



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION I
600 ALLENDALE ROAD
KING OF PRUSSIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19406
NOV 27 1990

Docket No. 50-423
File No. RI-89-A-0099

Information in this record was deleted
in accordance with the Freedom of Information
Act, exemptions b1, b2, b7C
FOIA- 91-165

Dear [REDACTED]

Subject: Allegation concerning Millstone Nuclear Power Station Unit 3

The NRC Region I office has completed its follow up in response to the concerns you brought to our attention on August 30, 1989, alleging the following:

1. The Nuclear Engineering and Operations Procedures which provide guidance for the development of Quality Related Computer Programs at the Millstone site are inadequate in that they do not fully implement recognized industry standards. For example, NEO 2.24 "Quality Software Programs" does not fully adhere to ANS 7.4.3.2 "Application Criteria for Programmable Digital Computer Systems in Safety Systems or Nuclear Power Generating Stations."
2. The verification/validation process for computer software programs at the Millstone site is deficient since the verification/validation process does not include a functional test with specific predetermined acceptance criteria. This is contrary to accepted industry practice.
3. Personnel qualification for review of software are not specified by procedure. Therefore, the possibility exists for unqualified people to conduct reviews of software packages.

We found your allegation to be unsubstantiated and have documented our findings in NRC Region I Inspection Report No. 50-423/90-19 dated November 14, 1990. Applicable sections of this report are enclosed for your information.

We appreciate you informing us of your concerns and feel that our actions in this matter have been responsive to those concerns. Should you have any additional questions, or if I can be of further assistance in this matter, please call me collect at (215) 337-5120.

Sincerely,

Donald R. Haverkamp, Chief
Reactor Projects Section 4A
Division of Reactor Projects

Enclosure: As Stated

9212210332 920608
PDR FOIA
GUILD91-162 PDR

M/36

[REDACTED]

bcc:
Allegation File No. RI-89-A-0099
A. Vogel
K. Kolaczyk

ALLEGATION RECEIPT REPORT

Date/Time Received: 1/11/90 7:00 PM

Allegation No. RZ-89-A-0099

Name: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

City/State/Zip: [REDACTED]

Confidentiality:

Was it requested? ☐ Yes ☒ No
 Was it initially granted? ☐ Yes ☒ No
 Was it finally granted by the allegation panel? ☐ Yes ☒ No
 Does a confidentiality agreement need to be sent to allee? ☐ Yes ☒ No
 Has a confidentiality agreement been signed? ☐ Yes ☒ No
 Memo documenting why it was granted is attached? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Allee's Employer: Dow Chemical

Position/Title: Process Engineer

Concession

Duck Wagon

Facility: Millstone Unit 3

Docket No.: 50-1123

(Allegation Summary (brief description of concern(s)): Northwest

Utilities does not adequately test their
computer hardware systems to verify and validate
computer hardware systems to verify and validate
that a computer system would perform as required
that a computer system would perform as required

Number of Concerns: 2

Northwest will not trust their engineers
poorly

Employee Receiving Allegation: K S Kolaczuk
 (first two initials and last name)

Type of Regulated Activity (a) ☒ Reactor (d) ☐ Safeguards
 (b) ☐ Vendor (e) ☐ Other: (Specify)
 (c) ☐ Materials

Materials License No. (if applicable): [REDACTED]

Functional Area(s): ☒ (a) Operations ☐ (e) Emergency Preparedness
☐ (b) Construction ☐ (f) Onsite Health and Safety
☐ (c) Safeguards ☐ (g) Offsite Health and Safety
☐ (d) Transportation ☐ (h) Other: [REDACTED]

(NRC Region I Form 207
 Revised 10/89)

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

M/37

I met [redacted] a former instrumentation and controls engineer at Kaman Instrumentation and Controls Engineering at Northeast Utilities Service Company (NUSCO) at the Quality Inn Dining Room in Glastonbury, CT. He provided me with a rough copy of his letter of resignation which he indicated would explain the reasons why he left NUSCO. [redacted] indicated that NUSCO treated engineers poorly and he cited his case as an example. [redacted] indicated that he had spent 18 years in the industry and had specialized in instrumentation and controls. He provided me with a copy of his resume to back up his resignation. [redacted] indicated that critical software at (NU) Northeast Utilities (NU) which he defined as software that if failed would endanger public health and safety, would endanger public health and safety, is not adequately tested at the Millstone site. Therefore an individual would not have adequate assurance that all computer driven hardware functions would operate when required. He specifically cited KAMAN radiation monitor which he worked on as an example. He said that the reason for the

Detailed Description of Allegations:

inadequate test methods was due to the fact
 inadequate test methods was due to the fact
 that the test procedures that were
 these test procedures that were
 developed to test computer software
 developed to test computer software
 programs were based on two generic
 programs were based on two generic
 Nuclear Engineering and Operating Procedures
 Nuclear Engineering and Operating Procedures (NEO)
 that were developed in Berlin did not
 those who developed the Berlin did not
 adhere to enough industry standards
 adhere to enough industry standards
 Mr. [REDACTED] provided me with copies of
 Mr. [REDACTED] provided me with copies of
 the generic NEO procedures and other
 the generic NEO procedures and other
 NEO procedures which provide guidance on
 NEO procedures which provide guidance on
 the development of computer software.
 the development of computer software.
 He indicated that he would like to have the
 He indicated that he would like to have the
 material copied then mailed back to him.
 material copied then mailed back to him.

[REDACTED] indicated that he did not pursue
 [REDACTED] indicated that he did not pursue
 his work grievance through the NLRB
 his work grievance through the NLRB
 grievance committee because of a perception
 grievance committee because of a perception
 that it would not work. I asked him if
 that it would not work. I asked him if
 he pursued his work concern through the
 he pursued his work concern through the
 DOL when he resigned; but he did not
 DOL when he resigned; but he did not
 He indicated that he only applied for
 He indicated that he only applied for
 unemployment compensation with the state of
 unemployment compensation with the state of
 Connecticut.
 Connecticut.

Page 3 of 4

Detailed Description of Allegation:

The conversation lasted approximately 1 hour and 15 minutes. Approximately 1 hour and 15 minutes. I thanked [redacted] for the information and notified him that we would inform him of the results of our investigation. I notified him that we would inform him of the results of our investigation.

Specific weakness that [redacted] identified: Specific weakness that [redacted] identified:

① [redacted] stated that radiation monitors are not tested to ensure that when a high radiation condition is indicated the monitor will continuously display the radiation level while shutting a damper or valve. I stated that this capability may not be necessary since the monitor has performed the intended function.

② [redacted] also stated that radiation monitors should be tested to ensure they will restart after a loss of power and read accurately after a loss of power. I stated that this capability may not be necessary since the operator can manually start the monitor if required.

ALLEGATION PANEL DECISIONS

SITE: MILLSTONE 2

ALLEGATION NO.: RI-27-A-0113

DATE: 7/6/89 (Mtg. 1 (2) 3 4 5)

PRIORITY: (High) Medium Low

SAFETY SIGNIFICANCE: Yes No (Unknown)

CONCURRENCE TO CLOSEOUT: DD BC SC

CONFIDENTIALITY GRANTED: Yes (No)

PANEL ATTENDEES:

Chairman - S. COLLINS

Branch Chief - E. WENZINGER

Section Chief - E. McLAKE

J. DURR, DRS

S. BARR, DRI

M. PERKINS, MOMT 1557

ACTION:

- 1) PANEL MET FOR BRIEF BY J. DURR RCE, HIS MEMO DATED 6/29/89. RECONVENE PANEL IF AND WHEN
- 2) ALLEGES RESIDUOS.
- 3) CHAIRMAN WANTS ADDITIONAL PANEL WITH J. DURR ON 7/7/89.

4)

5)

6)

W/30

RECORD OF ALLEGATION PANEL DECISIONS

SITE: MILWAUKEE UNIT 2 PANEL ATTENDEES:
 ALLEGATION NO.: RZ-87-A-0113 Chairman - J. LITTLE
 DATE: 2-22-89 (Mtg. 1 2 3 4 5) Branch Chief - E. WENTZNER
 PRIORITY: High Medium Low Section Chief (AOC) - D. HAVESKAMP
 SAFETY SIGNIFICANCE: Yes No Unknown Others - N. RAYMOND
 CONCURRENCE TO CLOSEOUT: DD BC SC
 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) WRITE LETTER TO ALLEGOR READING LETTER
AND THAT THERE IS A DOL FINDING. HAVE RECORD
28 CLC TO ALLEGOR. [FILE 1-7-90]

- 3)
- 4)
- 5)

NOTES:

W/31

ALLEGATION PANEL DECISIONS

SITE: HILLSTONE 2

ALLEGATION NO.: RZ-87-A-0113

DATE: 8/30/89 (Mtg. 1 2 3 4 5)

PRIORITY: High Medium Low

SAFETY SIGNIFICANCE: Yes No Unknown

CONCURRENCE TO CLOSEOUT: DD BC SC

CONFIDENTIALITY GRANTED: Yes No

PANEL ATTENDEES:

Chairman - S. COLLINS

Branch Chief -

^{RETIRED}
Section Chief - N. ADLET

D. DEMPSEY, DRP

J. DARR, DRS

M. PERKINS, DRMA

ACTION:

- 1) AOC TO RESPOND TO ALLEGOR LTR RECEIVED IN
REGION I 8/4/89. AOC TO PROVIDE DRAFT
- 2) FOR REVIEW AT NEXT ALLEGATION PANEL MTG 9/6/89.

3)

4)

5)

6)

W/32

ALLEGATION PANEL DECISIONS

SITE: MILLSTONE 2

ALLEGATION NO.: AZ-87-A-0113

DATE: 9/6/89 (Mtg. 1 2 3 4 5)

PRIORITY: High Medium Low

SAFETY SIGNIFICANCE: Yes No Unknown

CONCURRENCE TO CLOSEOUT: DD BC SC

CONFIDENTIALITY GRANTED: Yes No

PANEL ATTENDEES:

Chairman - S. COLLINS

Branch Chief -

Section Chief - D. HAVERRAMP

D. OSMY, DRP

J. DARR, DRJ

M. PERKINS, DRMA

ACTION:

1) ADC TO SEND LTR TO ALLEGER TO CLOSEOUT (ECO 9/12/89.

2)

3)

4)

5)

6)

M/33