

SSER

Task: Allegation A-64; A-65; A-66 ; A-322

Reference No.: 4-83-A-88/16, 17, and 18 ; 4-84-A-12/12

Characterization: The allegation is that Ebasco site letters F-63724E, F-618958 and F-61147E imply that Mercury inspection activities may be unacceptable.

Assessment of Allegation: The implied significance of this allegation is that unacceptable inspections by Mercury could have permitted invalid installations, *to have gone undetected.*

The NRC staff reviewed the letters identified in this allegation. The staff also reviewed Mercury letter WA-2065, February 25, 1983; Ebasco letter F-61120E, January 13, 1983; Mercury letter WA-2014, December 21, 1983. The numerous solutions called for in these documents were implemented, and resulted in the issuance of approximately 100 nonconformance reports (NCR) and discrepancy notices (DN). As a result of the reinspections required by the above letters, and the issuance of ~~NCRs and DNs~~, two Significant Construction Deficiencies (SCDs), SCD-57 and SCD-84, ~~were also issued.~~ *These facts substantiate that sufficient inspection was performed. The staff concludes*

The NRC staff concludes that Ebasco identified the problem that Mercury lacked sufficient implementation of the quality assurance program and Ebasco has performed the necessary inspections and additional work to bring the Mercury installation work up to an acceptable level. This allegation therefore has neither safety significance nor generic implications.

Potential Violations: None.

Actions Required: None.

References

1. Ebasco letter F-63724E dated, July 25, 1983.
2. Ebasco letter F-61895E dated, March 19, 1983.
3. Mercury letter WA-2065 dated, February 25, 1983.
4. Ebasco letter F-61147E dated, February 10, 1983.
5. Ebasco letter F-61120E dated, January 13, 1983
6. Mercury letter WA-2014 dated, December 21, 1982.
7. Significant Construction Deficiency - 84
8. Significant Construction Deficiency - 57
9. Nonconformance Reports, e.g., W3-6159

Statement Prepared By:

T. Morgan

Date

Reviewed By:

Team Leader

Date

Reviewed By:

Site Team Leader(s)

Date

Approved By:

Task Management

Date

Document Name:

SSER X A-64

Requestor's ID:

CONNIE

Author's Name:

T. Morgan

Document Comments:

A-65, A-66

SSER

Task: Allegation A-64; A-65; A-66

Reference No.: 4-83-A-88/16, 17, and 18

Characterization: The allegation is that Ebasco site letters F-63724E, F-618958 and F-61147E imply that Mercury inspection activities may be unacceptable.

Assessment of Allegation: The implied significance of this allegation is that unacceptable inspections by Mercury could have permitted invalid installations.

The NRC staff reviewed the letters identified in this allegation. The staff also reviewed Mercury letter WA-2065, February 25, 1983; Ebasco letter F-61120E, January 13, 1983; Mercury letter WA-2014, December 21, 1983. The numerous solutions called for in these documents were implemented, and resulted in the issuance of approximately 100 nonconformance reports (NCR) and discrepancy notices (DN). As a result of the reinspections required by the above letters, and the issuance of NCRs and DNs, two Significant Construction Deficiencies (SCDs), SCD-57 and SCD-84, were also issued. These facts substantiate that sufficient inspection was performed.

The NRC staff concludes that Ebasco identified the problem that Mercury lacked sufficient implementation of the quality assurance program and Ebasco has performed the necessary inspections and additional work to bring the Mercury installation work up to an acceptable level. This allegation therefore has neither safety significance nor generic implications.

Potential Violations: None.

Actions Required: None.

References

1. Ebasco letter F-63724E dated, July 25, 1983.
2. Ebasco letter F-61895E dated, March 19, 1983.
3. Mercury letter WA-2065 dated, February 25, 1983.
4. Ebasco letter F-61147E dated, February 10, 1983.
5. Ebasco letter F-61120E dated, January 13, 1983
6. Mercury letter WA-2014 dated, December 21, 1982.
7. Significant Construction Deficiency - 84
8. Significant Construction Deficiency - 57
9. Nonconformance Reports, e.g., W3-6159

Statement Prepared By:

T. Morgan

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewed By:

Team Leader

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewed By:

Site Team Leader(s)

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Approved By:

## Task Management

Date \_\_\_\_\_

SSER

Task: Allegation A-64; A-65; A-66

Reference No.: 4-83-A-88/16, 17, and 18

Characterization: The allegation is that Ebasco site letters F-63724E, F-618958 and F-61147E imply that Mercury inspection activities may be unacceptable.

Assessment of Allegation: The implied significance of this allegation is that unacceptable inspections by Mercury could have permitted invalid installations.

The NRC staff reviewed the letters identified in this allegation. The staff also reviewed Mercury letter WA-2065, February 25, 1983; Ebasco letter F-61120E, January 13, 1983; Mercury letter WA-2014, December 21, 1983. The numerous solutions called for in these documents were implemented, and resulted in the issuance of approximately 100 nonconformance reports (NCR) and discrepancy notices (DN). As a result of the reinspections required by the above letters, and the issuance of NCRs and DNs, two Significant Construction Deficiencies (SCDs), SCD-57 and SCD-84, were also issued. These facts substantiate that sufficient inspection was performed.

The NRC staff concludes that Ebasco identified the problem that Mercury lacked sufficient implementation of the quality assurance program and Ebasco has performed the necessary inspections and additional work to bring the Mercury installation work up to an acceptable level. This allegation therefore has neither safety significance nor generic implications.

Potential Violations: None.

Actions Required: None.

References

1. Ebasco letter F-63724E dated, July 25, 1983.
2. Ebasco letter F-61895E dated, March 19, 1983.
3. Mercury letter WA-2065 dated, February 25, 1983.
4. Ebasco letter F-61147E dated, February 10, 1983.
5. Ebasco letter F-61120E dated, January 13, 1983
6. Mercury letter WA-2014 dated, December 21, 1982.
7. Significant Construction Deficiency - 84
8. Significant Construction Deficiency - 57
9. Nonconformance Reports, e.g., W3-6159



Statement Prepared By:

T. Morgan

Date

Reviewed By:

Team Leader

Date

Reviewed By:

Site Team Leader(s)

Date

Approved By:

Task Management

Date