

SSER

Task: Allegations A-113, A-135, A-137

Reference No.: 4-84-A-06-8; 4-84-A-06-30; 4-84-A-06-32

Characterization: It has been alleged that based on the information presented in an Ebasco memorandum on concrete placement records dated December 9, 1982, a 100% review of the concrete placement records should have been started and the problems should have been identified on the nonconformance reports (NCRs). It is further alleged that some of the resulting NCRs may contain deficiencies reportable to NRC pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55(e).

Assessment of Allegation: <sup>100%</sup> The NRC staff reviewed the chronology of events related to the QA reviews on concrete placement and determined that LP&L decided to initiate a review of the concrete placement packages on July 11, 1983 and actually began the review during August 1983. Based on their preliminary findings, LP&L later expanded this review to include all concrete placement records, not just those cited in the memorandum. Thirty-three NCRs were generated by Ebasco to address the deficiencies (no deficiencies were reported on Discrepancy Notices (DNs)). These NCRs were also reviewed in accordance with Administrative Site Procedure, ASP-IV-122, to determine the reportability of deficiencies to NRC pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55(e). The NRC staff's safety findings based on the review of the above NCRs are discussed in the SSER for Allegation A-112. LP&L also undertook a 100% review of Cadweld records, and four NCRs were generated as a result of this review. These NCRs also indicated that the Cadweld records were reviewed for reportability pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55(e). The staff's safety findings are reported in the SSER for Allegations A-106, A-110, A-115, and A-146.

The waterstops and related activities were considered nonsafety-related items as noted in Ebasco memorandum ES-8271-83, dated December 13, 1983. The staff's safety findings with respect to waterstop activities are reported in the SSER for Allegation A-129.

Based on the above information, the NRC staff concluded that LP&L had undertaken activities to review the records as recommended by the allegor, and that the allegor was satisfied that his concerns were fully addressed. LP&L approached this 100% review in a time-stepped method which spanned an 8-month period.

The NRC staff also reviewed the allegation against the requirements of 10 CFR 50.55(e) regarding reporting a significant breakdown in any portion of the QA program conducted in accordance with requirements of 10 CFR 50 Appendix B. Based on the detailed review of the various issues involved, the NRC staff determined that there was no need for LP&L to report any of these issues to the NRC under 10 CFR 50.55(e) since nothing had been identified which, had it remained uncorrected, could have adversely affected the safe operation of the plant.

This allegation has neither safety significance nor generic implications.

Potential Violations: See Allegations A-106, A-110, A-112, and A-146.

Actions Required: See Allegations A-110 and A-146.

References

1. Ebasco Memorandum from J. Davis to M. Burgan, dated December 9, 1982.
2. Memorandum from J. Davis to T. Gerrets, dated December 22, 1983.
3. Memorandum from R. Milhiser to G. Rogers, T. Gerrets, L. Bass and L. Stinson, dated July 11, 1983.
4. Procedure ASP-III-7.
5. Procedure ASP-IV-122.
6. SSERs of allegations A-106, A-112, A-115, A-129, A-146 and A-148

Statement Prepared By:

N. C. Chokshi

Date

R. E. Shewmaker

Date

Reviewed By:

Team Leader

Date

Reviewed By:

Site Team Leader(s)

Date

Approved By:

Task Management

Date

Document Name:  
SSER X A-113

Requestor's ID:  
CONNIE

Author's Name:

Document Comments:

REV 2  
Needed  
incorporate  
REV 1 comments

SSER

*AND*  
Task: Allegations A-113, A-135, *AND* A-137

Reference No.: 4-84-A-06/8; 4-84-A-06/30; *AND* 4-84-A-06/32

*items which did result in*  
Characterization: It has been alleged that based on the information presented in an Ebasco memorandum on concrete placement records dated December 9, 1982, a 100% review of the concrete placement records should have been started and the problems should have been identified on the nonconformance reports (NCRs). It is further alleged that some of the resulting NCRs may contain deficiencies reportable to NRC pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55(e).

Assessment of Allegation: The NRC staff reviewed the chronology of events related to the QA reviews on concrete placement and determined that LP&L decided to initiate a review of the concrete placement packages on July 11, 1983 and actually began the review during August 1983. Based on their preliminary findings, LP&L later expanded this review to include all concrete placement records, not just those cited in the memorandum. Thirty-three NCRs were generated by Ebasco to address the deficiencies (no deficiencies were reported on Discrepancy Notices (DNs)). These NCRs were also reviewed in accordance with Administrative Site Procedure, ASP-IV-122, to determine the reportability of deficiencies to NRC pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55(e). The NRC staff's safety findings based on the review of the above NCRs are discussed in the SSER for Allegation A-112. LP&L also undertook a 100% review of Cadweld records, and four NCRs were generated as a result of this review. These NCRs also indicated that the Cadweld records were reviewed for reportability pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55(e). The staff's safety findings are reported in the SSER for Allegations A-106, A-110, A-115, and A-146.

The waterstops and related activities were considered nonsafety-related items as noted in Ebasco memorandum ES-8271-83, dated December 13, 1983. The staff's safety findings with respect to waterstop activities are reported in the SSER for Allegation A-129.

Based on the above information, the NRC staff concluded that LP&L had undertaken activities to review the records as recommended by the allegor, and that the allegor was satisfied that his concerns were fully addressed. LP&L approached this 100% review in a time-stepped method which spanned an 8-month period.

The NRC staff also reviewed the allegation against the requirements of 10 CFR 50.55(e) regarding reporting a significant breakdown in any portion of the QA program conducted in accordance with requirements of 10 CFR 50 Appendix B. Based on the detailed review of the various issues involved, the NRC staff determined that there was no need for LP&L to report any of these issues to the NRC under 10 CFR 50.55(e) since nothing had been identified which, had it remained uncorrected, could have adversely affected the safe operation of the plant.

This allegation has neither safety significance nor generic implications.

[ Potential Violations: See Allegations A-106, A-110, A-112, and A-146. ]

Actions Required: See Allegations A-110 and A-146.

References

1. Ebasco Memorandum from J. Davis to M. Burgan, dated December 9, 1982.
2. Memorandum from J. Davis to T. Gerrets, dated December 22, 1983.
3. Memorandum from R. Milhiser to G. Rogers, T. Gerrets, L. Bass and L. Stinson, dated July 11, 1983.
4. Procedure ASP-III-7.
5. Procedure ASP-IV-122.
6. SSERs of allegations A-106, A-112, A-115, A-129, A-146 and A-148

Statement Prepared By:

\_\_\_\_\_  
N. C. Chokshi

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
R. E. Shewmaker

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Reviewed By:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Team Leader

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Reviewed By:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Site Team Leader(s)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Approved By:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Task Management

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date