



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

JUN 14 1990

Docket No. 50-336

File No. RI-90-0042

A2-87-A-0113

[REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

Information in this record was deleted
in accordance with the Freedom of Information
Act, exemptions b1, b7C
FOIA- 91-162

This letter is in response to your letter dated October 27, 1989, and in acknowledgement of your telephone conversation with William Raymond, Senior Resident Inspector, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, on June 5, 1990.

In your letter of October 27, 1989, you requested NRC action with respect to a proposed settlement agreement and the potential violation of your rights under 10 CFR 50. We addressed your concerns about the proposed settlement agreement in our letter dated June 14, 1990. Concerning your complaint that your rights were violated under 10 CFR Part 50 and 29 CFR Part 24 based on findings in Inspection Reports 50-336/88-13 and 50-336/89-13, we found your concern unsubstantiated. First, in your letter dated October 27, 1989, you did not specify Inspection Report 50-336/89-13, but based on our understanding of your concerns we surmised that you were referring to that report vice Inspection Report 50-336/88-13 which you reference later. We reviewed the above stated inspection reports and found no violations of your rights with respect to 10 CFR Part 50 and 29 CFR Part 24. As we stated in our previous correspondence with you in the enclosed letters dated July 12, 1989, and September 26, 1989, we have evaluated your technical allegations as being unsubstantiated and do not intend any further dedicated inspection followup specific to those concerns. But, as we stated before, the NRC is continuing to monitor licensee performance in the areas of work control and tagouts of plant systems important to nuclear safety through routine resident inspector coverage.

Concerning your telephone conversation with William Raymond on June 5, 1990, you expressed the concern that Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company does not operate their reactor properly; specifically you stated "they don't follow procedures over there." Your concern does not express sufficient detail to warrant additional NRC followup. If you have specific details of procedural non-compliance we would appreciate your submitting them to this office in writing, in detail, as soon as possible for our consideration.

Thank you for your concern.

Sincerely,

Edward C. Wenzinger
Edward C. Wenzinger, Chief
Projects Branch 4
Division of Reactor Projects

9212210327 920608
PDR FOIA
GUILD91-162 PDR

M/28

[REDACTED]

2

Enclosures:

1. Copy of July 12, 1989, letter from
E.C. Wenzinger to J. [REDACTED]
2. Copy of Sep 26, 1989, letter from
Samuel J. Collins to [REDACTED]

bcc:
A. Vogel, DRP
W. Raymond
Allegation File No. R1-90-A-0042
AZ-87-A-0113

12.5

PLANT PROCEDURES

In accordance with the Appendix A and Appendix B of DPR-65, as well as 10CFR50, Appendix B written procedures are required. To meet these requirements, many different levels of procedures and instructions have been established.

Administrative Control Procedures (ACP) exist which have established a system for control of the performance of all auditable activities conducted at Millstone Nuclear Power Station. These procedures are issued by the Station Superintendent. Administrative Control Procedure 1.01 describes this program.

Station Procedures are those procedures written on a Unit and Service Group level which control the specifics of station operations including maintenance and modifications, test, inspection, calibration, special processes and plant operating procedures. Station procedures consist of Unit procedures applicable to individual units as well as common site procedures applicable to the entire station. ACP #QA-3.02 establishes the requirements for controlling the Station Procedures.