

ALLEGATION ACTION PLAN

AMS NO. RIII-2004-A-0047

Licensee: Point Beach

Docket/License No: 050-00266/301

Assigned Division/Branch: DRS/Plant Support Branch

Allegation Review Board Membership:

Chairman -Grant/ Pederson/ Grobe

✓ Paul/ ✓ Berson/ ✓ Heller/ Lambert/ Clayton

Dapas/ Caniano/ Reynolds
✓ Riemer

~~Lambert~~ KONDOWSKI

Alexander

GENERIC CONCERNS: If Yes Explain:

DISCUSSION OF SAFETY SIGNIFICANCE: No immediate threat to public health safety

OI ACCEPTANCE: YES NO (Priority: HIGH NORMAL LOW)

Basis for OI Priority:

OI has Accepted Concern(s) No(s) Signature

ARB MINUTES PROVIDED TO: Caldwell/Berson/Riemer

ACKNOWLEDGMENT LETTER: PRINT IN FINAL REVISE N/A

REFERRAL LETTER: A. Licensee YES ___ NO ___
B. State of YES ___ NO ___
C. DOE YES ___ NO ___

date received	April 9, 2004	due date of 1 st ARB	May 9, 2004
due date of ACK Ltr	May 9, 2004	date -90 days old	July 8, 2004
date -120 days old	August 7, 2004	date -150 day old	September 6, 2004
date -180 days old	October 6, 2004	date -365 days old	April 9, 2005
projected date for the 5 yr statue of limitation			April 8, 2009

COMMENTS:

NRC Identified.

Steven G. Reynolds
Allegation Review Board Chairman

8/03/04
Date

G-60 (7)

~~SENSITIVE ALLEGATION MATERIAL~~

AMS No. RIII-04-A-0047

Each stated concern or NRC identified issue should be documented on a separate sheet. Each concern must be documented and written with enough detail to allow thorough follow up.

Concern No. 1

The NRC is concerned that three contract ISI/NDE workers knowingly entered Containment to conduct work while signed in on a Radiation Work Permit (RWP) only for activities in the Auxiliary Building.

Regulatory Basis:

Licensee Procedure NP 4.2.19, however the procedure is not required by Technical Specifications or any other NRC regulation.

I. Action Evaluation: The following method of resolution is recommended (circle):

- A. Send to Licensee Requesting Response in _____ Days. (Describe the general areas we expect the licensee to address.)
- B. Priority RIII Follow up and Closure Memo to OAC
- C. Follow up During Routine Inspection Within _____ Days and Closure Memo to OAC
- D. Refer to OI. Recommended Priority: HIGH NORMAL LOW
Recommended Basis:
- E. Outside NRC's Jurisdiction. Describe Basis Below.
- F. Too General for Follow-up. Describe Basis Below.
- XX ✓ G. Other (specify) - **NO REGULATORY BASIS, CLOSE AS SUCH.**

Responsible for Action - EICS

II. Special Considerations/Instructions:

~~SENSITIVE ALLEGATION MATERIAL~~

AMS No. RIII-04-A-0047

Each stated concern or NRC identified issue should be documented on a separate sheet. Each concern must be documented and written with enough detail to allow thorough follow up.

Concern No. 2

The NRC is concerned that while the three contract ISI/NDE workers were conducting work in Containment on the incorrect RWP, at least one worker knowingly worked up to his dosimetry dose alarm limit (50 mrem), and subsequently received dose in excess of the allowed amount by the RWP (the individual received 51 mrem).

Regulatory Basis:

Licensee Procedure NP 4.2.27, however the procedure is not required by Technical Specifications or any other NRC regulation.

I. Action Evaluation: The following method of resolution is recommended (circle):

- A. Send to Licensee Requesting Response in _____ Days. (Describe the general areas we expect the licensee to address.)
- B. Priority RIII Follow up and Closure Memo to OAC
- C. Follow up During Routine Inspection Within _____ Days and Closure Memo to OAC
- D. Refer to OI. Recommended Priority:
Recommended Basis:
- ✓
XX E. Outside NRC's Jurisdiction. Describe Basis Below.
- F. Too General for Follow-up. Describe Basis Below.
- G. Other (specify) - **NO REGULATORY BASIS, CLOSE AS SUCH.**

Responsible for Action - EICS

II. Special Considerations/Instructions: