

From: <VMBLANCH@aol.com>  
To: WND2.WNP3(jnh,jaz),TWD1.TWP4(wjs,ljn1),WND1.WNP2(d...  
Date: 6/4/96 8:44pm  
Subject: Another \$100,000

Paul:

The NRC's press release on the proposed \$100,000 fine against NU for mistreating an employee voicing safety concerns states that NU was fined \$100,000 in 1993 and \$100,000 in 1994 for similar offenses. What happened in 1995? NU had such a nice streak going, but its good to see that they are back in stride. Chairman Fox spoke at the recent shareholders' meeting about his skills. It appears that NU is the industry leader with respect to illegally treating its employees. Are these Chairman Fox's special skills? NU seems to have cornered the market on mishandling employee concerns.

From: <VMBLANCH@aol.com>  
To: WND2.WNP3(jnh,jaz),TWD1.TWP4(wjs,ljn1),WND1.WNP2(d...  
Date: 6/4/96 11:43am  
Subject: Fwd: PR-136 Proposed Fine Against Nuclear Energy Co.

-----  
Forwarded message:

From: opa@nrc.gov (PUBLIC AFFAIRS)  
Sender: pr-opa@nrc.gov  
Reply-to: pr-opa@nrc.gov  
To: pr-opa@nrc.gov (Multiple recipients of list)  
Date: 96-06-04 11:30:23 EDT

----- i36.txt follows -----  
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Office of Public Affairs, Region I  
475 Allendale Road King of Prussia, PA 19401  
Phone: 610/337-5330 Fax: 610/337-5241  
Internet: dps@nrc.gov or vld@nrc.gov

I-96-36

Contact: Diane Screnci

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE  
Victor Dricks

June 4, 1996

NRC STAFF PROPOSES \$100,000 FINE AGAINST NORTHEAST NUCLEAR ENERGY  
CO. FOR ALLEGED DISCRIMINATION AGAINST FORMER CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEE

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff has cited Northeast Nuclear Energy Co. (NU) for alleged discrimination against a former contractor employee at its Millstone Nuclear Power Station in Waterford, Connecticut. The staff has proposed a fine of \$100,000.

The NRC staff proposed the fine after determining that a senior health physics technician of Bartlett Nuclear, Inc., an NU contractor, was discriminated against for raising safety concerns. The NRC also issued a Notice of Violation to Bartlett, citing the company for discriminating against an employee engaged in a protected activity.

In December 1995, a Department of Labor Administrative Law Judge ruled that NU had discriminated against the individual by laying him off at the Millstone site in December 1994, after the worker filed a complaint with DOL and an NRC inspection of concerns raised by the individual. The worker was subsequently rehired at the facility in March 1996.

Federal law protects workers who raise safety concerns with management or with NRC staff about possible violations of NRC rules and regulations. In a letter to NU officials, NRC Region I Administrator Thomas T. Martin said NU's acts of discrimination "are significant because they could have a chilling effect on other licensee or contractor personnel and deter them from identifying and/or raising safety concerns. The violation takes on even more significance because the NRC has

960607020 ZIP

issued two civil penalties to you since May 1993 for violations involving discrimination against employees who raised safety concerns."

The licensee was fined \$100,000 in May 1993 for harassment and intimidation of a former NU employee, and \$100,000 in July 1994 for harassment and intimidation of an NU engineer.

To emphasize the importance of maintaining a work environment in which employees are free to engage in protected activities without fear of retaliation, the base civil penalty of \$50,000 was doubled because the violation was not identified by the licensee and many of the corrective actions were still in the planning phase.

Since the civil penalty is based on the recommended decision and order of the DOL Administrative Law Judge, which is still being reviewed by the Secretary of Labor, NU may delay payment of the civil penalty until 30 days after the final decision of the Secretary of Labor. However, the licensee is required, within 30 days, to document the specific actions it has taken and additional actions it plans to take to prevent recurrence and counter the perceived "chilling effect" of the discriminatory actions.

\*\*\*

NOTE TO EDITORS: The NRC's Inspector General has made public a report on an investigation into the NRC staff's decision to withhold Northeast Utilities' internal task force reports on plant performance at Millstone Station from the Public Document Room. A copy of the executive summary is available through the Region I office.

\*\*\*

From: <VMBLANCH@aol.com>  
To: WND2.WNP3(jnh,jaz),TWD1.TWP4(wjs,ljnl),WND1.WNP2(d...  
Date: 6/4/96 9:30am  
Subject: Fwd: GALATIS AWARD

George was the NU Whistleblower featured of the cover of Time magazine eariler this year.

-----  
Forwarded message:  
From: hollom@wasc.egginc.com (Mark Holloway)  
To: VMBLANCH@aol.com  
Date: 96-06-04 07:57:33 EDT

Paul,

George Galatis has been named the 1996 winner of the Deane C. Avery award. This award is given by the New London Day (our regional newspaper) to a Connecticut citizen who has made a sgnificant contribution to the public good by defending the free flow of public information. George was nominated by the CRC.

960604 1P

From: <VMBLANCH@aol.com>  
To: udl.internet3("PAUL.SMITH@trobb.com")  
Date: 6/4/96 8:44pm  
Subject: MAINE YANKEE OIG REPORT

The following was received from an unidentified source and is forwarded for your information.

Paul

I noted the comment from Paul Smith "I've worked for NRC and for utilities. I've seen both sides." What is he trying to say? He has seen only one side and that is the side of the industry. Maybe he should take a look at the side that is concerned about nuclear safety. Seems strange that he will not publish an OIG Report that is somewhat critical of the industry.

Author Unknown

CC: WND2.WNP3(jnh,jaz),TWD1.TWP4(wjs,ljn1),WND1.WNP2(d...

9608070220 1P

From: <VMBLANCH@aol.com>  
To: WND2.WNP3(jnh,jaz),TWD1.TWP4(wjs,ljn1),WND1.WNP2(d...  
Date: 6/4/96 8:44pm  
Subject: 10 CFR 100

Paul:

Get a load of this. Somebody doesn't read TIME magazine!! Or, somebody reads TIME magazine but doesn't believe Mr. Taylor!! These folks should know that the NRC doesn't care about 10 CFR 100 once the plant is sited. it would save alot of time and effort (although it may not save lives, but 2 out of 3 ain't bad).

+-----+		+-----+	
POWER REACTOR		EVENT NUMBER: 30568	
+-----+		+-----+	
+-----+		+-----+	
FACILITY: MAINE YANKEE		REGION: 1	
UNIT: [1] [ ] [ ]		STATE: ME	
RX TYPE: [1] CE		NOTIFICATION DATE: 05/31/96	
+-----+		NOTIFICATION TIME: 18:19 [ET]	
NRC NOTIFIED BY: BOB HATHAWAY		EVENT DATE: 05/31/96	
HQ OPS OFFICER: JOHN MacKINNON		EVENT TIME: 16:00[EDT]	
+-----+		LAST UPDATE DATE: 05/31/96	
+-----+		+-----+	
EMERGENCY CLASS: NOT APPLICABLE		NOTIFICATIONS	
10 CFR SECTION:		+-----+	
AIND 50.72(b)(2)(iii)(D) ACC MITIGATION		DAN HOLODY	
+-----+		RDO	
+-----+		+-----+	
+-----+			
EVENT TEXT			
+-----+			

THE 10 CFR 100 LIMITS COULD HAVE BEEN EXCEEDED DURING A STEAM GENERATOR TUBE RUPTURE (SGTR) WITH A COINCIDENT LOSS OF CONDENSER VACUUM.

DURING A RECENT REVIEW OF THE ASSUMPTIONS USED IN THEIR EMERGENCY OPERATING PROCEDURES VERIFICATION ANALYSIS, IT WAS DETERMINED THAT ACTUAL TIMES TO PERFORM CERTAIN FUNCTIONS VARY FROM THE ANALYSIS ASSUMPTIONS. SPECIFICALLY, FOR A SGTR EVENT WITH COINCIDENT LOSS OF CONDENSER VACUUM (WHICH IS A MAINE YANKEE DESIGN BASIS EVENT), THE ACTUAL TIME TO ISOLATE THE RUPTURED STEAM GENERATOR (SG) IS NOW ASSUMED TO TAKE 20 MINUTES. THIS IS A 15 MINUTE INCREASE OVER THE PREVIOUS ASSUMPTION.

THE INCREASE IN THE TIME REQUIRED IS BASED ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS THAT WOULD EXIST IN THE MAIN STEAM AND VALVE HOUSE DURING THE POSTULATED EVENT. BLOW BACK FROM THE MAIN STEAM SAFETY VALVES, WHICH WOULD BE LIFTING DUE TO THE LOSS OF CONDENSER VACUUM, WOULD CREATE A RADIOACTIVE STEAM ENVIRONMENT. THUS, FOR A SGTR, WITH A COINCIDENT LOSS OF CONDENSER VACUUM, THE INITIATION OF THE COOLDOWN WOULD BE DELAYED. THE DELAY CONSISTS OF THE TIME IT WOULD TAKE AN EQUIPMENT OPERATOR TO DON PROTECTIVE CLOTHING AND LOSE THE MANUAL STOP CHECK VALVE IN THE LINE FROM THE RUPTURED SG TO THE DECAY HEAT RELEASE HEADER. DURING THIS DELAY, BREAK FLOW LEAKING INTO THE RUPTURED SG WILL SIGNIFICANTLY DECREASE THE MARGIN TO SG OVERFILL, AND CAUSE THE MAIN STEAM SAFETY VALVE IN THE RUPTURED SG TO CYCLE ADDITIONAL TIMES.

9608070270 2PP

AS A RESULT OF THIS EXTENDED ISOLATION TIME, THE POTENTIAL EXISTS THAT A SGTR EVENT, WITH COINCIDENT LOSS OF CONDENSER VACUUM COULD RESULT IN AN OVERFILL OF THE RUPTURED SG. THIS COULD LEAD TO A% OFF-SITE DOSE IN EXCESS

OF 10 CFR 100 LIMITS.

THE FOLLOWING IMMEDIATE ACTION HAS BEEN TAKEN. MAINE YANKEE HAS PUT IN PLACE AN ADMINISTRATIVE RESTRICTION TO LIMIT THE REACTOR COOLANT SYSTEM IODINE CONCENTRATION TO LESS THAN 10% OF THE TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION 3.2 (REACTOR COOLANT SYSTEM ACTIVITY LIMITS). THE TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION LIMIT IS 1.0 Eci/ml DOSE EQUIVALENT IODINE. THE ADMINISTRATIVE LIMIT IS 0.1 Eci/ml DOSE EQUIVALENT IODINE. BASED ON ENGINEERING JUDGMENT, IMPOSING

THIS RESTRICTION WILL ENSURE THAT THE 10 CFR 100 LIMITS WILL NOT BE EXCEEDED EVEN IF THE RUPTURED SG OVERFILLS.

LONGER TERM ACTIONS INCLUDE ENHANCEMENTS TO THE SGTR PROCEDURE TO REDUCE THE LIKELIHOOD OF OVERFILL AND POSSIBLE HARDWARE CHANGES TO REDUCE THE ISOLATION TIME TO 5 MINUTES AS ORIGINALLY ASSUMED.

LICENSEE WILL NOTIFY THE STATE OF THIS EVENT NOTIFICATION. THE NRC RESIDENT INSPECTOR WAS INFORMED OF THIS EVENT BY THE LICENSEE.