



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS FIELD OFFICE, REGION I
475 ALLENDALE ROAD
KING OF PRUSSIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19406

Scott - panel
Ed
4/23
92-91-A-0029

April 22, 1991

MEMORANDUM FOR: Charles W. Hehl, Director
Division of Reactor Projects, Region I *awh*
FROM: Chester W. White, Director *(initials)*
Office of Investigations Field Office, Region I
SUBJECT: ALLEGATION RECEIPT REPORT RE: ALLEGED SUBSTANDARD CONNECTORS,
MILLSTONE UNITS 1, 2, AND 3

Attached for your action is an Allegation Receipt Report of a concern
raised by [REDACTED] on Friday, April 19, 1991.

Attachment:
As stated

Information in this document is being
disclosed in accordance with the Freedom of Information
Act, exemptions *b1, b7C*
FOIA- *92-162*

ALLEGATION RECEIPT REPORT

Date/Time Received: April 19, 1991 1:00 p.m. Allegation No. 27-91-A-0029
(leave blank)

Name: [REDACTED] Address: _____

Phone: [REDACTED] City/State/Zip: _____

Confidentiality:

Was it requested?	Yes _____	No <u>X</u>
Was it initially granted?	Yes _____	No <u>X</u>
Was it finally granted by the allegation panel?	Yes _____	No <u>X</u>
Does a confidentiality agreement need to be sent to allegor?	Yes _____	No <u>X</u>
Has a confidentiality agreement been signed?	Yes _____	No <u>X</u>
Memo documenting why it was granted is attached?	Yes _____	No <u>X</u>

Allegor's Employer: Millstone Unit 2 Position/Title: ISC Technician

Facility: _____ Docket No.: _____

(Allegation Summary (brief description of concern(s): [REDACTED] advised the

following: Approximately 10 months ago, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] was provided a cracked QA nut by a Millstone worker.

[REDACTED] went to the warehouse where the nut had been stored and found

Number of Concerns: _____

Employee Receiving Allegation: C. W. White
(first two initials and last name)

Type of Regulated Activity (a) X Reactor (d) _____ Safeguards
(b) _____ Vendor (e) _____ Other: _____
(c) _____ Materials (Specify)

Materials License No. (if applicable): _____

Functional Area(s): _____ (a) Operations _____ (e) Emergency Preparedness
_____ (b) Construction _____ (f) Onsite Health and Safety
_____ (c) Safeguards _____ (g) Offsite Health and Safety
_____ (d) Transportation _____ (h) Other: _____

Detailed Description of Allegation: 160 cracked nuts (approximately 1/2 of the total). [REDACTED] then went to [REDACTED] (John Coleman) and reported the matter. Coleman allegedly told [REDACTED] to get rid of the cracked nuts and put the good ones back.

[REDACTED] then raised, with Coleman, the issue of the problem of possible cracked nuts already installed at the plant. Allegedly, nothing was done.

[REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] is reluctant to report the matter to the NRC. This incident took place approximately 10 months ago, and [REDACTED] took his concern to the Nuclear Concerns Program who have not dispositioned it satisfactorily for [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] stated that he was notifying the NRC at this time because he had talked to [REDACTED] two days ago and the issue was still unresolved. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Coleman's supervisor is Duncan McCory.

ALLEGATION RECEIPT REPORT

Date/Time Received: April 1, 1991 11:30a.m.Allegation No. RI-91-A-0063
(leave blank)

Name: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

City/State/Zip: [REDACTED]

Confidentiality:

Was it requested?

Yes

No ☒

Was it initially granted?

Yes

No

Was it finally granted by the allegation panel?

Yes

No

Does a confidentiality agreement need to be sent to allegor?

Yes

No

Has a confidentiality agreement been signed?

Yes

No

Memo documenting why it was granted is attached?

Yes

No

Allegor's

Employer:

Northeast Nuclear Energy Co.

Position/Title:

[REDACTED]

Facility: Millstone 2Docket No.: 50-336(Allegation Summary (brief description of concern(s): ①. The allegor is concerned about operation of the local security alarm for access into the auxillary building. ②. A question as to the right of information during a closed-door meeting betweenNumber of Concerns: 3NNE/NRC after SALP management meeting on 3/28.

Employee Receiving Allegation:

P.J. Habighorst

(first two initials and last name)

Type of Regulated Activity (a)

☒ Reactor(d) ☐ Safeguards(b) ☐ Vendor(e) ☐ Other:(c) ☐ Materials

(Specify)

Materials License No. (if applicable):

Functional Area(s):

☒ (a) Operations☐ (e) Emergency Preparedness☐ (b) Construction☐ (f) Onsite Health and Safety☐ (c) Safeguards☐ (g) Offsite Health and Safety☐ (d) Transportation☐ (h) Other:(NRC Region I Form 207
Revised 10/89)

Information

in accordance

Act, exemptions

FOIA

b7C92-162

Information

f/r

DETAIL DESCRIPTION OF ALLEGATION.

1. On April 1, the alleged and a co-worker were assigned troubleshooting activities for the Unit 2 stack radiation monitor (RM-8132). The co-worker was a contractor who previously worked at Millstone Unit 1 and 2.

The alleged and his co-worker entered into the auxiliary building (vital area) to investigate work conditions and tagging for the corrective maintenance work on RM-8132. The alleged stayed into the auxiliary building, subsequently followed by the contractor leaving in. Both individuals entered the 14th elevation of the auxiliary building together. The individuals remained in the area for approximately 10 - 15 minutes. Both individuals exited the auxiliary building in the same manner as the entrance. The contractor was unaware that in both entrances it he was not authorized for the area. He had assumed, since he had previously worked in the Millstone Unit 2 auxiliary building that he still had access into the area. The alleged was unaware that the individual had unauthorized access. The alleged notified his line management of the issue.

Based on unauthorized entrance by the contractor, the security force receive an alarm and responded to the area. The alleged and the contractor were stopped by security upon exiting the auxiliary building. The security organization conferred with both individuals and told the alleged that the issue will be logged into the security quarterly report.

The alleged's concern is that the particular access door is equipped with a local alarm. The audible alarm, in addition, to indication lights is to warn individuals of unauthorized access in a vital area. During this event on April 1, the local alarm did not work. The alleged believes a problem with the audible alarm exists when this condition occurs, and as such does not provide indication to the individuals that unauthorized access has occurred.

2. The alleged has become aware of the meeting between the NRC and Northeast Utilities representatives after the GALE management meeting on March 28, 1991. The alleged believes, that since he is part of the "problem" he should have access to the informational exchange that occurred within this meeting. The inspector told the alleged he was not part of the meeting, and was directed to put in the inspection report a summary of the topics discussed at this meeting. The alleged believes this informational exchange is very important to him and other whistleblowers.

The alleged is aware of the FOIA approach, however he would appreciate if he could acquire the information. The inspector told the alleged he would get back to him on his question.

THE INSPECTOR DISCUSSED THE ABOVE TWO ISSUES WITH THE DRP SECTION CHIEF ON APRIL 1.

3. At approximately 5:10 p.m. the alleged presented an additional concern to the resident inspector. The concerns are listed below:

a. Field Design Change RDCB 10-9-80 installation of a photovoltaic flow control sensor for radiation monitoring. RDCB 10-9-80 Unit 2 start radiation monitoring did not have appropriate guidance for tag-out control wiring diagrams included in the installation did not provide sufficient details to adequately tag-out the monitor.

b. The alleged identified per drawing D401704 sheet 1 of 2 ~~that~~ that the motor for the monitor RDCB 10-9-80 supplies 120 volt a.c. power to both flow control valves and indication and alarm circuits. The alleged believed that maintenance representative performed preventative maintenance activities on the motor circuit. If the motor was out-of-service the flow control valve would not respond to opening signal and no indication would be available. In addition, if the motor is tagged out, potential for 120 volt a.c. exists at the flow control circuitry for the flow control valve. The alleged advised, RDCB 10-9-80 is a turbine, specification for, used radiation monitor.