

G:\ALLEG\-panel\20020132ARB4.WPD\ALLEGATION REVIEW BOARD DISPOSITION RECORD

Allegation No.: RI-2002-A-0132
Site/Facility: Salem/HC
ARB Date: 2/21/03

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

Issue discussed: The alieger raised five issues in the security area related to inadequate staffing, insufficient training, chilled work environment, security equipment, and security command and control. Later, the NRC received an additional comment relative to armed responder capability when assigned to other posts or duties. These issues were referred to PSEG who then formed an independent investigation team to review these assertions. The team's report made findings and conclusions in the same areas delineated in the original allegation, and PSEG and responded to their findings and conclusions as documented in a December 19, 2002, letter.

During a meeting on February 20, 2003, PSEG (Friedlander, Straub, Keenan) provided their plans to address the security issues raised in this allegation, including additional actions to improve station wide security performance. NRC personnel questioned PSEG on the scope of their proposed corrective actions for these issues. They agreed to provide specific details including estimated completion dates by March 21, 2003.

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

ALLEGATION REVIEW BOARD DECISIONS

Attendees: Chair - Rogge Branch Chief (AOC) - Barber (Actg BC) SAC - Vito
OI Rep. - Teator RI Counsel - Fewell Others - Crlenjak, Smith

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

- 1) During a meeting on February 20, 2003, PSEG (Friedlander, Straub, Keenan) agreed to provide specific details of their improvement plans including estimated completion dates in a March 21, 2003 letter to NRC. After the letter is received, DRP and DRS will review it and evaluate its adequacy.

Responsible Person: Meyer/White
Closure Documentation: _____

ECD: 04/02/03
Completed: _____

SAFETY SIGNIFICANCE ASSESSMENT:

This issue is of low significance since the February 20 meeting clarified a number of aspects of PSEG's response to the alleged concerns.

PRIORITY OF OI INVESTIGATION:

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):

ARB MINUTES ARE REVIEWED AND APPROVED AT THE ARB

F-1370

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? _____

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.

NOTES: (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)