


RELATED CORRESPONDENCE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD



In the Matter)	
)	
METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY)	
)	Docket No. 50-289
(Three Mile Island Nuclear)	(Restart)
Station, Unit No. 1))	

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF DENNIS J. BONETTI

Because of the massive amount of documents involved in evaluating work requests (over 40,000), TMIA used a computer summary to initially scrutinize the work requests. This computer summary was provided by Licensee in response to TMIA Interrogatory Set 5, Number 6, and was entitled "Corrective Maintenance Component History Report."

In evaluating the data contained within the computer summary, I set very simple parameters for volunteers to search. The completion date, as appeared on the computer summary, was compared to the origination date on the computer summary. If the difference was one year or greater and it was a one or two priority, the work request was listed on a work sheet along with other relevant data. In addition to the one and two priority work requests, number three priority work requests were included if the time lag was extraordinary, the work request related to other noted work requests or the problem had been identified as a higher priority item previously.

8010140585

After this task was completed, all of the actual work requests identified by this search were requested by TMIA for further scrutiny. As they were received, TMIA volunteers double checked to assure that the information contained on Licensee's computer summary (and therefore TMIA's summaries) were correct. From this review, it became apparent that the information contained on Licensee's computer summary did not reflect the dates contained in the work requests.

For example, the date the work request was originated was not the date that appeared on the computer summary, for the large majority of items reviewed. TMIA Exhibits 1 through 7 contain the origination date which appears on the actual work request. An asterik is placed beside this date if the date on the computer summary differed from the actual work request. If there was a significant difference in origination dates, the incorrect computer date is also included in parentheses in the same column.

There were also major differences in the completion dates. The completion date on the computer summary was neither the date the work was performed nor the date that it was finally signed off. Therefore, the dates which appear on TMIA's Exhibits 1 through 7 are the dates which appeared on line 19 of the actual work request. That is, the day the work was performed.

Exhibit 1 represents those work requests where the actual work was deferred in excess of one year.

Exhibit 2 represents those work requests involved in the purging of 11/5/79, 11/6/79 and 12/3/79.

Exhibit 3 represents those work requests that were cancelled because work was to be performed on another work request. By "tacking" the origination date of the former work request with the completion date of the latter work request, there is an item of deferred maintenance.


Exhibit 4 represents work requests where, although the "work performed" may have been within one year, the component was never aligned for testing, tested or returned to normal use within one year.

Exhibit 5 represents work requests where the "work performed" was within one year, but the QA/QC was not performed within one year.

Exhibit 6 represents work requests that were cancelled, per Mike Ross leak list.

Exhibit 7 represents work requests that were cancelled without explanation, date or signoff. The date in the "work performed" column in parenthesis is the completion date appearing on the computer summary.

Respectfully submitted,


Dennis J. Bonetti

Dated: