

g:\alleg\panel\20040036ARB2.wpd **ALLEGATION REVIEW BOARD DISPOSITION RECORD**

<b>Allegation No.:</b>	<b>RI-2004-A-0036</b>	<b>Branch Chief (AOC):</b>	<b>Gene Cobey</b>					
<b>Site/Facility:</b>	<b>Salem</b>	<b>Acknowledged:</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>No</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>N/A</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>ARB Date:</b>	<b>June 23, 2004</b>	<b>Confidentiality Granted:</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>No</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

**Issue Discussed:**

- 1) PSEG has had history of overpressurizing and damaging the Salem steam generator blowdown process radiation monitors (R19's). The allegor contends that tagging process inadequacies have been at the root cause of the problem but management's attention has been inappropriately focused on just changing the underlying system procedure. The allegor also described a concern for inadequate extent of condition review for the tagging process inadequacies and that PSEG does not have adequate personnel or contract resources to resolve issues. The allegor has been working this issue through the corrective action process and employee concerns program.
- 2) On February 27, 2004, control room operators incorrectly entered an ODCM action statement for an inoperable plant vent process radiation monitor, 1R41. The action statement for an inoperable vent stack flow rate monitor should have been entered. Notification 20179286 was initiated in the corrective action program. The Allegor was approached by his supervisor to implement corrective actions and revise all I&C radiation monitor work procedures to include specific technical specification and ODCM action statement references. The intended corrective action is to assist operators in applying accurate TS and ODCM requirements. The allegor stated that his supervisor also believed the procedure revisions to be editorial in nature, requiring less manpower to implement. He/she disagreed with that the procedure changes would be editorial and nature and indicated that PSEG does not have the resources to implement the corrective actions or procedure revisions in a timely manner. The allegor also stated that the supervisor suggested to another procedure writer that he perform a station qualified review for a particular procedure/equipment issue that he/she was not qualified to perform. According to the allegor, this review was not performed. The allegor believed the affected procedure was HC.MD-PM.BF-0010. The allegor did not want to involve the procedure writer in his allegation. The allegor intended to take his concerns on this issue to ECP.
- 3) The allegor stated that he had less fear of retaliation compared to his coworkers because he is [REDACTED] 7C. The allegor has been maintaining a PC notebook for the last several years in defense of potential harassment and intimidation issues. The allegor did NOT allege any current H&I. The allegor referenced a potential H&I issue from several months ago and stated that it was satisfactorily resolved through ECP. The allegor referenced a H&I issue from 1994 in that he was excluded from becoming a qualified I&C technician because of his own high maintenance standards which would interfere with production. The allegor was then assigned to the [REDACTED]. He did not pursue the H&I at the time. The allegor spoke highly of his involvement with ECP but believed that Tom Lake, the ECP manager is overwhelmed.

<b>Allegor contacted prior to referral to licensee?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>No</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>N/A</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
---	------------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	------------	-------------------------------------	--

**ALLEGATION REVIEW BOARD DECISIONS:**

**Attendees:**

<b>Chair:</b>	<b>Blough</b>	<b>Br. Chief (AOC):</b>	<b>Cobey</b>	<b>SAC:</b>	<b>Vito, Harrison</b>
<b>OI Rep:</b>	<b>Wilson</b>	<b>RI Counsel:</b>	<b>Farrar</b>	<b>Others:</b>	<b>Passarelli, Barber, Collins, Clifford</b>

**Disposition Actions:**

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

1. DRP Branch 3 (Passarelli/Barber) concluded that PSEG's response to referral was acceptable.

<b>Responsible Person:</b>	<b>PB3</b>	<b>ECD:</b>	
----------------------------	------------	-------------	--

<b>Closure Documentation:</b>		<b>Completed:</b>	<b>06/22/2004</b>
-------------------------------	--	-------------------	-------------------

Information in this record was deleted in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, exemptions 7C  
FOIA- 2007314

*P-6*

2. DRP Branch 3 to draft Enclosure for Closeout letter. Decide the appropriate enforcement decision and, if we determine that a violation is involved, inform licensee verbally and either (1) document in inspection report (if non-minor) or (2) document for allegation file if minor or less than minor.			
Responsible Person:	PB3	ECD:	07/22/2004
Closure Documentation:		Completed:	
3. Closeout allegation.			
Responsible Person:	SAC	ECD:	8/12/2004
Closure Documentation:		Completed:	

<b>SAFETY SIGNIFICANCE ASSESSMENT</b>			
Provide narrative assessment of safety significance; should be commensurate with estimated action plan completion dates.			
The initial safety significance of this issue is low because the important aspects of the underlying technical condition(s) have been addressed.			
<b>PRIORITY OF OI INVESTIGATION</b>			
High	Normal	Low	
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):			
<b>ENFORCEMENT STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS CONSIDERATION</b> (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?			
When did the potential violation occur?			
(Assign action to determine date, if unknown) 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.			
<b>NOTES:</b> (Include other pertinent comments. Also include considerations related to licensee referral, if appropriate. Identify any potential generic issues)			

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

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