

Mon, Oct 15, 1990

from the desk of **Bill Raymond**

Received JS Stewart  
10/24/90

FOR: ~~Don Haverkamp~~  
Scott Stewart

R1-90-A-120, ISSUE 9

SUBJECT: RECEIPT OF INFORMATION ON HILLSTONE 3 FUEL OIL

In response to your initial request by telephone, I and the Millstone residents reviewed our office and personal files. No information on the Millstone 3 fuel oil sampling issue was located. Further, none of the residents recalled receiving such information.

The memo(s) on Millstone 3 fuel oil you sent to us (attached) was routed to all residents to see if anyone recognized the documents. Again, no one recalls having seen the material before at the Millstone resident office.

Ken Kolaczyk thinks he did see some of the writeups during one of his inspections in the NSE or QAD area onsite while performing an inspection of the NU assessment functions. He recalls, at that time, he felt the issue was being adequately addressed. I am returning the subject information for your information and files.

Based on the above, I have concluded that the materials were never received at the resident office.

\*\*\*\*\*

My impression of this matter is that, if merely a copy of the enclosures was transmitted to the NRC office without explanation or statement of a concern, then the individual chose a rather poor way to bring a matter to NRC attention for action.

K/26

SAMPLE RECORD OF ALLEGATION PANEL DECISIONS

SITE: MS-7, 2, 3 & HOBBS NECK

PANEL ATTENDEES:

ALLEGATION NO.: R1-90-A-12.0

Chairman - Wiggins

DATE: 11/21/90 (Mtg. 1 2 3 4 5)

Branch Chief - FCW

PRIORITY: High Medium Low

Section Chief (AOC) - Stewart

SAFETY SIGNIFICANCE: Yes No Unknown

Others - Gray - Briggs - DRS mgmt

CONCURRENCE TO CLOSEOUT: DD BC SC

Woodard - DRS inspector

CONFIDENTIALITY GRANTED: Yes No  
(See Allegation Receipt Report)

IS THEIR A DOL FINDING: Yes No

IS CHILLING EFFECT LETTER WARRANTED: Yes No

HAS CHILLING EFFECT LETTER BEEN SENT: Yes No

HAS LICENSEE RESPONDED TO CHILLING EFFECT LETTER: Yes No

ACTION:

1) Issue 9 - Document to file & consider closed (close w/ other issues)

2) Issue 6 - Perform informal review of REF response to determine if timetable was contrary to procedural requirements

3) Consider technical issue w/ DRS inspection (Woodard), Issue 6 - routine closeout.

Done JS 11/23/90

4) \_\_\_\_\_

5) \_\_\_\_\_

NOTES: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

K/37