

WATERFORD OPEN ISSUE

Task: \*A-232, A-234, A-237, A-238, A-243, A-244, A-245, A-262, A-311, A-312, A-313, A-316, A-317, A-318, A-320, A-321, A-323, A-324, A-325, A-326, A-327, A-328, A-331

Ref. No.: 4-84-A-06/120, 123, 124, 125, 129, 130, 131, 144  
4-84-A-12/3(a), (b), (c), 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18  
4-84-A-31

Characterization: The Mercury nonconformance system did not (1) properly identify nonconforming components; prevent the installation of nonconforming materials, parts, and components place the required hold tags, and disposition nonconformances; (2) give QA personnel the freedom to write nonconformances; and (3) assure corrective action was inadequate. In some cases these conditions also relate to Ebasco.

Initial Assessment of Significance: This allegation appears to be generic; however, Individual [ "C" ] provided a large number of specific examples which are identified in the reference numbers above. This allegation is also related to statements or changes that DN, QI, DR, FCR, DCN and speedy memos were used to circumvent writing nonconformance reports (NCR). The impact may be incomplete documentation of nonconforming conditions and corrective action relative to both QA record packages for turnover and hardware.

[ Source: Individual "C" ]

Approach to Resolution:

1. Review the information described in each task/reference number and the referenced exhibits for the particular issue assigned.
2. Review Ebasco and Mercury procedures for identifying (including tagging, controlling, dispositioning, and correcting conditions adverse to quality such as failures, malfunctions, deficiencies, deviations, defective materials/equipment and nonconformances. This includes request for information and speed letters.
3. Review NCR, deficiency report/notice, etc., logs. Select reports similar to those above (identified by Individual [ "C" ]) and include those in your review. Review Hold Tag Log and letter W3QA-26547, dated 9/28/83.
4. Interview, as necessary, those persons in Ebasco and Mercury management, supervision, construction, engineering, and quality assurance/control organizations involved with the NCR system and the specific NCR's inspected by NRC. The object is to evaluate the nonconformance/corrective action system at Waterford 3.

5. Identify potential hardware deficiencies to other NRC teams.
6. Evaluate for generic/safety implications. Report the results of the review/evaluation of these allegations.

Status: In progress - Team 2 (Fox/Whittemore/Morgan)

Review Lead: J. Harrison

Support:

Estimated Resources: 5 man days

Estimated Completion: 5/4/84

CLOSURE:

Document Name:  
X A-232

Requestor's ID:  
CONNIE

Author's Name:

Document Comments:



WATERFORD OPEN ISSUE

Task: \*A-232, A-234, A-237, A-238, ~~A-239~~, A-243, A-244, A-245, A-311,  
A-312, A-313, A-316, A-317, A-318, A-320, A-321, A-323, A-324, A-325,  
A-326, A-327, A-328, A-331 **262**

Ref. No.: 4-84-A-06/120, 123, 124, ~~125~~, 129, 130, 131, **144**  
4-84-A-12/3(a), (b), (c), 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17,  
18  
4-84-A-31 ~~4-84-A-06/120~~

Characterization: The Mercury nonconformance system did not (1) properly identify nonconforming components; prevent the installation of nonconforming materials, parts, and components; place the required hold tags, and disposition nonconformances; (2) give QA personnel the freedom to write nonconformances; and (3) assure corrective action was inadequate. In some cases these conditions also relate to Ebasco.

Initial Assessment of Significance: This allegation appears to be generic; however, Individual ["C"] provided a large number of specific examples which are identified in the reference numbers above. This allegation is also related to statements or changes that DN, QI, DR, FCR, DCN and speedy memos were used to circumvent writing nonconformance reports (NCR). The impact may be incomplete documentation of nonconforming conditions and corrective action relative to both QA record packages for turnover and hardware.

[Source: Individual "C"]

Approach to Resolution:

1. Review the information described in each task/reference number and the referenced exhibits for the particular issue assigned.
2. Review Ebasco and Mercury procedures for identifying (including tagging, controlling, dispositioning, and correcting conditions adverse to quality such as failures, malfunctions, deficiencies, deviations, defective materials/equipment and nonconformances. This includes request for information and speed letters.
3. Review NCR, deficiency report/notice, etc., logs. Select reports similar to those above (identified by Individual ["C"]) and include those in your review. Review Holt Tag Log and letter W3QA-26547, dated 9/28/83.
4. Interview, as necessary, those persons in Ebasco and Mercury management, supervision, construction, engineering, and quality assurance/control organizations involved with the NCR system and the specific NCR's inspected by NRC. The object is to evaluate the nonconformance/corrective action system at Waterford 3.

5. Identify potential hardware deficiencies to other NRC teams.
6. Evaluate for generic/safety implications. Report the results of the review/evaluation of these allegations.

Status: In progress - Team 2 (Fox/Whittemore/Morgan)

Review Lead: J. Harrison

Support:

Estimated Resources: 5 man days

Estimated Completion: 5/4/84

CLOSURE: