

ALLEGATION DISPOSITION RECORD

Rev. 6/6/97

Allegation No.: RI-98 -A-0060

Branch Chief (AOC): Linville

Site: Hope Creek

Acknowledged: No

Panel Date: 3/12/98

Confidentiality Granted: No

Issue discussed (original allegation): Recent Operator license class did not spend the required 13 weeks of "on-shift time" in the control room. Rather they spent most of their time studying in separate areas. Allegor indicated that he had raised these concerns to site management's attention, but not much was done.

Allegor contacted prior to referral to licensee (if applicable)? Anonymous allegation

ALLEGATION PANEL DECISIONS (Previous Allegation Panels on issue: No)

Attendees: Chair - Crlenjak Branch Chief(AOC) - Linville SAC - Modes
OI Rep. - Letts RI Counsel - _____ Others - JWhite, Florek, Conte

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) **OI to incorporate this allegation into the the Region II investigation in allegation number RI-98-A-0060**

Responsible Person: Letts
Closure Documentation: _____

ECD: TBD
Completed: _____

- 2) **DRS/OLHP to coordinate with OI regarding issuance of licenses to those applicants who passed the examination. The goal is to be able to issue the licenses by 4/2/98.**

Responsible Person: R. Conte
Closure Documentation: _____

ECD: TBD
Completed: _____

- 3) **Close out memo to file**

Responsible Person: L. Harrison
Closure Documentation: _____

ECD: TBD
Completed: _____

Safety Significance Assessment: **SSW regarding operator license applications, 10CFR55.31(a)(4) not completing operator training program requirements and 10 CFR 55.9 providing inaccurate information.**

Priority of OI Investigation High

ARB MINUTES ARE REVIEWED AND APPROVED AT THE ARB

Handwritten initials and scribbles on the right side of the page.

NOTES: (Include rationale for any referral to licensee, and identify any potentially generic allegations)

Alleger stated that PSE&G management was aware of concern but did not effectively resolve concern

Issue not to be referred to licensee

A. Region 1 should refer as many allegations as possible to the licensee for action and response unless any of the following factors apply:

- Information cannot be released in sufficient detail to the licensee without compromising the identity of the alleger or confidential source (unless the alleger has no objection to his or her name being released).
- The licensee could compromise an investigation or inspection because of knowledge gained from the referral.
- The allegation is made against the licensee's management or those parties who would normally receive and address the allegation.
- The basis of the allegation is information received from a Federal agency that does not approve of the information being released in a referral.

Even if the above conditions exist, Region 1 shall refer the substance of the allegation to the licensee regardless of any factor if the allegation raises an overriding safety issue, using the guidance in Management Directive 8.8.

Factors to Consider Prior to Referral to a Licensee

In determining whether to refer eligible allegations to a licensee, The Region 1 Allegation Panel shall consider the following:

- Could the release of information bring harm to the alleger or confidential source?
- Has the alleger or confidential source voiced objections to the release of the allegation to the licensee?
- What is the licensee's history of allegations against it and past record in dealing with allegations, including the likelihood that the licensee will effectively investigate, document, and resolve the allegation?
- Has the alleger or confidential source already taken this concern to the licensee with unsatisfactory results? If the answer is "yes," the concern is within NRC's jurisdiction, and the alleger objects to the referral, the concerns should normally not be referred to the licensee.

- Are resources to investigate available within the region?

Prior to referring an allegation to a licensee, all reasonable efforts should be made to inform alleged or confidential sources of the planned referral. This notification may be given orally and subsequently documented in an acknowledgment letter. If the alleged or confidential source objects to the referral, or does not respond within 30 calendar days, and the NRC has considered the factors described above, a referral can be made despite the alleged's or confidential source's objection or lack of response. In all such cases, an attempt will be made to contact the alleged by phone just prior to making the referral.

Also, referrals are not to be made if it could compromise the identity of the alleged, or if it could compromise an inspection or investigation. Note: Document the basis for referring allegations to a licensee in those cases where the criteria listed above indicate that it is questionable whether a referral is appropriate.

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

Options for Resolution:

Licensee Referral (Div. Dir. Concurrence Required (First Consider Factors Prior to Referral) / Document NRC Review of Response - Resp. - AOC)

Referral to Another Agency (OSHA, etc. - Resp. - SAC)

Referral to an Agreement State (MD, ME, NH, NY, RI - Resp. - SAC)

Referral to Another NRC Office (OIG, NRR, Other Regions - Resp. - SAC)

Request for Additional Info.(From alleged, licensee, others - Resp. - AOC)

Closeout Letter/Memo (If no further action planned - Resp. - AOC)

Inspection (Resident/Specialist routine or reactive)

IF H&ID INVOLVED:

- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| 1) has the individual been informed of the DOL process and the need to file a complaint within 180 days (has DOL information package been provided?) | Yes | No |
| 2) has the individual filed a complaint with DOL | Yes | No |
| 3) if the complainant filed directly with DOL, have they been contacted to obtain their technical concerns (Resp. - SAC) | Yes | No |
| 4) is a chilling effect letter warranted:
(DOL finding in favor of alleged)
(conciliation w/licensee prior to DOL decision) | Yes | No |

ADDITIONAL NOTES: _____
