

BCD

AUG 1 8 1989

Docket No. 50-461

Illinois Power Company
ATTN: Mr. D. P. Hall
Senior Vice President
Clinton Power Station
Mail Code V-275
P. O. Box 678
Clinton, IL 61727

Gentlemen:

When Region III forwarded NRC Inspection Report No. 50-461/89018(DRP) to you via a July 25, 1989 letter Addendum 1 was inadvertently omitted. We hereby forward Addendum 1 for your information.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.790 of the Commission's regulations, a copy of this letter and the enclosure will be placed in the NRC Public Document Room.

We regret any inconvenience caused by the omission and we will gladly entertain any questions concerning this matter.

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY R. W. DeFAYETTE

R. C. Knop, Chief
Reactor Projects Branch 3

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/enclosure:

- J. S. Perry, Assistant Vice President
- R. D. Freeman, Manager, Nuclear Station Engineering Department
- DCD/DCB (RIDS)
- Licensing Fee Management Branch
- Resident Inspector, RIII
- Richard Hubbard
- J. W. McCaffrey, Chief, Public Utilities Division
- H. S. Taylor, Quality Assurance Division, Sargent & Lundy Engineers
- David Rosenblatt, Governor's Office of Consumer Services
- Sheldon Zabel, Esquire, Schiff, Hardin, & Waite
- L. Larson, Project Manager, General Electric Company
- Chairman of DeWitt County
- Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety
- D. Schopfer, Project Manager, Sargent & Lundy Engineers

RIII ^{up} Drouin/jp RIII ^{up} Ring RIII ^{yes} Knop RWD 8/18

IEC1
/.

8908250298 890818
PDR ADCK 05000461
PDC

CLINTON

ENFORCEMENT CONFERENCE

JUNE 14, 1989

Discussion of actions related to Lead Radiation Monitoring System Engineer's Instruction to Subordinates to Deviate from Illinois Power Procedures (Ref: OI Report No. 3-86-008).

CLINTON

ENFORCEMENT CONFERENCE

JUNE 14, 1989

- Opening Remarks : R. Knop, Br. Chief, DRP
- NRC Presentation : M. Ring, Sec. Chief, DRP
- License Presentation : IL Power Representative
- Closing Remarks : C. Paperiello, Deputy RA

CLINTON
ENFORCEMENT CONFERENCE DISCUSSION
ISSUES

- a. What management action was initiated once IP management was informed that the lead Radiation Monitoring Systems (RMS) engineer had instructed subordinates to intentionally deviate from IP procedures?

CLINTON
ENFORCEMENT CONFERENCE DISCUSSION
ISSUES

- b. What actions were taken against the lead RMS engineer, and why?

- c. Was management's response to the lead RMS engineer's intentional disregard for procedures appropriate? Why or Why not?

CLINTON
ENFORCEMENT CONFERENCE DISCUSSION
ISSUES

- d. Why did the lead RMS engineer's intentional disregard for IP procedures entitle him to continued employment at Clinton Power Station until December 1988? Did his duties involve safety-related activities? If yes, was there any indication that he intentionally violated or he intentionally caused to be violated any safety-related practices or procedures? If yes, explain the potential impact that these events had on the safe operation of Clinton Power Station.

ENFORCEMENT CONFERENCE

OFFICE OF INVESTIGATION RESULTS

ALLEGED INSTRUCTION TO VIOLATE PROCEDURE

June 14, 1989

ILLINOIS POWER COMPANY 1985 INVESTIGATIONS

- INVESTIGATED BY SUPERVISION AND SAFETEAM INDEPENDENT OF EACH OTHER IN 1985
- INTERVIEWS OF REMAINING TECHNICIANS DID NOT SUBSTANTIATE ALLEGATION
- THE ENGINEER DENIED INSTRUCTING TECHNICIANS TO VIOLATE PROCEDURES
- CREDIBILITY OF ALLEGERS QUESTIONABLE
- SITE PRACTICE ALLOWED UNCALIBRATED M&TE TO BE USED FOR QUALITATIVE MEASUREMENTS

ILLINOIS POWER COMPANY 1989 REVIEW

- ISSUE REVIEWED AGAIN BY IP IN 1989
- EVIDENCE DID NOT SUBSTANTIATE ALLEGATION
- CONFIRMED ACTIONS IN 1985 WERE REASONABLE
- EVIDENCE FROM INVESTIGATIONS AND REVIEWS DID NOT SUBSTANTIATE THAT THE ENGINEER HAD ANY INTENT TO VIOLATE PROCEDURES OR INSTRUCTED TECHNICIANS TO VIOLATE PROCEDURES

SAFETY SIGNIFICANCE

- NO SAFETY IMPACT
 - TECHNICIANS DID NOT FOLLOW ALLEGED INSTRUCTIONS
 - NO HARDWARE DISCREPANCIES IN FIELD
 - PERIODIC CALIBRATION/TESTING ASSURES ADEQUATE FUNCTION

- NO VIOLATION OF PROCEDURES OR 10CFR50, APPENDIX B

PROGRAMMATIC ACTIONS

- INTENTIONAL DISREGARD OF PROCEDURES IS A SERIOUS REGULATORY CONCERN AND IS OF CONCERN TO ILLINOIS POWER COMPANY
- IP HAS TAKEN EXTENSIVE MEASURES OVER THE YEARS TO INSTILL THIS CONCERN IN OUR EMPLOYEES
 - POLICY STATEMENTS
 - EXECUTIVE PLAN
 - NUCLEAR PROGRAM ENVIRONMENT

CONCLUSIONS

- IP MANAGEMENT ACTION IN 1985 WAS REASONABLE
- 1989 REVIEW DID NOT SUBSTANTIATE THAT THE ENGINEER HAD ANY INTENT TO VIOLATE PROCEDURES OR INSTRUCTED TECHNICIANS TO VIOLATE PROCEDURES
- NO SAFETY IMPACT
- INDIVIDUALS INVOLVED ARE NO LONGER AT CLINTON
- EXTENSIVE ACTIONS TAKEN TO ADDRESS THE UNDERLYING ISSUE
- ESCALATED ENFORCEMENT WOULD NOT RESULT IN ADDITIONAL ACTION AND IS THEREFORE NOT WARRANTED