

SSER

Task: Allegation A-156, A-106, A-108, A-133

Reference No.: 4-84-A-06/51; 4-84-A-06/1; 4-84-A-06/3; 4-84-A-06/28

Characterization: It has been alleged that J. A. Jones Daily Cadweld Inspection Reports contained inspectors' signatures or initials that were noticeably different. There was a concern that these were forged signatures and initials, leaving the authenticity of these records in question.

Assessment of Allegation: The NRC staff reviewed Nonconformance Report (NCR) W3-6245 which was issued on May 20, 1983, to address discrepancies with the signatures and initials in the Cadweld records. One of the NCR attachments included the records which have the questionable initials. The authenticity of the signatures of five inspectors was under question and is being addressed by the NRC Office of Investigation.

In the initial technical disposition of this NCR, LP&L reviewed the concrete preplacement checklist records and Cadweld location maps to assure that the Cadwelds were installed and inspected as required. The authenticity of the signatures on these records was not questioned or examined at that time. It should be noted that the "Cadweld mapping" according to the project procedure, was used to record verification of the location of each splice, verification of the sizes of the splice bars, and verification of Cadweld identification number (ID), position and splice data.

LP&L, in further attempts to clarify the reasons for occurrences such as discrepant initials, obtained signed statements in January 1984 from the involved inspectors. These statements provided explanations for the appearance of the initials. It appeared that either the original reports were soiled in the field or the inspectors were in a physically awkward inspection position and called out data which was recorded and initialled by a second inspector. The inspectors stated that, when they entered the information onto the Cadweld map, they had to look at each Cadweld number stenciled on the Cadweld sleeve.

These numbers were readily discernible, and acceptable Cadwelds were painted white. The rejected Cadweld sleeves were painted red, while sample Cadwelds selected for testing were painted yellow. Since each Cadweld had to be examined for Cadweld mapping, the color coding scheme made it very unlikely that an unacceptable Cadweld would be left in place.

Based on the NRC staff's evaluation of the disposition of NCR W3-6245 and examination of the concrete preplacement checklist records, the staff believes that the questionable Cadwelds were actually installed and inspected and that no reject or test splices required for testing were left in a placement. The

integrity of structures was not in question. The indications were that this was a general practice in the Cadweld splicing area but was assessed as having no safety significance.

It should be noted that the alleged had not questioned the acceptability of the Cadwelds. In a discussion with the staff, the alleged indicated that he was more concerned about the authenticity of the signatures on the inspection forms.

This allegation has neither safety significance nor generic implications.

Potential Violations: The practice of signing or initialling the Cadweld daily inspection report by other than the original inspector is a violation of LP&L Site Inspection and Test Procedure W-SITP-4.

Actions Required: None.

References:

1. Procedure No. W-SITP-4, "Reinforcing Steel-Handling, Storage, Installing, Cadwelding and Modification Inspection Procedures." October 13, 1975.
2. Procedure No. W-WP-7, "Concrete Placing, Curing, Finishing, and Repairs."
3. Specification No. LOU-1564-79, "Mechanical Splicing of Concrete Reinforcing Steel," Revision 0, March 8, 1974.
4. NCR-W3-6245, "J. A. Jones Daily Cadweld Inspection Reports had signatures or initials on the records that are noticeably different," May 20, 1983.

Statement Prepared By:

L. Yang

Date

Statement Prepared By:

N. Chokshi

Date

Reviewed By:

Team Leader

Date

Reviewed By:

Site Team Leader(s)

Date

Allegation A-156

- 3 -

Approved By:

Task Management

Date

Document Name:
SSER A A-156

Requestor's ID:
JOHNNIE

Author's Name:
L. Yang

Document Comments:
A-106, A-108, A-133

Document Name: .
SSER X A-156

Requestor's ID:
JOHNNIE

Author's Name:
L. Yang

Document Comments:
A-106, A-108, A-133

SSER

Task: Allegation A-156, A-106, A-108, A-133

Reference No.: 4-84-A-06/51; 4-84-A-06/1; 4-84-A-06/3; 4-84-A-06/28

Characterization: It has been alleged that J. A. Jones Daily Cadweld Inspection Reports contained inspectors' signatures or initials that were noticeably different. There was a concern that these were forged signatures and initials, leaving the authenticity of these records in question.

Assessment of Allegation: The NRC staff reviewed Nonconformance Report (NCR) W3-6245 which was issued on May 20, 1983, to address discrepancies with the signatures and initials in the Cadweld records. One of the NCR attachments included the records which have the questionable initials. The authenticity of the signatures of five inspectors was under question and is being addressed by the NRC Office of Investigation.

In the initial technical disposition of this NCR, LP&L reviewed the concrete preplacement checklist records and Cadweld location maps to assure that the Cadwelds were installed and inspected as required. The authenticity of the signatures on these records was not questioned or examined at that time. It should be noted that the "Cadweld mapping" according to the project procedure, was used to record verification of the location of each splice, verification of the sizes of the splice bars, and verification of Cadweld identification number (ID), position and splice data.

LP&L, in further attempts to clarify the reasons for occurrences such as discrepant initials, obtained signed statements in January 1984 from the involved inspectors. These statements provided explanations for the appearance of the initials. It appeared that either the original reports were soiled in the field or the inspectors were in a physically awkward inspection position and called out data which was recorded and initialed by a second inspector. The inspectors stated that, when they entered the information onto the Cadweld map, they had to look at each Cadweld number stenciled on the Cadweld sleeve.

These numbers were readily discernible, and acceptable Cadwelds were painted white. The rejected Cadweld sleeves were painted red, while sample Cadwelds selected for testing were painted yellow. Since each Cadweld had to be examined for Cadweld mapping, the color coding scheme made it very unlikely that an unacceptable Cadweld would be left in place.

Based on the NRC staff's evaluation of the disposition of NCR W3-6245 and examination of the concrete preplacement checklist records, the staff believes that the questionable Cadwelds were actually installed and inspected and that no reject or test splices required for testing were left in a placement. The

integrity of structures was not in question. The indications were that this was a general practice in the Cadweld splicing area but was assessed as having no safety significance.

It should be noted that the alleged had not questioned the acceptability of the Cadwelds. In a discussion with the staff, the alleged indicated that he was more concerned about the authenticity of the signatures on the inspection forms.

This allegation has neither safety significance nor generic implications.

Potential Violations: The practice of signing or initialling the Cadweld daily inspection report by other than the original inspector is a violation of LP&L Site Inspection and Test Procedure W-SITP-4.

Actions Required: None.

References:

1. Procedure No. W-SITP-4, "Reinforcing Steel-Handling, Storage, Installing, Cadwelding and Modification Inspection Procedures." October 13, 1975.
2. Procedure No. W-WP-7, "Concrete Placing, Curing, Finishing, and Repairs."
3. Specification No. LOU-1564-79, "Mechanical Splicing of Concrete Reinforcing Steel," Revision 0, March 8, 1974.
4. NCR-W3-6245, "J. A. Jones Daily Cadweld Inspection Reports had signatures or initials on the records that are noticeably different," May 20, 1983.

Statement Prepared By:

L. Yang

Date

Statement Prepared By:

N. Chokshi

Date

Reviewed By:

Team Leader

Date

Reviewed By:

Site Team Leader(s)

Date

Allegation A-156

- 3 -

Approved By:

Task Management

Date

DRAFT 4
07/17/84

WATERFORD OPEN ISSUE

Task: A-106; A-108; A-133, and A-156,

Reference No.: 4-84-A-06/1, 3, 28, and 51

Characterization: Alleged falsification of daily cadweld inspection reports.

Initial Assessment of Significance: Based on the initial information, it appears that the technical data are not in question although the question of falsification could subject the data to question. Probably will not have any major impact on structural safety.

Source: Allegor ["A"] transcript, pages 130 through 140.

Approach to Resolution:

1. Review NCR W3-6245.
2. Evaluate the impact of the attached alleged falsified records on hardware/structure as to structural integrity.
3. Evaluate for generic/safety implications. OI to evaluate irregularities of the records.
4. Report results of review/evaluation of allegation.

Status:

Review Lead: L. Shao/W. Crossman

Support: OI

Estimated Resources: C/S engineer

Estimated Completion: 1 man-day

CLOSURE:

WATERFORD OPEN ISSUE

Task: A-106; A-108; A-133, and *A-156

Reference No.: 4-84-A-06/1, 3, 28, and 51

Characterization: Alleged falsification of daily cadweld inspection reports.

Initial Assessment of Significance: Based on the initial information, it appears that the technical data are not in question although the question of falsification could subject the data to question. Probably will not have any major impact on structural safety.

Source: Alleger ["A"] transcript, pages 130 through 140.

Approach to Resolution:

1. Review NCR W3-6245.
2. Evaluate the impact of the attached alleged falsified records on hardware/structure as to structural integrity.
3. Evaluate for generic/safety implications. OI to evaluate irregularities of the records.
4. Report results of review/evaluation of allegation.

Status:

Review Lead: L. Shao/W. Crossman

Support: OI

Estimated Resources: C/S engineer

Estimated Completion: 1 man-day

CLOSURE:

Document Name:

A-106

Requestor's ID:

JOHNNIE

Author's Name:

LShao/jkh

Document Comments:

DRAFT 4
07/17/84

WATERFORD OPEN ISSUE

Task: A-106; A-108; A-133, and A-156

Reference No.: 4-84-A-06/1, 3, 28, and 51

Characterization: Alleged falsification of daily cadweld inspection reports.

Initial Assessment of Significance: Based on the initial information, it *however* appears that the technical data *are* not in question, although ~~the question of~~ falsification could subject the data to question. *Probably will* not have any major impact on structural safety. *this will*

Source: Alleger "A" transcript, pages 130 through 140.

Approach to Resolution:

1. Review NCR W3-6245.
2. Evaluate the impact of the attached alleged falsified records on hardware/structure as to structural integrity.
3. Evaluate for generic/safety implications. OI to evaluate irregularities of the records.
4. Report results of review/evaluation of allegation.

Status:

Review Lead: L. Shao/W. Crossman

Support: OI

Estimated Resources: C/S engineer

Estimated Completion: 1 man-day

CLOSURE:

Document Name:
A-106

Requestor's ID:
JOHNNIE

Author's Name:
LShao/jkh

Document Comments:

Retype Draft 5
Change document
title to A-156
show
OK
W

WATERFORD OPEN ISSUE

Task: [A-106; A-108; A-133; and A-156,]

Reference No.: 4-84-A-06/1, 3, 28, and 51

Characterization: Alleged falsification of daily cadweld inspection reports.

Initial Assessment of Significance: Based on the initial information, it appears that the technical data is not in question, however, falsification could subject the data to question. This will probably not have any major impact on structural safety.

Source: Allegor ["A"] transcript, pages 130 through 140.

Approach to Resolution:

1. Review NCR W3-6245.
2. Evaluate the impact of the attached alleged falsified records on hardware/structure as to structural integrity.
3. Evaluate for generic/safety implications. OI to evaluate irregularities of the records.
4. Report results of review/evaluation of allegation.

Status:

Review Lead: L. Shao/W. Crossman

Support: OI

Estimated Resources: C/S engineer

Estimated Completion: 1 man-day

CLOSURE:

DRAFT 5
07/18/84

WATERFORD OPEN ISSUE

Task: A-106; A-108; A-133; and A-156

Reference No.: 4-84-A-06/1, 3, 28, and 51

Characterization: Alleged falsification of daily cadweld inspection reports.

Initial Assessment of Significance: Based on the initial information, it appears that the technical data is not in question, however, falsification could subject the data to question. This will probably not have any major impact on structural safety.

Source: Allegor ["A"] transcript, pages 130 through 140.

Approach to Resolution:

1. Review NCR W3-6245.
2. Evaluate the impact of the attached alleged falsified records on hardware/structure as to structural integrity.
3. Evaluate for generic/safety implications. OI to evaluate irregularities of the records.
4. Report results of review/evaluation of allegation.

Status:

Review Lead: L. Shao/W. Crossman

Support: OI

Estimated Resources: C/S engineer

Estimated Completion: 1 man-day

CLOSURE:

WATERFORD OPEN ISSUE

Task: A-156; A-106; A-108; A-133

Reference No.: 4-84-A-06/1, 3, 28, and 51

Characterization: Alleged falsification of daily cadweld inspection reports.

Initial Assessment of Significance: Based on the initial information, it appears that the technical data is not in question, however, falsification could subject the data to question. This will probably not have any major impact on structural safety.

Source: Allegor [A] transcript, pages 130 through 140.

Approach to Resolution:

1. Review NCR W3-6245.
2. Evaluate the impact of the attached alleged falsified records on hardware/structure as to structural integrity.
3. Evaluate for generic/safety implications. OI to evaluate irregularities of the records.
4. Report results of review/evaluation of allegation.

Status:

Review Lead: L. Shao/W. Crossman

Support: OI

Estimated Resources: C/S engineer

Estimated Completion: 1 man-day

CLOSURE:

Document Name:

A-156

Requestor's ID:

JOHNNIE

Author's Name:

LShao/jkh

Document Comments:

DRAFT 6
07/18/84

WATERFORD OPEN ISSUE

Task: A-156; A-106; A-108; A-133

Reference No.: 4-84-A-06/1, 3, 28, and 51

Characterization: Alleged falsification of daily cadweld inspection reports.

Initial Assessment of Significance: Based on the initial information, it appears that the technical data is not in question, however, falsification could subject the data to question. This will probably not have any major impact on structural safety.

Source: Allegor ["A"] transcript, pages 130 through 140.

Approach to Resolution:

1. Review NCR W3-6245.
2. Evaluate the impact of the attached alleged falsified records on hardware/structure as to structural integrity.
3. Evaluate for generic/safety implications. OI to evaluate irregularities of the records.
4. Report results of review/evaluation of allegation.

Status:

Review Lead: L. Shao/W. Crossman

Support: OI

Estimated Resources: C/S engineer

Estimated Completion: 1 man-day

CLOSURE: