



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION IV
811 RYAN PLAZA DRIVE, SUITE 400
ARLINGTON, TEXAS 76011-4005

June 6, 2006

(b)(7)c

SUBJECT: ALLEGATION NO. RIV-2006-A-0033

Dear (b)(7)c

This letter is in regard to the concerns you brought to the NRC in your letter dated April 13, 2006, to the NRC Resident Inspectors at the Callaway Plant. In addition to this letter, you provided clarifying information during your conversation with Mr. Anthony Gody, Operations Branch Chief, and Ms. Judith Walker, Allegations Coordinator, on May 24, 2006, and our conversation on May 22, 2006. Specifically, you clarified your understanding of the approximate number of individuals that had regular contact with the (b)(7)c you clarified that you had been told that no regulatory requirements were violated in the requalification and grading process, and you provided one additional concern.

The enclosure to this letter documents our understanding of your concerns. Please note that we have modified this list of concerns to better characterize the issues and reflect our updated information. If the summary of your concerns is not accurate, please contact me so that we can correct any misunderstanding before we complete our review.

Thank you for clarifying your concerns with us. We will advise you when we have completed our review of this matter. Should you have any questions or comments during the interim regarding this matter, please call me Monday - Friday between 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. central time at 800-952-9677 extension 245 or on the NRC Safety Hotline at 800-695-7403. Should you want to respond in writing, our mailing address is listed in the header of this letter.

Sincerely,

Harry A. Freeman
Senior Allegation Coordinator

Enclosure:
Statement of Concerns

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Information in this record was deleted in
accordance with the Freedom of Information Act.
Exemptions 7C
FOIA/PA 2009-127

C/3

STATEMENT OF CONCERNS

RIV-2006-A-0033

Allegedly:

Concern 1

✓ An operations (b)(7)c was not attentive to his duties for months.

Concern 2

✓ You and the (b)(7)c told licensee management about the problem but management took no action to address the issue until they were forced to by an Employee Concerns Program investigation.

Concern 3

✓ You were subjected to retaliation for reporting this fitness-for-duty problem to the Employee Concerns Program in that you did (b)(7)c

Concern 4

✓ The operations crew may have been "carrying" the inattentive operations (b)(7)c during licensed operator requalification in that the shift crew had to compensate for the (b)(7)c inadequacies and the grading standard was relaxed in order for the crew to pass. (b)(7)c told you that this was not a regulatory issue since the exam still met the NRC threshold.

Concern 5

✓ Based upon your concerns, the NRC is concerned that although the inattentive operations (b)(7)c (b)(7)c has been purportedly removed from shift duties, the licensee has not terminated his SRO license and the individual may be placed on shift as needed.

Concern 6

✓ You believe that there was a failure of the licensee's fitness-for-duty program in that 20 to 30 individuals had regular contact with the (b)(7)c but did not pursue resolution of his lack-of-attention to duties.

Concern 7

✓ On more than one occasion, an on-shift operations (b)(7)c left the control room area for four to five hours. During these absences the shift crew could not contact the (b)(7)c by any communications method. The operations (b)(7)c may not have designated another individual to assume the control room command function during these absences.

ENCLOSURE