

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of: )

DUKE POWER COMPANY, et al. ) Docket Nos. 50-413  
 ) 50-414

(Catawba Nuclear Station, )  
Units 1 and 2) )

JULY 13, 1983  
1:17 P.M.

DEPOSITION OF:

ROBERT A. MORGAN



## 1 APPEARANCES:

2 ROBERT GUILD, ESQ.  
3 Columbia, S. C.4 Counsel on Behalf of Intervenor, Palmetto  
5 Alliance Corporation6 RONALD L. GIBSON, ESQ.  
7 Charlotte, N. C.8 Counsel on Behalf of Applicant, Duke Power  
9 Company10 Also Present:11 Roger Ouellette  
12 Duke Power Company13 Glenn H. Bell  
14 Duke Power Company15 William O. Henry  
16 Duke Power Company17 Phil Jos  
18 Palmetto Alliance19 Betsy Levitas  
20 Carolina Environmental  
21 Study Group

22

23

24

25 I N D E X26 WITNESS27 DIRECT28 CROSS

29 Robert A. Morgan

30 3

31 117

32

33

34

35

## EXHIBITS

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
2		
3	Morgan Exhibit One	31
4		
5	Morgan Exhibit Two	32
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1           The Deposition of Robert A. Morgan is  
2 taken at the corporate offices of Duke Power Company,  
3 Charlotte, North Carolina, on this the 13th day of  
4 July, 1983, in the presence of Robert Guild, Attorney  
5 for the Intervenor; and Ronald L. Gibson, Attorney  
6 for the Applicant.

7           All formalities as to caption, certificate  
8 and transmission are waived. It is agreed that Lynn  
9 B. Gilliam, Notary Public in and for the State of  
10 North Carolina, may take said Deposition in machine  
11 shorthand and transcribe the same to typewriting.

12           Said Deposition is taken subject alone to  
13 testimony for competency, relevancy and materiality;  
14 and all objections, save as to the form of questions  
15 asked, are reserved until the Hearing.

16  
17           ROBERT A. MORGAN,  
18 having been first duly sworn to tell the truth, was  
19 examined and testified as follows:

20  
21           DIRECT EXAMINATION

22           BY MR. GUILD:

23           Q       State your full name and business address  
24 for the Record, please, sir.

25           A       Robert A. Morgan.



1 Q And your business address, sir?

2 A Duke Power Company, Box 223, Clover,  
3 South Carolina, 29710.

4 Q And that is at the Catawba Nuclear Station?

5 A That's correct.

6 Q In what capacity are you employed by Duke?

7 A My job is Senior Quality Assurance Engi-  
8 neer, Projects.

9 MR. GIBSON: Mr. Guild, I wanted to  
10 do this before you got started; I assume  
11 we are proceeding under the same stipula-  
12 tions that we have operated under with  
13 respect to the other Depositions?

14 MR. GUILD: Yes.

15 MR. GIBSON: Pursuant to your  
16 Notice of Deposition and earlier testimony,  
17 we are making available a copy of a three  
18 page draft that was prepared and main-  
19 tained by Mr. Morgan.

20 He will answer specific questions,  
21 but for general identity there was a question  
22 of whether anyone took a look at the number  
23 of NCIs before, after and during the  
24 Welding Inspector concerns.

25 I believe Mr. Davison and perhaps

1 someone else indicated it was done and  
2 done by Mr. Morgan.

3 This is something that was in Mr.  
4 Morgan's files, and as I say, pursuant to  
5 the Notice of Deposition, we had him bring  
6 a copy.

7 I show you the original and will make  
8 a copy available to you (indicating). As  
9 you can see, the numbers are in red, and  
10 some of the copies may not be as legible;  
11 but I think it comes through legible.

12 Also with respect to the copy of the  
13 Zwissler notes respecting Mr. Morgan,  
14 our copy is about as bad as your copy.

15 MR. GUILD: Did Mr. Zwissler give  
16 you his original notes? Did he present  
17 original notes?

18 MR. BELL: I would have to check  
19 to see what I do have.

20 MR. GUILD: Let's see if we can go  
21 forward, and we may need to come back to  
22 this.

23  
24 BY MR. GUILD:

25 Q Mr. Morgan, my name is Robert Guild,

1 and I am Counsel for Palmetto Alliance. Are you  
2 aware that my Clients are Intervenors in the operating  
3 license proceeding for the Catawba Station?

4 A Yes.

5 Q And we have filed for litigation a contention  
6 referred to as Contention Six that questions the  
7 adequacy of Quality Assurance at the Catawba Station.

8 A Yes.

9 Q I will show you a copy of that contention  
10 and let you familiarize yourself with it (indicating).  
11 Mr. Morgan, I want to direct your attention to Pages  
12 Three and Four of the December 31st, 1982, Answers  
13 of Duke Power Company to questions posed by Palmetto  
14 on Contention Six; and they are there, the text is  
15 quoted if you will take a moment and read the indent-  
16 ed, single spaced quotation.

17 It begins at Page Three and extends over  
18 to Page Four.

19 A All right, sir; are you talking about this  
20 section here (indicating)?

21 Q Down to the bottom there.

22 A Okay.

23 Q All right, sir; have you seen the text of  
24 Contention Six before?

25 A No, I don't think so.

1           Q     All right, sir; that is fine if you will  
2 hand that back to me, Mr. Morgan. I will ask you  
3 a series of questions, and the purpose of my  
4 questions is to gather information and evidence for  
5 use in the operating licensing proceeding on the  
6 subject of Contention Six.

7                 If I ask a question and you do not under-  
8 stand the question or I am not being clear, please  
9 ask me to rephrase or tell me you don't understand.

10                What will be done with this Deposition is  
11 your testimony will be transcribed, and unless you  
12 ask for clarification, we will see my question and  
13 your answer, and I will presume that your answer is  
14 responsive, and that you did understand.

15                Give me a general description, if you  
16 would, of your duties as a Senior QA at the project.

17           A     I am responsible for QA technical engineer-  
18 ing and technical functions as it relates to the QA  
19 Department at the project.

20                I am responsible for the collection and  
21 documentation of how the plant was built, the  
22 collection of all the QA Program documents.

23           Q     Mr. Morgan, would you relate, please,  
24 your work history with Duke Power, when you came  
25 to work for the company and approximately the dates

1 at which you have held the various positions you have  
2 held, sir?

3 A I came to work June 22nd, 1970. I work-  
4 ed at Oconee Nuclear Station as an Assistant Con-  
5 struction Engineer.

6 I worked primarily as a Tech Support for  
7 the Craft activities and interfaced with Design  
8 Engineering Department.

9 I moved from a position at Oconee where I  
10 worked in the field to Associate Field Engineer  
11 Office, and the approximate date would be probably  
12 1973.

13 At that time I was responsible, and I  
14 worked for the Senior Office Engineer. His title is--  
15 I can't recall his exact title back then--and I was  
16 responsible for processing the administrative duties  
17 of the office.

18 I handled Fire Protection, Security, and  
19 Home Purchase Plans. We transferred a lot of  
20 people from Oconee to McGuire at that time.

21 Q Where were you located at that time?

22 A Still at the same location, Oconee Nuclear  
23 Station. I was at Oconee until about September,  
24 1974, and then I was assigned to the Design Engineer-  
25 ing Department of Duke Power Company here in

1 Charlotte; and I was there, I worked there for one  
2 year in the Structural Section of Design Engineering  
3 responsible for designing structural steel for  
4 McGuire and some activities for Catawba.

5 Also I wrote specifications for procure-  
6 ment of design equipment such as hoists and cranes.  
7 In September of '75, I came into the QA Department  
8 and was temporarily--somewhere along the line I've  
9 lost my titles, is that important?

10 Q It would be helpful if you could--the last  
11 one you gave me was Assistant Associate Field  
12 Engineer Office, and then you moved to Design  
13 Engineer in Charlotte.

14 A I maintained the same title, Associate  
15 Engineer in Design; and when I came over to QA,  
16 I came over as QA Engineer, Civil.

17 That was in September of '75. I worked  
18 at McGuire Nuclear Station for approximately six to  
19 nine months with the QA Program at McGuire.

20 I came to Catawba in May of '76, and I  
21 was promoted to--when I came to Catawba, I was the  
22 only QA Engineer there.

23 The only activity we had going on was  
24 basically foundation work.

25 Q What was your position at Catawba?

1 A QA Engineer.

2 Q Civil?

3 A Civil, Electrical, Mechanical.

4 Q Everything?

5 A Yeah, everything at that time. At that  
6 time there were only two people, I was there and  
7 one other person was there.

8 Q All right, sir.

9 A And we started adding our work force, had  
10 an increase in our work force, and I think it was '78  
11 that I was promoted to what was known as Project  
12 Senior Quality Assurance Engineer.

13 That was the title of that particular job.

14 Q At Catawba?

15 A At Catawba; and that was when our staff,  
16 we started adding our other QA Engineers at that  
17 time.

18 And on 2/1/81, I moved to the title of  
19 Project QA Engineer, and on I think September--  
20 these dates are kind of difficult to remember exactly,  
21 but I tried to study these before I came in--  
22 September of '82, I was moved to Senior QA Engineer,  
23 Projects; and that is my present position to date.

24 Q All right, sir; at the time of your promo-  
25 tion to Senior QA Engineer, Projects, there were more

1 than one project under construction.

2 A No, not at that time; that was basically,  
3 well, I guess you are right. Cherokee was still  
4 functioning.

5 It was still staffed at that time.

6 Q Where were you located in September of '82?

7 A Catawba, I had been at Catawba since May  
8 of '76.

9 Q What were your duties before that in the  
10 position you had in February of '81?

11 A Project QA Engineer. On 2/1/81, I was  
12 responsible for the QA Engineers and the QC Techni-  
13 cal Supervisors and the QC Engineers.

14 Q All right, sir; and how did your position  
15 change in September?

16 A In September I was only responsible for  
17 the QA Engineers.

18 Q Did someone else take the position Project  
19 QA Engineer?

20 A No, that particular job was, I guess you  
21 would say done away with, or they did not fill that  
22 job.

23 Q When you were Project QA Engineer, Mr.  
24 Morgan, were you responsible for supervising the  
25 Technical Supervisors in the Quality Control?



1 A Yes.

2 Q And that would include the Technical Super-  
3 visors who were in charge of Welding Inspectors?

4 A Yes.

5 Q And did you have any responsibility, Mr.  
6 Morgan, for reviewing the processing of nonconform-  
7 ing item reports?

8 A Only on the basis that someone else wasn't  
9 there. Those are normally handled by the QA  
10 Engineers that work for me, and for some reason  
11 they were all on vacation or at a meeting, and it  
12 was not as a general practice.

13 MR. GIBSON: Excuse me, Mr. Guild;  
14 I think this may be more legible than the  
15 original copy.

16 I assume you will do the same thing  
17 with Mr. Shropshire. Do you want me to  
18 give one of those to Mr. Morgan?

19 MR. GUILD: Yes, please, if you  
20 would make one available to him.

21  
22 BY MR. GUILD:

23 Q What was your responsibility at that time  
24 when you were Project QA Engineer for reviewing  
25 the resolution of nonconforming items?

1           A       The same as I stated earlier, that was the  
2 primary responsibility of the QA Engineers, and they  
3 would normally process those.

4                   It is really the same.

5           Q       How about your responsibility for review-  
6 ing the resolutions, of reviewing nonconforming items  
7 or the resolutions of nonconforming items for pur-  
8 poses of identifying the root cause of deficiencies,  
9 identifying trends in deficiencies and reviewing the  
10 appropriateness of corrective action?

11          A       That is really the same as processing  
12 NCIs; that is part of the NCI Program, and that would  
13 only be on an as needed basis.

14                   Again, not in the normal flow of activities  
15 for that.

16          Q       How about in the course of supervising  
17 those who did that function? What was your responsi-  
18 bility in that supervision, Mr. Morgan?

19                   Did you get support, did you review the  
20 raw documents; describe for me, if you will, what  
21 you did?

22          A       Well, the QA Engineers reported to me.  
23 The people, as I explained earlier, that process, the  
24 nonconforming items, if they detected something that  
25 looked peculiar they would bring it to my attention.

1 That was part of their responsibility, to  
2 keep me advised of any problems or potential problems.

3 Q How did they do that?

4 A They would come around and tell me.

5 Q Did they report to you in a written form?

6 A No, just bring the report, itself, and say,  
7 talk to me about it if they needed to.

8 Q Right, did they bring any other reporting  
9 on a regular basis that you would review to determine  
10 trends or review appropriateness of corrective actions?

11 A No, sir.

12 Q Let me take you one step back before that.  
13 In your duties as Project Senior QA Engineer, did  
14 you have responsibility for reviewing nonconforming  
15 items or their resolutions?

16 A Project Senior QA Engineer is the same  
17 job. I had QA Engineers that worked for me that  
18 did that particular work, and they do that.

19 Q Did you ever do this particular work,  
20 yourself?

21 A Only in the early stages during the time  
22 period '76 to--

23 Q '79?

24 A Yeah, when I was a QA Engineer, probably.

25 Q And during the period '76 to '78, you, as

1 a QA Engineer, did the actual review that later was  
2 done by persons under your supervision?

3 A Ask me that question again.

4 Q Sure; in '76 through '78, when you were a  
5 QA Engineer, you performed the review of nonconform-  
6 ing items and their resolutions?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Mr. Morgan, tell me first, give me a brief  
9 summary of your professional background and training  
10 prior to joining Duke Power.

11 A Let me see, I graduated from Virginia  
12 Polytechnic Institute in 1970, and I took you through  
13 my work history.

14 Q Sure, what was your degree in?

15 A B.S. in Civil Engineering, and I have  
16 attended lots of seminars and I'm a Registered Pro-  
17 fessional Engineer, North and South Carolina.

18 At one time I was a Registered Waste  
19 Water Treatment Plant Operator and Water Treatment  
20 Operator.

21 Q And what kind of work did you do after you  
22 got your Civil Engineering degree?

23 A I came to work for Duke Power. It was  
24 two weeks later.

25 Q You don't have any training or experience

1 in welding?

2 A Only seminars that I've attended and any  
3 background I may have picked up in Design Engineer-  
4 ing.

5 Q So you are not a welder?

6 A No, sir.

7 Q Now Counsel made available a copy of a  
8 document that he described as a graph showing numbers  
9 of NCIs.

10 Did you prepare this or was this prepared  
11 by someone under your supervision?

12 A It was prepared by someone under my  
13 supervision.

14 Q When was this prepared?

15 A Well, it was prepared somewhere around  
16 the end of January or February, and then it was pre-  
17 pared on a daily basis.

18 It was kept up to date on a daily or I think  
19 it was on a daily basis that we updated this particular  
20 chart.

21 Q January and February of what year, sir?

22 A That would be 1982.

23 Q January, 1982; is that right?

24 A Around January, February, end of January.

25 Q Would it have been about the time of the

1 Welding Inspector concerns and the Task Force work?

2 A Yes.

3 Q So it would be January and February, '82;  
4 right?

5 A Yeah.

6 Q And you began it then and kept it up to  
7 date through what period?

8 A It looks like July 15.

9 Q Of what year?

10 A 1982.

11 Q And why did you do this graph or have this  
12 graph done?

13 A Okay, the QA, I guess the QA Engineers  
14 brought to my attention during the time period they  
15 could see an increase in the number of NCIs being  
16 written by the Welding Inspectors, and that would be  
17 indicated, as you can see here on the graph on Page  
18 One, around the end of January through the first part  
19 of February, at that time.

20 I used this as a human relations skill  
21 indicator that I wanted to see how it used to be.  
22 This little hump here (indicating) represents a time  
23 period when the final decision was made on pay.

24 Q By "hump," around where it says February  
25 on Page One?

1 A Yeah.

2 Q I can see what you are referring to, but  
3 the Record, unfortunately, is just in words; so you  
4 will have to verbally tell me what you are pointing  
5 to.

6 A Okay, so what I was trying to do is measure  
7 here how the people had reacted, so I said go back  
8 to the first of the year, which as you can see on this  
9 particular graph, January 1st, and apply to the  
10 number of NCIs that were normally written by the  
11 Welding Inspectors, and monitor it to see what kind  
12 of effect the situation has.

13 I'm saying we carried it on out until it  
14 seemed to taper back off. In my analysis, my graph,  
15 we had a little peak and it went away after that  
16 period of time, so I just stopped.

17 I considered the graph really informal.  
18 Any graph I present to my supervision would have  
19 title blocks and the exact date.

20 This is a rough, personal graph is what it  
21 is.

22 Q Did you present this graph to your manage-  
23 ment?

24 A I've shown this graph to Mr. Davison, yes.

25 Q When did you do that?



1           A       I would say it was the time, I'm saying  
2       hey, I can see we have an indicator here that it was  
3       going up '81/'82.

4           Q       So he saw this graph and was aware of its  
5       existence?

6           A       Yes.

7           Q       Did you report on it as you went along?

8           A       Yes, he would come down once or twice a  
9       week and I would show it to him.

10          Q       On the first of January the graph, you  
11       were probably celebrating New Year's Day, and you  
12       do not have any NCIs that day at all?

13          A       That's correct.

14          Q       What is the extreme range; what are the  
15       extremes of the range of numbers per day of NCIs?

16          A       It could be from "0" to "11".

17          Q       Eleven is the most that occurred any day  
18       during this period?

19          A       That's correct.

20          Q       Are all those NCIs in Welding?

21          A       That's correct.

22          Q       How did you establish the universe that  
23       you are measuring here?

24          A       I don't understand your question.

25          Q       How did you determine which NCIs you were



1 going to count on your plot?

2 A The QA Engineers were broken up into  
3 various disciplines, and the QA Engineer, Welding,  
4 indicated there was a trend in this particular area;  
5 and I said well, we can watch that.

6 Q Who was the QA Engineer Welder at the  
7 time?

8 A Joe Shropshire.

9 Q Where did you get your data from?

10 A These were out of the log for the proce-  
11 dure log. I think it is Q1B or Q1C; that is the form  
12 number out of the nonconforming procedure.

13 Q Okay, that is --

14 A Part of the QA Program.

15 Q It is the log of nonconforming items? That  
16 same log is used to log all the nonconforming items;  
17 is that correct?

18 A That's correct.

19 Q How do you decide which ones you are  
20 going to count and which you weren't?

21 A You have to count the person initiating the  
22 form, so the name was given on the log.

23 Q Whose name was given?

24 A The individuals who were writing the NCIs.

25 Q Whose did you count and whose didn't you

1 count?

2 A When the trend started developing we  
3 counted the work in this particular area, which was  
4 Welding Inspection.

5 Q These were the ones initiated by Welding  
6 Inspectors?

7 A That's correct.

8 Q All Welding Inspectors?

9 A Yes.

10 Q NDE, RT?

11 A No.

12 Q Not all the Welding Inspectors?

13 A NDE Inspectors are not Welding Inspectors.

14 Q When you say Welding Inspectors you mean  
15 persons performing visual inspections of welds?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Who have the job title Welding Inspector?

18 A That's correct.

19 Q But that is not all the people inspecting  
20 welds; is it?

21 A That's correct, no.

22 Q People doing NDE and RT are inspecting  
23 welds?

24 A That's right.

25 Q And you didn't graph that?

1 A No.

2 Q Do you maintain or have prepared under  
3 your supervision, Mr. Morgan, any other trend  
4 analysis of NCIs at Catawba?

5 A No.

6 Q Who does the other trend analysis?

7 A QA Manager, Technical Services.

8 Q Who is that?

9 A W. O. Henry.

10 Q Mr. Henry does that analysis; did Mr. Henry  
11 do that trend analysis during this period?

12 A Yes, I believe so. It is his responsibility  
13 to perform trend analyses, so I assume that he did.

14 Q Who does trend analyses of R2A's?

15 A It is the responsibility of the Construction  
16 Department.

17 Q Who in particular?

18 A I'm trying to think of the title, it is the  
19 Office Engineer who reports to the Engineering Manager  
20 who reports to the Project Manager.

21 Q Who is the Office Engineer?

22 A Larry Vincent.

23 Q And Mr. Vincent, has he been there for  
24 awhile?

25 A He has been there a couple of years.

1 Q Since '81?

2 A I'm not exactly sure, maybe '82, '81 or '82.

3 Q Do you know who held that position before  
4 he did?

5 A That is a new position.

6 Q Do you know who is responsible for trend  
7 analyses of R2A's before Mr. Vincent?

8 A No.

9 Q Was anyone responsible? Did they trend  
10 R2A's before Mr. Vincent's time?

11 A I don't recall.

12 MR. GIBSON: Excuse me, are you  
13 referring to R2A's in welding or R2A's  
14 generally wherever they were used?

15 MR. GUILD: Whatever the appropriate  
16 answer is, I didn't know what his answer  
17 would be to that.

18 MR. GIBSON: I am asking you in your  
19 questioning.

20 MR. GUILD: I'm not knowledgeable  
21 on the subject. I want to know from the  
22 Witness.

23 Do you know what the answer was?

24 THE WITNESS: What is the question  
25 again?

1 BY MR. GUILD:

2 Q Are trending of R2A's in welding, and who  
3 is responsible for trending R2A's in welding?

4 A The Office Engineer.

5 Q Larry Vincent, and before Mr. Vincent?

6 A Before Mr. Vincent, the Welding Inspectors  
7 did not use R2A's. It was not their practice to use  
8 R2A's.

9 Q Who trended R2A's other than in areas of  
10 welding before Mr. Vincent?

11 A I can't recall, it may be the QA Manager,  
12 Technical Services, again.

13 Q Mr. Henry?

14 A Yeah.

15 Q Okay, when did they begin trending R2A's  
16 in welding?

17 A I'm trying to recall when the new revision  
18 procedure came out. That would be I would say may-  
19 be 12 months ago or 9 months ago.

20 Q Did they begin trending R2A's when the  
21 procedure was changed to provide for use of R2A's  
22 in welding as opposed to NCIs?

23 A It became part of that procedure, yes, to  
24 start trending R2A's assigned to the Construction  
25 Department.

1 Q But they trended all areas, not just Weld-  
2 ing, like Electrical, Mechanical, Civil, Receiving;  
3 R2A's in all those areas?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Always have been?

6 A Someone did a trend analysis on R2. I  
7 can't recall who, but the use of R2A's was fairly  
8 minimal until the last revision procedure.

9 Q Minimal generally?

10 A People would normally use another form  
11 rather than an R2A.

12 Q In Mechanical and Civil as well as Welding?

13 A Yeah, plus those procedures provided their  
14 own means of corrective action.

15 Q On the process control forms?

16 A Yeah, process control.

17 Q So use of R2A's to note deficiencies is  
18 relatively recent in all areas?

19 A I would say yeah.

20 Q And trending, therefore, followed the same  
21 practice to the best you can remember?

22 A I can't recall, but someone was responsi-  
23 ble for trending R2A's.

24 MR. GUILD: Counsel, has determina-  
25 tion been made about the availability of the

1 NCI trend analysis?

2 MR. GIBSON: It wasn't my recall  
3 that was something you had requested. If  
4 you did, I've overlooked it in terms of my  
5 memory.

6 It is something I haven't taken up with  
7 management or discussed with other Counsel.  
8 It is not my recollection, we may have  
9 discussed it and I've forgotten it.

10 MR. GUILD: Yes, but the trend  
11 analysis is definitely something we would  
12 like access to and like produced.

13 MR. GIBSON: I will let you know,  
14 but I can state to you generally unless some  
15 item in our view clearly relates to welding  
16 and Welding Inspection, it is clearly be-  
17 yond the scope of Discovery and up to the  
18 Board; but I will get back with you after I  
19 talk to the other Counsel.

20 MR. GUILD: Again, Mr. Gibson,  
21 understanding your position and disagreeing  
22 with it so we can move forward, we would  
23 ask that you do make available those docu-  
24 ments in the Welding area; and we believe  
25 that it is relevant in Discovery to seek



1 production of trend analyses beyond that  
2 area.

3 But so we can move forward we would  
4 appreciate your making that available on  
5 the Welding area.

6 On the same point, the outstanding  
7 relating area on the documentation from  
8 Mr. Bradley's testimony, the NCI evaluation.  
9

10 MR. GIBSON: Our inclination is to  
11 make those items relating to welding available  
12 Our folks in QA have been occupied in  
13 Depositions or Mr. Henry or Mr. Grier  
14 is out of town.

15 Who could possibly do that in addition  
16 after their review would be done, Counsel  
17 will have to take some time to look at  
18 that so that review is simply not completed.

19 As I say, I am not representing to  
20 you that we firmly will or will not; but  
21 our inclination is to make the welding  
22 documents available.

23 We will need guidance from the Board,  
24 I expect, at the conference call which Mr.  
25 McGerry is trying to call for early next



1 week.

2 I think that would be a good time to  
3 bring this up. Where something relates  
4 to Welding, and we are attempting to make  
5 those things available, I just cannot tell  
6 you when that other stuff will be available  
7 or that that decision is firm.

8 MR. GUILD: Okay, I guess for pur-  
9 poses of planning, I am trying to under-  
10 stand the limitations that would, therefore,  
11 be on the scope of the question to be asked  
12 Mr. Morgan and the remaining Witnesses;  
13 and the trends and NCIs and the results  
14 of that work of that Evaluation Team are  
15 areas that I believe fall within these  
16 gentlemen's likely area of knowledge and  
17 expertise; and so I would desire to ask  
18 them questions on that area, and I want  
19 the Record to reflect that I will proceed  
20 now in the absence of that information.

21 MR. GIBSON: You haven't observed  
22 many limitations on the scope thus far, Mr.  
23 Guild.

24 Go ahead.  
25

1 BY MR. GUILD:

2 Q What is the more current experience in the  
3 number of NCIs in the Welding area, Mr. Morgan?

4 A I have no record of that.

5 Q Based on your knowledge and information?

6 A The program has changed where the use of  
7 R2A's can be used, so I have not collected any data  
8 past July of '82.

9 Q All right, sir; are you informed on how  
10 many NCIs there are in the Welding area currently?

11 A No.

12 Q Would you know generally if there is an  
13 NCI in the Welding area? Would that come to your  
14 attention?

15 A The only way I would know is if it would  
16 be an item that QA Engineers would be advised of,  
17 and they would bring that to my attention.

18 Q Have they advised you of NCIs in the  
19 Welding area?

20 A Yes.

21 Q How many; give me an idea of what kind of  
22 NCIs you reviewed in Welding?

23 A Well, they may discover something that  
24 would be reportable under the guidelines of 10CFR50.55E  
25 that they need to bring to my attention, or it could

1 be something that would result in additional work or  
2 have an impact on the schedule.

3 Q Have they brought to your attention NCIs  
4 in Welding that were so reportable?

5 A Yes.

6 Q Recently?

7 A No, none this week.

8 Q What is the most recent one you have been  
9 involved in?

10 A As it relates to Welding?

11 Q Yes.

12 A The most recent one I can recall would be  
13 an item identified during NRC Inspection of a low  
14 spot in a weld that was not acceptable, which I think  
15 was later, I think we got an NRC violation out of  
16 that.

17 It was a support restraint.

18 Q What kind of system?

19 A Pipe hanger.

20 Q And how was the item detected?

21 A NRC Inspector, during his inspection, found  
22 the spot which was low, which had already been  
23 accepted by Welding Inspectors.

24 Q What time frame was this; when had this  
25 happened?

1 A Probably two or three years ago.

2 Q '81?

3 A Yeah, '81.

4 Q This was before the change in procedure?

5 A Which one?

6 Q The change to use R2A's instead of NCIs  
7 in the welding?

8 A Yes, it was before that.

9 Q Any NCIs in welding that come to your  
10 attention since the procedure changed?

11 A Not that I can recall.

12 Q Do you have a copy of the notes there, the  
13 more legible copy of notes?

14 A Yeah.

15 Q Let's do this; let's identify this as the  
16 first Exhibit to your Deposition, call it Exhibit One.

17 (Whereupon, the document referred  
18 to as graph was marked and received  
19 by the Court Reporter as Morgan  
20 Exhibit One and entered into the  
21 Record.)

22

23 BY MR. GUILD:

24 Q Mr. Morgan, if you take a moment and  
25 review the notes, you were interviewed by Mr.

1      Zwissler, the consultant to the Welding Inspector Task  
2      Force?

3           A      Yes.

4           Q      On or about the 3rd of February, 1982?

5           A      Yes.

6           Q      All right, sir; and I have notes here that  
7      were produced in Discovery that I believe reflect  
8      that interview.

9                   Why don't you take a look at them and I  
10     will look through them as well.

11                   MR. GUILD:  Let's mark these notes  
12     as Exhibit Two, please.

13                           (Whereupon, the document referred  
14     to as notes of Mr. Zwissler's inter-  
15     view were marked and received by the  
16     Court Reporter as Morgan Exhibit Two  
17     and entered into the Record.)

18  
19     BY MR. GUILD:

20           Q      All right, sir; now you and Mr. Zwissler  
21     had this meeting, and I gather he asked you some  
22     questions and took notes on your answers?

23           A      He asked me some questions.  I don't re-  
24     call him taking any notes.

25           Q      Let's see if these notes reflect your con-

1    versation. After noting your background and a good  
2    bit of what you've already told me under the heading  
3    "Problem," on Page One it says here:

4                    "Previously Davison handled one on one  
5    with inspectors. Now Morgan, through Shropshire,  
6    supervises inspectors."

7                    Does that reflect what you told him?

8            A        Yes.

9            Q        Mr. Davison used to do the first line  
10   review of the Welding Inspectors. He reviewed the  
11   nonconforming items that were originated?

12           A        Yes.

13           Q        Is that the nature of the one on one relation-  
14   ship?

15           A        What that says is that when his three  
16   supervisors came to work for me on 2/1/81, I had  
17   five people reporting to me instead of two, instead  
18   of previously.

19                    That was when QC and QA came together.  
20   I did not review NCIs. That was the responsibility  
21   of the QA Technical Supervisors and the QA Engineers.

22                    That was something that I did differently  
23   than Larry did. Larry would think different than I  
24   do.

25           Q        You just lost me a little bit. Previously

1 Davison handled one on one before the change. He  
2 was responsible for reviewing the NCIs?

3 A He could have delegated that down to his  
4 Technical Supervisors, but that was something he  
5 wanted to do so he did.

6 Q Afterwards you had the responsibility and  
7 you delegated that?

8 A Through the QA Engineers and QA Technical  
9 Supervisors.

10 Q What position does Mr. Shropshire hold?

11 A QA Engineer, Welding.

12 Q How was it structured after the change?

13 A Okay, my title was Project Engineer, QA  
14 Engineer, and I had five people reporting to me after  
15 the change.

16 Q Who are the five people that reported to  
17 you?

18 A H. D. Mason.

19 Q What position did he hold?

20 A QA Engineer, Civil and Electrical.

21 Q All right, sir.

22 A Joe Shropshire, QA Engineer, NDE,  
23 Mechanical and Welding.

24 Q Has that been his position all along since  
25 that change?



1 A Yes.

2 Q Third?

3 A Charles Baldwin, C. R. Baldwin; he had  
4 responsibility for Welding--NDE.

5 Q QA Engineer?

6 A QA Technical Supervisor.

7 Q All right, Welding and NDE?

8 A That's correct. T. A. Barron.

9 Q How do you spell his last name?

10 A B-A-R-R-O-N; he was the QC Engineer,  
11 Mechanical.

12 Q Okay.

13 A And J. N. Warren.

14 Q Warren?

15 A Warren; he was the QC Engineer, Civil  
16 and Electrical and Receiving.

17 MR. GIBSON: I didn't get that last  
18 thing.

19 THE WITNESS: And Receiving.

20

21 BY MR. GUILD:

22 Q And where were these people before the  
23 2/1/81, change?

24 A The last three, Baldwin, Warren, and  
25 Barron, reported to Mr. Davison.



1 Q Before?

2 A Before; and Shropshire and Mason reported  
3 to me.

4 Q All right, sir; after the change when you  
5 took over those two additional people, you did not  
6 do the direct review of the NCIs. You delegated  
7 that?

8 A That's correct.

9 Q To the Technical Supervisors?

10 A Yes, at this time there were still two  
11 reviews in the course of the program, the three  
12 people that reported to Larry reviewed it first and  
13 it came to the QA Department where it was known as  
14 the QA Review.

15 I'm saying there were two reviews.

16 Q Before?

17 A Yeah, so we kind of double checked our-  
18 selves.

19 Q And now and after the change?

20 A How was the review process altered after  
21 the change--it remained the same. The only  
22 difference was Larry was no longer there, and NCIs  
23 were reviewed by those three people rather than by  
24 Larry.

25 Q I see, all right, sir; let's look at Page

1 Two of your notes then. What is "use QC inquiry  
2 form to obtain answers to questions." What does  
3 that refer to?

4 A On 2/1/81, when we did have our reorgani-  
5 zation and those three people and the people report-  
6 ing to them, which was a new one hundred or one  
7 hundred fifty people that came to the QA Department,  
8 I, myself, felt, to make sure that we were communi-  
9 cating with those people or make sure they wanted  
10 to communicate with us, came up with an informal  
11 QA/QC inquiry was the name of the form where if an  
12 inspector had a question about a procedure or any  
13 technical related subject, he could address that  
14 question.

15 He put his question down in writing, and  
16 that way we could address it in writing so we had  
17 that informal process set up for that.

18 We had new management, and we wanted to  
19 make sure that they had the opportunity to talk to us.

20 Q Was that form used?

21 A Yes.

22 Q Frequently?

23 A No.

24 Q Infrequently?

25 A Infrequently, yes.

1 Q Did you ever get Welding Inspectors using  
2 that form to raise questions about applications of  
3 procedure?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Frequently?

6 A No.

7 Q How many times did that procedure get  
8 used, form get used, if you know?

9 A Maybe five, I don't know, that's a guess.

10 Q Fine, and you provided written responses  
11 when the form was used?

12 A Yes.

13 Q And did you maintain those documents?

14 A Yes.

15 Q You've got them in your files?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Were any of the concerns expressed by  
18 Welding Inspectors expressed through the use of this  
19 inquiry form?

20 A No.

21 Q Any of the same subjects raised on the  
22 inquiry form?

23 A No.

24 Q What inquiries by Welding Inspectors were  
25 received on those forms?

1           A       I really can't recall; see it was an informal  
2 process, just ask questions. They might say why do  
3 we have to do this, well, because the code--and we  
4 quote them a paragraph in the code or make them a  
5 copy, show them why.

6                   It is an informal process of trying to  
7 develop some relationship with them. Their super-  
8 visor may not know the answer to the question and  
9 say let's go in and we will get us an answer on this  
10 question.

11           Q       Did the Welding Inspector Task Force  
12 review your inquiry forms?

13           A       Not that I recall.

14           Q       Did Mr. Zwissler express any interest in  
15 looking at your inquiry forms?

16           A       I know we talked about the process of what  
17 an inquiry was; but I don't think he looked at any,  
18 no.

19           Q       Were any significant concerns or questions  
20 raised through those inquiry forms?

21           A       No. Normally if they asked us a question  
22 we would answer. If it was significant we would say  
23 you need to write an NCI or put it on another docu-  
24 ment, depending on what their question led us to.

25                   I can't recall that.

1 Q What if it were a question that said Larry  
2 Davison or Charles Baldwin is improperly voiding  
3 many NCIs?

4 A Well, it was set up, we would not--let's  
5 see--I didn't get into questions like that. It was set  
6 up for answers, technical questions from the Techni-  
7 cal Group on technical subjects.

8 If a question like that were to arise, it  
9 would not come up on that document.

10 Q How about technical questions on procedures?

11 A Normally it would be handled through the  
12 supervisor, and I would say yes, on occasion we had  
13 a question about a procedure.

14 Q Let's go back to these notes now. While  
15 in Construction, Beau Ross had two Welding Inspectors  
16 reporting to him, and that was before the '81 change.  
17 Is that what you are referring to?

18 A That was in the real early stages of  
19 construction when they were adding to the work force.

20 Q Right, Mr. Ross had 26 reporting to him?

21 A I'm not exactly--I would say a good many  
22 people.

23 Q That number is not exact, but a large  
24 number reporting to him?

25 A Yeah.

1 Q Were there others holding Mr. Ross'  
2 position at that time?

3 A No, he was the only supervisor.

4 Q He was the only supervising person or  
5 technician that held that position?

6 A Yeah.

7 Q And it says here, "Question ability to  
8 supervise this many." Was that your question?

9 A No, he didn't report to me at this time.

10 Q I'm saying this is your interview with Mr.  
11 Zwissler when it says, "Questioned his ability,"  
12 who were you referring to?

13 A I guess I was probably saying that was a  
14 lot of people for one person to keep track of, saying  
15 it would be difficult to keep up with twenty-six people  
16 or twenty-five.

17 Q As a result Welding Inspectors were operating  
18 independently?

19 A Yes.

20 Q That was your opinion, given that relation-  
21 ship that was a large number of people to supervise?

22 A They work independently of their super-  
23 visor because he probably did not get around to seeing  
24 them every instant of the day. Most of my people  
25 that report to me are within the same room or 50

1 feet or a 100 feet of my office, whereas in the field  
2 you are spread out a little bit more.

3 Q Okay, "Presently three supervisors and  
4 Welding Inspectors resent direction as a change from  
5 previous autonomy."

6 Do you see that?

7 A At that time there were three Welding  
8 Inspector Supervisors. I don't understand the notes.

9 Q What don't you understand?

10 A The last part, "resent directions as a  
11 change from previous autonomy."

12 Q You did not express that opinion?

13 A In substance or those words; I don't use  
14 "autonomy." I'm saying I didn't say that, that is not  
15 in my vocabulary.

16 Q Do you get the drift of what he is saying,  
17 that is what these consultants are hired for?

18 MR. GIBSON: That is reserved for  
19 Lawyers, we will have to speak to him.

20 THE WITNESS: I can't recall what  
21 that means.

22  
23 BY MR. GUILD:

24 Q Did you express that opinion, that the  
25 change of having more direct supervision caused



1 resentment on the part of Welding Inspectors?

2 A I don't recall making that statement, no;  
3 but I would probably say they used to work indepen-  
4 dently, and being independent and very knowledgeable  
5 of the procedure, they probably felt that they did  
6 not need supervision, but now we have provided that  
7 supervision for them which they needed.

8 Q Is that inconsistent with your opinion,  
9 whether you said it to them or not; they might have  
10 resented that new direction?

11 A I don't think they resented it, no.

12 Q "No longer can talk to the man in charge,"  
13 meaning they now had a supervisor between them and  
14 who, Larry Davison?

15 A No, I think that was related to the situation  
16 that developed between the First Line Supervisor,  
17 Mr. Baldwin, and they were having a communication  
18 problem, and they were having trouble communicating  
19 with each other.

20 Q I'm sorry.

21 A The man in charge would have been Baldwin  
22 in this case.

23 Q So that was reflecting the communications  
24 problem that existed at that time with Mr. Baldwin?

25 A As best I can recall.



1 Q Supervisor now handles Welding Inspectors  
2 and spends 65 percent of time in field." Who would  
3 that be referring to?

4 A One of the things I did on 2/1/81, I set  
5 up what was known as key result areas, responsible  
6 for different jobs; and my philosophy was that the  
7 Welding Inspectors' supervision needed to be in the  
8 field to work on a day to day basis with their people,  
9 and they tried to find ways so they did not have to  
10 handle so many administrative things, so I set a goal  
11 for them to spend more time in the field handling the  
12 day to day activities.

13 I also set goals for QA Engineers and  
14 everyone else.

15 Q And the goal for the supervisor was 65  
16 percent?

17 A Yes, I thought that was reasonable. I had  
18 people outside, they should be out a minimum of 65  
19 percent of the time.

20 Q How did they measure the amount of time  
21 they spent in the field, if they did?

22 A I had them report into their clerk how much  
23 time they were spending in the field, and today how  
24 did your percentage of time break up; that way you  
25 could analyze their job and see if maybe they needed

1 help in this particular area or this particular area.

2           Maybe they were spending too much time  
3 in Personnel getting insurance, or maybe they needed  
4 a runner or clerk, and you collect the data of how  
5 you spend their time during the day, and you analyze  
6 that and sit with them and say hey, where are you  
7 spending your time?

8           It is just really a management tool I used  
9 to analyze their availability.

10           Q     What else did you have them report?

11           A     On this particular goal as far as time?

12           Q     At this time what kind of reporting did you  
13 institute beyond, in addition to the time they spent  
14 in the field and doing other jobs?

15           A     I think that was the major portion of their  
16 job, and I can't recall. I know we wanted to make  
17 sure they were really getting out in the field.

18           Q     Okay now, you are talking about Mr. Baldwin,  
19 the level above?

20           A     No, this would have been the First Line  
21 Supervisor.

22           Q     Mr. Ross and the people at his level of  
23 supervision?

24           A     Yes.

25           Q     The Supervising Technicians?

1 A That's correct.

2 Q "Feels issue is 100 percent pay problem."

3 Did you express that to Mr. Zwissler?

4 A As I recall, the issue was why did the  
5 technical concerns come up.

6 Q Yes?

7 A Yes, that is what I feel.

8 Q What did you say to him, you thought it  
9 was 100 percent a pay problem?

10 A Yes.

11 Q And what did that mean, what was your  
12 understanding then of the technical concerns? What  
13 was your belief about the technical concerns?

14 A I believed that the inspectors felt that  
15 the work that they had accepted was acceptable, and  
16 that when they were told that their pay would be  
17 reduced they felt they had someone--they wanted to  
18 blame it on someone; and they wanted to hold someone  
19 responsible for getting their pay grade reduced.

20 Q Who was that?

21 A In my opinion they held Larry Davison  
22 responsible for that reduction in their pay rate.

23 Q What was the relationship between that  
24 and the technical concerns in your opinion?

25 A Relationship between those two?

1 Q Yes.

2 A They called it lack of support, they said  
3 we have had lack of support in the past and we have  
4 a lack of support now; and as I recall they said we  
5 have lack of support in the pay issue; it is all tied  
6 together.

7 If you don't support us on pay, you won't  
8 support us on anything. That is just my opinion.

9 Q What was your opinion about the technical  
10 concerns?

11 A My opinion, I don't understand your  
12 question.

13 Q I've followed you so far, but I want to  
14 understand your opinion on the technical concerns.

15 A My opinion on the technical concerns, there  
16 were questions that needed to be addressed and  
17 answered, and it was our responsibility to address  
18 and answer those, and that is what we did.

19 Q But it is 100 percent a pay problem?

20 A My speculation would be if they hadn't  
21 reduced it then they may not have had any concerns.

22 Q Okay, had them or expressed them?

23 A Had them.

24 Q What does that say about the technical  
25 concerns?

1           A       As I said earlier, if people have concerns  
2 I think it is our responsibility in management to  
3 evaluate those technical concerns, to investigate them;  
4 and that was what was done.

5                    Maybe I didn't understand your question.

6           Q       I guess I'm trying to see if I am clear on  
7 your opinion. I want you to state your opinion and  
8 understand it and have it clearly stated.

9                    You think it was a pay issue; you said that  
10 in the note to Mr. Zwissler, and you have confirmed  
11 that, and you did not think the concerns would exist  
12 except for the pay issue?

13          A       That's correct.

14          Q       They would not be stated, but you also  
15 thought they wouldn't exist except for the pay?

16          A       That's correct.

17          Q       Concerns were expressed, concerns were  
18 held and the Welding Inspectors believed there was a  
19 problem.

20                   What was your opinion about the problems  
21 that they ultimately did express?

22          A       I would say that those were things that  
23 may have been bothering them or bothered them at  
24 one time.

25                   They did not like the answer they got, and

1 they did not communicate well enough with their  
2 supervision to get it straightened out.

3 At the time supervision was satisfied and  
4 management was satisfied, but the inspectors did not  
5 feel comfortable with the answer, but he accepted it  
6 at that time, and when given the opportunity to come  
7 up with some real reasons of lack of support, they  
8 said well, what can I think of where I may have had  
9 lack of support, and that is what a lot of them came  
10 up with.

11 Q They came up with a pretty good, long  
12 list; didn't they?

13 A Yeah.

14 Q Are you trying to tell me, am I reading  
15 you correctly you did not think they were valid?

16 A On 2/1/81, when I became Project QA  
17 Manager, if they had concerns, their management that  
18 they had problems with was no longer there; and they  
19 would come to me and I was a different manager in  
20 charge, and they did not come to me.

21 I guess it is loss of time now; I was  
22 available and I made my field runs through the field  
23 and no one felt like they wanted to tell me any of  
24 their concerns, and that is why I feel that way.

25 Q Do you think the concerns, themselves,

1 were not valid?

2 A I think if the individual had a concern or  
3 had a feeling in his mind it was valid, and each was  
4 evaluated and each concern would be valid, yes; but  
5 in his own mind, that is why we investigate them,  
6 to determine if there is--

7 Q Let me see if I can approach it another  
8 way: Is it your opinion, Mr. Morgan, because of  
9 the way those concerns arose, in other words, did  
10 they all come as a result of what you saw as 100  
11 percent pay problem, that that suggestion that the  
12 concerns, the substance of the concerns is not valid?

13 They may have felt they were valid, they  
14 may have felt they were concerns; but because they  
15 arose out of a pay problem, in your judgment the  
16 substance was invalid?

17 A No, I think that the inspectors had some  
18 legitimate problems that they had trouble with; but  
19 I feel they were all communication problems.

20 Q Okay, let's go back to the notes here,  
21 "Hold Larry Davison responsible for pay, lack of  
22 support. Feel if Larry did not support them on pay  
23 he would not support them on anything."

24 Whose opinion is that that the notes  
25 reflect, yours or the inspectors or both?



1           A       I would say from the gist of the notes that  
2 I was involved with, that that came up in conversation  
3 several times.

4                   Different Welding Inspectors, and Larry  
5 used to be our boss and he let us down. When he  
6 went to Charlotte he had their pay re-evaluated and  
7 they told me they did not hold me responsible because  
8 I had only been there a short period of time, and  
9 Larry knew how busy they were and how much work  
10 they had to do.

11                   So they just felt that he was the guy that  
12 was responsible for their pay being re-evaluated.

13           Q       Was he?

14           A       Was he, it is part of our program to  
15 evaluate the jobs that we have such as Welding  
16 Inspectors, Mechanical Inspectors, Welding Inspectors,  
17 and it is part of management's job to do that.

18           Q       I mean I understand it was approved in the  
19 highest circles of Duke Power; but was Mr. Davison,  
20 who was closely informed on the work of Welding  
21 Inspectors and supervised them, was he responsible  
22 for that evaluation as it had to do with the Welding  
23 Inspectors?

24           A       No, the evaluations are done by an inde-  
25 pendent party in Corporate Personnel, and they come



1 down and look at the problem and weigh the values and  
2 present that to management.

3 They do the analysis, I guess you would  
4 say. They are "experts" in doing that particular type  
5 of work.

6 Q Do they know anything about Welding  
7 Inspection?

8 A They were trained in the skill of analyzing  
9 positions. I don't know what their qualifications are,  
10 okay?

11 Q What role, if any, did Mr. Davison have  
12 in providing input or expertise or decision making  
13 or anything on the re-evaluation of the pending  
14 inspectors?

15 A At the time they were re-evaluating all  
16 the Welding Inspectors. Others had reductions in grades  
17 also, not just Welding Inspectors.

18 He was in the approval process for the  
19 Position Analysis, that is the name of the documents.

20 Q So he approved the Position Analysis in  
21 part?

22 A He had a step for approval, yes.

23 Q And he did approve it as far as you know?

24 A Yes.

25 Q You are not aware of Mr. Davison arguing

1 against the re-evaluation of the Welding Inspector  
2 position or analysis?

3 A I don't understand your question.

4 Q You are not aware of Mr. Davison saying  
5 no, this is wrong, Welding Inspectors work much  
6 harder than this; they need more?

7 A Larry did not work for me, and I wouldn't  
8 know that.

9 Q You are not aware of him doing that?

10 A No.

11 Q There is a quote here, it says, "Super-  
12 visors helped a few Welding Inspectors."

13 A Yes.

14 Q And who were the few that you had in mind?

15 A At this time there were only two people I  
16 can recall who would fit into this classification in  
17 my opinion.

18 Q Who were they?

19 A John Bryant and John Rockholt.

20 Q Okay, and who is the supervisor who helped?

21 A And Beau Ross.

22 Q And Mr. Bryant and Rockholt were on Mr.  
23 Ross' crew?

24 A That's correct.

25 Q "Too many NCIs were being written." What

1 is that reference to?

2 A Okay, I think around 2/1, what we were  
3 having is having the system flooded with questions  
4 and not really through NCIs, and we were looking for  
5 ways to handle some of the questions, either an R2A  
6 or returning to the process control activity plan.

7 Q Okay, by this time you mean 2/1/82,  
8 around then?

9 A No, it would have been 2/1/81.

10 Q So you are referring to a period--

11 A Earlier, yes. It is not related to this  
12 period here.

13 Q You are talking about a much earlier period?

14 A Yeah.

15 Q What period, the year before?

16 A Probably 1980 and 1981.

17 Q All right.

18 A That was a period of increased work also.

19 Q Why was that?

20 A I am saying there was more work force  
21 on the job than had previously been, more construction  
22 employees.

23 Q And during that period, too many NCIs  
24 were being written, as you said, to raise questions?

25 A Well, there were a lot of NCIs written,

1 not too many, I'm saying you write as many as you  
2 have to write.

3 A lot of things that were being written  
4 were minor and could have been handled in another  
5 way more economically on the company, but our pro-  
6 cedure required us to do that so that is the way we  
7 did it; and then we looked for ways to document  
8 discrepancies in other ways such as the R2 Program  
9 which developed later.

10 Q What was the response to writing too many  
11 NCIs or inappropriate NCIs at that point in the 1980-81,  
12 time period?

13 A You didn't have the R2A--how do you get  
14 people to write NCIs--it was a question, a question  
15 would not go on a nonconforming item report.

16 Our process in the past has been to allow  
17 them to come in that way.

18 Q In '80-'81, when it was the practice to use  
19 NCIs for questions, how did you get them to write  
20 less for that purpose?

21 A We had meetings with Mr. Henry and Mr.  
22 Davison and discussed procedures and looked for  
23 other ways.

24 One way would be to use R2A's. We did  
25 have an R2A procedure at that time, we just did not

1 use that procedure.

2 Q Did you start using it then?

3 A In welding there were some, that was when  
4 the first R2A's were written, yes, I think during that  
5 time.

6 Q In welding?

7 A Yes.

8 Q If not an R2A, what other ways of handling  
9 things were approved?

10 A The inspector has control over the work  
11 with his signature, and if it was something minor that  
12 the individual corrected, maybe he turned the paper-  
13 work in and said I'm ready, but he did not put his  
14 date in.

15 If he did not date it, the inspector could  
16 say rather than writing that as an NCI he could  
17 return that to him and say you need to fix this so  
18 Process Control can inspect it.

19 Q And did it work, the meetings and counseling  
20 instructions?

21 A Yes, but there was some communication  
22 gap on what our real purpose was, what we were  
23 trying to do.

24 I don't think the word ever got to all the  
25 inspectors. I don't think they said the purpose is to

1 turn the paperwork back, and we are not losing any  
2 quality because the minor problems can be handled  
3 in a different manner.

4           Somehow maybe the inspectors did not get  
5 the word, and it broke down through the communications  
6 in the Task Force.

7           That was one of the big things.

8           Q     Who was responsible for the communications  
9 to the Welding Inspectors in this time frame, Mr.  
10 Davison, '80/'81 now?

11          A     Mr. Davison would have been, yes.

12          Q     Now help me understand--

13                THE WITNESS: I need to speak to  
14 Ron a minute.

15                (Whereupon, the Witness and his  
16 Counsel conferred out of the hearing  
17 of the Court Reporter.)

18  
19                MR. GIBSON: Mr. Guild, Mr. Morgan  
20 has indicated that he thinks he misspoke  
21 a date.

22  
23 BY MR. GUILD:

24                Q     If anything occurs that you want to change  
25 your answer--

1 MR. GIBSON: That is the purpose of  
2 the conference.

3 THE WITNESS: Instead of 1980, it  
4 was after 2/1/81. When you asked me the  
5 question about Mr. Davison, I realized no,  
6 the time periods were wrong.

7  
8 BY MR. GUILD:

9 Q Before 2/1/81, it would have been Mr.  
10 Davison?

11 A Right.

12 Q But after that he no longer was in that  
13 position?

14 A That's correct.

15 Q But after that he would have been the  
16 supervisor to communicate this instruction back to  
17 the Welding Inspector?

18 A Yes.

19 Q Help me understand in what way is an  
20 NCI less efficient or more administratively time  
21 consuming than handling it some other way?

22 A During the earlier stages of the job, we  
23 allowed people to ask questions on NCIs basically  
24 because we had a staff there that could answer  
25 questions that way.

1           It was obvious that was not what the pro-  
2 cedure required. It required us to document non-  
3 conforming items.

4           We had to get out of the practice of asking  
5 questions, so that is what we did. As the work  
6 increased, the number of possibilities for questions  
7 can increase also.

8           Q     Did you have more staff early on to respond  
9 to that in that way relative--

10          A     When you have more staff, it is a different  
11 type work. At the earlier stages it was less process  
12 control in the early part of the project.

13          Q     And as the work increased, less staff was  
14 available to respond to NCIs?

15          A     We have always had adequate staff, it was  
16 just that--ask me the question again.

17          Q     What change; why was it less efficient to  
18 do it that way in later days as compared to earlier  
19 days of the project?

20          A     I don't guess it was less efficient, it was  
21 the same.

22          Q     Where was it an important change then,  
23 in your opinion if it was?

24          A     I can recall that we had an NRC inspection  
25 that came in that said we had too many NCIs on items



1 which were not significant which could have been  
2 handled in another manner.

3 I'm saying that is only my recollection.

4 Q Your recollection is did you respond to  
5 criticism by the NRC, too many NCIs being used for  
6 less significant items?

7 A They were saying we somehow had so many  
8 on our system that we, in a phrase, could not see  
9 the forest for the trees because we had the little  
10 trees and the big trees.

11 MR. GIBSON: Okay, if this is a con-  
12 venient time for us to make a pit stop,  
13 break.

14 MR. GUILD: Let me finish this little  
15 bit.

16  
17 BY MR. GUILD:

18 Q Who coined that phrase, if you can remember,  
19 who was that poet?

20 A If it was in the woods, it was probably  
21 Thoreau.

22 Q Would that have been the Resident, Mr.  
23 VanDoorn?

24 A I don't think Mr. VanDoorn was the Resi-  
25 dent at that time.

1 Q Mr. Maxwell?

2 A No, this was a Team Inspection that came  
3 in.

4 Q Mr. Bryant, he was a rather colorful  
5 individual, as I recall.

6 A I don't recall who was on the team. I  
7 know two people that were on the team at that time.

8 Q All right, let me finish this little bit and  
9 you have gone back to writing NCIs so that the  
10 instruction and training and guidance resulted in  
11 reduction of use of NCIs for that purpose; and now  
12 you have gone back to writing NCIs. This is the  
13 little peak that you show on your graph there?

14 A No, this is a different time period; this  
15 is 1982 on that one. This is 1981 (indicating). I  
16 think what I was saying there was--

17 Q Wait a second, this is the notes of your  
18 conversation with Mr. Zwissler in February, '82,  
19 and your graph is February, '82.

20 A Yes, but the statement that he has back  
21 to me now, we have gone back to writing NCIs.  
22 Again, a human relations scale indicator, we felt  
23 that at this time period that the inspectors were  
24 saying they were not being supported.

25 They had lack of support, and so we said

1 we made the decision that we would process any  
2 question on NCIs, so we went back to the old way we  
3 were doing it and said if it makes you feel more  
4 comfortable to do that, do it; and we processed them  
5 all that way during that time period.

6 We went back to the old way we were doing  
7 it.

8 Q Okay, how was that change made?

9 A Going back?

10 Q To the old way of doing it.

11 A We told them if you have an NCI bring it  
12 to us, you know, if you have a question.

13 Q Who did that, Mr. Davison?

14 A I don't recall, I think that was something  
15 that I did. I told them hey, if they didn't think I  
16 was supporting them, to tell me why I wasn't support-  
17 ing them.

18 Q And to do it through an NCI?

19 A If they felt more comfortable. I had the  
20 Manager of the Human Relations saying they were  
21 very tense because of the pay situation.

22 I said if it makes you feel more comfortable,  
23 do that.

24 Q All right, so you gave them this guid. e  
25 in February, 1982, is that the time frame for which

1 you are talking about?

2 A It would be early, probably November of  
3 '81, something in the end of 1981.

4 Q The pay grade change was announced in  
5 July of '81.

6 A Yes, it was more along that time.

7 Q See if you can remember now July of '81,  
8 was the pay grade change, the first level recourses  
9 were beginning to come in in the August, September  
10 time frame.

11 Would it have been around in there?

12 A Around the time of their first recourses.

13 (Whereupon, the Deposition was  
14 recessed at 2:59 p.m., and reconvened  
15 at 3:20 p.m.)  
16

17 BY MR. GUILD:

18 Q Mr. Morgan, this is sort of an unrest  
19 amongst the Welding Inspectors as a result of the  
20 reclassification and as a Human Relations device  
21 you had, if you had problems related to the work  
22 questions, you suggested to use the NCI process, in  
23 short?

24 A What we were saying was they felt com-  
25 fortable before we changed our practice, so I told

1 them we would go back to the same practice that we  
2 had before until we could get our procedures in place.

3 Q Because you knew they would feel com-  
4 fortable under that procedure?

5 A As far as I knew they would feel comfort-  
6 able, yes.

7 Q Had they raised at that point, concerns to  
8 you that were about the way they were doing their  
9 job, lack of support?

10 A No.

11 Q What was the basis then for your judgment  
12 that they needed any other device to raise questions?

13 A Are you referring to the inquiry process?

14 Q No, about the time when you told them to  
15 use NCIs to go back to the old process of NCIs; why  
16 did you do that?

17 A Because I did not want to do anything to  
18 upset people any more than what they were. Saying  
19 hey, if it makes you feel comfortable, it makes me  
20 feel comfortable, so let's go back to the old way we  
21 were doing it.

22 Q They were unhappy about this pay, you  
23 were telling me; how did the discussion of NCIs enter  
24 into it at all?

25 A They were unhappy, I'm trying to get my

1 time frames straight here, this was after the pay  
2 had been re-evaluated, and it was when, it was after  
3 the NRC had come in and addressed the fact that they  
4 were documenting things that were not proper on NCIs,  
5 and all I can recall is that they had changed, you  
6 know, that they were not getting support; and I, my-  
7 self, did not want them to feel like I wasn't giving  
8 them support, so since they had an empty feeling in  
9 this area, I said let's go back to where you feel  
10 comfortable.

11 Q Aside from the specifics of the precise  
12 time, it was after July that they changed the Welding  
13 Inspectors?

14 A Yes.

15 Q Did Welding Inspectors come to you and  
16 say we want to go back to the old system of using  
17 NCIs?

18 A Yes.

19 Q Okay, give me an idea how that happened,  
20 how that came to your attention.

21 A As I recall it was a situation of lack of  
22 support, and they were saying we haven't had the  
23 support on the pay situation, and you won't support  
24 us on NCIs.

25 That is where we had the communication

1 breakdown before; and they didn't understand what we  
2 were trying to do with NCIs.

3           So rather than myself trying to bridge that  
4 communication gap, we said, they suggested and I  
5 agreed, that we go back to the way they were doing  
6 them before for awhile until we can get other  
7 mechanisms in place to handle this type of deficiency.

8           Q       So you can write new procedures?

9           A       Yes.

10          Q       Who brought this to your attention?

11          A       As I recall from memory it was Mr. V. C.  
12 Godfrey, I think is his initials.

13          Q       He was a Welding Inspector?

14          A       Yes, he was.

15          Q       Any others?

16          A       No, but in his conversation he was trying  
17 to speak for a group of people saying hey, we all  
18 feel this way.

19          Q       He was trying to speak for a number of  
20 other inspectors?

21          A       And in most conversations they all implied  
22 this is how everyone feels, but you never really know  
23 because this is only his opinion of what other people  
24 feel.

25          Q       Did you understand he was speaking for a

1 number of other Welding Inspectors?

2 A Yeah, and I agreed with him.

3 Q Did he make a suggestion in writing?

4 A No.

5 Q It was all oral, all in conversations?

6 A Yeah.

7 Q Did you respond in writing?

8 A No, it was a very informal conversation.

9 He said, "May I have an idea?"

10 Q Okay, did you discuss this with anyone  
11 else in management?

12 A I'm sure that I discussed it with Larry.

13 Q With Larry Davison?

14 A Yes.

15 Q What did he say?

16 A I can't recall exactly what he said, but  
17 he concurred with the decision that we would do that.

18 Q All right, anybody else; did you discuss it  
19 with anybody beyond Mr. Davison?

20 A Well, I discussed it with Mr. Baldwin and  
21 Mr. Allum, but not up the organization.

22 Q Not up beyond Mr. Davison?

23 A No.

24 Q Did you discuss it with Mr. Ross?

25 A No.



1 Q The other technicians?

2 A I would have discussed it with the QA  
3 Engineers.

4 Q And what position did they have, how did  
5 they feel about it?

6 A As far as I remember, we were all in agree-  
7 ment that it was a good human relations move to do  
8 that at that time.

9 Q Okay, it was good business, another business  
10 decision had been made. Was there any increased  
11 administrative burden as a result of that decision?

12 A No. To qualify, there might have been for  
13 a day or two, maybe, but the answer is no.

14 Q Okay, and was there an increase in the  
15 number of NCIs written?

16 A I would say only temporarily. Again, it is  
17 the same answer, no. It might have been that way  
18 for a couple of days.

19 Q All right, the longer term trend was un-  
20 altered, the number of NCIs coming from Welding?

21 A The trend, what I am saying, for a day or  
22 two we might have had a flurry coming in, and after  
23 that it would level back off, as best I can recall.

24 Q Back to the level it was before, as best  
25 you can recall?

1 A Yes.

2 Q So no significant effect on the number of  
3 NCIs except for this little peak for a day or two?

4 A As best I can recall.

5 Q And how long did that practice continue?

6 A That practice would have continued until  
7 the new revisions to our QA Program, as it related  
8 to nonconforming items and corrective action.

9 Q Which would have been when; after the  
10 Task Force?

11 A Yes, it was after the Task Force.

12 Q Okay, that helps.

13 A Okay, it is hard to remember when a pro-  
14 cedure comes to the site.

15 Q All right, well, at least it did not change,  
16 that practice continued through the end of the year,  
17 '81 into '82?

18 A I was going to say as a result of the  
19 Welding Inspector Task Force, a lot of things that  
20 were on NCIs were communications, questions about  
21 concerns; and we started a new process after the  
22 Welding Inspector concerns.

23 Q But the practice of going back to the old  
24 system of using NCIs continued up until those new  
25 procedures came into place?

1 A Yes.

2 Q All right, sir; I am looking at Page Three  
3 of your notes. At the top is the name "Bryant,  
4 Rockholt; Beau Ross, Supervisor."

5 What is the significance of the names  
6 indicated there?

7 A I have no idea. It might have been mentioned  
8 in the same context we talked about just now. I note  
9 that Zwissler wrote them down here again, but I have  
10 no idea what that connotation means.

11 Q Did you discuss this practice that you just  
12 told me about with Mr. Zwissler?

13 A I probably did.

14 Q Okay; on Page Three it says, "Solution,  
15 people on team were part of resolution to previous  
16 concerns. Welding Inspectors filed recourse on  
17 Larry after his visit."

18 What is the reference first there to the  
19 "people on team"?

20 A People on team are part of the resolutions  
21 to previous concerns.

22 Q Would that be the first Task Force?

23 A December, '81; I can't recall what it means.

24 Q Can you give me any more clarification  
25 of what that reference is?

1 A No, I don't recall.

2 Q Do you remember the Task Force that was  
3 organized in early December to review the Welding  
4 Inspector concerns, December of '81; a three-man  
5 Task Force?

6 A Yes.

7 Q Did it have Mr. Williams on it, Royce  
8 Williams?

9 A I don't think he was on the first team.

10 Q Was he on the second team?

11 A Yes, I do believe he was on the second.

12 Q Second Task Force?

13 A Yeah.

14 Q The first Task Force, a three-man Task  
15 Force, who was on that; do you recall?

16 A Yeah, I will stab at those--McMeekin,  
17 Helms, H-E-L-M-S, L. E.; W. J. --I can see the  
18 guy's face, but I can't recall his name.

19 His name is Wholeman.

20 MR. GIBSON: I've got those names,  
21 Earl Hoellen, H-O-E-L-L-E-N; and Mr.  
22 McMeekin, M-C-M-E-E-K-I-N; and Al  
23 H-E-M-E-S-L-E-Y, Hemesley.

24

25 BY MR. GUILD:

1 Q All right, sir; were those three gentlemen  
2 a part of the resolution process of resolving non-  
3 conforming items?

4 A Mr. McMeekin is in the Design Engineering  
5 Department. There is a possibility that--let me  
6 clarify that--Mr. McMeekin is in Electrical Design,  
7 so the answer would be no.

8 Q How about the other two?

9 A One was from Steam Production Department  
10 or Nuclear Production Department; and I think the  
11 other guy was from Mill House Supply Company.

12 Q So you were not referring to the member-  
13 ship of the first Task Force?

14 A I can't remember what that note says.

15 Q And it is your testimony that the members  
16 of the first Task Force did not have anything to do  
17 with resolving NCIs?

18 A Not as it relates to Welding.

19 Q How about NCIs generally?

20 A Mr. McMeekin works in the Design  
21 Engineering Department, and it is possible he could  
22 have resolved NCIs as they related to Electrical, his  
23 area of responsibility.

24 Q Did you ever hear a question raised as to  
25 the incident of the first Task Force, because of their

1 prior involvement in NCI resolution?

2 A No, I don't think anybody knew those--the  
3 only people I knew was Ted McMeekin, and the other  
4 two people I had never seen before in my life.

5 Q Okay, "Welding Inspectors filed recourses  
6 on Larry after his visit." What is that reference?

7 A I guess when Larry came down and request-  
8 ed that they provide all the documentation, that was  
9 a meeting sometime in January, '82.

10 It was after that meeting that they had the  
11 concerns. That is what I meant by that one, he asked  
12 for them and they gave them to him.

13 Q They gave them to him?

14 A They gave them to me, and I gave them to  
15 Bradley.

16 Q By filing a recourse on Larry, they com-  
17 plained about Mr. Davison?

18 A It was a collection of the concerns, as best  
19 I can recall.

20 Q Okay, down at the bottom of that, "Day to  
21 day most difficult job is to get procedures changed,  
22 takes awhile, QC can be changed quickly."

23 A At that time what that meant was the QA  
24 procedures that we had that we were too, if we wanted  
25 a revision it was difficult to do that.

1 I mean it wasn't difficult, it took time to  
2 get all the comments because we have a corporate  
3 program and we make sure that all of our plant, at  
4 the time they received comments from all the different  
5 projects and it took time to collect and resolve all  
6 those comments; whereas, you know, I would have had  
7 a set of procedures for Catawba and a set for McGuire  
8 and a set for Cherokee, but we had a corporate pro-  
9 gram so it took time to get all the comments in and  
10 resolve those procedures.

11 Q What is "local QC" can be changed  
12 quickly"?

13 A If we had our own site procedure we would  
14 not have to go to other projects to get procedures.  
15 We could do them, ourselves.

16 Q Is that a Construction procedure?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Last page, "Charles and Art were changed."  
19 That reference is to the transfer of Mr. Baldwin as  
20 replaced by Mr. Allum?

21 A Yes, that is what that says. I am trying  
22 to figure out what that means.

23 Q And then afterwards it is sort of a critique,  
24 he wanted to do this?

25 A I don't understand, he has lost me with his



1 notes.

2 Q "You," was he referring to you?

3 A Yes, I recommended along with Larry, we  
4 both worked pretty close together, that I thought  
5 that was one of the things that we could do to help  
6 improve communications.

7 We would need to switch some people  
8 around to help improve communications. That was,  
9 in my opinion, one of the big problems.

10 That is what that means, that is me.

11 Q What is the saying that says, "Complete,"  
12 up there; that means it has been done already?

13 A Yes, it has been done.

14 Q About that time?

15 A It had already been completed, yes.

16 Q "Ross has a lot of knowledge, move him  
17 to work on procedures; people would look upon this  
18 as being right."

19 A I guess he asked me the question as I can  
20 recall there were two blocks in the communications;  
21 people were not communicating so Larry and I  
22 recommended that we move people.

23 We had a job for it, and it was easy to  
24 switch Art and Charles because they were both  
25 knowledgeable in their respective areas, so that was

1 easy to do.

2 We did not have another supervisory job  
3 open, as I recall; but rather than have a lot of--  
4 Beau had a lot of technical knowledge, in my opinion,  
5 and my recommendation was I thought he would be  
6 good working with procedures.

7 Q Okay, what, specifically, did you have in  
8 mind?

9 A I recommended him more for Mr. Henry  
10 in the technical sense in Charlotte.

11 Q And did you communicate that to your  
12 supervision?

13 A Yes, I did.

14 Q Who did you tell; who did you suggest that  
15 to?

16 A Mr. Davison.

17 Q What did Larry Davison say to that?

18 A I guess in my communication with Larry  
19 would be he would take my recommendation generally.  
20 He would not say hey, you are crazy; he would say,  
21 "I'll take that and evaluate it."

22 That is the way our relationship is. I  
23 don't know what his reaction was the day I told him.

24 Q What did you get for feedback, if anything,  
25 from Mr. Davison about that?

1           A       I can't recall. We talked on a day to day  
2 basis, and you lose track.

3           Q       Did you say that to him in writing?

4           A       No.

5           Q       Did you do that; did you transfer Mr. Ross?

6           A       No.

7           Q       Why not?

8           A       Well, I'm trying to put the pieces together,  
9 for one thing, I don't think there were any additional  
10 supervisors available to replace him, so that was  
11 one consideration; plus it continually would have been  
12 a job that may have been different--what I want to  
13 say--it may have been a job that may not have paid  
14 as much money as what he was making based on  
15 position.

16          Q       Did anybody make that determination, to  
17 the best you recall?

18          A       If it had been done, Larry would have done  
19 it, yes.

20          Q       Did you talk to Mr. Ross about this?

21          A       No.

22          Q       Do you know whether he understood this  
23 recommendation?

24          A       I don't think he knew anything about it.

25          Q       And why has the comment, "Their people

1 would look upon this as being right," that proposal  
2 about Mr. Ross--

3 A Well, people in his crew were saying Beau  
4 was very knowledgeable of procedures, and we needed  
5 to harness or use that energy.

6 He does on procedures much better, and  
7 they kind of thought he really should have Charles'  
8 job; but as far as technical knowledge, the best  
9 place for the technical knowledge would be in the QA  
10 Technical Services Group.

11 Q Why wasn't Mr. Ross given Charles Baldwin's  
12 position?

13 A It was a lateral transfer between Charles  
14 and Art, so it was not a position open there. It was  
15 just a lateral transfer; it is not a position.

16 Q Was he considered for that position?

17 A No, because it was a lateral transfer of  
18 people and not a promotion for either one of the  
19 people.

20 Q There was no need to consider anybody?

21 A Mr. Allum was not involved in supervising  
22 Welding Inspectors at all. The problem was perceived  
23 as a problem with Mr. Baldwin in terms of  
24 communication.

25 You are going to move Mr. Baldwin some

1 place out, and Allum was not in the picture.

2 Q Why not move Mr. Baldwin some place else  
3 and promote Mr. Ross?

4 A I perceived it was more than one person  
5 communicating; it was not only Charles. It included  
6 also Beau communicating, it was two ways.

7 Q So you did not think it appropriate to  
8 promote Mr. Ross for that reason?

9 A There was no position open so it wasn't a  
10 promotion.

11 Q If Mr. Allum was not in the picture you  
12 could have put him in the position to close that?

13 A If there was no one else there we would  
14 have made up a list of qualified candidates for the  
15 position open, but in this case there was never a  
16 position open.

17 Q You never considered a promotion for Mr.  
18 Ross?

19 A No.

20 Q If there had been a position open, would  
21 Mr. Ross have been recommended?

22 A He would have been considered, yes.

23 Q Would you have recommended putting him in  
24 the position?

25 A I would have to consider all the candidates

1 since I did not get to do that analysis, I can't, in  
2 my mind, put together all the candidates.

3 He would have been one of the candidates.  
4 There would be several candidates for this project  
5 and other projects.

6 Since I didn't go through that process, I  
7 can't say he would be the one.

8 Q Let me put it in simpler terms: Beau Ross  
9 was the first to occupy the position. He supervised  
10 as many as 26 inspectors at one point, he had the  
11 experience and he had the knowledge.

12 A Yes, but when we consider someone for a  
13 promotion we don't look only at the project, we look  
14 at the entire department, and there are other people  
15 who had equal amounts of experience or maybe more.

16 Q Who?

17 A I think he worked for Mr. Sifford, and  
18 there was Mr. Bulgin, the people at McGuire and  
19 some people at Cherokee who could be considered  
20 for the job, as well as people in Engineering.

21 Q You are saying who had as much experience  
22 as he had?

23 A Experience is only one of the factors for  
24 considering a promotion.

25 Q You say Mr. Sifford had as much experience

1 and Mr. Bulgin had as much experience. What do you  
2 consider experience, the number of years he has  
3 worked in this particular field?

4 I am asking you.

5 A That is what I call experience, and I don't  
6 have access to their files so I can't say how long  
7 each one has been employed.

8 I would say there are people who have  
9 equal experience as Mr. Ross.

10 Q And they are Mr. Sifford and Mr. Bulgin?

11 A Yeah, and Deaton and Ledford and Harris;  
12 those are the other Welding Inspectors.

13 Q "Three inspectors were really stirring the  
14 pot. One has gone to Construction, don't know what  
15 to do with them."

16 Okay, the three inspectors you talked  
17 about there, is that Mr. Bryant and Mr. Rockholt?

18 A Yes.

19 Q Mr. Godfrey?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Mr. Godfrey is the one who had gone back  
22 to Construction?

23 A Yes.

24 Q "Have some people qualified in Welding  
25 Inspection looking for a way to move into Technical



1 Support."

2 What does that mean?

3 A The welding, as best I can recall, the  
4 Welding Inspectors felt that they would like to be  
5 considered for positions that we have in Technical  
6 Support.

7 Q What general kinds of positions are you  
8 talking about, what job titles?

9 A QA Technicians, Construction Technicians,  
10 all they were saying is we want to be considered for  
11 those jobs, and I guess they were feeling like they  
12 weren't considered, and they were being considered  
13 for those jobs when we had jobs open; you just don't  
14 have jobs open everyday.

15 Q Have any Welding Inspectors moved into  
16 a Technical Support job?

17 A I would say yes.

18 Q Who?

19 A We have Welding Inspectors that worked at  
20 McGuire that have moved. When they came to Catawba,  
21 they moved into different type jobs.

22 Ray Williams used to be a Welding  
23 Inspector.

24 Q What is he doing now?

25 A He works in QA Scheduling, and then we

1 have a guy that used to be a Welding Inspector that  
2 moved into Audit, his name is Don Owens.

3 I think he used to be a Welding Inspector.

4 Q How about Tech Support?

5 A None in Tech Support, no. We really filled  
6 most of our Tech Support needs with the excess work  
7 force available at McGuire.

8 We haven't had any openings, per se,  
9 because those jobs were filled with the excess work  
10 force at McGuire.

11 Q Okay, so where else have Welding Inspectors  
12 had to move to if they were looking to progress?

13 A They could move to Senior Welding  
14 Inspector, they could move to Technician. If we had  
15 openings available, they could move to Surveillance  
16 or Audit, if we had positions available.

17 Q Have you?

18 A Have we had positions available?

19 Q In Audit?

20 A Yes, we had a position open, but we had  
21 excess work force from McGuire so all the jobs got  
22 filled from those people.

23 Q Where else could a Welding Inspector go?

24 A I don't know. He could put in a transfer  
25 request and go anywhere he wants to.

1 Q Right, with the qualifications of a Welding  
2 Inspector though?

3 A That is about it, Technician or Surveillance.

4 Q How about back to Craft Welding?

5 A He could put in a transfer request and go  
6 back if the Construction Department would honor his  
7 request and they had a need for that position.

8 Q Have they done that, has that happened?

9 A One individual, as I recall in Mr. Lee's  
10 letter, said that anyone who wanted to go back to  
11 Construction, to go back to Construction; so three  
12 people chose to go back to Construction and be  
13 welders again.

14 Q Who was that?

15 A Mr. Godfrey, and I can't think of the guy's  
16 name. One other individual went.

17 Q Okay, anyone else on Mr. Ross' crew?

18 A I don't recall whose crew it was on.

19 Q Here is a list of inspectors that filed  
20 concerns (indicating).

21 A Okay, this fellow didn't have any concerns,  
22 I do recall he didn't have any. If you had an organi-  
23 zation chart I could put my finger on his name.

24 Q I wish I had one. Three gentlemen here  
25 are just waiting to give me an organization chart.

1           A       He would not be on a current organization  
2 chart; he would be on a real old one. I just can't  
3 recall the guy's name.

4           Q       Okay, Mr. Godfrey is welding at Catawba?

5           A       That's correct; yes, sir.

6           Q       Is his work being inspected by the people  
7 who used to work with him as inspectors?

8           A       Yes, sir.

9           Q       How is he working out?

10          A       As far as I know I talked to him at the  
11 K-Mart, I guess about a couple months ago. He likes  
12 being back in welding.

13                   He lives around Rock Hill somewhere, so  
14 I see him on occasion.

15          Q       And he seems pleased being back as a  
16 welder?

17          A       Yeah, he's happy to be back welding.

18          Q       Mr. Morgan, the first level recourses that  
19 were addressed to you, you passed them on to Mr.  
20 Wells; is that correct?

21          A       Those letters were addressed to Mr. Wells,  
22 yes.

23          Q       Some were addressed to you as well?

24          A       Some addressed to me, they all went to  
25 Bill Bradley and Mr. Wells answered them.

1 Q Could I see the document that you are  
2 talking about there?

3 A Sure, there is a whole slew of them there.

4 Q Some recourse letters went to you, Mr.  
5 Morgan?

6 A That is funny, this is the other guy's name  
7 right here (indicating).

8 Q Who is that?

9 A Gene Lawing, L-A-W-I-N-G.

10 Q He did not file a recourse?

11 A No, he went back to Construction.

12 Q He is a welder?

13 A Yeah.

14 Q At Catawba?

15 A Yeah.

16 Q How is he doing?

17 A I haven't seen him since he has gone up  
18 there.

19 MR. GIBSON: He doesn't shop at  
20 K-Mart.

21 THE WITNESS: I think he lives in  
22 Mooresville or some place like that.

23

24 BY MR. GUILD:

25 Q And so the question, were the recourses

1 that went to you, they got answered by Mr. Wells?

2 A Yes, that's correct.

3 Q All right, sir; how about in January of  
4 1982, you received expressions of concern from one,  
5 two, three, four, from four Welding Inspectors; Mr.  
6 McCoy, Mr. Karriker, Mr. Godfrey and Mr. Henson.

7 A Let me see what you are talking about.

8 Q Sure (indicating).

9 A No on Mr. McCoy, yes on Mr. Karriker,  
10 yes on Mr. Godfrey, and yes on Mr. Henson.

11 Q Did you respond to those?

12 A No, sir.

13 Q What did you do?

14 A Okay, this was the time where we were  
15 collecting the concerns of the Welding Inspectors,  
16 the technical concerns, and those were forwarded to  
17 the Welding Inspector Task Force.

18 That is what I'm saying, only a few came  
19 to me. I think some are addressed to Larry or  
20 Bill Bradley.

21 Those are part of the concerns. Some of  
22 them typed them out and some did them in longhand.

23 Q Those four referred to the Task Force?

24 A Yes.

25 Q Who did you send them to, specifically?

1 A That would be W. H. Bradley.

2 Q And Mr. Bradley, he was in charge of the  
3 non-technical concerns?

4 A Mr. Bradley was in charge of the, okay,  
5 maybe he wasn't--Mr. Bradley was in charge of--I  
6 take that back.

7 Q Coordinator?

8 A Correct the Record, Mr. Bradley was in  
9 charge of coordinating the implementation of the Task  
10 Force recommendations; correct.

11 He had other responsibilities; he was the  
12 Personnel administrative man at the time. I feel  
13 sure those went to him.

14 MR. GIBSON: The timing was off,  
15 he was on Personnel function during that  
16 time, I believe, and at a couple other  
17 points he took on those duties.

18 THE WITNESS: Yeah, he had both at  
19 the time. Mr. Alexander came over and  
20 they switched jobs.

21  
22 BY MR. GUILD:

23 Q Your understanding was Mr. Bradley was  
24 receiving Welding Inspector concerns?

25 A Yes, I guess.



1 Q And the ones you got you sent to him?

2 A That's correct.

3 Q Okay, and you received a later technical  
4 concern from Mr. Bryant, did you not? Let me show  
5 you a handwritten document (indicating).

6 It appears to be 7/19/82?

7 A Yes, sir; that's correct. Okay, I received that document 7/19/82.

9 Q And July 28, 1982, a memo from you to  
10 Mr. Bryant (indicating). Does that reflect your  
11 resolution of that concern?

12 A Yes, we asked him to handle this. If there  
13 was a cause for recourse that was a quality recourse,  
14 that was a new procedure and--let me read the letter  
15 first.

16 Q Sure.

17 A Okay.

18 Q Yes, go ahead.

19 A Where was I?

20 Q You said you asked Mr. Bryant.

21 A Yeah, to initiate a quality recourse on it  
22 so I could answer him formally.

23 Q That was the new procedure?

24 A Yes, quality recourse; and then I looked  
25 into his concern and this is the response I gave him.

1 Q Are you aware of any other uses of that,  
2 the Quality Recourse Procedure?

3 A Well, since I am no longer in the flow as  
4 the project Quality Assurance Engineer, I would not  
5 be privileged to know that information.

6 Q Do you know of any more?

7 A I can't recall, there are very few. I am  
8 saying this maybe the only one.

9 Q Maybe the only one?

10 A Yeah, as far as--

11 Q It is the only one you know about?

12 A I think it is the only one I have ever had  
13 to answer.

14 Q And you don't know of any others you have  
15 answered? Someone else has taken care of others?

16 A This is the only one I've ever had to  
17 answer.

18 Q All right, sir; you have been responsible  
19 for some implementation of the Welding Inspector  
20 Task Force recommendations?

21 A That's correct.

22 Q What areas have you been responsible for  
23 implementation?

24 A One thing that came out was the stickman  
25 process, which was the way we handled verbal and

1 written inquiries, verbal inquiries that maybe an  
2 inspector or technician would ask us a question, and  
3 it is handled through the supervisors.

4 The other way is we have a program set  
5 up to make sure that we have quarterly meetings with  
6 the Construction Department to help improve our  
7 relationship with them.

8 Q Quarterly meetings?

9 A Quarterly meetings with the Construction  
10 Department in various disciplines, and once a quarter  
11 we would talk about Civil related items and in another  
12 we would talk about Mechanical and Electrical, we  
13 would talk about Welding with them.

14 We would sit down and lay our cards on the  
15 table and say here is where our problems are, and  
16 they would say here is where our problems are.

17 And we would talk about that and work to  
18 resolve the problems we might have.

19 Q That was a Task Force recommendation  
20 you were responsible for?

21 A Yes, another was Procedure Comments.  
22 We were charged with making sure that we collect  
23 all the comments on procedures, make sure they go  
24 down to the First Line Supervisor to make sure that  
25 he gets the documents to comment on a procedure.

1 We are doing that and that is going real  
2 well.

3 Q What is the stick man?

4 A Stick man is a big head and a body and two  
5 arms going out. It gets the name stick man because  
6 it is a circle that gets questions and answers, and  
7 it looks like a little man.

8 Do you want me to draw you a picture?

9 Q Sure.

10 A I think that would be it (demonstrating).

11 It may be in that document you have there.

12 Q Nope, afraid not; do some work there, Mr.  
13 Morgan.

14 A You put it in a comical sense, we have  
15 the question arises and this is the flow (demonstrating).

16 Q Tell me what you are pointing at.

17 A Okay, I would have to have the actual  
18 document.

19 Q The inspector has the question. You are  
20 pointing to the head?

21 A Yes, that is the question, and your flow  
22 chart comes down and you ask this person or this  
23 person (indicating).

24 Q Down to the arms?

25 A Yes, and depending on the answer you go down

1 to the next part of the process.

2 Q Down to the legs there?

3 A Yes, you go down the leg.

4 Q And whose term is that?

5 A That is not Mr. Thoreau, Mr. Davison  
6 made this observation. We will give him full credit.

7 Q He doesn't get the free credit though, the  
8 stick man--

9 A Stick man process.

10 Q We won't mark that one as the next exhibit.  
11 What else were you responsible for in the imple-  
12 mentation that comes to mind?

13 A As I recall there were two more things,  
14 one was the inspectors in M24, I saw that document  
15 laying there, you are giving me a lead.

16 I don't recall, but it was the M24 and  
17 another one was tell engineers not to make decisions  
18 that are outside their realm of responsibility.

19 Q You mean QA?

20 A QA, yeah; our QA Engineers.

21 Q Okay, what is M24?

22 A M24 is our procedure for internal cleanli-  
23 ness in piping systems. It is a procedure that  
24 specifies the acceptance criteria.

25 Q Would that have to do with rust?

1           A       Yes. If it is a carbon steel pipe it could  
2 have rust in it, possibly.

3           Q       Stainless pipe?

4           A       I would have to have the procedure to go  
5 through all the criteria. Basically, it gives the  
6 inspector the criteria for determining whether a  
7 system is clean or not at the time it fits, and they  
8 hook up in the pipe to make sure it is not violating  
9 M24.

10          Q       And you have that training together--

11          A       As I recall, I assigned that training to  
12 someone else, and it was done.

13          Q       Mr. Ross did the training?

14          A       Yes.

15          Q       He did an hour and a-half worth of training?

16          A       Yes, this is a documentation of the  
17 training. It goes on, M24 Procedure, and apparently  
18 he picked up some other concerns here because these  
19 are the references to the concerns.

20                 QA3, no, WI3, that is this one right here  
21 (indicating).

22          Q       Okay.

23          A       He got his particular, the people that were  
24 involved in that WI3 concern, and he went over the  
25 procedure with them again.

1 Q So the list of attendees there are the  
2 people who had the concerns?

3 A Well, you have to look at WI3. Apparently  
4 WI3 probably references some NCIs or something.  
5 I am not familiar with WI3, and those are the people  
6 who received the training.

7 Q Why them?

8 A Beats me, I would have to look; you would  
9 have to look in WI3 as it relates.

10 Q Right, but when you had a resolution that  
11 called for training you did not train everyone, you  
12 just trained some.

13 What I want to understand is who got  
14 trained and why?

15 A Okay, these people got trained and maybe  
16 that was all the people that were on his crew.

17 Q Was that all the people who got trained as  
18 a resolution of that recommendation?

19 A I don't recall.

20 Q Well, this is all I got, this one sheet of  
21 paper; and I guess my question is you are the one  
22 who is in charge of implementation.

23 Did that reflect, it says, "Train inspectors  
24 in purpose of M24." Is that your handwriting?

25 A No.



1 Q It says, "Inspectors have been trained."  
2 Whose handwriting is that?

3 A It is Mr. Allum's.

4 Q Okay.

5 A I don't think I can answer your question;  
6 I would have to research WI3, and I would--

7 Q I guess without you having to do that, when  
8 it says, "Train inspectors," why don't you train all  
9 inspectors?

10 Are you training the inspectors who have  
11 the concern or who did not do it right as a result  
12 of the Task Force report or what?

13 A I would say that would be the logical thing,  
14 to do those who had some difficulty or the ones that  
15 needed a refresher.

16 Q Fine, so I'm an inspector and I express  
17 some concern, and after it goes through all of this  
18 inspection detection, reflection processing, the  
19 recommendation of the Task Force is train inspectors,  
20 and what that role boils down to is train me.

21 A Well, I think it is train those as they  
22 relate to the concern. You get all the fact together  
23 and say okay, here is the problem we had with WI3;  
24 what do we need to do with WI3?

25 And apparently that is all the documents

1 on WI3 and that is who got trained.

2 Q The people who had concerns?

3 A I don't know. Some of these people did not  
4 have concerns, but apparently they must have been  
5 related to the situation.

6 Q Do we have a copy of the Volume Two there?

7 MR. GIBSON: Do you want to have  
8 him look at WI3?

9 MR. GUILD: Sure, see if he can  
10 answer that, please.

11 MR. GIBSON: All right, Mr. Morgan,  
12 has the mystery been solved?

13 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't know.  
14 Mr. Allum worked for me. He said the  
15 inspectors had been trained.

16 It is addressed to me and when we  
17 looked at that and one of the issues was  
18 an interpretation of what is heavy rust.  
19

20 BY MR. GUILD:

21 Q Heavy rust, I remember the heavy rust  
22 question.

23 A That is an area that is not black and  
24 white, it is pretty gray.

25 Q Red.

1           A       It was red or brown, so the supervisor  
2 will give the guidance as to what is acceptable or  
3 not acceptable.

4           Q       The heavy rust question?

5           A       Yeah.

6           Q       The point is why there are seven?

7           A       There are eight.

8           Q       Why those eight on the heavy rust training?

9           A       I don't know.

10                   MR. GIBSON: That is the mystery  
11 we have not been able to solve by looking  
12 at the documents during that pause.

13

14 BY MR. GUILD:

15           Q       How many Welding Inspectors are there  
16 out there, approximately 50?

17           A       No, I don't think there is 50, maybe 35.

18           Q       What about the other 28 Welding Inspectors;  
19 how do we know whether they have had appropriate  
20 training on heavy rust?

21           A       I guess the only thing, Mr. Allum signed  
22 this, action was completed and they had been trained.

23           Q       But you only had eight of them trained;  
24 are they the only ones that had problems identifying  
25 heavy rust?

1           A       I could speculate and say maybe; I just  
2 don't know.

3           Q       Everyone else could identify heavy rust  
4 when they saw it, so they didn't need more training  
5 on the subject?

6           A       I don't know.

7           Q       If you call for training you only trained  
8 the people identified as having a problem in that  
9 area?

10          A       You would take the concern and go back to  
11 the specific recommendation and see exactly what was  
12 required, yeah.

13          Q       Who required the training in that instance?

14          A       Yes.

15          Q       And in this instance it was apparently  
16 those eight that required the training if you did what  
17 you are supposed to do in terms of implementing the  
18 recommendation?

19          A       I don't know.

20          Q       It was assigned to you, Mr. Morgan. How  
21 come you didn't figure this out?

22          A       This one came back to me and said that  
23 this one was done.

24          Q       You say Mr. Allum did it?

25          A       I don't think Mr. Allum wrote his name on

1 this piece of paper. He said he did it.

2 Q That is what I mean, he signed a form  
3 saying he did it; and as far as you know that ended  
4 the matter?

5 A I'm saying as far as I was concerned I  
6 gave him that assignment, and he returned that  
7 assignment as complete.

8 Q And it didn't raise any question in your  
9 mind that you dealt with anyway, or if you did, tell  
10 me about it; but that satisfied you?

11 A Yes, now these documents went on into  
12 Mr. Bradley, and I am sure they have done them  
13 again.

14 Q You are the one under oath and sitting  
15 here now. Mr. Bradley is done gone; so as far as  
16 you know it was taken care of?

17 A It says, "Inspectors have been trained."  
18 It has been documented on this document that it was  
19 done.

20 Q That leaves me with a nagging worry, Mr.  
21 Morgan, if you have a problem that is identifying  
22 heavy rust, maybe you haven't implemented that  
23 recommendation effectively.

24 Do you have any other information that  
25 would satisfy my doubt there?

1 A No.

2 Q Do you remember inspectors expressing  
3 a concern that they needed some kind of a standard  
4 of what heavy rust was?

5 They wanted Mr. Davison or Mr. Baldwin  
6 to give them an example.

7 A Workmanship sample.

8 Q Yeah, a sample of what is heavy rust; do  
9 you remember that?

10 A No, I know what a workmanship sample is.

11 Q You did not know, you weren't aware of  
12 prior requests from Welding Inspectors to have Mr.  
13 Davison or Mr. Baldwin give them a workmanship  
14 sample of what heavy rust was like?

15 A No, sir.

16 Q Do you know whether or not Mr. Ross  
17 showed those nine inspectors a sample of heavy rust  
18 as part of his training?

19 A I don't know.

20 Q Do you know what the training consisted  
21 of?

22 A No, sir.

23 Q It took an hour and a-half according to  
24 this form; right?

25 A Yes, well, he covers more than one concern.

1 Q More than just heavy rust?

2 A Yes.

3 Q You don't know how much of that hour and  
4 a-half was heavy rust?

5 A No, sir.

6 Q Where did they do the training?

7 A I have no idea.

8 Q All right, sir; I am not trying to trick  
9 you now. It says, "Catawba Meeting Building."

10 A Okay, at the Catawba Meeting Building,  
11 that is where it was.

12 Q Where is that?

13 A That is the name of the building, it is  
14 like an auditorium. That is the name of the facility,  
15 they call it the Meeting Building.

16 That was about--it probably holds about  
17 two or three hundred people.

18 Q Do you think they might have invited two  
19 or three hundred and only the eight showed up?

20 A No, we have a problem getting a conference  
21 room at the project, and you have to get the one  
22 available; and you might have three people in a room  
23 that holds three hundred.

24 Q I've had this problem before of calling a  
25 meeting and hoping three hundred would show up and



1 finding eight.

2 Did Mr. Ross have this problem, wanting  
3 a training session for two or three hundred inspectors  
4 and only eight showed up?

5 A I have no idea.

6 Q Oh, here is the one you did (indicating).  
7 This is the one where you are going to instruct QA  
8 Personnel not to make engineering decisions.

9 You did this instruction, didn't you?  
10 That is your signature, right?

11 A Yes, I did this one.

12 Q Which recommendation is that?

13 A Will.

14 Q And you gave that instruction, right?

15 A That's correct.

16 Q Where did you give the instruction?

17 A Where did I give it?

18 Q Yeah.

19 A At Catawba. This would have been in my  
20 office or it could have been in a conference room.

21 Q How long did it take to give that  
22 instruction?

23 A One-quarter hour.

24 Q That is 15 minutes?

25 A That's correct.

1 Q It did not take long to get that message  
2 across?

3 A Apparently not.

4 Q Is that effectively training anybody?

5 A Yes.

6 Q They got the message, all right. What did  
7 you do?

8 A I instructed QA Personnel not to make  
9 engineering decisions as it related to Welding  
10 Inspection and specifically in relation to Task Force  
11 references.

12 They should be instructed they are not  
13 allowed to make engineering decisions, Number  
14 1114486.

15 Q That is an NCI number?

16 A Yeah.

17 Q This is one attached (indicating)?

18 A Okay.

19 Q So what did you do in that training there?

20 A I went over this particular NCI with them  
21 and told them in this case the Welding Inspector Task  
22 Force had determined these are the kinds of decisions  
23 that should be made by the Design Engineering Depart-  
24 ment; and in the future we would not make these types  
25 of decisions.

1 Q What did they say?

2 A I can't recall.

3 Q Did they ask any questions?

4 A I feel sure they did, but I don't recall any.

5 Q Not too many if it took 15 minutes.

6 A Well, it didn't take too long to read this  
7 particular NCI and tell them the background. One  
8 specific case should not take very long.

9 Q Did you use any instructional material be-  
10 sides that NCI?

11 A Instructional material; no, sir.

12 Q Charts, graphs, nothing like that?

13 A No, sir; I used this document that is attached.

14 Q How do you know that they were effectively  
15 instructed?

16 A How do I know they were effectively in-  
17 structed--because they were listening to me and they  
18 do what I tell them to do.

19 Q Do you give them a quiz or something  
20 afterwards?

21 A No, sir.

22 Q You just told them don't do this any more,  
23 and the meeting is adjourned, in short?

24 MR. GIBSON: Mr. Guild, he just  
25 described a moment ago exactly what he did

1 in the meeting, and you have asked him a  
2 third time.

3 MR. GUILD: Counsel, I would like  
4 him to tell me, if this is a serious subject  
5 and if this is reflective of the serious  
6 effort to address concerns, and this is one  
7 he knows about because he did it; I want  
8 him to tell me in glaring detail exactly  
9 what you did.

10 MR. GIBSON: Would you tell him  
11 again what you did in glaring detail, what  
12 you did to instruct that specific personnel?  
13

14 BY MR. GUILD:

15 Q I want you to tell me what you did in 15  
16 minutes, and I want you to tell me why that is an  
17 effective instruction that responds to that concern.

18 A I told them that they would not make  
19 engineering decisions similar to the one made on NCI  
20 1114486.

21 I went over the NCI, I read them the NCI;  
22 and I discussed and told them they could not make  
23 those types of decisions.

24 Q Period, end of discussion?

25 A I am sure there was a feedback, we did not

1 feel like it was an engineering discussion or some-  
2 thing I had to tell them we could no longer make these  
3 types of decisions.

4 This is the only case that I am aware of  
5 where we have ever made a decision like this.

6 Q What is the nature of the decision that you  
7 made that the Task Force had determined was an im-  
8 proper engineering decision?

9 A I don't understand your question.

10 Q What was the nature of the improper  
11 engineering decision?

12 A I would have to study this document to  
13 refresh myself.

14 Q Okay, please do.

15 A The situation dealt with thinness of material  
16 versus thickness of welds, and we interpreted these  
17 standards, the ASTM Standard, to mean that we had  
18 acceptable tolerances to accept the situation at hand,  
19 which was a quarter-inch plate; it is kind of like when  
20 you go to buy a two by four you don't get a two by  
21 four; your get one and a-half by three and a-half,  
22 or whatever.

23 It is the same way with a quarter-inch  
24 plate, the manufacturer of a particular product, they  
25 have rolling tolerances in which the plate could be

1 a little over or below; and in this case the Engineer-  
2 ing Department specified a weld to be one-quarter of  
3 an inch, and the plate in this particular case was not  
4 .250, it was below the tolerance but within acceptable  
5 standards, and we said that is okay, we don't make  
6 that type of decision.

7 We are engineers and we felt we could make  
8 that particular decision, and our management and the  
9 Task Force said don't.

10 We do not think you should be making those  
11 types of decisions. You should go back to the  
12 responsible department, so it was evaluated by the  
13 Task Force.

14 That is basically what it was, the fact  
15 that there were tolerances and we interpreted the  
16 case saying that is okay.

17 Q And that is the only instance in which that  
18 happened?

19 A As far as I know.

20 Q And that was the specific instruction, don't  
21 do that again?

22 A Yes, you go through this and read the  
23 situations, most of the people were already familiar  
24 with this situation because we, during the Welding  
25 Inspector Task Force they talked with the people that

1 made the decision, why do you do this; so they had  
2 gathered background information on it.

3 It was an easy task to say we could no  
4 longer make these types of decisions, we need to go  
5 back to the people making those decisions to make  
6 sure they are correct.

7 Fortunately, they found our decisions were  
8 correct. We are engineers and they are engineers,  
9 and it is just a matter of where you sit.

10 Q But it is probably a decision for Design  
11 Engineering, not QA?

12 A That's correct, not for us.

13 Q End of instruction, that is what you told  
14 them?

15 A Yes.

16 Q How do you know that was effective imple-  
17 menting in correcting the deficiencies that the Task  
18 Force identified?

19 A Because I have confidence in the people  
20 that work for me that they got the instruction and  
21 they understood not to do that any more.

22 Q And they haven't?

23 A And they haven't.

24 Q Are you sure?

25 A To the best of my knowledge.



1 Q Was this a decision as to the acceptability  
2 of the dimensions of a weld or the dimensions of a  
3 piece of plate?

4 A Apparently the base material had to be  
5 ultrasonically tested, and it was detected at that  
6 particular point that it was below the .250, so the  
7 weld was shown as being undersized.

8 Q It was an inspection of a weld, not of a  
9 piece of base material?

10 A The situation would have resulted at the  
11 inspection of a weld.

12 Q And it was the weld that was rejected?

13 A I don't think that they wrote it up as a  
14 specific weld, I think they wrote up an addition that  
15 said we have some material that could be below the  
16 tolerance quarter-inch plate, and we cannot make  
17 quarter-inch welds on it because we inspect to make  
18 sure there is actually .250 there.

19 Q Okay, are there any other Task Force  
20 recommendations that you are responsible for the  
21 implementation of?

22 A Not as far as I know, no.

23 Q Did you have any responsibility for imple-  
24 menting the recommendations of the non-technical Task  
25 Force?

A I am not familiar with the non-technical portions. If you are talking about Harassment Procedure and Quality Recourse Procedures on this, yeah.

Q I am asking you whether you know, whether you were responsible for implementing any Task Force recommendations of the Non-technical Task Force?

A No, only as it would relate to a new procedure on harassment I, myself, would have to implement with my people.

Q In that instance were you responsible for Harassment Procedures?

A Yeah, probably.

Q You have the right to say no.

A I guess I don't really understand your question.

Q You are responsible for implementing Harassment Procedures in your area of responsibility?

A That's correct.

Q As it relates to Welding Inspection?

A I have no Welding Inspectors that report to me now, and after the non-technical concerns came

out I was no longer in that particular job.

I didn't have any Welding Inspectors reporting to me.

Q Okay, how do you understand the term "harassment"?

A Harassment is a situation where I looked up the definition of harassment it says repeated questioning is harassment.

It is what you term harassment in your own mind. Each individual would consider harassment different.

You have to evaluate all the facts and the situation at hand and talk to each involved and determine whether someone was being harassed.

Q Is there a standard that relates to harassment that you understand is represented by the company's policy and practices?

A No, anyone who feels they have been harassed in any way can implement that procedure, and it will be evaluated by the Personnel Department.

Q You understand that harassment is prohibited; is that correct?

A Yes.

2 Q All right, sir; what is prohibited?

3 A What is harassment? Harassment is the  
4 determination if you think you are being harassed  
5 you should file a charge with your management to  
6 tell them that you feel you are being harassed.

7 It can be verbal abuse, physical abuse;  
8 it could be a number of things.

9 Q And your testimony is it is the subjective  
10 state of mind of an individual?

11 A Yes.

12 Q What is prohibited, if anything?

13 A Nothing is prohibited if you think you  
14 are being harassed or bothered, you go and file  
15 your charge and let somebody look at it.

16 Q Are you aware of anybody filing a charge  
17 of harassment?

18 A Yes.

19 Q How many harassment charges are you  
20 aware of?

21 A Off the top of my head I know of two.

22 Q What are those?

23 A One is not related to the Welding  
24 Inspection. Shall I go into that?

25 MR. GIBSON: Tell me about it first.

(Whereupon, the Witness and his  
Counsel conferred off the Record.)

MR. GIBSON: If he wants to go into  
them, I suggest you not give the name of  
the person in the non-welding harassment  
incident.

If he wants the facts, give them to  
him.

BY MR. GUILD:

Q Do you know the facts of the non-welding  
incident? I want to know about any harassment  
charges he knows of.

A Okay, the situation was a female employee  
who was walking through a work area, and one of  
the inspectors threw a little babycake at her  
and hit her on the buttocks, and she turned around  
and asked him why he did it, and he said, "Honey,  
I couldn't miss that big tail."

So she felt she was harassed.

Q Did she file a charge?

A She filed a charge.

Q What happened to that charge?

2 A It was investigated.

3 Q What did they determine?

4 A I think they gave the individual a viola-  
5 tion of the Rules of Conduct.

6 Q Did they determine that harassment had  
7 occurred?

8 A I'm not sure.

9 Q You just don't know?

10 A I don't know, I'm saying she felt she  
11 was being harassed. It was investigated.

12 Q What I want to know is did the company  
13 determine that was harassment, if you know?

14 A I don't know.

15 Q Who would know, who investigated that?

16 A I don't know.

17 Q Did you?

18 A No.

19 Q What was your role in it, if anything?

20 A The employee came to me and felt she  
21 had been harassed, and I told her if she felt she  
22 had been harassed, she ought to file a charge.

23 Q And she did?

24 A Yeah.

25 Q With you?

2 A Probably with Personnel.

3 Q The Employee Relations people?

4 A Yeah.

5 Q And you don't know what the resolution  
6 is?

7 A No, I'm speculating whether the guy got  
8 a violation.

9 Q You don't know whether the guy got a  
10 harassment charge in that case?

11 A No.

12 Q What was the other?

13 A An inspector wrote an NCI as it relates  
14 to a weld. I think this was part of the Welding  
15 Inspector Task Force.

16 And the inspector filed a harassment  
17 charge.

18 Q And what was that, who was that Welding  
19 Inspector?

20 A Larry Jackson.

21 Q Was harassment found in that case?

22 A I don't think so, I think it was just a  
23 confrontation.

24 Q Those are the only two incidents of  
25 harassment charges that you are aware of?



A (The Witness nodded his head affirmative-  
ly.)

Q Yes?

A I can't recall any others.

Q Has the company ever found harassment?

A I don't know, that is outside my area of  
responsibility.

Q Do you know of the company ever having  
determined that a case of harassment existed?

A I don't know, I can't answer that question.  
That is investigated by Personnel; I am not privi-  
leged to review that information, so I can't answer  
that question.

Q Answer to the best of your ability; do  
you know of any charge of harassment that was  
found to be valid by the company?

A No.

MR. GUILD: All right, thank you  
very much. That is all I have.

MR. GIBSON: I have two questions,  
Mr. Morgan.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. GIBSON:

Q With respect to WI3, the document Mr. Guild showed you regarding Mr. Allum indicating that training had been conducted for certain Welding Inspectors, do you know how a determination was made as to which inspectors would take that training or how a determination was made as to which inspectors signed the sheet that Mr. Guild showed you?

A No, I wouldn't know that.

Q Okay, finally are you aware of anything that would cause you to question whether the Catawba Nuclear Station was safely built?

A I am sorry, something fell over there.

Q Are you aware of anything that would cause you to question whether the Catawba Nuclear Station is safely built?

A No.

MR. GIBSON: Anything further, Mr. Guild?

MR. GUILD: No.

MR. GIBSON: That is all I have.  
FURTHER THE DEPONENT SAITH NOT.

(Whereupon, the Deposition was  
adjourned at 4:55 p.m.)

I, Robert A. Morgan, hereby certify that I have read and understand the foregoing transcript and believe it to be a true, accurate and complete transcript of my testimony.

Robert A. Morgan

This Deposition was signed in my presence by Robert A. Morgan on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of July, 1983.

Notary Public

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF MECKLENBURG

I, Lynn B. Gilliam, do hereby certify that the proceedings were by me reduced to machine shorthand in the presence of the Witness, afterwards transcribed upon a typewriter under my

1  
2 direction; and that the foregoing is a true and  
3 correct transcript of the proceedings.

4 I further certify that these proceed-  
5 ings were taken at the time and place in the fore-  
6 going caption specified.

7 I further certify that I am not a  
8 relative, Counsel or Attorney for either Party or  
9 otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

10 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have here-  
11 unto set my hand at Charlotte, North Carolina, on  
12 this the \_\_\_\_\_ day of July, 1983.

13  
14  
15  
16 LYNN B. GILLIAM  
Court Reporter

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 My Commission expires May 12, 1988.  
24  
25