

g:\alleg\panel\20040033arb.wpd **ALLEGATION REVIEW BOARD DISPOSITION RECORD**

Allegation No.:	RI-2004-A-0033	Branch Chief (AOC):	Glenn Meyer				
Site/Facility:	Hope Creek	Acknowledged:	Yes		No	X	N/A
ARB Date:	April 1, 2004	Confidentiality Granted:	Yes		No	X	

Issue Discussed: On March 13, an NEO identified a banging noise coming from the "A" shutdown cooling (SDC) return to the "A" Recirc Pipe Loop. On March 15, a Tech Issues Team was convened to review the issue. A team member suggested that recirc flow should be varied to determine its affect on the banging noise. He received "push back" on the suggestion and was told not to bring it up again. Later on Monday, another team member suggested that the plant should probably be shutdown if plant staff doesn't understand where the banging sound is coming from. An Ops team member suggested that it was unnecessary because another loop of SDC was available. The allegor believed this was an unacceptable response but did not mention it because he did not want to be labeled as a troublemaker.

On Tuesday March 16, allegor attended the team meeting. Prior to meeting, it was announced that management intended to take plant offline on Friday (March 19). Allegor stated this was made without recommendation from team as to cause of noise. Additionally actions such as recirculation pump speed variation to see if the noise was eliminated were not being pursued. Allegor believes that if PSEG does not know the cause of the banging noise in RHR piping, and has not taken all reasonable actions to eliminate noise, they should shutdown.

The allegor added the following on March 17, and reiterated his position: Allegor indicated that Sr management (Plant Manager - Jim Hutton) was previously not open to responses from the allegor. During a morning management meeting that included an update from the allegor, the plant manager questioned three items in regard to IST program: (1) why is the SLC discharge valve radiographed? (2) Why is the IST flow band for RHR so tight? (3) Why is HPCI started in auto during IST? When allegor tried to answer, he indicated the plant manager held up his hand and said he didn't want the answer there. The allegor's manager indicated they would be responded to via the corrective action program. However, the allegor did not initiate notifications. Instead the response was forwarded by voicemail as to why these actions were necessary. No changes were made in this regard to the IST program by the allegor. The allegor interpreted this as plant manager was not approachable. He characterized him as a "loose cannon."

Allegor contacted prior to referral to licensee?	Yes		No		N/A	X	
--	-----	--	----	--	-----	---	--

ALLEGATION REVIEW BOARD DECISIONS:

Attendees:

Chair:	Blough	Br. Chief (AOC):	Meyer	SAC:	Vito
OI Rep:	Wilson	RI Counsel:	Farrar	Others:	Barber, Crlenjak

Disposition Actions:

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

1. Panel decision that this is NOT an allegation because the NRC was aware of the issue, PSE&G had decided to go into a forced outage and no new information was provided.

Responsible Person:	Panel	ECD:	
Closure Documentation:		Completed:	4/1/04

2. Senior Resident to contact individual and provide response to individual's concern(s). Discussion to include banging noise and interaction with plant manager. Provide documentation of phone conversation to SAC for file.

Responsible Person:	Meyer	ECD:	4/16/04
Closure Documentation:	<i>email from M. Gray</i>	Completed:	<i>4/14/04</i>

3. Administratively close file, based on documentation from M. Gray and track as non-allegation in AMS.

Responsible Person:	SAC	ECD:	4/30/04
Closure Documentation:		Completed:	

2004
4/1

SAFETY SIGNIFICANCE ASSESSMENT				
Provide narrative assessment of safety significance; should be commensurate with estimated action plan completion dates.				
The initial safety significance of the issue is low to moderate because PSEG is aware of it and has taken some action to address them the effectiveness of which has yet to be determined. This issue is related to the SCWE which is part of an ongoing review by NRC.				
PRIORITY OF OI INVESTIGATION				
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):				
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)

ARB MINUTES ARE REVIEWED AND APPROVED AT THE ARB