

SSER

Task: Allegations A-81 and A-82

Ref. No.: 4-83-A-88/Ac and Ad

Characterization: The allegation is that changes were made to N-5 documentation packages for instrument lines without the knowledge of the authorized nuclear inspector (ANI) after his approval signature had been placed on the package.

Assessment of Allegation: The implied significance is that the requirements of the ASME Code, Section III, NA-8000, were not complied with because the completed Code Data Reports were incorrect.

The NRC staff reviewed N-5 data packages for 28 different instrument lines. There was no evidence of changes to N-5 data after the ANI's approval. The NRC did not interview Mercury's ANIs, as they were not available onsite. The staff did however, interview the EBASCO ANI who was not aware of any changes made to N-5 packages after the Mercury ANI had approved them. Three instrument lines were found to have conflicts between the drawings, weld records, and N-5 data. DPT-RC-120/121 (low pressure) N-5 data showed field welds FW-1C, 1D, 51, 61, and 31 which were not on the drawings or final weld records. Field welds FW-47, 56, 57, 72, and 73 were on the drawings and weld records but were not on the N-5 Data Report. DPT-RC-120/121 (high pressure) had FW-30 and 31 on drawings and final weld records but were not on the N-5 Data Report. DPT-RC-124Y (high pressure) showed FW-15 on the N-5 data form but not on the drawing or the final weld records. The NRC staff conducted a walkdown of the three lines. The walkdown revealed that the drawings accurately reflected the installed system. LP&L initiated a Site Surveillance Report to document and follow-up on these discrepancies.

The NRC staff found no evidence of changes to N-5 data having been made after the ANI's approval, and the staff's walkdown of the three lines that had deficiencies in the N-5 data revealed that the hardware installed was accurately reflected on the drawings and supporting QA records. The NRC staff concludes that this allegation has neither safety significance nor generic implications.

Potential Violations: None.

Actions Required: None.

References

1. Operational Control Report (OCR)
OCR-1019, -1020, -1022, -1782, -1881, -1855
2. ASME Code, Section III, NA-8000, 1974 Summer and 75 Addendum.

8510030060 840622
PDR ADOCK 05000382
E PDR

Statement Prepared By:

J. Furren

Date

Reviewed By:

Team Leader

Date

Reviewed By:

Site Team Leader(s)

Date

Approved By:

Task Management

Date

Document Name:
SSER X A-81

Requestor's ID:
CONNIE

Author's Name:
J. Farren

Document Comments:
A-82

SSER

Task: Allegations A-81 and A-82

Ref. No.: 4-83-A-88/Ac and Ad

Characterization: The allegation is that changes were made to N-5 documentation packages for instrument lines without the knowledge of the authorized nuclear inspector (ANI) after his approval signature had been placed on the package.

Assessment of Allegation: The implied significance is that the requirements of the ASME Code, Section III, NA-8000, were not complied with because the completed Code Data Reports were incorrect.

The NRC staff reviewed N-5 data packages for 28 different instrument lines. There was no evidence of changes to N-5 data after the ANI's approval. The NRC did not interview Mercury's ANIs, as they were not available onsite. The staff did however, interview the EBASCO ANI who was not aware of any changes made to N-5 packages after the Mercury ANI had approved them. Three instrument lines were found to have conflicts between the drawings, weld records, and N-5 data. DPT-RC-120/121 (low pressure) N-5 data showed field welds FW-1C, 1D, 51, 61, and 31 which were not on the drawings or final weld records. Field welds FW-47, 56, 57, 72, and 73 were on the drawings and weld records but were not on the N-5 Data Report. DPT-RC-120/121 (high pressure) had FW-30 and 31 on drawings and final weld records but were not on the N-5 Data Report. DPT-RC-124Y (high pressure) showed FW-15 on the N-5 data form but not on the drawing or the final weld records. The NRC staff conducted a walkdown of the three lines. The walkdown revealed that the drawings accurately reflected the installed system. LP&L initiated a Site Surveillance Report to document and follow-up on these discrepancies.

The NRC staff found no evidence of changes to N-5 data having been made after the ANI's approval, and the staff's walkdown of the three lines that had deficiencies in the N-5 data revealed that the hardware installed was accurately reflected on the drawings and supporting QA records. The NRC staff concludes that this allegation has neither safety significance nor generic implications.

Potential Violations: None.

Actions Required: None.

References

1. Operational Control Report (OCR)
OCR-1019, -1020, -1022, -1782, -1881, -1855
2. ASME Code, Section III, NA-8000, 1974 Summer and 75 Addendum.

a
J. Furren

Date _____

Reviewed By:

Team Leader

Date _____

Reviewed By:

Site Team Leader(s)

Date _____

Approved By:

Task Management

Date _____

Document Name:
SSER X A-81

Requestor's ID:
CONNIE

Author's Name:
J. Farren

Document Comments:
A-82

*note spelling of name
on Pg 2
no need to change Rev #*

References:

1. Operational Control Report (OCR) OCR-1019, -1020, -1022, -1782, -1881, and -1855
2. ASME Code, Section III, NA-8000, 1974 Summer and 75 Addendum.

Statement Prepared By:

J. Furren

Date

Reviewed By:

Team Leader

Date

Reviewed By:

Site Team Leader(s)

Date

Approved By:

Task Management

Date