

SSER

Task: Allegation A-145

Reference No.: 4-84-A-06-40

Characterization: It is alleged that the location plots for some of the in-place density tests for soil backfill did not fall within the fill area that was identified on the test report.

Assessment of Allegation: The NRC staff conducted a review of the in-place density tests for approximately 25 percent of the total soils packages for the seven fill areas. The NRC discovered during the review of five of the seven fill areas that the location of the in-place density test noted on the test report did not always fall within the fill area that was stated on the test report. Additionally, it was found that some of the in-place density test reports were located in the wrong soils package. The following table summarizes the results of that review:

	Fill #1	Fill #2	Fill #3	Fill #4	Fill #7
Number of Test Sample Reports Reviewed	33	29	52	59	55
Incorrect Test Location on Test Sample Report	6	21	0	2	10

While it appears that there were errors in recording test locations, there is no safety significance to this item in that the in-place densities which were determined by the tests show adequate results and the NRC staff believes the distribution of the tests was adequate. Generically, these discrepancies indicate that inadequate attention may have been given to maintaining quality records.

Potential Violation: The incorrect test location stated on some records indicates that there is some doubt as to the validity of the inspection of some of the backfill based on the records available, and that Criteria XVII of Appendix B of 10 CFR 50 may have been violated in that the records contain errors.

100

1. Backfill documentation in volume 1 for each of the seven (7) fill areas.
2. LOU-1564.482 EBASCO Specification "Filter & Backfill; Seismic Class I" Rev. 6
3. LOU-1564 G 497S02 "General Backfill Plan & Sections" Rev. 3
4. LOU-1564 G 497S01 "General Backfill Plan & Section"

Statement prepared by

J. K. Devers

Date _____

Reviewed by:

Team Leader

Date _____

Reviewed by:

Site Team Leader(s)

Date _____

Approved by:

Task Management

Date _____

Document Name:
SSER A-145

Requestor's ID:
CONNIE

Author's Name:
JDevers

Document Comments:

FINAL

Document Name:
SSER A-145

FILE

Requestor's ID:
CONNIE

Author's Name:
JDevers

Document Comments:

FINAL SSER ROUTING A-145				
Revision :	0	1	2	3
✓ Denny Crutchfield				
✓ Jim Gagliardo			XXXXXXXXXX	

~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

FINAL SSER ROUTING A-145				
Revision :	0	1	2	3
✓ Denny Crutchfield	<i>[Signature]</i>			
Jim Gagliardo				

SSER

Task: Allegation A-145

Reference No.: 4-84-A-06-40

Characterization: It is alleged that the location plots for some of the in-place density tests for soil backfill did not fall within the fill area that was identified on the test report.

Assessment of Allegation: The NRC staff conducted a review of the in-place density tests for approximately 25 percent of the total soils packages for the seven fill areas. The NRC discovered during the review of five of the seven fill areas that the location of the in-place density test noted on the test report did not always fall within the fill area that was stated on the test report. Additionally, it was found that some of the in-place density test reports were located in the wrong soils package. The following table summarizes the results of that review:

	Fill #1	Fill #2	Fill #3	Fill #4	Fill #7
Number of Test Sample Reports Reviewed	33	29	52	59	55
Incorrect Test Location on Test Sample Report	6	21	0	2	10

While it appears that there were errors in recording test locations, there is no safety significance to this item in that the in-place densities which were determined by the tests show adequate results and the NRC staff believes the distribution of the tests was adequate. Generically, these discrepancies indicate that inadequate attention may have been given to maintaining quality records.

Potential Violation: The incorrect test location stated on some records indicates that there is some doubt as to the validity of the inspection of some of the backfill based on the records available, and that Criteria XVII of Appendix B of 10 CFR 50 may have been violated in that the records contain errors.

WATERFORD OPEN ISSUE

Task: A-145

Reference No.: 4-84-A-06/40

Characterization: It is alleged that the location plots for some of the in-place densite tests for soil backfill did not fall within the area that was identified on the test report.

Initial Assessment of Significance: If the allegation is found to be valid, it would appear that there were gross errors which were not identified previously which could tend to indicate the quality assurance program had not identified these errors, or it could possibly indicate "manufactured" data with respect to the location of the test samples.

Source: Allegor ["A"] transcript, page 100.

Approach to Resolution:

1. Review NCR W3-5997.
2. Review selected samples of the soils records packages for the location and position of where test samples were extracted.
3. Attempt to locate plots of test locations on a plot plan which was prepared by QA personnel.
4. Evaluate the facts, provide conclusions, and define any necessary licensee actions.
5. Prepare an SSER.

Status:

Review Lead: L. Shao, Civil-Structural

Support: None.

Estimated Resources: 2 man-days

Estimated Completion: May 25, 1984

CLOSURE:

Document Name:
A-145

Requestor's ID:
JOHNNIE

Author's Name:
SHEWMAKER/jkh

Document Comments:

Retype out 2

Shaw.

WATERFORD OPEN ISSUE

Task: A-145

Reference No.: 4-84-A-06/40

Characterization: It is alleged that the location plots for some of the in-place densite tests for soil backfill did not fall within the area that was identified on the test report.

Initial Assessment of Significance: If the allegation is found to be valid, it would appear that there were gross errors, which were not identified previously, which would tend to indicate the quality assurance program had not identified these errors, or it could possibly indicate "manufactured" data with respect to the location of the test samples.

Source: Allegor ["A"] transcript, page 100.

Approach to Resolution:

1. Review NCR W3-5997.
2. Review selected samples of the soils records packages for the location and position of where test samples were extracted.
3. Attempt to locate plots of test locations on a plot plan which was prepared by QA personnel.
4. Evaluate the facts, provide conclusions, and define any necessary licensee actions.
5. Prepare an SSER.

Status:

Review Lead: L. Shao, Civil-Structural

Support: None.

Estimated Resources: 2 man-days

Estimated Completion: May 25, 1984

CLOSURE:

Document Name:
A-145

Requestor's ID:
JOHNNIE

Author's Name:
SHEWMAKER/jkh

Document Comments:

WATERFORD OPEN ISSUE

Task: A-145

Reference No.: 4-84-A-06/40

Characterization: It is alleged that the location plots for some of the in-place densite tests for soil backfill did not fall within the area that was identified on the test report.

Initial Assessment of Significance: If the allegation is found to be valid, it would appear that there were gross errors, not identified previously, which would tend to indicate that the quality assurance program had not identified these errors, or could possibly indicate "manufactured" data with respect to the location of the test samples.

Source: Allegor["A"]transcript, page 100.

Approach to Resolution:

1. Review NCR W3-5997.
2. Review selected samples of the soils records packages for the location and position of where test samples were extracted.
3. Attempt to locate plots of test locations on a plot plan which was prepared by QA personnel.
4. Evaluate the facts, provide conclusions, and define any necessary licensee actions.
5. Prepare an SSER.

Status:

Review Lead: L. Shao, Civil-Structural

Support: None.

Estimated Resources: 2 man-days

Estimated Completion: May 25, 1984

CLOSURE:

WATERFORD OPEN ISSUE

Task: A-145

Ref. No.: 4-84-A-06140

Characterization: It is alleged that the location plots for some of the in-place density tests for soil backfill did not fall within the area that was identified on the test report.

Initial Assessment of Significance: If the allegation is found to be valid it would appear that there were gross errors which were not identified previously which would ^{tend to} indicate the quality ^{assurance} program had not identified these errors, or it ~~could~~ ^{could} ~~mean~~ possibly indicate "manufactured" ^{data} ~~results~~ with respect to the location of the test samples.

Source: Allegor[A] Transcript page 100

Approach to Resolution:

1. Review NCR W3-5997
2. Review selected samples of the soils records packages ~~for~~ for the location and position of where test samples were extracted.
3. Attempt ~~to~~ locate plots of ~~test~~ ^{test locations} on ~~a~~ plot plan which was prepared by QA personnel.
4. Evaluate the facts ~~and~~ provide conclusions and define any necessary licensee actions.
5. Prepare an SSER

Status:

Review Lead: L. Shao, Civil-Structural

Support: None

Estimate Resources: 2 man days

Estimated Completion: May 25, 1984

CLOSURE: