

Allegation No.: RI-99-A-0042
Site: Salem
Panel Date: 4/22/99

Branch Chief (AOC): Meyer
Acknowledged: Not yet
Confidentiality Granted: No

Issues discussed:

- [1] The allegor has a personnel safety concern regarding the option to wear forced air bubble hoods inside an high temperature area. Salem radiation protection has not allowed the bubble hoods due to their ALARA review of the work in question.
- [2] The allegor thinks that there should be an NRC generic policy for the use of bubble hoods because of the personnel safety and ALARA perspectives.

Allegor contacted prior to referral to licensee (if applicable)? Not specifically about referral.

ALLEGATION PANEL DECISIONS (Previous Allegation Panels on issue: No)

Attendees: Chair - Crlenjak Branch Chief(AOC) - _____ SAC - Vito/Modes
OI Rep. - Letts RI Counsel - Fewell Others - Nimitz, Harrison, Ruland, Scholl

DISPOSITION ACTIONS:

Assign Allegation Number (RI-99-A-0042)

- 1) Ack/closeout letter - inform allegor of policy at Salem. Inform allegor NRC will refer generic aspect of concern to NRR. Provide point of contact at NRR to allegor.

Responsible Person: SAC
Closure Documentation:

ECD: 5/20/99
Completed:

- 2) Refer issue to NRR

Responsible Person: SAC
Closure Documentation:

ECD: 5/20/99
Completed:

- 3) Allegation information to be provided to RI OSHA Liaison (Bores) to determine follow-up action from an OSHA standpoint.

Responsible Person: SAC
Closure Documentation:

ECD: 4/23/99
Completed:

4/23/99 SLJ

Safety Significance Assessment: The use of air bubble hoods is a licensee matter based on consideration of ALARA and heat stress. The NRC cannot require licensee's to specifically use a certain type of protective gear.

ARB MINUTES ARE REVIEWED AND APPROVED AT THE ARB

415
F

Priority of OI Investigation _____

Rationale used to defer OI: _____

If potential discrimination or wrongdoing and OI is not opening a case, rationale is: _____

NOTES: (Include rationale for any referral to licensee, and identify any potentially generic allegations)

Issue not to be referred to licensee

A. Region 1 should refer as many allegations as possible to the licensee for action and response unless any of the following factors apply:

- Information cannot be released in sufficient detail to the licensee without compromising the identity of the alleged or confidential source (unless the alleged has no objection to his or her name being released).
- The licensee could compromise an investigation or inspection because of knowledge gained from the referral.
- The allegation is made against the licensee's management or those parties who would normally receive and address the allegation.
- The basis of the allegation is information received from a Federal agency that does not approve of the information being released in a referral.

Even if the above conditions exist, Region 1 shall refer the substance of the allegation to the licensee regardless of any factor if the allegation raises an overriding safety issue, using the guidance in Management Directive 8.8.

Factors to Consider Prior to Referral to a Licensee

In determining whether to refer eligible allegations to a licensee, The Region 1 Allegation Panel shall consider the following:

- Could the release of information bring harm to the alleged or confidential source?
- Has the alleged or confidential source voiced objections to the release of the allegation to the licensee?
- What is the licensee's history of allegations against it and past record in

ARB MINUTES ARE REVIEWED AND APPROVED AT THE ARB

dealing with allegations, including the likelihood that the licensee will effectively investigate, document, and resolve the allegation?

- Has the alleged or confidential source already taken this concern to the licensee with unsatisfactory results? If the answer is "yes," the concern is within NRC's jurisdiction, and the alleged objects to the referral, the concerns should normally not be referred to the licensee.
- Are resources to investigate available within the region?

Prior to referring an allegation to a licensee, all reasonable efforts should be made to inform alleged or confidential sources of the planned referral. This notification may be given orally and subsequently documented in an acknowledgment letter. If the alleged or confidential source objects to the referral, or does not respond within 30 calendar days, and the NRC has considered the factors described above, a referral can be made despite the alleged's or confidential source's objection or lack of response. In all such cases, an attempt will be made to contact the alleged by phone just prior to making the referral.

Also, referrals are not to be made if it could compromise the identity of the alleged, or if it could compromise an inspection or investigation. Note: Document the basis for referring allegations to a licensee in those cases where the criteria listed above indicate that it is questionable whether a referral is appropriate.

Distribution: Panel Attendees, Regional Counsel, OI, Responsible Persons (original to SAC)

Options for Resolution:

Licensee Referral (Div. Dir. Concurrence Required (First Consider Factors Prior to Referral) / Document NRC Review of Response - Resp. - AOC)

Referral to Another Agency (OSHA, etc. - Resp. - SAC)

Referral to an Agreement State (MD, ME, NH, NY, RI - Resp. - SAC)

Referral to Another NRC Office (OIG, NRR, Other Regions - Resp. - SAC)

Request for Additional Info.(From alleged, licensee, others - Resp. - AOC)

Closeout Letter/Memo (If no further action planned - Resp. - AOC)

Inspection (Resident/Specialist routine or reactive)

IF H&ID INVOLVED:

- 1) has the individual been informed of the DOL process and the need to file a complaint within 180 days Yes No

ARB MINUTES ARE REVIEWED AND APPROVED AT THE ARB

(has DOL information package been provided?)

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|
| 2) has the individual filed a complaint with DOL | Yes | No |
| 3) if the complainant filed directly with DOL, have they been contacted to obtain their technical concerns (Resp. - SAC) | Yes | No |
| 4) is a chilling effect letter warranted:
(DOL finding in favor of alleged)
(conciliation w/licensee prior to DOL decision) | Yes | No |

ADDITIONAL NOTES:

ARB MINUTES ARE REVIEWED AND APPROVED AT THE ARB