## ALLEGATION DISPOSITION RECORD

Rev. 6/6/97

Allegation No.: RI-98-A-0047 Branch Chief (AOC): Linville Acknowledged: No Site: Hope Creek Panel Date: 2/26/98 Confidentiality Granted: No Issue discussed (original allegation): Alleger claims HP technicians did not follow control point exit procedures which require frisking of personnel after they cause an alarm on the portal monitors. After the monitor alarmed, they were decontaminated and released, subsequently bypassing the frisking step in the procedure. Discussed issue with J.Noggle (DRS)-- exit portal monitors (IPM-9s) are far more sensitive than friskers and by bypassing the frisking step and going straight to deconning it is more efficient. This is a known issue by DRS. J.Noggle performed an HP inspection at the site recently (2/9-13/98) and stated there is no safety consequence to bypassing the frisker step. Alleger contacted prior to referral to licensee (if applicable)? No ALLEGATION PANEL DECISIONS (Previous Allegation Panels on issue: No ) Attendees: Chair - Crleniak Branch Chief(AOC) - Linville SAC - Vito, Modes Ol Rep. - Letts RI Counsel - Fewell Others - Wiggins DISPOSITION ACTIONS: (State actions required for closure (including special concurrences), responsible person, ECD and expected closure documentation) NOTE: If filling out electronically, use a larger, bold font to aid individuals in reading this material. 1) Acknowledgment letter Responsible Person: \_L.Harrison\_\_\_\_\_ ECD: <u>3/6/98</u> Completed: \_\_\_\_\_ Closure Documentation: 2) Closeout letter to alleger (including J.Noggle's insp.report) Responsible Person: <u>L.Harrison</u> ECD: <u>3/31/98</u> Closure Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_ Completed: \_\_\_\_\_ Safety Significance Assessment: None, portal monitors are more sensitive to contamination than friskers Priority of OI Investigation \_\_\_\_\_\_

, /

ARB MINUTES ARE REVIEWED AND APPROVED AT THE ARB