RAS - \$ 139 SDP/EA REQUEST & STRATI	EGY FORM		
Case Data Disputed:	Related Cases:	03-025, 05-066-073,	
SDP/EA No.: 06-191 Number: 1 Docket No.:	N/A		
Request Date: 8-3-06 Region: III Case Type: IAR	Small Entity: x	lo Yes	
icensee: <b>Individuals</b> Facility / City: <b>Da</b>	SCHOOL STATE OF THE PROPERTY AND STATE OF TH		
License No.: N/A Last Day of Insp.:	7-28-06		75808270070070753
nsp. Rpt No.: <b>01-3-2002-006</b> Keywords:		E	S: drs
Facts An enforcement panel was convened on August 3, 2006, to consider whe (EATS): additional individuals regarding incomplete and inaccurate information provided company (FENOC), the licensee for Davis-Besse, in response to Bulletin background information and panel conclusions.	ided to the NRC by F	irstEnergy Nuclear Op	erating
ccussion (if required):			
SDP x No Yes  Assessment: Green White Yellow R	ad NOV	Yes X No	180000000000000000000000000000000000000
	au NOV	Yes x No	-
Wrongdoing X No Yes Ol Rpt. No.: 3-2002-006		Etion Ction	Date Marked for ID: Date Offered in Ev: hrough Witness/Pane
OOJ Referral? X Yes Ref. Date 117-03 Action Date	1-19-06	Decline x Accep	Date Marked for ID Date Offered in Evrough Witness/Par
Awaiting DOJ Needs coordination with	n DOJ		fere Vitn
Resolution: Does not meet the NRC Legal X Policy threshold for	r taking enforcement ac	tion regarding	d in
X Deliberate Misconduct Careless Disregard	r taking enforcement ac	ction regarding 2808 attion(s)	Fu. Pan
Escalated Action	Date of Violation:	N/A F P	
Consequence: Actual Potential Reg. Impact Willfulnes	<b>L</b>	26	
Prior Esc. Action? No Yes EA: Da		LECTE 2302	2008 2008 2008
ID Credit? No Yes TBD	SL:	5 0	2 8 6
CA Credit?		· A	7 7 7
CA Credit? No Yes TBD  CP? No CP Base Double Base Other:	Supp:	풀	min
			12/2
Discretion or Order? X No Yes Explain:		· <b>2</b>	
Future Action			Anna de deservatores de la constante de la con
Conference? No Yes Open Closed Addition	onal Info:		
Action? No Violation Re-panel PEC Letter Choice Letter	Choice Call	SLIV R	e-caucus
Region Issue Esc. Full Package Review by HQ DEDR Review	Commission	NCV O	ffer ADR
Other Action?			
Adicipants: Region Ken O'Brien, Bruce Berson			
Mike Johnson, Dave Solono, Doug Starkey OE		ra Brock, Mike Spenc ul, Scott Langan	er/Rich
Program Office	Other	,	
narks/Comments/Lessons Learned:			
DOCKETED USNRC		·	
September 9, 2009 (11:00am)			
OFFICE OF SECRETARY	Approved, Dir.	OE: /RA/	

TENPLATE = SECY-028

DS 02

\*Packground: On December 20, 2005, OE issued Enforcement Notification (EN) 05-054 to the Commission. The EN notified the Commission of the staff's intention to issue Immediately Effective Orders to four individuals, all former employees at Davis-Besse, for their participation in providing incomplete and inaccurate information in the licensee response(s) to NRC Bulletin 2001-001. The four Orders, which were subsequently issued on January 4, 2006, were based on information obtained during an OI investigation which determined that 11 Davis-Besse employees provided incomplete and inaccurate information to the NRC. (The staff previously issued an Order to a fifth individual on April 21, 2005). EN-05-054 informed the Commission that the staff did not intend to take enforcement action against the other six individuals unless additional evidence became available to the NRC as a result of the Department of Justice (DOJ) criminal proceeding on these matters.

Subsequent to the issuance of the above Orders, the staff obtained the following new information:

- 1. On January 19, 2006, DOJ issued an indictment to one of the other six individuals, a former contractor at Davis-Besse who was responsible for compiling and drafting the responses to Bulletin 2001-001. A previous enforcement panel had determined that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that this individual had prior knowledge and acted on that knowledge to provide incomplete and inaccurate information to the NRC in the licensee's response to the Bulletin.
- 2. In early July 2006, FENOC informed the NRC of additional documents that had been discovered at Davis-Besse which appeared to be relevant to the above OI investigation but which had not previously been given to the NRC. One of those documents, a draft response to Bulletin 2001-001 containing hand written notes by the Davis-Besse Regulatory Affairs Compliance Licensing Supervisor, caused the staff to reevaluate the involvement of that individual in the preparation of the licensee's September 4, 2001, response to Bulletin 2001-001. A previous enforcement panel had determined that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that this individual had prior knowledge and acted on that knowledge to provide incomplete and inaccurate information to the NRC in the licensee's response to the Bulletin. As a result of these additional documents, on July 28, 2006, OI interviewed the Regulatory Compliance Licensing Supervisor in order to resolve the staff's concerns regarding the additional documents.

**8-3-06** - **Enforcement Panel**: An enforcement panel was convened on this date to determine, based on the new information above, whether enforcement actions should be issued to the former contractor or the Licensing Superviosr.

Note: In evaluating this new evidence, the panel used the same evaluation criteria which it had used in reviewing the available evidence for each of the other individuals identified during the OI Davis -Besse investigation as providing incomplete and inaccurate information to the NRC, i.e, did the individual have prior knowledge of the condition of the Davis-Besse reactor vessel had and, if so, did the individual provide incomplete or inaccurate information to the NRC in response to the Bulletin.

The panel made the following determinations and recommendations:

Regarding the former contractor: The panel reviewed the DOJ indictment issued to the former contractor, the evidence contained in the OI report, the additional documents the licensee provided to the NRC in early July, and the July 28, 2006 OI interview of transcript of the Licensing Supervisor which made reference to the contractor. The panel concluded that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that the former contractor had personal knowledge of the condition of the reactor vessel head or that he deliberately provided incomplete or inaccurate information to the NRC in the Bulletin responses. The panel noted that, in accordance with the Enforcement Policy, the NRC would not normally take an enforcement action against an individual, such as this contractor, who is in a low level position within the licensee's organization. The panel reaffirmed its previous position to recommend that the NRC not take enforcement action against the former contractor.

Regarding the Licensing Supervisor. The panel reviewed the additional documents the licensee provided to the NRC in early July and the OI July 28, 2006, transcript of interview of the Licensing Supervisor and concluded that he provided credible responses to address the staff's concerns regarding his written comments on the newly discovered documents. The panel concluded that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that the Licensing Supervisor had prior knowledge of the condition of the reactor vessel head or that he deliberately provided incomplete or inaccurate information to the NRC. The panel reaffirmed its previous position to recommend that the NRC not take enforcement action against the Licensing Supervisor.

100/

Wulco