



**Commonwealth Edison**  
 One First National Plaza, Chicago, Illinois  
 Address Reply to: Post Office Box 767  
 Chicago, Illinois 60690 - 0767

*Charles Robert Davis*

March 18, 1988

PRIORITY ROUTING

First	Second
RA	
ORA	
WRD	
ORS	
ORSS	
ORMA	

*(will)*  
*take right*

FILE *100*

Mr. A. Bert Davis  
 Regional Administrator  
 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
 Region III  
 799 Roosevelt Road  
 Glen Ellyn, IL. 60137

Subject: Byron Station Pipefitter Complaint  
 Regarding Termination of Employment  
NRC Dockets 50-454 and 50-455

Reference: Letter from K.A. Ainger to A. Bert Davis dated November 9, 1987

Dear Mr. Davis:

This letter provides supplemental information concerning the termination of a Hunter Corporation Pipefitter at Byron Station (NRC allegation 87/A-0050). This information was requested at a meeting held on February 1, 1988 in your offices with Mr. L.D. Butterfield and other Commonwealth Edison (Edison) representatives. The information discussed below was developed through conversations held with Edison Project and Construction Services personnel and the Hunter Corporation (Hunter) Project Manager.

Termination of the pipefitter occurred immediately after the event which took place on March 28, 1987, as discussed in the referenced letter. The pipefitter had a history of minor work problems so that, when the Hunter project manager was called late at night about the pipefitter's refusal to work on March 28, the decision to terminate him was considered to be a logical evolution to the Hunter project manager. There was no discussion of radiological concerns at that time. The pipefitter filed for unemployment compensation and, when refused, filed a complaint with the Department of Labor. The complaint was dropped and Hunter agreed not to contest the unemployment compensation request in early May, 1987.

Because there was a lapse of over a month between the event and the radiological concern, no immediate specific actions were taken by Hunter to look for any "chilling" effects or to develop any extra documentation concerning the pipefitter's termination. As discussed in the referenced report, subsequent interviews were held with the terminated pipefitter's foreman, the shift pipefitter steward, and a co-worker (journeyman pipefitter). They were asked if they believed that the termination of the

8805230250 880516  
 PDR ADDOCK 05000454  
 P PDR

pipefitter would affect their ability to raise a radiological concern or other issues to the attention of their superiors. All interviewed indicated that the termination of this pipefitter would not affect their abilities to raise concerns. Based on these interviews, the Hunter project manager, in concert with the Edison project and construction services construction manager, concluded that there was no "chilling" effect.

As a result of the request for supplemental information, the Hunter project manager has determined that there are presently five pipefitters, on the shift at the time of the event, still at the Byron site. A meeting has been held with them by the Hunter project manager and they concur that there was no "chilling" effect. Notes from the interview are in the Hunter files. There are no other co-workers available to be interviewed.

I hope that this information respond adequately to your questions. If you have further questions, please contact me.

Very truly yours,



L. D. Butterfield  
Nuclear Licensing Manager

/klj

cc: W. Forney-RIII  
NRC Resident Inspector-Byron

4374K