

SSER

Task: Allegation A-132

Reference No.: 4-84-A-06-27

Characterization: It is alleged that the J. A. Jones Construction Company used a form of communication called "speed letters" to report information that should have been reported in deficiency notices (DNs) and possibly in nonconformance reports (NCRs). This is a concern because "speed letters" are not quality assurance (QA) documents and do not receive an EBASCO QA review.

Assessment of Allegation: In order to determine the validity and significance of the allegation, the NRC staff reviewed J. A. Jones speed letters 0001 through 1122 dated approximately November 11, 1977 to October 15, 1980, transmitted to EBASCO engineering personnel. These speed letters concerned J. A. Jones concrete work performed in the reactor containment building (RCB), reactor auxiliary building (RAB), fuel handling building (FHB), and concrete basemat. The NRC staff also interviewed EBASCO QA and engineering personnel regarding the use of speed letters.

The majority of the J. A. Jones speed letters reviewed by the NRC staff were related to logistics of work schedules and performance ; however, the staff discovered some speed letters involving deviations from, or changes to, the original design specifications. Examples of deviations and field design changes included ; a pilaster 5" too high and requiring modification, slight shifting of reinforcing steel locations, and the use of Cadwelding kits on reinforcing steel sizes other than those sizes for which the kit was made. (See the NRC staff's assessment of Allegation A-171).

The NRC staff's interviews with EBASCO QA personnel revealed that the QA personnel were aware of potential problems regarding the misuse of speed letters, and that QA personnel also believed that the Engineering Information Request (EIR) document was possibly being misused. EBASCO QA personnel informed the NRC staff that they were in the process of conducting a review to

identify potential problems regarding the use of speed letters and the misuse of EIRs. In a memorandum dated February 20, 1984, the EBASCO QA Site Supervisor requested that the EBASCO Site Support Engineering (ESSE) Supervising Engineer review the J. A. Jones speed letters and EIRs. The results of an ESSE cursory review were themselves presented in a speed letter of January 27, 1984. Another EBASCO speed letter of February 18, 1984, substantiated that design changes had been the subject of some of the J. A. Jones speed letters and EIRs reviewed. Although EBASCO itself had used speed letters instead of the required QA documentation to relay this information, they accurately pointed out that a review of Field Change Requests (FCRs) and Design Change Notifications (DCNs) would have to be performed to determine if the issues presented in the J. A. Jones speed letters were also correctly addressed in the required QA documentation.

Based on its review, the NRC staff determined that some of the J. A. Jones speed letters and EIRs addressed areas where DNs, NCRs, or FCRs should have been required by the existing QA program, and that EBASCO QA personnel were aware of these discrepancies in the QA procedures.

When EBASCO's review of the DN, NCR, and FCR files, and LP&L's review and followup are complete, the NRC staff will determine if a violation of QA procedures occurred. However, the staff's review indicated that the vast majority of the items addressed in the J. A. Jones speed letters involved situations with negligible impact on structural integrity or plant safety.

This allegation has no safety significance at this time; however, the generic implications involving the use of documents outside the formal QA program require action by LP&L.

Potential Violations: None.

Actions Required: See Item 14 of the enclosure to the letter from D. Eisenhut to J. M. Cain (LP&L), dated June 13, 1984.

References

1. Ebasco Services Incorporated Procedure for Inspection and Test Status, WQC-150, Revision 3, dated November 9, 1983 with Amendments 1 and 2.
2. Ebasco Services Incorporated Procedure for Processing of Nonconformances, ASP-III-2, Issue J, dated December 9, 1983 with Amendment 1.
3. Ebasco Services Incorporated Procedure for Design Change Notice and Field Change Request E-69, dated February 20, 1983.
4. Ebasco Services Incorporated Procedure for Design Control ASP-I-4, Issue K, dated June 7, 1983.
5. J. A. Jones/Ebasco "Speed Letters" numbered 0001 through 1122 and written during the period from November 18, 1977 to October 15, 1980 (examples included).
6. Letter from Mr. Sam Horton, Ebasco QA Site Supervisor, to Mr. Brian Grant, Civil Ebasco Site Services Engineering Supervising Engineer, dated February 20, 1984. Subject: Design Review of J. A. Jones Construction Company's Engineering Information Requests and Three Part Memos.

7. Speed Letters from Mr. Brian Grant to Mr. Sam Horton dated February 18, 1984 and February 27, 1984. Subject: Review of J. A. Jones Speed Letters and Review of J. A. Jones IR's, respectively.
8. Ebasco Services Incorporated Procedure for Control of Information Requests Between Ebasco and Site Contractors.

Statement Prepared By:	_____	_____
	J. Strosnider	Date
Reviewed By:	_____	_____
	Team Leader	Date
Reviewed By:	_____	_____
	Site Team Leader(s)	Date
Approved By:	_____	_____
	Task Management	Date

Document Name:

SSER A-132

Requestor's ID:

PATTYN

Author's Name:

Document Comments:

comm from displaywriter 5/29/84

SINGLE SPACE

SSER

Task: Allegation A-132

file

Reference No.: 4-84-A-06-27

Characterization: It is alleged that the J. A. Jones Construction Company used a form of communication called "speed letters" to report information that should have been reported in deficiency notices (DNs) and possibly in nonconformance reports (NCRs). This is a concern because "speed letters" are not quality assurance (QA) documents and do not receive an EBASCO QA review.

The implied significance of this allegation is that

Assessment of Allegation: In order to determine the validity and significance of the allegation, the NRC staff reviewed J. A. Jones speed letters ^{numbered} 0001 through 1122, ^{covering the period of} dated approximately November ~~11~~ 1977 to October ~~15~~ 1980. ^{These speed letters had been} transmitted to EBASCO engineering personnel. ^{and} These speed letters concerned J. A. Jones concrete work performed in the reactor containment building (RCB), reactor auxiliary building (RAB), fuel handling building (FHB), and concrete basemat. The NRC staff also interviewed EBASCO QA and engineering personnel regarding the use of speed letters.

The majority of the J. A. Jones speed letters reviewed by the NRC staff were related to ^{the} logistics of work schedules and performance ; however, the staff discovered some speed letters involving deviations from, or changes to, the original design specifications. Examples of deviations and field design changes included ; a pilaster 5" too high and requiring modification, slight shifting of reinforcing steel locations, and the use of Cadwelding kits on reinforcing steel sizes other than those sizes for which the kit was made. (See the NRC staff's assessment of Allegation A-171).

The NRC staff's interviews with EBASCO QA personnel revealed that the QA personnel were aware of potential problems regarding the misuse of speed letters, and that QA personnel also believed that the Engineering Information Request (EIR) document was possibly being misused. EBASCO QA personnel informed the NRC staff that they were in the process of conducting a review to

identify potential problems regarding the use of speed letters and the misuse of EIRs. In a memorandum dated February 20, 1984, the EBASCO QA Site Supervisor requested that the EBASCO Site Support Engineering (ESSE) Supervising Engineer review the J. A. Jones speed letters and EIRs. The results of an ESSE cursory review were themselves presented in a speed letter of January 27, 1984. Another EBASCO speed letter of February 18, 1984, substantiated that design changes had been the subject of some of the J. A. Jones speed letters and EIRs reviewed. Although EBASCO itself had used speed letters instead of the required QA documentation to relay this information, they accurately pointed out that a review of Field Change Requests (FCRs) and Design Change Notifications (DCNs) would have to be performed to determine if the issues presented in the J. A. Jones speed letters were also correctly addressed in the required QA documentation.

~~Based on its review,~~ ^{review} The NRC staff determined that some of the J. A. Jones speed letters and EIRs addressed areas where DNs, NCRs, or FCRs should have been required by the existing QA program, and that EBASCO QA personnel were aware of these discrepancies in the QA procedures. X

^{speed letters and EIRs}
When EBASCO's review of the ~~DN, NCR, and FCR~~ files, and LP&L's review and followup are complete, the NRC staff will determine if a violation of QA procedures occurred. However, the staff's review indicated that the vast majority of the items addressed in the J. A. Jones speed letters involved situations with negligible impact on structural integrity or plant safety.

^{based on the staff's preliminary findings;}
This allegation has no safety significance ~~at this time;~~ however, the generic implications involving the use of documents outside the formal QA program require action by LP&L. X

Potential Violations: None, ^{based on preliminary findings.} X

Actions Required: See Item ^{No.}14 of the ^EEnclosure to the letter from D. Eisenhower to J. M. Cain (LP&L), dated June 13, 1984. X

References

1. Ebasco Services Incorporated Procedure for Inspection and Test Status, WQC-150, Revision 3, dated November 9, 1983 with Amendments 1 and 2.
2. Ebasco Services Incorporated Procedure for Processing of Nonconformances, ASP-III-2, Issue J, dated December 9, 1983 with Amendment 1.
3. Ebasco Services Incorporated Procedure for Design Change Notice and Field Change Request E-69, dated February 20, 1983.
4. Ebasco Services Incorporated Procedure for Design Control ASP-I-4, Issue K, dated June 7, 1983.
5. J. A. Jones/Ebasco "Speed Letters" numbered 0001 through 1122 and written during the period from November 18, 1977 to October 15, 1980 (examples included).
6. Letter from Mr. Sam Horton, Ebasco QA Site Supervisor, to Mr. Brian Grant, Civil Ebasco Site Services Engineering Supervising Engineer, dated February 20, 1984. Subject: Design Review of J. A. Jones Construction Company's Engineering Information Requests and Three Part Memos.

7. Speed Letters from Mr. Brian Grant to Mr. Sam Horton dated February 18, 1984 and February 27, 1984. Subject: Review of J. A. Jones Speed Letters and Review of J. A. Jones IR's, respectively.
8. Ebasco Services Incorporated Procedure for Control of Information Requests Between Ebasco and Site Contractors.

Statement Prepared By:

J. Strosnider

Date

Reviewed By:

Team Leader

Date

Reviewed By:

Site Team Leader(s)

Date

Approved By:

Task Management

Date

SSER

Task: Allegation A-132

Reference No.: 4-84-A-06-27

Characterization: It is alleged that the J. A. Jones Construction Company used a form of communication called "speed letters" to report information that should have been reported in deficiency notices (DNs) and possibly in nonconformance reports (NCRs). This is a concern because "speed letters" are not quality assurance (QA) documents and do not receive an EBASCO QA review.

The implied significance of this allegation is that

Assessment of Allegation: In order to determine the validity and significance of the allegation, the NRC staff reviewed J. A. Jones speed letters ^{numbered} 0001 through 1122 dated ^{covering the period of} approximately November ~~15~~, 1977 to October ~~15~~, 1980. ^{These speed letters had been} transmitted to EBASCO engineering personnel. ^{and} These speed letters concerned J. A. Jones concrete work performed in the reactor containment building (RCB), reactor auxiliary building (RAB), fuel handling building (FHB), and concrete basemat. The NRC staff also interviewed EBASCO QA and engineering personnel regarding the use of speed letters.

The majority of the J. A. Jones speed letters reviewed by the NRC staff were related to ^{the} logistics of work schedules and performance ; however, the staff discovered some speed letters involving deviations from, or changes to, the original design specifications. Examples of deviations and field design changes included ; a pilaster 5" too high and requiring modification, slight shifting of reinforcing steel locations, and the use of Cadwelding kits on reinforcing steel sizes other than those sizes for which the kit was made. (See the NRC staff's assessment of Allegation A-171).

The NRC staff's interviews with EBASCO QA personnel revealed that the QA personnel were aware of potential problems regarding the misuse of speed letters, and that QA personnel also believed that the Engineering Information Request (EIR) document was possibly being misused. EBASCO QA personnel informed the NRC staff that they were in the process of conducting a review to

identify potential problems regarding the use of speed letters and the misuse of EIRs. In a memorandum dated February 20, 1984, the EBASCO QA Site Supervisor requested that the EBASCO Site Support Engineering (ESSE) Supervising Engineer review the J. A. Jones speed letters and EIRs. The results of an ESSE cursory review were themselves presented in a speed letter of January 27, 1984. Another EBASCO speed letter of February 18, 1984, substantiated that design changes had been the subject of some of the J. A. Jones speed letters and EIRs reviewed. Although EBASCO itself had used speed letters instead of the required QA documentation to relay this information, they accurately pointed out that a review of Field Change Requests (FCRs) and Design Change Notifications (DCNs) would have to be performed to determine if the issues presented in the J. A. Jones speed letters were also correctly addressed in the required QA documentation.

^{review}
~~Based on its review,~~ the NRC staff determined that some of the J. A. Jones speed letters and EIRs addressed areas where DN, NCRs, or FCRs should have been required by the existing QA program, and that EBASCO QA personnel were aware of these discrepancies in the QA procedures.

When EBASCO's review of the DN, NCR, and FCR files, and LP&L's review and followup ^{work has been} ~~are~~ completed, the NRC staff will determine if a violation of QA procedures occurred. ~~However,~~ ^{preliminary} the staff's review indicated that the vast majority of the items addressed in the J. A. Jones speed letters involved situations with negligible impact on structural integrity or plant safety.

^W This allegation has no safety significance ~~at this time~~; ^{based on the staff's preliminary findings} however, the generic implications involving the use of documents outside the formal QA program require action by LP&L.

Potential Violations: None.

*words about
violations should
not be put into the
assessment section.*

Actions Required: See Item ^{No.} 14 of the ^Enclosure to the letter from D. Eisenhower to J. M. Cain (LP&L), dated June 13, 1984.

References

1. Ebasco Services Incorporated Procedure for Inspection and Test Status, WQC-150, Revision 3, dated November 9, 1983 with Amendments 1 and 2.
2. Ebasco Services Incorporated Procedure for Processing of Nonconformances, ASP-III-2, Issue J, dated December 9, 1983 with Amendment 1.
3. Ebasco Services Incorporated Procedure for Design Change Notice and Field Change Request E-69, dated February 20, 1983.
4. Ebasco Services Incorporated Procedure for Design Control ASP-I-4, Issue K, dated June 7, 1983.
5. J. A. Jones/Ebasco "Speed Letters" numbered 0001 through 1122 and written during the period from November 18, 1977 to October 15, 1980 (examples included).
6. Letter from Mr. Sam Horton, Ebasco QA Site Supervisor, to Mr. Brian Grant, Civil Ebasco Site Services Engineering Supervising Engineer, dated February 20, 1984. Subject: Design Review of J. A. Jones Construction Company's Engineering Information Requests and Three Part Memos.

7. Speed Letters from Mr. Brian Grant to Mr. Sam Horton dated February 18, 1984 and February 27, 1984. Subject: Review of J. A. Jones Speed Letters and Review of J. A. Jones IR's, respectively.
8. Ebasco Services Incorporated Procedure for Control of Information Requests Between Ebasco and Site Contractors.

Statement Prepared By:	_____	_____
	J. Strosnider	Date
Reviewed By:	_____	_____
	Team Leader	Date
Reviewed By:	_____	_____
	Site Team Leader(s)	Date
Approved By:	_____	_____
	Task Management	Date

Document Name:

SSER A-132

file

Requestor's ID:

PATTYN

Author's Name:

Document Comments:

comm from displaywriter 5/29/84

*Single
space*