g:\alleg\panel\20040062arb.wpd ALLEGATION REVIEW BOARD DISPOSITION RECORD Allegation No.: RI-2004-A-0062 Branch Chief (AOC): Holody Acknowledged: Yes No X N/A Site/Facility: **Hope Creek** Confidentiality Granted: Yes No X ARB Date: May 20, 2004 Issue Discussed: The alleger received third party information that: the A Hope Creek EDG had a problem with metal filings or grit in its lacket water system. This was causing jacket water leaks. PSEG did not adequately flush the system to remove grit. Also, a shaft needed replacement but wasn't because of cost. The alleger expressed the above concerns: - [After some debris in the in the soft side seal face of the C EDG jacket water pump were identified after a notification was written about jacket water pump leaks] who concluded that the soft material in the seal face could not cause the leak? - What was the basis for deferring the B EDG flush [for removing grit from lube oil/jacket water] until April 2006? - What was the history of the shaft replacement for all four EDGs? - What was the history of pump seal replacements for all four EDGs? No Alleger contacted prior to referral to licensee? Yes **ALLEGATION REVIEW BOARD DECISIONS:** Attendees: Br. Chief (AOC): D. Holody SAC: Chair: R. Blough D. Vito, L. Harrison Ol Rep: Wilson RI Counsel: Farrar Others: Barber, Passarelli **Disposition Actions:** (List actions for processing and closure. Note responsible person(s), form of action closure document(s), and estimated completion dates.) 1. **Acknowledgment letter** SAC ECD: Responsible Person: May 27, 2004 Closure Completed: Documentation: 2. Next step would logically be to refer to licensee. Alleger has been contacted and we are waiting for a response as to whether this is ok (since the information was given to the alleger third party). Responsible Person: **DRP** (Anne Passarelli) ECD: June 3, 2004 Closure Completed:

3. Review referral response assuming the State does not object to referral.

Documentation:

 $\chi^{\mathcal{U}}$

Responsible Person:	DRS/DRP	ECD:	7/15/04
Closure Documentation:		Completed:	

4. Close if referral response is acceptable.

Responsible Person: Holody ECD: 7/31/04

SAFETY SIGNIFICANCE ASSESSMENT			
Provide narrative assessment of safety significance; should be commensurate with estimated action plan completion dates.			
The safety significance is low due to the fact that there are no existing significant leaks on the EDGs and the licensee has the issues documented in their corrective action program.			
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, Ol, Responsible Individuals (original to SAC)

ARB MINUTES ARE REVIEWED AND APPROVED AT THE ARB