

SSER

Task: Allegation A-59

Reference No.: 4-83-A-88-11

Characterization: The allegation is that there was little control over nonconforming conditions, in that no Hold Tags were placed on items in the field by EBASCO.

Assessment of Allegation: The implied significance of this allegation is that nonconforming materials, parts, or components may not have been properly identified to prevent their inadvertent use or installation.

The individual who wrote the letter raising this concern is unknown to the NRC staff. On December 27, 1983, the Senior Resident Inspector at Waterford brought this concern to the attention of LP&L QA for action in accordance with NRC policy for handling technical allegations at that time. LP&L responded that EBASCO did not replace Mercury Construction Company Hold Tags that were hung in the field when EBASCO assumed the responsibility for Mercury's contract. EBASCO did renumber approximately 80% of the Mercury Hold Tags with the EBASCO Noncompliance Report (NCR) numbers. The remaining 20% of the hold tags were not required by EBASCO procedure. The NRC staff noted that not all NCRs required the use of Hold Tags. The EBASCO procedure, Processing of Nonconformances Number ASP-III-7, issue K, stated that when a Discrepancy Notice (DN) was upgraded to an NCR, the NCR number was added to the DN tags. If an NCR was generated on a discrepant hardware item not previously documented, a Hold Tag was to be prepared. Hold Tags were not issued for NCRs involving documentation deficiencies.

The NRC staff found that there is no Hold Tag Index, but that the Hold Tags are indicated on the open NCR status card file. The NRC staff obtained this information from a review of the EBASCO NCR procedure, and interviews with LP&L and EBASCO QA/QC personnel.

This allegation has neither safety significance nor generic implication.

Potential Violations: None.]

Actions Required: None.

References

1. EBASCO Procedure for Processing of Nonconformances, ASP-III-7 issue K.
2. Interview with George Koehler, LP&L Quality Engineer.
3. Interview with Mark Quinn, EBASCO QC Supervisor.

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 A-59

Requestor's ID:  
CONNIE

Author's Name:

Document Comments:

SSER

Task: Allegation A-59

Reference No.: 4-83-A-88-11

Characterization: The allegation is that there was little control over nonconforming conditions, in that no Hold Tags were placed on items in the field by EBASCO.

Assessment of Allegation: The implied significance of this allegation is that nonconforming materials, parts, or components may not have been properly identified to prevent their inadvertent use or installation.

The individual who wrote the letter raising this concern is unknown to the NRC staff. On December 27, 1983, the Senior Resident Inspector at Waterford brought this concern to the attention of LP&L QA for action in accordance with NRC policy for handling technical allegations at that time. LP&L responded that EBASCO did not replace Mercury Construction Company Hold Tags that were hung in the field when EBASCO assumed the responsibility for Mercury's contract. EBASCO did renumber approximately 80% of the Mercury Hold Tags with the EBASCO Noncompliance Report (NCR) numbers. The remaining 20% of the hold tags were not required by EBASCO procedure. The NRC staff noted that not all NCRs required the use of Hold Tags. The EBASCO procedure, Processing of Nonconformances Number ASP-III-7, issue K, stated that when a Discrepancy Notice (DN) was upgraded to an NCR, the NCR number was added to the DN tags. If an NCR was generated on a discrepant hardware item not previously documented, a Hold Tag was to be prepared. Hold Tags were not issued for NCRs involving documentation deficiencies.

The NRC staff found that there is no Hold Tag Index, but that the Hold Tags are indicated on the open NCR status card file. The NRC staff obtained this information from a review of the EBASCO NCR procedure, and interviews with LP&L and EBASCO QA/QC personnel.

This allegation has neither safety significance nor generic implication.

Potential Violations: None.]

Actions Required: None.

References

1. EBASCO Procedure for Processing of Nonconformances, ASP-III-7 issue K.
2. Interview with George Koehler, LP&L Quality Engineer.
3. Interview with Mark Quinn, EBASCO QC Supervisor.

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 A-59

Requestor's ID:  
CONNIE

Author's Name:

Document Comments: