

MAY 31 1988

Docket No. 50-423
File RI-88-A-0047



Dear [Redacted]

This letter addresses the NRC disposition of matters you identified to Mr. E. L. Conner of this office on April 26, 1988. Those matters were also discussed with you by telephone call from Mr. C. Anderson of this office and me on May 27, 1988.

We understand that you encountered problems with field make-up of Litton-Veam connectors, and with obtaining data for turn-over packages for Litton-Veam connectors. However, the disposition of the problems was acceptable, as was the documentation finally obtained. We further understand that you are aware of no uncorrected safety inadequacy in regard to these matters. Based on these considerations, we are closing this matter as not representing an issue which needs follow-up to assure safety.

Thank you for bringing this matter to our attention. If you have any additional information or any questions for the NRC, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Original Signed By:

Ebe C. McCabe, Jr., Chief
Reactor Projects Section 1B
Division of Reactor Projects
Tel: (215) 337-5231

bcc:
W. Raymond
C. Anderson
A. Shropshire
E. Conner

RI:DRP
McCabe/meo
5/31/88

RI:DRP
Bettenhausen
5/31/88

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

62/MCCABE/5/31/88 - 0001.0.0
05/31/88

9203110145 910821
PDR FOIA
GUILD91-162 PDR

6/22

ALLEGATION RECEIPT REPORT

Date/Time Received: 10:15 am
May 5, 1988

Allegation No. _____
(leave blank)

Name: [REDACTED]
home Phone: [REDACTED]

Address: _____

City/State/Zip: _____

Confidentiality Requested: Yes _____

No _____ Implied X - at least for new-
su write up.

Allegor's Employer: Byrnes

Position/Title: Security Guard

Facility: Millstone 1, 2 and 3

Docket No.: 50-245,336,425

(Allegation Summary (brief description of concern(s): 1. The contingency security force is undermanned.

2. The perimeter CCTV's were not manned from October 87 to Feb 88.

Number of Concerns: 2

Employee Receiving Allegation: L.M. Kolonowski
(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): N/A

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

[redacted] a member of the striking security force at Millstone, called the NRC residents' office on May 5, 1980. He asked if the NRC had evaluated the security strike, specifically, contingency force response to security events. He felt, for example, that the present staffing level could not adequately respond to a security computer failure with a simultaneous security event.

Walt Martin, a Region 1 security inspector, observed the contingency force during a security drill and found no inadequacies. He also stated that the required minimum staffing levels were maintained and that if needed, the Unit 3 maintenance shop area or an access point could be secured to release extra guards for emergency response.

His second concern was that no one was stationed to watch the perimeter CCTVs from October 1987 to February 15, 1988, and that I could verify this by reviewing the NNECO bills from Burnes. I told him about the August 1987 security inspection which identified "blank spots" in the CCTV perimeter coverage. In response to the inspection, the licensee discontinued the use of those CCTVs for alarm assessment, and instead responded to every perimeter alarm involving the questionable CCTVs. He said that he felt the security procedures still required perimeter CCTV manning. He stated that the access point CCTVs were deemed,

Joe Mandan, another regional security inspector, confirmed what I told [redacted]. He said that perimeter CCTVs are not required to be manned unless some other component in the barrier-detection-assessment chain is operable. The associated CCTV must then be manned as a compensatory measure. He said it is possible that [redacted] observed guards posted at the CCTVs and misunderstood their posts as permanent requirements.

I explained the allegation process to [redacted] and that I would have to talk to both licensee and my management. [redacted] asked that I not state his name if ever "just yet." He said he would call me on May 6, 1988 and gave me his home phone number.