

September 12, 1997

50-245/336
423

Mr. David A. Lochbaum
Nuclear Safety Engineer
Union of Concerned Scientists
1626 P Street NW., Suite 310
Washington, DC 20036-1495

Dear Mr. Lochbaum:

I am responding to the letter you sent me on August 6, 1997, in which you commented on a slide used by Little Harbor Consultants, Inc. (LHC), during its presentation at a Commission meeting on August 6, 1997, concerning the status of activities at Millstone Nuclear Power Station. In its presentation, LHC indicated that 100 percent of the work force interviewed is willing to raise safety concerns. You commented that the slide and the LHC presentation implied that employees felt free to raise safety concerns to Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (licensee) rather than to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

In its presentation to the Commission, LHC stated that the 100-percent willingness of the work force to raise safety concerns was related to all of the options available for employees to raise concerns. Although LHC did not explicitly state this point in its presentation, the available options referred to by LHC include the willingness of the work force to raise safety concerns through the line organization, the Employee Concerns Program, or the NRC. Therefore, the 100-percent figure cited by LHC includes employees who might raise safety concerns to the NRC rather than to the licensee. At a meeting with the public on August 12, 1997, in Waterford, Connecticut, LHC representatives explained in greater detail that the options applied to those employees who would be willing to bring concerns to the NRC as well as those who would be willing to bring concerns to the licensee. LHC is assessing how future interview questions, on willingness to raise safety concerns, may be revised to distinguish how a licensee employee may use the available options for raising safety concerns.

We generally agree with your point that allegation data constitute a measure that should be considered in the overall assessment of Millstone's safety-conscious work environment, and we have forwarded your comments to LHC for its review and consideration. We appreciate your input on this important topic.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:

William Travers
Special Projects Office
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Handwritten initials: DT

DISTRIBUTION:

See next page

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\MCKEE\GT970589.GRN

*See previous concurrence

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without attachment/enclosure "E" = Copy with attachment/enclosure "N" = No copy

OFFICE	SPO-L:DR	*SPO-L:LA	*TECH ED	SPO:D	SPO:D
NAME	PMcKee	LBerry	BCalure	DT	WT
DATE	09/16/97	08/22/97	08/20/97	09/16/97	09/16/97

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

9710010232 970912
PDR ADOCK 05000245
H PDR

NRC FILE CENTER COPY





UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

September 12, 1997

Mr. David A. Lochbaum
Nuclear Safety Engineer
Union of Concerned Scientists
1616 P Street NW., Suite 310
Washington, DC 20036-1495

Dear Mr. Lochbaum:

I am responding to the letter you sent me on August 6, 1997, in which you commented on a slide used by Little Harbor Consultants, Inc. (LHC), during its presentation at a Commission meeting on August 6, 1997, concerning the status of activities at Millstone Nuclear Power Station. In its presentation, LHC indicated that 100 percent of the work force interviewed is willing to raise safety concerns. You commented that the slide and the LHC presentation implied that employees felt free to raise safety concerns to Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (licensee) rather than to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

In its presentation to the Commission, LHC stated that the 100-percent willingness of the work force to raise safety concerns was related to all of the options available for employees to raise concerns. Although LHC did not explicitly state this point in its presentation, the available options referred to by LHC include the willingness of the work force to raise safety concerns through the line organization, the Employee Concerns Program, or the NRC. Therefore the 100-percent figure cited by LHC includes employees who might raise safety concerns to the NRC rather than to the licensee. At a meeting with the public on August 12, 1997, in Waterford, Connecticut, LHC representatives explained in greater detail that the options applied to those employees who would be willing to bring concerns to the NRC as well as those who would be willing to bring concerns to the licensee. LHC is assessing how future interview questions, on willingness to raise safety concerns, may be revised to distinguish how a licensee employee may use the available options for raising safety concerns.

We generally agree with your point that allegation data constitute a measure that should be considered in the overall assessment of Millstone's safety-conscious work environment, and we have forwarded your comments to LHC for its review and consideration.

We appreciate your input on this important topic.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "William D. Travers".

William D. Travers, Director
Special Projects Office
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

ACTION

EDO Principal Correspondence Control

FROM:

DUE: / /

EDO CONTROL: G970589

DOC DT: 08/06/97

FINAL REPLY:

David A. Lochbaum
Union of Concerned Scientists

TO:

Travers, NRR

FOR SIGNATURE OF :

** GRN **

CRC NO: 97-0817

DESC:

EMPLOYEE CONCERNS PROGRAM AT MILLSTONE

ROUTING:

Callan
Thadani
Thompson
Norry
Blaha
Burns
Miller, RI

DATE: 08/08/97

ASSIGNED TO:

CONTACT:

NRR

Collins

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS OR REMARKS:

For Appropriate Action.

