g:\alleg\panel\20040020arb.wpd **ALLEGATION REVIEW BOARD DISPOSITION RECORD**

Allegation No.:	**RI-2004-A-0020**	Branch Chief (AOC):	**Glenn Meyer**						
Site/Facility:	**Salem/Hope Creek**	Acknowledged:	Yes		No	X	N/A		
ARB Date:	**April 1, 2004**	Confidentiality Granted:	Yes		No	X	[redacted]		

Issue Discussed:

1. The Salem/Hope Creek notification process incorrectly codes corrective maintenance and exceeds corrective maintenance/preventative maintenance periods. This affects safety related equipment and tech spec requirements. The same issue could improperly influence equipment reliability decisions.

2. Salem had a valve with a boron leak from the packing gland area that may not have been resolved timely manner after it was first identified in 2002.

3. The failure to code and process notifications properly may discourage people from identifying concerns.

Alleger contacted prior to referral to licensee?	Yes		No		N/A	X	[redacted]

ALLEGATION REVIEW BOARD DECISIONS: [redacted]

Attendees: [redacted]

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. ~~Acknowledge receipt of allegation (include DOL rights, although the individual has not made a discrimination complaint).~~ ~~letter~~ See 3/8/04 e-mail. Alleger does not want correspond

Responsible Person:	~~SAG~~	ECD:	~~4/6/04~~
Closure Documentation:		Completed:	

2. Refer issue to PSEG. DRP to provide words for Enclosure 1 for referral letter.

Responsible Person:	Meyer	ECD:	4/20/04
Closure Documentation:		Completed:	

3. Repanel after PSEG response.

Responsible Person:	SAC	ECD:	6/04/04
Closure Documentation:		Completed:	

SAFETY SIGNIFICANCE ASSESSMENT	[redacted]

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 them and has taken some action to address them the effectiveness of which has yet to be determined. Many of these issues are related to the SCWE which is part of an ongoing review by NRC.

PRIORITY OF OI INVESTIGATION	[redacted]

263

High		Normal		Low		[redacted]

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): [redacted]

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