



Commonwealth Edison
72 West Adams Street, Chicago, Illinois
Address Reply to: Post Office Box 767
Chicago, Illinois 60690 - 0767

October 30, 1989

Directorate III-2
Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Subject: Dresden Station Units 2 and 3
Quad Cities Station Units 1 and 2
Zion Station Units 1 and 2
LaSalle County Station Units 1 and 2
Byron Station Units 1 and 2
Braidwood Station Units 1 and 2
Supplemental Response to NRC Notification of
Employees' Potential Safety Issues
Docket Nos. 50-237/249, 50-254/265, 50-295/304,
50-373/374, 50-454/455, 50-456/457

- References:
- (a) V. Stello (NRC) letter to B. Thomas (CECo), dated April 27, 1989.
 - (b) M. Richter (CECo) letter to U.S. NRC, dated July 31, 1989.
 - (c) M. Richter (CECo) letter to U.S. NRC, dated September 15, 1989.

Dear Sir:

Reference (a) reemphasized to licensees their responsibilities to assure that employees, including those of the licensee's contractors and subcontractors, are permitted to contact the NRC with concerns about potential safety issues. Additionally, licensees were requested to examine current and previous labor settlement agreements to assure that restrictive clauses, which would hinder the employees from providing information of potential safety issues to the NRC, are not present. References (b) and (c) indicated the review of labor settlement agreements for Commonwealth Edison Company (CECo) personnel revealed no restrictive clauses, however, the review of labor settlement agreements for contractor personnel was still in progress. This letter presents a status on the review of contractor agreements.

8911070154 891030
PDR ADOCK 05000237
P EDC

0286K

ZZZZ
1/0
See Attached Dist

October 30, 1989

To accomplish the review of the contractor agreements, CECO contacted (via letter) approximately 100 companies. At this time, CECO has received a response from approximately 40 percent of the companies contacted, and no restrictive clauses in any labor settlement agreements have been identified. In most cases, the companies for which a response is still outstanding have not been utilized recently by CECO. CECO is actively pursuing, and will continue to pursue, a "follow-up" effort for those companies who have not responded to ensure completion of the contractor review. A status on the contractor review will be submitted by December 15, 1989.

If any restrictive clauses are found during this review, CECO will promptly notify the employee and make every effort to notify any former employee that the restriction should be disregarded. Additionally, CECO will notify the NRC if any restrictive clauses are found.

Please direct any questions that you may have concerning this response to this office.

Respectfully,

Milton H. Richter

M.H. Richter
Generic Issues Administrator

cc: A.B. Davis - Regional Administrator, Region III
Resident Inspectors D/QC/Z/LSC/BY/BDWD