

Allegation No.: RI-2002-A-0099  
Site/Facility: Hope Creek  
ARB Date: 8/8/2002

Branch Chief (AOC): Meyer  
Acknowledged: No  
Confidentiality Granted: No

Issue discussed: 1) Concerns identified with the use of the Work Clearance Module (WCM) software for tagging paperwork, 2) Improper use of the Tech Spec grace period for surveillance testing, 3) Discrimination against the alleged in 2000 for raising safety concerns

Alleger contacted prior to referral to licensee (if applicable)? Yes

### ALLEGATION REVIEW BOARD DECISIONS

Attendees: Chair - Clifford Branch Chief (AOC) - Meyer SAC - Vito  
OI Rep. - Monroe, Neff RI Counsel - \_\_\_\_\_ Others - Crlenjak

**DISPOSITION ACTIONS:** (List actions for processing and closure. Note responsible person(s), form of action closure document(s), and estimated completion dates.)

- 1) Acknowledgment letter to the alleged along with his DOL rights. Indicate that the alleged H&ID occurred over 1.5 years ago, so DOL may not take his case due to their statute of limitations for such filings.

Responsible Person: SAC  
Closure Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

ECD: 8/23/2002  
Completed: \_\_\_\_\_

- 2) Residents to inspect the Tech Spec scheduling issue in the course of the baseline inspection program (ROP IPs 71111.22 (Surveillance Testing) & 7111.13 (Maintenance Risk Assessments and Emergent Work Control)) in the current quarterly inspection report that ends on September 30, 2002. DRP to provide copy of inspection report to SAC for file.

Responsible Person: Meyer/Schoppy  
Closure Documentation: Inspection Report Issuance

ECD: 10/30/2002  
Completed: \_\_\_\_\_

- 3) OI to open up a case on H&I (1-2002-027)

Responsible Person: Letts/Neff  
Closure Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

ECD: TBD  
Completed: \_\_\_\_\_

- 4) Following the interview, repanel to determine how technical issue related to WCM will be resolved (referral or inspection)

Responsible Person: SAC  
Closure Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

ECD: 9/30/2002  
Completed: \_\_\_\_\_

**ARB MINUTES ARE REVIEWED AND APPROVED AT THE ARB**

N-1

**SAFETY SIGNIFICANCE ASSESSMENT:** The risk significance of this allegation is potentially moderate since PSEG was known to have significant problems with the work clearance module system in the 1999-2000 time frame and [REDACTED] involved in a protected activity. Regarding the TS scheduling practice, the risk significance is likely low as all required surveillance are being performed, but not at the optimum equal surveillance intervals. 1C

**PRIORITY OF OI INVESTIGATION:** High

If potential discrimination or wrongdoing and OI is not opening a case, provide rationale here (e.g., no prima facie, lack of specific indication of wrongdoing):

Rationale used to defer OI discrimination case (DOL case in progress):

**ENFORCEMENT STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS CONSIDERATION (only applies to wrongdoing matters (including discrimination issues) that are under investigation by OI, DOL, or DOJ):**

What is the potential violation and regulatory requirement? 10 CFR 50.7

When did the potential violation occur? 12/2000

Once date of potential violation is established, SAC will assign AMS action to have another ARB at four (4) years from that date, to discuss enforcement statute of limitations issues.

**NOTES:**

Regional Counsel made determination that allegor has articulated prima facie case.

**Distribution:** Panel Attendees, Regional Counsel, OI, Responsible Individuals (original to SAC)