

**From:** Michael Kunowski  
**To:** James Heller; OaC3  
**Date:** Wed, Jul 3, 2002 12:36 PM  
**Subject:** KEWAUNEE/POINT BEACH ISSUE

Here's what I have on the issue I spoke with you this morning. I called Terry Madeda, who has both Kewaunee and Point Beach. He is assessing the info and will let me know what I should do next.

<b>ALLEGATION RECEIPT FORM</b> <i>Please email the following information to OAC3, JKH, and ALK.</i>	
Received By: MIKE KUNOWSKI	Receipt Date: WEDNESDAY, JULY 3, 2002
Receipt Method (meeting, phone call, letter)	MESSAGE LEFT ON RESIDENCE OFFICE PHONE-PLANT PHONE LINE, NOT REGULAR OFFICE PHONE LINE, TUESDAY AT 4:44 P.M., APPARENTLY JULY 2, 2002
FACILITY	
Facility Name	POINT BEACH AND KEWAUNEE
Location	TWO RIVERS, WI
Docket(s)	50-266; 50-301; 50-305
<b>CONCERN</b> <i>Records of conversations for receipt of allegations should contain the following information as a minimum. Obtain as many concern specifics as possible.</i>	
<b>1. What is the concern?</b> <p>The CI prefaced the two concerns with the statement that the call pertained to issues of security violations. The two concerns were 1) the CI stated that "we have got paperwork that shows you got some people out there that are basically untrustworthy. [REDACTED] The CI concludes by stating that (s)he has gone through the NMC employee concerns program, through security, and through other avenues and now has come to us. He requested a return call. He did not mention Point Beach, only Kewaunee and NMC.</p>	
<b>2. When did the concern occur?</b> <p>Unknown-I have not talked to or attempted to call the CI. I passed the above information on to Terry Madeda, Wednesday morning.</p>	
<b>3. Is this an ongoing concern?</b> <p>Unknown-I have not talked to or attempted to call the CI.</p>	
<b>4. Who was involved?</b> <p>Unknown-I have not talked to or attempted to call the CI.</p>	
<b>5. Were there any witnesses?</b> <p>Unknown-I have not talked to or attempted to call the CI.</p>	
<b>6. What is the potential safety impact?</b> <p>Unknown-I have not talked to or attempted to call the CI.</p>	

outside of scope

D-7

Information in this record was deleted in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, exemptions 7E, outside scope  
 FOIA- 2006-113

(3)

7. Ask the CI what requirement/regulation does the individual believe governs this concern? (If the CI does not have this information, please document this response. If the CI does not provide this information and the individual receiving the allegation can obtain the information within the 3 day deadline for forwarding the information to EICS, the information should be provided by the NRC staff member)

Unknown—I have not talked to or attempted to call the CI.

8. Ask the CI what records should the NRC review?

Unknown—I have not talked to or attempted to call the CI.

9. Ask the CI what other individuals could the NRC contact for information?

Unknown—I have not talked to or attempted to call the CI.

10. How did the individual find out about the concern?

Unknown—I have not talked to or attempted to call the CI.

11. Was the concern brought to management's attention? If so, what actions have been taken; if not, why not?

The CI stated that (s)he has gone through the NMC employee concerns program and through security. I spoke with Zach Dunham, the resident at Kewaunee, who recalled seeing a condition report last week that pertained to [redacted] but remembers no specifics.

12. Was a condition report (or other corrective action document) initiated in response to the issue? If so, what was the resolution?

As stated above for question 11, apparently a condition report may have been written at Kewaunee.

13. Is the individual satisfied with the licensee's response? If not, why?

Unknown—I have not talked to or attempted to call the CI.

14. If the licensee has not responded, does the individual wish to wait on the licensee's response before NRC pursues the issue? If not, why? Unknown—I have not talked to or attempted to call the CI.

15. What does the individual believe NRC should do in regard to this concern? Unknown—I have not talked to or attempted to call the CI.

**Discrimination Regulations prohibit NRC licensees (including contractors and subcontractors) from discriminating against individuals who engage in protected activities (alleging violations of regulatory requirements, refusing to engage in practices made unlawful by statutes, etc.).**

1. Does the concern involve discrimination? If so, was the alleged informed that identity will be released during an investigation?

There was no mention of discrimination in the phone answering machine message.

2. Was the individual advised of the DOL process and the 180 day restriction on filing? No—I have not talked to or attempted to call the CI.

3. What adverse actions have been taken? When?

Unknown—I have not talked to or attempted to call the CI.

4. Why does the individual believe the actions were taken as a result of engaging in a protected activity?

Unknown—I have not talked to or attempted to call the CI.

5. What does the individual believe was the protected activity?

Unknown—I have not talked to or attempted to call the CI.

What safety issues did the individual raise? When? (DOCUMENT ABOVE)

outside scope

Unknown—I have not talked to or attempted to call the CI.

Did you contact the NRC about these safety issues> Was/Is you management aware that you informed the NRC? Unknown—I have not talked to or attempted to call the CI.

**ALLEGER INFORMATION**

Preference for method and time of contact Unknown

Was the individual advised of limitations on identity protection No—I have not talked to or attempted to call the CI.

**Referral** Explain that if the concerns are referred to the licensee, that the NRC will review and evaluate the thoroughness and adequacy of the licensee's response. If the concerns are an agreement state issue or the jurisdiction of another agency, explain that we will refer the concern to the appropriate agency. If the alieger agrees, we will provide the alieger's identity for followup by the agreement state or other agency.

Does the individual object to referral?

Unknown—I have not talked to or attempted to call the CI.

Does the individual object to releasing their identity?

Unknown—I have not talked to or attempted to call the CI.

If the issue involves another agency, does the individual object to referral to the agency and release of identity to that agency?

Unknown—I have not talked to or attempted to call the CI.

Was the individual informed that objecting to referral to another agency might impact review of the concern?

Unknown—I have not talked to or attempted to call the CI.

**Provide the CI with the OAC contact information (names of OACs) and RIII switchboard number (1-800-522-3025) Explain the allegation process (CI will receive an acknowledgment letter within 30 days and will be advised of NRC's resolution of the issue(s) via letter.)**

**From:** Terry Madeda  
**To:** James Heller  
**Date:** Wed, Jul 3, 2002 12:50 PM  
**Subject:** ALLEGATION FOLLOWUP FROM INFORMATION PROVIDED TO MIKE KUNOWSKI

On this date I received a call from M. Kunowski regarding information on the residents voice mail at the Point Beach site. Mike indicated that a named individual left a voice mail on 7/2/02 that

7C

identified two security related concerns of a general nature. The CI left a telephone number for followup. On this date, based on Jim Heller's request, I contacted the CI to discuss the concerns.

The first concern involved a potential FFD issue. The CI indicated that he/she and several other craft employees were being unjustly accused that they failed to report the smell of alcohol on a foreman while being employed as craft employees during the steam generator project at Kewaunee. The CI stated that they did report the issue to their supervisor, that but the supervisor took no action. Our review of this issue determined that the concern that the supervisor took no action was depositioned and closed in allegation AMS 2001-A-0176, and in addition during our review of the licensee's response we also identified a potential wrongdoing issue that allegedly involved several craft personnel not reporting the smell of alcohol on a foreman. As identified in our memo to B. Clayton dated 3/11/02, we recommended that this issue be referred to OI for their review. This FFD concern is apparently related to OI's current investigation. We recommend that the above information be forwarded to OI for their review and evaluation.



outside  
if scope

In his writeup Mike Kunowski will provide the CI's name and telephone numbers. I have the CI's home address.