

ALLEGATION DISPOSITION RECORD

Rev. 6/6/97

Allegation No.: RI-98-A-0053

Branch Chief (AOC): Linville

Site: Salem

Acknowledged: No

Panel Date: 2/26/98

Confidentiality Granted: No

Issue discussed (original allegation): Potential Staff Suspected Wrongdoing by Chemistry Supervisor and Control Room Supervisors. Chemistry Supervisor made non-conservative pen & ink procedural change by changing the safety factor from 4 to 1 to enable a liquid release to the Delaware River and signed that an independent verification had been completed in support of the release even though it had not been done. A fact-finding review is currently in-progress by the licensee to determine any potential wrongdoing by Operations personnel.

Note: The Chemistry Supvr. has had his site access revoked and has been placed on administrative suspension.

Recommend OI review results of PSE&G's investigation.

Alleger contacted prior to referral to licensee (if applicable)? No

ALLEGATION PANEL DECISIONS (Previous Allegation Panels on issue: Yes )

Attendees: Chair - Crlenjak Branch Chief(AOC) - Linville SAC - Vito/Modes  
OI 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.

Assign Allegation # RI-98-A-0053

- 1) OI review of PSE&G's investigation, then determine if any further action is necessary.

Responsible Person: Letts  
Closure Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

ECD: TBD  
Completed: \_\_\_\_\_

- 2) DRS to review issues. Provide SAC and OI results of DRS review.

Responsible Person: JWhite (Lead)/Conte  
Closure Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

ECD: TBD  
Completed: \_\_\_\_\_

ARB MINUTES ARE REVIEWED AND APPROVED AT THE ARB

283  
F

**Safety Significance Assessment: Apparent intentional failure to follow procedures regarding releases.**

**Priority of OI Investigation: High**

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

---

---

**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 allegor or confidential source (unless the allegor 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 allegor or confidential source?**
- **Has the allegor 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 alleged 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 alleged 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 allegor)  
(conciliation w/licensee prior to DOL decision)

Yes No

**ADDITIONAL NOTES:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_