problems, e.g., engineering not aware that dilution process did not comply with FSAR. Evaluate whether engineering cutbacks have negatively impacted performance. Several design control issues since the last SALP. FSAR review found over 600 discrepancies (mostly not substantive) indicating configuration control problem.

WNP

SALP 3 in engineering last three cycles. Licensee has engineered many BOP modifications. Recent major modifications indicate continued weak engineering. WNP had been scheduled for an IPAP, augmented with an SSFI, to address design/licensing basis issues. Due to the focus on design/licensing basis issues, it was considered prudent to have the architect-engineer design inspection replace the IPAP/SSFI.

RATIONALE FOR PLANTS CONSIDERED FOR SECOND QUARTER FY 97 DESIGN INSPECTIONS

Farley

Number one priority based on regional re-review of plants. Areas where Farley ranked highest in priority were average age of units, risk ranking, and the low number of safety systems addressed under their design document reconstitution. Lack of knowledge regarding the AE-Southern Services.

Perry

History of design and engineering problems. SALP 2 in Engineering with indications of improvement. Additional engineering inspection is needed to validate the indications of improvement. Only Gilbert designed plant in Region 3.

ANO Unit 2

Longstanding concerns with plant design and equipment operability. Many hardware and programmatic changes since Entergy became owner. Additional engineering inspection is needed to verify that the changes have been effective.

Beaver Valley

BV engineering has shown signs of not being thorough, although at the SALP Board just completed they were considered to have an overall good engineering program. The licensee showed good engineering curiosity in pursuing design issues related to AMSAC, component cooling water piping overpressurization and fire suppression system design. However, each of these issues had gone unidentified for an extended period of time, and a long-standing risk-significant issue involving Power Operated Relief Valve (PORV) block valve lineup was recently identified by the NRC and not by the licensee.