

# OPEN CASE CHRONOLOGY

04-Apr-97

## RII-1996-A-0249

		<u>DATE RECEIVED</u>	<u>DATE ASSIGNED</u>	<u>DATE DUE</u>	<u>DATE COMPLETE</u>	<u>DAYS TO COMPLETE</u>
<u>Concern</u>	1	12/16/96	3/18/97	3/18/97	3/18/97	0
<u>Action</u>		<i>Other</i>				
<u>Description</u>		INFORMED ALGR BY LTR THAT TECH ISSUE WILL BE TRACKED BY RII-1996-A-0249. RII-1997-A-0058 TRACKS DOL COMPLAINT.				
<u>Concern</u>	1		3/18/97	3/18/97	3/18/97	0
<u>Action</u>		<i>Other</i>				
<u>Description</u>		INFORMED ALGR BY LTR THAT HIS TECH ISSUE BE TRACKED BY RII-1996-A-0249. RII-1997-A-0058 TRACKS DOL COMPLAINT.				
<u>Concern</u>	1		3/13/97	3/21/97	3/17/97	4
<u>Action</u>		<i>Other</i>				
<u>Description</u>		ARB MEETING. OPEN NEW CASE TO TRACK DOL ACTION (REF: RII-1997-A-0058)				
<u>Concern</u>	1		2/18/97	4/30/97		
<u>Action</u>		<i>Other</i>				
<u>Description</u>		1/15/1997 DATE OF COMPLAINT. DD PENDING				
<u>Concern</u>	1		2/18/97	3/14/97	3/13/97	23
<u>Action</u>		<i>ARB Meeting</i>				
<u>Description</u>		ARB REQUIRED FOR DOL COMPLAINT SO OI CAN OPEN CASE.				
<u>Concern</u>	1		2/18/97	3/18/97	3/18/97	28
<u>Action</u>		<i>Acknowledgement Letter</i>				
<u>Description</u>		ACKNOWLEDGEMENT LETTER REQUIRED FOR DOL COMPLAINT. NOTE, THE 3/18/97 ACK LTR FOR RII-1997-A-0058 ADDRESSES THIS DOL COMPLAINT. DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINT WILL BE TRACKED UNDER RII-1997-A-0058, WHILE TECH ISSUES UNDER RII-1996-A-0249.				
<u>Concern</u>	1		2/10/97	2/10/97	2/10/97	0
<u>Action</u>		<i>Phone Call w/Alleger</i>				
<u>Description</u>		RCVD CALL FROM ALGR. ALGR RCVD ACK LTR. REGARDING ENCLOSED STATEMENT OF CONCERNS, ALGR SAID THAT HE WILL PROVIDE ADDITIONAL INFO TO WBN SRI WHEN SUBMITTING PER. ALGR SAID HE FILED COMPLAINT WITH DOL.				

12 w/118

RII-1996-A-0249

		<u>DATE RECEIVED</u>	<u>DATE ASSIGNED</u>	<u>DATE DUE</u>	<u>DATE COMPLETE</u>	<u>DAYS TO COMPLETE</u>
<u>Concern</u>	1	<del>12/16/96</del>	2/5/97	2/5/97	2/5/97	0
<u>Action</u>			<i>Phone Call w/Alleger</i>			
<u>Description</u>			RCVD CALL FROM ALGR. STILL HASN'T RCVD ACK LTR. TOLD ALGR THAT I WILL RESEND ANOTHER ACK LTR.			
<u>Concern</u>	1		1/31/97	1/31/97	1/31/97	0
<u>Action</u>			<i>Phone Call w/Alleger</i>			
<u>Description</u>			RCVD CALL FROM ALGR. DIDN'T RECEIVE 1/14/97 ACK LTR. SAID BROKEN SCREWS PROBLEM APPLIES AT DPC & D.C. COOK. ALGR SAW NO BROKEN SCREW HEADS AT WBN PRIOR TO DEC '94. CALLED TVA/SQN IN JUNE 95. PER ISSUED BY TVA.			
<u>Concern</u>	1		12/19/96	4/30/97		
<u>Action</u>			<i>Inspection</i>			
<u>Description</u>			DRS REVIEW OF TVA's REPORT, THE INSPECTOR MAY NEED TO CHECK WITH DUKE POWER COMPANY'S DISPOSITION OF A SIMILAR PROBLEM AND THEIR REASON WHY THEY CHOSE TO REPLACE THE SCREWS WITH STAINLESS STEEL TYPE.			
<u>Concern</u>	1		12/19/96		12/19/96	0
<u>Action</u>			<i>Initial ARB Meeting</i>			
<u>Description</u>						
<u>Concern</u>	1		12/19/96	1/15/97	3/3/97	74
<u>Action</u>			<i>Inspection</i>			
<u>Description</u>			RESIDENT INSPECTOR TO OBTAIN A COPY OF TVA's PER AND METALLURGICAL ANALYSIS AND FORWARD TO DRS/MAINTENANCE BRANCH FOR REVIEW. DRP action is complete, weforwarded required analysis and PER to DRS for review; please remove from DRPaction list.			
<u>Concern</u>	1		12/16/96	1/16/97	1/14/97	29
<u>Action</u>			<i>Acknowledgement Letter</i>			
<u>Description</u>						
<u>Concern</u>	2		12/19/96	4/30/97		
<u>Action</u>			<i>Inspection</i>			
<u>Description</u>			DRS REVIEW OF TVA's REPORT, THE INSPECTOR MAY NEED TO CHECK WITH DUKE POWER COMPANY'S DISPOSITION OF A SIMILAR PROBLEM AND THEIR REASON WHY THEY CHOSE TO REPLACE THE SCREWS WITH STAINLESS STEEL TYPE.			

RII-1996-A-0249

		<u>DATE RECEIVED</u>	<u>DATE ASSIGNED</u>	<u>DATE DUE</u>	<u>DATE COMPLETE</u>	<u>DAYS TO COMPLETE</u>
<u>Concern</u>	2	12/16/96	12/19/96		12/19/97	365
<u>Action</u>		<i>Initial ARB Meeting</i>				
<u>Description</u>						

ATTACHMENT

ALLEGATION ACTION PLAN

RII-1996-A-0249

ISSUE: 1. The allegor stated they (TVA, Watts Bar) recently laid him off because the system engineer function he was doing on the ice condenser did not require a full time position. He stated that the system did require full time attention due to the many challenges the system presents based on his many years of experience with it. He is concerned the system may degrade and not receive sufficient attention. The currently assigned person (reserved) has two other systems also.

ACTION: 1. This issue should be reviewed by the resident inspector. If he thinks the licensee is focusing proper resources on the ice condenser system, then the issue is not substantiated.

ISSUE: 2. The allegor also had a technical concern involving broken screws which were found in the ice condenser in 1995. A PER was initiated to perform an evaluation. TVA initially performed a metallurgical analysis. Subsequent to that report, the issue was given to Westinghouse to analyze. The issue was very quickly analyzed away, and the first report was not used to support the analysis. He is concerned whether the analysis is adequate.

ACTION: 2. DRS/MB obtain copy of PER(s), metallurgical analysis, and Westinghouse evaluation, as appropriate. Inspector to review report(s), analysis, and determine if technical issue was properly resolved. This issue may require visit to site (Watts Bar).

ISSUE: 3. The allegor called Duke Power to ask if they had experienced a similar problem. They stated that they find broken screws regularly during outages and replace them with stainless steel screws. They implied to him that they had performed an internal analysis of the issue and did not involve Westinghouse, nor did they highlight the issue as an industry problem. He stated that he would mail copies of two reports to the NRC office at Watts Bar.

ACTION: 3. DRS/MB conduct inspection at Duke site (McGuire) and determine if ice condenser broken screws has been a problem. If so, review the licensee's corrective action for problem and determine if corrective actions are adequate. Document in inspection report.

The NRC IG is involved in this issue. I talked to Ms. Rosanna Raspa about the allegation on 4/8/97. She wanted to know status of review of technical issues. I believe that the IG is looking into whether the licensee reported the issue to the NRC when first identified and, if so, what we did about it.

April 8, 1997

NOTE TO: Bruno Uryc, Director  
Enforcement and Investigations Coordination Staff (EICS)

FROM: *William E. Holland*  
William E. Holland, Chief, Maintenance Branch, DRS

SUBJECT: IG CONTACT RELATING TO ALLEGATION NUMBER RII-1996-A-0249, ICE  
CONDENSER ISSUE INVOLVING BROKEN SCREWS

On April 8, 1997, at approximately 2:15 p.m., I received a phone call from Ms. Rosanna Raspa, (301) 415-5954, of the NRC OIG office. Ms. Raspa called me because she was informed by Mr. Al Ignatonis that I was the person responsible for review of the technical aspects of the subject allegation. Ms. Raspa wanted to know what the technical issues were, and how we were reviewing the same.

I informed Ms. Raspa that we were looking at three issues. I described the issues and ongoing activity as outlined in the attachment to this NOTE. I stated that Mr. Nick Economos was currently at the McGuire Nuclear Station reviewing the third issue associated with Duke Power. I also informed Ms. Raspa that we expected to finish our review in early May 1997. I stated that the inspection for the issues would be docketed in inspection reports for McGuire and Watts Bar. After the inspection reports were issued, we would be writing a letter back to the allegor with our findings.

Ms. Raspa was interested in the process for review of the technical aspects of each issue. I told her that licensees usually identify issues in corrective action documents (deviation reports). These documents also normally contain documentation associated with the licensee's evaluation and corrective actions. She was especially interested in whether the licensee was required to report issues of this nature to the NRC. I said that usually these documents require a review for safety significance and reportability. She further stated that she was interested in whether the issue was reported to the NRC when it was first identified and her office was following up on that aspect.

Ms. Raspa was interested in obtaining a copy of our final disposition of the issue. I told her that the appropriate contact for final disposition of the issue was Mr. Ignatonis. She acknowledged and said she would probably be talking with me again and possibly coming to Atlanta to followup on her part of the review.

The conversation was ended approximately 2:45 p.m.

cc: J. Jaudon  
D. Collins