

Region II Key Findings for the 4th Quarter of FY 2004

Information in this record was deleted
 in accordance with the Freedom of Information
 Act, exemptions 4
 FOIA-2006-0026

Westinghouse		
IR #	Description	Disposition
IR 2004-04	A weakness was identified. Two environmental program procedures lacked specific guidance for the collection of samples of vegetation and soil samples.	The licensee plans on reviewing the procedures and revising them as necessary.
	A SL IV VIO was identified for the failure to follow a procedure that resulted in the transfer of an unanalyzed uranyl nitrate solution to a non-favorable geometry tank (team leader opened wrong set of valves).	The licensee implemented an AEC to prevent this error from occurring again (computer-valve interlock)
IR 2004-202	One example of a SL IV VIO was identified for the failure to identify the limits and controls for the ash processing furnace in a CSA.	The licensee took appropriate actions.
	A weakness was identified for two examples of a lack of rigor in completing operator check-sheets.	An internal corrective action system was initiated for each issue, and operators were briefed on the importance of properly completing check-sheets.
	A program weakness and an IFI were identified for the lack of personnel assigned and trained for important emergency response functions.	

Ex. 4

R2/03

2-1

Westinghouse		
IR 2004-202 (cont.)	After an inspector noted a cardboard box in a chemical process area which could meet the licensee's definition of a non-favorable geometry container, an IFI was opened to track the licensee actions to clarify control requirements for greater than 5-gallon cardboard boxes in chemical areas.	The licensee committed to clarify the control requirements for greater than 5-gallon cardboard boxes in chemical areas.
	The inspector identified that the Electronic Training and Procedure System (E-TAPS) was not displaying the "Last Review Date" for procedures. The licensee discovered that a programming error in E-TAPS prevented the routine procedural review feature from functioning. A URI was identified to followup on whether any procedures had missed their required review.	The licensee began investigating when the programming error occurred to more accurately pinpoint if any (or all) the procedures required a review. This issue will be dispositioned when the licensee determines when the error occurred, effectively establishing which procedures need to be reviewed.