

From: Merritt Baker
To: Jhl; RAn
Date: Wed, Oct 1, 2003 2:54 PM
Subject: quick review of Honeywell investigation

see the attached table of common (or different) factors from the 3 events

2-15

HF Exposure Event vs. SbF₅ Event Investigations

HF Exposure Event	SbF ₅ Event	UF6 Pigtail Release Event
Procedure expressly prohibits HF in vaporizers during maintenance		Valve PP-8 was OPEN
Direct cause (HF in vaporizer) not addressed	Direct cause (U-44 load cells inoperable) not addressed	Direct cause (Valve PP-8 OPEN) not addressed?
No discussion of the work package which allowed an unsafe practice	no discussion of the operator's action in unexpected condition	License requires leak check, but not performed?
Some engineering errors (1) effect of warm dip tube (2) new dip tube touches liquid level (3) didn't verify liquid level (4) didn't know about the last dip tube	didn't know the level in U-77	possible engineering errors (flow path open) blockage suspected by not verified
Pressure by Operations over maintenance And No corresponding corrective action		pressure to fill/empty Russian cylinders?
	Procedure OK?	Different operators performed the task differently
Several tasks on the same special work permit	"Incomplete instructions"	
	Inexperienced operator	
Mobile crane not used for insertion	Vent scrubber not sufficient	pigtail leak check not performed
	hardware problems (load cells, sight glass, drain valve)	hardware problem (cross-threaded nut)
internal memo received	TOP investigation received	e-mail from SRI

	other contributing causes (no door at sample point, drain valve handle) not addressed	