

5/31/2

Background

In his DPV, [REDACTED] ^{EX 6} takes exception with the processing of a violation of 10 CFR 50.70 observed by the Turkey Point Resident Inspector on January 18, 2002, as an NCV. He contends that the issue, which involved announcing the inspector's presence contrary to the regulation, would have been better handle as a violation. In the discussion contained in the DPV, [REDACTED] ^{EX 6} makes the following major points:

- Processing this issue as an NCV has generic or broad implications on the ability of the inspectors to monitor licensee activities as they normally occur.
- ^{EX 6} The licensee's investigation concluded that the event did not happen as described by the NRC. [REDACTED] ^{EX 6} suggests that this different conclusion allowed the licensee to downplay the issue, thereby stopping any enforcement action.
- Processing an issue as an NCV based on entering it into the corrective action program, allows the licensee to take only token corrective actions and not address the underlying root cause or organizational culture.

As a remedy, he suggests that the enforcement process be modified to require that the licensee be required to address the issue.

Documentation- The team reviewed the DPV filed by [REDACTED] ^{EX 6} Turkey Point [REDACTED] which documented the NCV in question, and the meeting minutes for the ARB of February 5, 2002 where the issue was presented for OI consideration. Additional NRC documentation such as the management directive associated with DPVs, the statements of consideration for 10 CFR 50.70 and 10 CFR 50.5, the enforcement policy, and selected regional office instructions was also reviewed by members of the panel. The panel also reviewed the licensee's corrective action document which captured the issue.

Interviews- The following persons were interviewed by members of the panel:

[REDACTED] ^{EX 6}
Carolyn Evans - Regional Counsel/Enforcement Officer
Randy Musser- Acting Branch Chief
Son Ninh- Project Engineer/Acting Branch Chief
Victor McCree- Deputy Division Director DRP
Len Williamson- Acting OI Director

Findings-

1. The panel agrees that announcing the presence of NRC inspectors can impact the ability of the inspectors to monitor licensee activities as they normally occur. However, based on the information obtained during its review, the panel does not agree that processing this issue as an NCV had broad programmatic implications. The panel believes that generically a sound corrective action program, should be capable of developing the appropriate corrective actions for issues such as this. The panel did not

Information in this record was deleted in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, exemptions 6

EOIA- 2002-361

CH2

review any evidence which would suggest problems with the licensee's corrective action program at Turkey Point.

2. The panel agrees that the licensee's investigation arrived at a different conclusion as to what happened than did the residents. However, the team did not find any evidence to suggest that this significantly impacted the outcome of the issue. The team believed that the licensee's corrective actions were sufficient to address either scenario. Further, the team considered that the licensee's actions to conduct an independent investigation and a phone call made to the Regional Administrator by the Site Vice President, do not support the contention that the licensee downplayed the issue. In addition, enforcement action was taken when the NCV was issued.
3. The team agrees that the NCV criteria which only requires that an item be entered into the licensee's corrective action program, can lead the situation of inappropriate or marginal corrective actions. However, the team believes that the ROP addresses this issue through the problem identification and resolution inspection. If an inspector feels strongly that the licensee has somehow missed the mark on an issue, this should be revealed by the PI&R inspection. In addition, if warranted, a violation for inadequate corrected actions can be issued. While not directly applicable to this issue, the panel also noted that the enforcement policy requires that compliance be restored as a condition of issuing an NCV. This helps minimize the possibility of corrective actions wide of the mark.
4. Though not part of DPV, the panel reviewed the handling of this issue against the NCV criteria identified in the NRC's Enforcement Policy. For the most part, the panel determined that the NCV criteria were satisfied. However, the team had difficulty in following the decision-making process used by the NRC to determine that the violation was not willful. The interviews conducted by the panel did not reveal that a consistent decision-making process was applied by key personnel in arriving at this decision.

In addition, the panel noted that when this issue was taken to the ARB it was done before the completion of the licensee's investigation. Hence, it was not clear to the panel, that the impact of licensee arriving at a direct conclusion as to what happened, was available for consideration by the ARP. The panel believes that this had the potential to impact the deliberations of the ARB.

In response, the panel recommends the following actions be taken:

- A. The Enforcement Officer provide amplifying information to the Region II staff on what constitutes a willful violation. It is also recommended that this guidance address what mechanism should be used to determine if willfulness is involved in a violation.
 - B. The ARB reconvene and review the licensee's investigation of this issue to determine if additional information is required by the NRC to determine if this violation was willful.
5. During its review, the team noted that the concurrence page for the inspection report, annotated by [REDACTED] to reflect his concerns with the processing of this issue as an NCV was not included in the ADAMS version of the report. The provision of ROI

2210 were not invoked since he did concur with the report. Further, it does not appear that the practice of retaining comments recorded during the concurrence process is explicitly required by existing Region II procedures. However, the panel felt that not including this information could result in losing information associated with the concurrence process for a report. The panel recommends that an existing ROI be modified to identify the need to include comments on the concurrence page (as appropriate) in ADAMS.

Conclusion:

The team does not support ^{EX} [REDACTED] DPV and does not believe that a change to the enforcement process is warranted.