



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

~~PDR (50-442)~~

**JUL 3 1980**

Mr. Tony White  
1127 State  
Emporia, Kansas 66801

Dear Mr. White:

This is in final response to your letter dated November 2, 1979 to former Chairman Hendrie relating to your concerns on the Wolf Creek facility. This response addresses the remaining issues not previously provided to you in our letters dated December 20, 1979 and January 31, 1980.

The points which you raised in your letter are addressed in the enclosure in the order listed in your letter. Thank you for your interest in these matters.

Sincerely,

*Victor Stello, Jr.*  
Victor Stello, Jr.  
Director  
Office of Inspection  
and Enforcement

Enclosures:

1. Response to Ltr. of 11/2/79
2. Appendix A, Memo, Civilk to Bickwit, 3/31/80
3. Appendix B, IE Investigation Report 50-482/79-14
4. Appendix C, IE Investigation Report 50-482/79-19
5. Appendix D, IE Investigation Report 50-482/79-21
6. Appendix E, IE Investigation Report 50-432/80-06

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS  
POOR QUALITY PAGES

8007220140 H

Enclosure 1

Response to Letter of 11/2/79

1. Extended Time Period for Commission Decision:

The basic reason for the extensions of time for the Commission decision on the Director's Denial was related to the fact that the staff was preparing a supplement to the decision issued on July 12, 1979 and one of the issues, that dealing with seismicity, required several months of staff effort. The January 31, 1980 letter sent to you contained a document entitled "Revised Director's Denial of Requests Under 10 CFR 2.206." Appendix A notes the final decision by the Commission regarding the Director's Denial on this issue.

2. Consideration of a New Epicenter for Seismic Events:

The seismicity question was specifically addressed in Appendix F of the Revised Denial sent to you by letter dated January 31, 1980.

3. Location and Condition of Local Public Document Room in Burlington, Kansas:

The policy for the location of the local public document rooms calls for the local PDR's generally being located in libraries in cities and towns near the site. In this case, the Coffey County Courthouse was the facility chosen because of location. These local repositories of documents are maintained without NRC funding, by local officials, for the local population. We recognize that in some cases not all local agencies/officials are able, due to personnel and budget limitations, to maintain the records in the same manner as in the NRC public document room in Washington. We believe the use of the Coffey County Courthouse in the case of Wolf Creek is appropriate because of its proximity to the site.

4. Testing of the Base Mat:

The details related to this issue were thoroughly discussed in Item #3 of Enclosure A to my letter of December 20, 1979.

5. Use of 90-day Test Results:

The details on this issue were thoroughly discussed in Item #2 of Enclosure A to my letter of December 20, 1979.

6. Corruption and Poor Workmanship:

You provided no specific details in your allegations related to "scandalous stories of corruption and poor quality of work abound from workers". Enclosed for your information as Appendices B, C, D, and E are four investigation reports that address allegations received during the period of June 1979 through December 1979. These allegations generally

address the areas in which you expressed concern. We have no other information related to your concerns and all of the specific allegations known to us have been investigated. Our investigations have disclosed no items of safety significance associated with allegations of corruption and workmanship.

7. Worker Intimidation and Greed:

During the course of our normal inspection activities workers have been contacted. Additionally, several workers were interviewed during the investigations referenced in Item 6. These activities failed to disclose information which indicated workers had been intimidated at the Wolf Creek site.

Within the last several weeks the licensee, Kansas Gas and Electric Company, reported a situation to the NRC that could be categorized as a case of harrassment. Verbal threats of bodily harm were made to a Level II QC welding (mechanical) inspector. This situation was revealed after charges of harrassment were made and Daniel International Corporation completed an investigation. As a result of the investigation five craftsmen were terminated and the QC inspector was reassigned to the New York area. Daniel's investigation indicated the actions against the inspector were of the nature of personality conflicts as opposed to attempts to keep the inspector from completing his assigned tasks. The NRC has not completed an evaluation of this incident at this time.

Your reference to worker greed does not appear to have relevant meaning in the context of construction of a safe nuclear facility. One could speculate or hypothesize many things from your statement, but specific facts or allegations are necessary if we are to act.

8. NRC Philosophy of Licensee's Reporting on Themselves:

Although you do not agree with the philosophy of regulation used by the NRC to assure the safety of nuclear power plants, the Congress has authorized an NRC regulatory program based on licensee self-reporting and an NRC overview and audit type inspection. We believe this approach is an appropriate and effective means for protecting the public health and safety. However we do recognize that improvements and adjustments can always be made and we continually do so as experience and resources dictate.