

- (1) *The degree of knowledge that the communicator should have had, regarding the matter, in view of his or her position, training or experience.*

The primary communicator for this phone call is unknown (could check with the PM to see if she or he recorded this in her or his notes). Based on staff experience, the primary communicators for licensees are generally experienced technical managers with excellent understanding of steam generator issues.

- (2) *The opportunity and time available prior to the communication to assure the accuracy or completeness of the information.*

Again, it is unknown when we notified the licensee that we would like to have a conference call to discuss the outage results. It is possible that the licensee did not have enough time to obtain, summarize and subsequently communicate to the staff the most up-to-date information. Even if the staff had given the licensee plenty of time to prepare, it is possible that the licensee did not go to the trouble of obtaining the most up-to-date information prior to the phone call. Also, because SG inspection work is typically in progress during these types of phone calls, it is possible that information may exist in the licensee's organization that the licensee's representatives participating in the phone call are not aware of.

- (3) *The degree of intent or negligence, if any, involved.*

The staff does not have a conclusion on this matter because it has not yet been determined whether the licensee had identified and confirmed the PWSCC flaw at the time of the May phone call.

- (4) *The formality of the communication.*

The phone call was informal.

- (5) *The reasonableness of NRC reliance on the information.*

These phone calls provide the staff an opportunity to identify potential issues in a timely way. Occasionally the staff recommends that licensees adjust inspections, in situ pressure testing, and repair plans. Licensees provide information through these phone calls that are often our only source of valuable SG inspection information. The staff did not rely on this information for any regulatory action (e.g., license amendment review). The licensee provided complete, accurate information in its July 1997 report to the staff on inspection results.

- (6) *The importance of the information which was wrong or not provided.*

The information was relevant to the February tube failure. However, given the complex nature of the causal factors that led to the tube failure, it is not clear that by providing this information during the phone call, subsequent events would have significantly changed.

- (7) *The reasonableness of the explanation for not providing complete and accurate information.*

ITEM 3

3

4/1

2

The staff does not have a conclusion on this matter because it has not yet been determined whether the licensee had identified and confirmed the PWSCC flaw at the time of the May phone call.