

SSER

Task: Allegation A-263

Reference No.: 4-84-A-06/145

Characterization: It is alleged that a Mercury Construction Superintendent did not agree with Mercury audit findings and refused to correct problems identified.

Assessment of Allegation: The allegation arose from an audit finding in Mercury Internal Audit No. 12-1-82 (December 12, 1982), which documented that tubing did not have end caps. It was alleged that the Construction Superintendent refused to take corrective action.

The NRC staff reviewed the Mercury audit files and noted that the audit recommendation block had the Construction Superintendent's comment, "Do not agree with your recommendation." The Mercury auditor had also referenced Corrective Action Report (CAR) 124-125, closed out February 27, 1983.

The NRC staff learned that a Mercury Construction Supervisor assigned to the area where end caps were found missing had immediately taken corrective action. His superintendent received the audit finding and noted an additional recommendation made by the Mercury auditor, that supervisors and lead personnel do not adequately instruct and train subordinates in correct interpretation of Mercury procedures and that a lack of enforcement exists. The superintendent disagreed with this additional recommendation, not with the missing end cap problem for which corrective action had already been taken.

The NRC staff determined that the Mercury auditor's finding did not contain sufficient objective evidence to support the auditor's additional recommendation; even though the auditor thought the situation to be true, he did not document his finding. The CAR which the auditor referenced, and which he had included in the audit report, stated that disciplinary action was not appropriately

applied or given to personnel; the auditor expected disciplinary action to be taken against certain Mercury construction craft personnel. The NRC staff and the Construction Superintendent agreed that this type of recommendation was not appropriate to include in any audit report. However, the review of the Mercury audit program identified significant problems; see the NRC staff's assessment of Allegation A-48.

In assessing this allegation, the NRC staff found similarities with Allegation A-48*, which alleged that a QA program breakdown existed between EBASCO and Mercury.

This specific allegation regarding the Construction Superintendent's refusal to take corrective action has neither safety significance nor generic implications.

Potential Violations: None.

Actions Required: None.

References

1. Mercury Audit No. 12-1-82, December 12, 1982, Exhibit 36
2. Mercury CAR No. 125, dated December 2, 1982, subject: Tubing Ends Not Capped per QAM Section 11 and PCP-2040.

Statement Prepared By: _____

H. Shannon Phillips

Date

Reviewed By:

Team Leader

Date

Reviewed By:

Site Team Leader(s)

Date

Approved By:

Task Management

Date

Document Name:
SSER A-263

Requestor's ID:
CONNIE

Author's Name:

Document Comments:
comm from displaywriter 5/29/84

SSER

Task: Allegation A-263

Reference No.: 4-84-A-06/145

Characterization: It is alleged that a Mercury Construction Superintendent did not agree with Mercury audit findings and refused to correct problems identified.

Assessment of Allegation: The allegation arose from an audit finding in Mercury Internal Audit No. 12-1-82 (December 12, 1982), which documented that tubing did not have end caps. It was alleged that the Construction Superintendent refused to take corrective action.

The NRC staff reviewed the Mercury audit files and noted that the audit recommendation block had the Construction Superintendent's comment, "Do not agree with your recommendation." The Mercury auditor had also referenced Corrective Action Report (CAR) 124-125, closed out February 27, 1983.

The NRC staff learned that a Mercury Construction Supervisor assigned to the area where end caps were found missing had immediately taken corrective action. His superintendent received the audit finding and noted an additional recommendation made by the Mercury auditor, that supervisors and lead personnel do not adequately instruct and train subordinates in correct interpretation of Mercury procedures and that a lack of enforcement exists. The superintendent disagreed with this additional recommendation, not with the missing end cap problem for which corrective action had already been taken.

The NRC staff determined that the Mercury auditor's finding did not contain sufficient objective evidence to support the auditor's additional recommendation; even though the auditor thought the situation to be true, he did not document his finding. The CAR which the auditor referenced, and which he had included in the audit report, stated that disciplinary action was not appropriately

applied or given to personnel; the auditor expected disciplinary action to be taken against certain Mercury construction craft personnel. The NRC staff and the Construction Superintendent agreed that this type of recommendation was not appropriate to include in any audit report. However, the review of the Mercury audit program identified significant problems; (see the NRC staff's assessment of Allegation A-48.

In assessing this allegation, the NRC staff found similarities with Allegation A-48*, which alleged that a QA program breakdown existed between EBASCO and Mercury.

This specific allegation regarding the Construction Superintendent's refusal to take corrective action has neither safety significance nor generic implications.

[Potential Violations: None.]

Actions Required: None.

References

1. Mercury Audit No. 12-1-82, December 12, 1982, Exhibit 36
2. Mercury CAR No. 125, dated December 2, 1982, subject: Tubing Ends Not Capped per QAM Section 11 and PCP-2040.

Statement Prepared By: _____

H. Shannon Phillips

Date

Reviewed By:

Team Leader

Date

Reviewed By:

Site Team Leader(s)

Date

Approved By:

Task Management

Date

Document Name:
SSER A-263

Requestor's ID:
CONNIE

Author's Name:

Document Comments:
comm from displaywriter 5/29/84