

Date: 3/1/83

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

RELATED CORRESPONDENCE

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In The Matter of)	
)	
COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY)	Docket Nos. 50-454 OL
)	50-455 OL
(Byron Nuclear Power Station,)	
Units 1 & 2))	

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BARNHART

Mr. Barnhart is the project engineer for Blount Brothers Corporation at Byron Station. His testimony is offered in response to the allegations made by Peter Stomfay-Stitz in support of DAARE-SAFE and League Contention 1A, which challenges the adequacy of quality assurance at the site.

Mr. Barnhart's testimony begins with a description of the positions he has held at Blount Brothers. (p. 1). Mr. Barnhart trained Mr. Stomfay-Stitz when Mr. Stomfay-Stitz began work in Blount Brothers' quality assurance department at Byron. (p. 2).

The remainder of Mr. Barnhart's testimony addresses the issues of Mr. Stomfay-Stitz' involvement with structural steel erection at the site. As a trainee in structural steel inspection Mr. Stomfay-Stitz examined slotted connections for the purpose of determining the status of ongoing

DS03

structural steel erection. Using design drawings which indicated the location of slotted connections, Mr. Stomfay-Stitz checked the connections to make sure that each hole in a structural connection had a bolt in it, that the nuts on the bolts were fastened in a finger tight fashion, and that the nuts were burred. Mr. Stomfay-Stitz recorded the results of his examination on the design drawings which served as the guides for his work. These structural steel examinations conducted by Mr. Stomfay-Stitz were not performed for acceptance purposes, but rather were conducted as spot reviews of ongoing erection work. The slotted connections reviewed by Mr. Barnhart subsequently were replaced due to design changes, and the new connections are being inspected on a 100% basis. (pp. 2-5).

TESTIMONY OF
RICHARD W. BARNHART

Q1 Please state your name.

A1 Richard W. Barnhart.

Q2 For whom do you work.

A2 I am employed by Blount Brothers Corporation at Byron Station.

Q3 What is your position at Blount Brothers?

A3 I am the project engineer. In this capacity I supervise the engineering staff at Blount Brothers, which consists of three office engineers, one engineering aide, and one document control supervisor.

Q4 What is the scope of your testimony?

A4 I am here to testify concerning some of the allegations made by Peter Stomfay-Stitz.

Q5 What positions have you held with Blount Brothers at Byron?

A5 I began with Blount Brothers in July, 1976, as a receiving clerk. I then became Blount Brothers' supervisor of receiving, and after that I moved into QA/QC work as a Level 1 material receiving controller. Subsequently, in early 1979, I became a Level 2 QA/QC welding inspector, and after that I became an office engineer.

I was the material receiving controller that immediately preceded Mr. Stomfay-Stitz' assumption of the position.

Q6 Did you work with Mr. Stomfay-Stitz while he worked for Blount Brothers?

A6 Yes. I trained Mr. Stomfay-Stitz for his position as QA/QC material receiving inspector. I instructed him in the procedures to be followed, and had him follow me through the inspections he would be required to do after he completed his training. Mr. Stomfay-Stitz was a trainee in material receiving in the months of October, November, and December, 1978, and while he was a trainee I signed off on each of the inspection reports to indicate that the inspections had been properly performed under my supervision.

Q7 Are you familiar with the allegations made by Mr. Stomfay-Stitz?

A7 Yes, I am. I have read Mr. Stomfay-Stitz' affidavit.

Q8 Beginning on page 5 of his affidavit Mr. Stomfay-Stitz discusses his involvement in the inspection of structural steel. Did Mr. Stomfay-Stitz have responsibilities with regard to the inspection of structural steel?

A8 When I left Blount Brothers Mr. Stomfay-Stitz did not yet have responsibilities with regard to the inspection of structural steel for acceptance purposes. Mr. Stomfay-Stitz received training from me in certain areas of structural steel inspection and did conduct reviews of on going work in those areas, but he remained a trainee with regard to structural steel inspection at

the time he left Blount Brothers, in April, 1979.

Q9 In what areas of structural steel inspection did Mr. Stomfay-Stitz receive training?

A9 I instructed Mr. Stomfay-Stitz in the inspection process known as "bolting in." This involved determination that all holes at a structural steel connection had nuts and bolts located in them, and that all bolted connections were being installed according to the design drawings and the pertinent Blount Brothers Work Procedure.

Q10 Was Mr. Stomfay-Stitz asked to undertake any tasks with regard to bolting in inspections?

A10 As part of his training Mr. Stomfay-Stitz was asked to perform reviews of slotted connections. Slotted connections are those in which the structural members are permitted to move as the building shifts due to thermal expansion and contraction. Because the structural members must be able to move, the hole in which the nut and bolt assembly is placed is slotted, rather than round. In addition, the nut remains finger tight rather than being torqued to a particular value. To prevent the nut from coming off the bolt, the bolt was burred, or scored. Mr. Stomfay-Stitz was asked to review slotted connections to confirm that each hole had a nut and bolt in it, and that each nut was finger tight and each bolt was burred.

The background data for Mr. Stomfay-Stitz' reviews were the design drawings. I instructed Mr. Stomfay-Stitz in the reading of such drawings. With regard to his examination of slotted connections, Mr. Stomfay-Stitz would review those connections which were marked with an "s" on the drawings, this mark denoting a slotted connection. Mr. Stomfay-Stitz took a copy of the design drawing with him to the field, and he would note the results of his review on the drawing in accordance with a color code. For example, a connection which conformed with the design drawing might be colored in using a blue marker, while a connection that was missing a bolt or which had bolts which were not burred would be colored in with another color marker. A sample of the type of design drawing which Mr. Stomfay-Stitz utilized in his review of slotted connections is attached to my testimony as Barnhart Exhibit 1.

The examinations performed by Mr. Stomfay-Stitz were not for acceptance purposes. Rather, they were for the purpose of spotchecking ongoing work to identify problems which were arising in the structural steel installation process. When Mr. Stomfay-Stitz would return from the field with the drawings on which he had recorded his findings, I would initiate appropriate action to resolve any problems which were reported.

I have searched the Blount Brothers files for the drawings which were utilized by Mr. Stomfay-Stitz in his reviews but I have been unable to locate any. Since such documents were not required to be retained in the files as part of acceptance of the structural steel erection, I surmise that the drawings were discarded after their purpose was served.

Q11 Were the structural steel connections which were examined by Mr. Stomfay-Stitz subsequently reinspected in any way?

A11 Yes. Due to design changes on the slotted connections each nut and bolt assembly which was examined by Mr. Stomfay-Stitz subsequently was replaced, and the new slotted connections are being inspected on a 100% basis.

