

SSER

Task: Allegations A-229, A-306g

Reference No.: A-84-A-06/117, 184g

Characterization: It is alleged that an individual was directed to turn over operational control records (OCR) packages [system startup quality assurance (QA) records] before system reviews were completed, and that the resulting documentation and hardware discrepancy lists submitted to LP&L documented inadequate reviews.

Assessment of Allegation: The implied significance of this allegation is that inadequate reviews of turnover documentation packages were performed which may affect the acceptability of safety-related systems.

The NRC staff examined an Ebasco interoffice memorandum which provided package turnover status. The staff interviewed Ebasco and LP&L personnel involved with the Mercury turnover documentation program, and examined the discrepancy list identified in the Ebasco memorandum to determine if referenced corrective action was documented. Also, the NRC staff reviewed a sample of Mercury SUS turnover packages to verify that deficiencies noted by Ebasco Quality Assurance Installation Review Group (QAIRG) had been adequately resolved.

The Ebasco interoffice memorandum provided the status of five SUS documentation packages prior to turnover the LP&L. The topics included Ebasco and Mercury integrated SUS turnover package review for approved checklists; training of Mercury and Ebasco personnel for parallel review; and a notation that the five SUS packages reviewed were missing preliminary as-built (PAB) drawings (PABs represent the as-built configuration). Also, two SUS turnover packages given to the Ebasco startup group were identified as not being reviewed against the PAB (baseline document), and that the Ebasco startup group had rejected the two packages and caused all five SUS packages to be rereviewed using the PABs as baseline documents.

The NRC staff interviewed LP&L and Ebasco personnel, including the addressee of the Ebasco interoffice memorandum, involved with Mercury and Ebasco reviews of turnover packages. The staff discovered that, between December 1982 and February 1983, there was a change in Mercury and Ebasco interface as to parallel and individual company documentation review. There was some confusion between Mercury, Ebasco, and LP&L reviews, and, as noted in the Ebasco memorandum, two SUS packages were submitted to EBASCO startup group without being evaluated against PABs. The EBASCO startup group rejected the packages, which caused re-review by Mercury and Ebasco QAIRG. The NRC staff believed this to be a good example of quality assurance system checks and balances working effectively to maintain system effectiveness.

The NRC staff could not locate the discrepancy lists for the two systems alleged to have been reviewed without PABs. However, LP&L did provide the staff with original turnover deficiency and status documents received by LP&L from Ebasco QAIRG. These records identified that Mercury and Ebasco reviews were performed using PABs as the baseline documents. After reviewing these current records, the NRC staff found no procedural violation.

Ten Mercury generated SUS turnover packages were reviewed by the NRC staff. The objective was to verify that Mercury and Ebasco documentation review did cover technical adequacy, completeness, and authenticity. The staff results showed that Mercury and Ebasco QAIRG reviews were adequately accomplished and documented. In addition, the NRC staff performed walkdowns for 19 instrumentation installations and found no problems. For further details, see the NRC staff assessments of Allegations A-188, A-190, A-191, A-193, A-35, and A-308.

The NRC staff found that Mercury, Ebasco, and LP&L had implemented adequate control of SUS turnover package reviews. This allegation has neither safety significance nor generic implications.

[Potential Violations: None.]

Actions Required: None.

References

1. Mercury Procedure: QCP-3010 (N4920-Supp.) Rev - Quality Assurance Records.
2. Ebasco Procedure: QAI 9 - Review and handling of construction installation records.
3. Ebasco Procedure: ASP-IV-50 - Release and turnover from construction to Waterford startup and area transfer to Waterford plant staff.
4. Exhibit 15, Ebasco interoffice memorandum.

Statement Prepared By: _____
V. J. Wenczel _____ Date

Reviewed By: _____
Team Leader _____ Date

Reviewed By: _____
Site Team Leader(s) _____ Date

Approved By: _____
Task Management _____ Date

SSER

*Comments
included
on DC's
REV D*

Task: Allegations A-229, A-306g

Reference No.: A-84-A-06/117, 184g

Characterization: It is alleged that an individual was directed to turn over operational control records (OCR) packages [system startup quality assurance (QA) records] before system reviews were completed, and that the resulting documentation and hardware discrepancy lists submitted to LP&L documented inadequate reviews.

Assessment of Allegation: The implied significance of this allegation is that if inadequate reviews of turnover documentation packages were performed, ~~which may affect the acceptability of safety-related systems;~~ *may have been affected*

The NRC staff examined an Ebasco interoffice memorandum which provided package turnover status. The staff interviewed Ebasco and LP&L personnel involved with the Mercury turnover documentation program, and examined the discrepancy list identified in the Ebasco memorandum to determine if referenced corrective action was documented. Also, the NRC staff reviewed a sample of Mercury SUS turnover packages to verify that deficiencies noted by Ebasco Quality Assurance Installation Review Group (QAIRG) had been adequately resolved.

The Ebasco interoffice memorandum provided the status of five SUS documentation packages prior to turnover the LP&L. The topics included Ebasco and Mercury integrated SUS turnover package review for approved checklists; training of Mercury and Ebasco personnel for parallel review; and a notation that the five SUS packages reviewed were missing preliminary as-built (PAB) drawings (PABs represent ^{ed} the as-built configuration). Also, two SUS turnover packages ^{that were} given to the Ebasco startup group were identified as not being reviewed against the PAB (baseline document), and that the Ebasco startup group had rejected the two packages and caused all five SUS packages to be rereviewed using the PABs as baseline documents.

The NRC staff interviewed LP&L and Ebasco personnel, including the addressee of the Ebasco interoffice memorandum, involved with Mercury and Ebasco reviews of turnover packages. The staff discovered that, between December 1982 and February 1983, there was a change in Mercury and Ebasco interface as to parallel and individual company documentation review. There was some confusion between Mercury, Ebasco, and LP&L reviews, and, as noted in the Ebasco memorandum, two SUS packages were submitted to EBASCO startup group without being evaluated against PABs. The EBASCO startup group rejected the packages, which caused re-review by Mercury and Ebasco QAIRG. The NRC staff believed this to be a good example of quality assurance system checks and balances working effectively to maintain system effectiveness.

The NRC staff could not locate the discrepancy lists for the two systems alleged to have been reviewed without PABs. However, LP&L did provide the staff with original turnover deficiency and status documents received by LP&L from Ebasco QAIRG. These records identified that Mercury and Ebasco reviews were performed using PABs as the baseline documents. After reviewing these current records, the NRC staff found no procedural violation.

Ten Mercury generated SUS turnover packages were reviewed by the NRC staff. The objective was to verify that Mercury and Ebasco documentation review did cover technical adequacy, completeness, and authenticity. The staff results showed that Mercury and Ebasco QAIRG reviews were adequately accomplished and documented. In addition, the NRC staff performed walkdowns for 19 instrumentation installations and found no problems. For further details, see the NRC staff assessments of Allegations A-188, A-190, A-191, A-193, A-35, and A-308.

The NRC staff found that Mercury, Ebasco, and LP&L had implemented adequate control of SUS turnover package reviews. This allegation has neither safety significance nor generic implications.

[Potential Violations: None.]

Actions Required: None.

References

1. Mercury Procedure: QCP-3010 (N4920-Supp.) Rev - Quality Assurance Records.
2. Ebasco Procedure: QAI 9 - Review and handling of construction installation records.
3. Ebasco Procedure: ASP-IV-50 - Release and turnover from construction to Waterford startup and area transfer to Waterford plant staff.
4. Exhibit 15, Ebasco interoffice memorandum.

Statement Prepared By:

V. J. Wenczel

Date

Reviewed By:

Team Leader

Date

Reviewed By:

Site Team Leader(s)

Date

Approved By:

Task Management

Date

SSER

*Comment
included
on DC's
REV 0*

Task: Allegations A-229, A-306g

Reference No.: A-84-A-06/117, 184g

Characterization: It is alleged that an individual was directed to turn over operational control records (OCR) packages [system startup quality assurance (QA) records] before system reviews were completed, and that the resulting documentation and hardware discrepancy lists submitted to LP&L documented inadequate reviews.

Assessment of Allegation: The implied significance of this allegation is that inadequate reviews of turnover documentation packages were performed which may affect the acceptability of safety-related systems.

The NRC staff examined an ^{CAPS}Ebasco interoffice memorandum which provided package turnover status. The staff interviewed ^{CAPS}Ebasco and LP&L personnel involved with the Mercury turnover documentation program, and examined the discrepancy list identified in the ^{CAPS}Ebasco memorandum to determine if referenced corrective action was documented. Also, the NRC staff reviewed a sample of Mercury SUS turnover packages to verify that deficiencies noted by ^{CAPS}Ebasco Quality Assurance Installation Review Group (QAIRG) had been adequately resolved. ✓

The ^{CAPS}Ebasco interoffice memorandum provided the status of five SUS documentation packages prior to turnover the LP&L. The topics included ^{CAPS}Ebasco and Mercury integrated SUS turnover package review for approved checklists; training of Mercury and ^{CAPS}Ebasco personnel for parallel review; and a notation that the five SUS packages reviewed were missing preliminary as-built (PAB) drawings (PABs represent the as-built configuration). Also, two SUS turnover packages given to the ^{CAPS}Ebasco startup group were identified as not being reviewed against the PAB (baseline document), and that the ^{CAPS}Ebasco startup group had rejected the two packages and caused all five SUS packages to be rereviewed using the PABs as baseline documents. ✓

The NRC staff interviewed LP&L and ^{CAPS}Ebasco personnel, including the addressee of the ^{CAPS}Ebasco interoffice memorandum, involved with Mercury and ^{CAPS}Ebasco reviews of turnover packages. The staff discovered that, between December 1982 and February 1983, there was a change in Mercury and ^{CAPS}Ebasco interface as to parallel and individual company documentation review. There was some confusion between Mercury, ^{CAPS}Ebasco, and LP&L reviews, and, as noted in the ^{CAPS}Ebasco memorandum, two SUS packages were submitted to EBASCO startup group without being evaluated against PABs. The EBASCO startup group rejected the packages, which caused re-review by Mercury and ^{CAPS}Ebasco QAIRG. The NRC staff believed this to be a good example of quality assurance system checks and balances working effectively to maintain system effectiveness. ✓

The NRC staff could not locate the discrepancy lists for the two systems alleged to have been reviewed without PABs. However, LP&L did provide the staff with original turnover deficiency and status documents received by LP&L from ^{CAPS}Ebasco QAIRG. These records identified that Mercury and ^{CAPS}Ebasco reviews were performed using PABs as the baseline documents. After reviewing these current records, the NRC staff found no procedural violation. ✓

Ten Mercury generated SUS turnover packages were reviewed by the NRC staff. The objective was to verify that Mercury and ^{CAPS}Ebasco documentation review did cover technical adequacy, completeness, and authenticity. The staff results showed that Mercury and ^{CAPS}Ebasco QAIRG reviews were adequately accomplished and documented. In addition, the NRC staff performed walkdowns for 19 instrumentation installations and found no problems. For further details, see the NRC staff assessments of Allegations A-188, ~~A-190~~, ~~A-191~~, ~~A-193~~, A-35, and A-308. ✓

close up 188 → 193

The NRC staff found that Mercury, ^{CAPS}Ebasco, and LP&L had implemented adequate control of SUS turnover package reviews. This allegation has neither safety significance nor generic implications. ✓

[Potential Violations: None.]

Actions Required: None.

References

1. Mercury Procedure: QCP-3010 (N4920-Supp.) Rev - Quality Assurance Records.
2. ^{CAPS} Ebasco Procedure: QAI 9 - Review and handling of construction installation records. ✓
3. ^{CAPS} Ebasco Procedure: ASP-IV-50 - Release and turnover from construction to Waterford startup and area transfer to Waterford plant staff. ✓
4. Exhibit 15, ^{CAPS} Ebasco interoffice memorandum. ✓

Statement Prepared By:

V. J. Wenczel

Date

Reviewed By:

Team Leader

Date

Reviewed By:

Site Team Leader(s)

Date

Approved By:

Task Management

Date

Document Name:

SSER X A-229

Requestor's ID:

STCINDY

Author's Name:

Document Comments:

comm from displaywriter 5/29/84

SSER

Task: Allegations A-229, A-306g

Reference No.: A-84-A-06/117; 4-84-A-06/184g

Characterization: It is alleged that an individual was directed to turn over operational control records (OCR) packages [system startup quality assurance (QA) records] before system reviews were completed, and that the resulting documentation and hardware discrepancy lists submitted to LP&L documented inadequate reviews.

Assessment of Allegation: The implied significance of this allegation is that inadequate reviews of turnover documentation packages were performed which may affect the acceptability of safety-related systems.

The NRC staff examined an Ebasco interoffice memorandum which provided package turnover status. The staff interviewed Ebasco and LP&L personnel involved with the Mercury turnover documentation program, and examined the discrepancy list identified in the Ebasco memorandum to determine if referenced corrective action was documented. Also, the NRC staff reviewed a sample of Mercury SUS turnover packages to verify that deficiencies noted by Ebasco Quality Assurance Installation Review Group (QAIRG) had been adequately resolved.

The Ebasco interoffice memorandum provided the status of five SUS documentation packages prior to turnover the LP&L. The topics included Ebasco and Mercury integrated SUS turnover package review for approved checklists; training of Mercury and Ebasco personnel for parallel review; and a notation that the five SUS packages reviewed were missing preliminary as-built (PAB) drawings (PABs represent the as-built configuration). Also, two SUS turnover packages given to the Ebasco startup group were identified as not being reviewed against the PAB (baseline document), and that the Ebasco startup group had rejected the two packages and caused all five SUS packages to be rereviewed using the PABs as baseline documents.

The NRC staff interviewed LP&L and Ebasco personnel, including the addressee of the Ebasco interoffice memorandum, involved with Mercury and Ebasco reviews of turnover packages. The staff discovered that, between December 1982 and February 1983, there was a change in Mercury and Ebasco interface as to parallel and individual company documentation review. There was some confusion between Mercury, Ebasco, and LP&L reviews, and, as noted in the Ebasco memorandum, two SUS packages were submitted to EBASCO startup group without being evaluated against PABs. The EBASCO startup group rejected the packages, which caused re-review by Mercury and Ebasco QAIRG. The NRC staff believed this to be a good example of quality assurance system checks and balances working effectively to maintain system effectiveness.

The NRC staff could not locate the discrepancy lists for the two systems alleged to have been reviewed without PABs. However, LP&L did provide the staff with original turnover deficiency and status documents received by LP&L from Ebasco QAIRG. These records identified that Mercury and Ebasco reviews were performed using PABs as the baseline documents. After reviewing these current records, the NRC staff found no procedural violation.

Ten Mercury generated SUS turnover packages were reviewed by the NRC staff. The objective was to verify that Mercury and Ebasco documentation review did cover technical adequacy, completeness, and authenticity. The staff results showed that Mercury and Ebasco QAIRG reviews were adequately accomplished and documented. In addition, the NRC staff performed walkdowns for 19 instrumentation installation and found no problems. For further details, see the NRC staff assessments of Allegations A188, A190, A191, A193, A35, and A308.

The NRC staff found that Mercury, Ebasco, and LP&L had implemented adequate control of SUS turnover package reviews. This allegation has neither safety significance nor generic implications.

[Potential Violations: None.]

Actions Required: None.

References

1. Mercury Procedure: QCP3010 (N4920Supp.) Rev Quality Assurance Records.
2. Ebasco Procedure: QAI 9 Review and handling of construction installation records.
3. Ebasco Procedure: ASPIV50 Release and turnover from construction to Waterford startup and area transfer to Waterford plant staff.
4. Exhibit 15, Ebasco interoffice memorandum.

Statement Prepared By: _____
V. J. Venczel Date

Reviewed By: _____
Team Leader Date

Reviewed By: _____
Site Team Leader(s) Date

Approved By: _____
Task Management Date

Document Name:

SSER X A-229

Requestor's ID:

CONNIE

Author's Name:

Document Comments:

comm from displaywriter 5/29/84

SSER

Task: Allegations A-229, A-306g

Reference No.: A-84-A-06/117; 4-84-A-06/184g

Characterization: It is alleged that an individual was directed to turn over operational control records (OCR) packages [system startup quality assurance (QA) records] before system reviews were completed, and that the resulting documentation and hardware discrepancy lists submitted to LP&L documented inadequate reviews.

Assessment of Allegation: The implied significance of this allegation is that inadequate reviews of turnover documentation packages were performed which may affect the acceptability of safety-related systems.

The NRC staff examined an Ebasco interoffice memorandum which provided package turnover status. The staff interviewed Ebasco and LP&L personnel involved with the Mercury turnover documentation program, and examined the discrepancy list identified in the Ebasco memorandum to determine if referenced corrective action was documented. Also, the NRC staff reviewed a sample of Mercury SUS turnover packages to verify that deficiencies noted by Ebasco Quality Assurance Installation Review Group (QAIRG) had been adequately resolved.

The Ebasco interoffice memorandum provided the status of five SUS documentation packages prior to turnover the LP&L. The topics included Ebasco and Mercury integrated SUS turnover package review for approved checklists; training of Mercury and Ebasco personnel for parallel review; and a notation that the five SUS packages reviewed were missing preliminary as-built (PAB) drawings (PABs represent the as-built configuration). Also, two SUS turnover pages given to the Ebasco startup group were identified as noted being reviewed against the PAB (baseline document), and that the Ebasco startup group had rejected the two packages and caused all five SUS packages to be re-reviewed using the PABs as baseline documents.

The NRC staff interviewed LP&L and Ebasco personnel, including the addressee of the Ebasco interoffice memorandum, involved with Mercury and Ebasco reviews of turnover packages. The staff discovered that, between December 1982 and February 1983, there was a change in Mercury and Ebasco interface as to parallel and individual company documentation review. There was some confusion between Mercury, Ebasco, and LP&L reviews, and, as noted in the Ebasco memorandum, two SUS packages were submitted to EBASCO startup group without being evaluated against PABs. The EBASCO startup group rejected the packages, which caused re-review by Mercury and Ebasco QAIRG. The NRC staff believed this to be a good example of quality assurance system checks and balances working effectively to maintain system effectiveness. XX

The NRC staff could not locate the discrepancy lists for the two systems alleged to have been reviewed without PABs. However, LP&L did provide the staff with original turnover deficiency and status documents received by LP&L from Ebasco QAIRG. These records identified that Mercury and Ebasco reviews were performed using PABs as the baseline documents. After reviewing these current records, the NRC staff found no procedural violation.

installations and Ten Mercury generated SUS turnover packages were reviewed by the NRC staff. The objective was to verify that Mercury and Ebasco documentation review did cover technical adequacy, completeness, and authenticity. The staff results showed that Mercury and Ebasco QAIRG reviews were adequately accomplished and documented. In addition, the NRC staff performed walkdowns for 19 instrumentation found no problems. For further details, see the NRC staff assessments of Allegations A-188, A-190, A-191, A-193, A-35, and A-308. X

The NRC staff found that Mercury, Ebasco, and LP&L had implemented adequate control of SUS turnover package reviews. This allegation has neither safety significance nor generic implications.

[Potential Violations: None.]

Actions Required: None.

References

1. Mercury Procedure: QCP-3010 (N4920-Supp.) Rev - Quality Assurance Records.
2. Ebasco Procedure: QAI 9 - Review and handling of construction installation records.
3. Ebasco Procedure: ASP-IV-50 - Release and turnover from construction to Waterford start-up and area transfer to Waterford plant staff.
4. Exhibit 15, Ebasco interoffice memorandum.

Statement Prepared By:

V. J. Venczel

Date

Reviewed By:

Team Leader

Date

Reviewed By:

Site Team Leader(s)

Date

Approved By:

Task Management

Date

Document Name:

SSER X A-229

Requestor's ID:

CONNIE

Author's Name:

Document Comments:

comm from displaywriter 5/29/84

SSER

Task: Allegations A-229, A-306g

Reference No.: A-84-A-06/117; 4-84-A-06/184g

Characterization: It is alleged that an individual was directed to turn over operational control records (OCR) packages [system startup quality assurance (QA) records] before system reviews were completed, and that the resulting documentation and hardware discrepancy lists submitted to LP&L documented inadequate reviews.

Assessment of Allegation: The implied significance of this allegation is that inadequate reviews of turnover documentation packages were performed which may affect the acceptability of safety-related systems.

The NRC staff examined an Ebasco interoffice memorandum which provided package turnover status. The staff interviewed Ebasco and LP&L personnel involved with the Mercury turnover documentation program, and examined the discrepancy list identified in the Ebasco memorandum to determine if referenced corrective action was documented. Also the NRC staff reviewed a sample of Mercury SUS turnover packages to verify that deficiencies noted by Ebasco Quality Assurance Installation Review Group (QAIRG) had been adequately resolved.

The Ebasco interoffice memorandum provided the status of five SUS documentation packages prior to turnover the LP&L. The topics included Ebasco and Mercury integrated SUS turnover package review for approved checklists; training of Mercury and Ebasco personnel for parallel review; and a notation that the five SUS packages reviewed were missing preliminary as-built (PAB) drawings (PABs represent the as-built configuration). Also, two SUS turnover pages given to the Ebasco startup group were identified as noted being reviewed against the PAB (baseline document), and that the Ebasco startup group had rejected the two packages and caused all five SUS packages to be re-reviewed using the PABs as baseline documents.

The NRC staff interviewed LP&L and Ebasco personnel, including the addressee of the Ebasco interoffice memorandum, involved with Mercury and Ebasco reviews of turnover packages. The staff discovered that, between December 1982 and February 1983, there was a change in Mercury and Ebasco interface as to parallel and individual company documentation review. There was some confusion between Mercury, Ebasco, and LP&L reviews, and, as noted in the Ebasco memorandum, two SUS packages were submitted to EBASCO startup group without being evaluated against PABs. The EBASCO startup group rejected the packages, which caused re-review by Mercury and Ebasco QAIRG. The NRC staff believed this to be a good example of quality assurance system checks and balances working effectively to maintain system effectiveness.

The NRC staff could not locate the discrepancy lists for the two systems alleged to have been reviewed without PABs. However, LP&L did provide the staff with original turnover deficiency and status documents received by LP&L from Ebasco QAIRG. These records identified that Mercury and Ebasco reviews were performed using PABs as the baseline documents. After reviewing these current records, the NRC staff found no procedural violation.

Ten Mercury generated SUS turnover packages were reviewed by the NRC staff. The objective was to verify that Mercury and Ebasco documentation review did cover technical adequacy, completeness, and authenticity. The staff results showed that Mercury and Ebasco QAIRG reviews were adequately accomplished and documented. In addition, the NRC staff performed walkdowns for 19 instrumentation found no problems. For further details, see the NRC staff assessments of Allegations A-188, A-190, A-191, A-193, A-35, and A-308.

The NRC staff found that Mercury, Ebasco, and LP&L had implemented adequate control of SUS turnover package reviews. This allegation has neither safety significance nor generic implications.

[Potential Violations: None.]

Actions Required: None.

References

1. Mercury Procedure: QCP-3010 (N4920-Supp.) Rev - Quality Assurance Records.
2. Ebasco Procedure: QAI 9 - Review and handling of construction installation records.
3. Ebasco Procedure: ASP-IV-50 - Release and turnover from construction to Waterford start-up and area transfer to Waterford plant staff.
4. Exhibit 15, Ebasco interoffice memorandum.

Statement Prepared By: _____
V. J. Wenczel _____ Date

Reviewed By: _____
Team Leader _____ Date

Reviewed By: _____
Site Team Leader(s) _____ Date

Approved By: _____
Task Management _____ Date