

AFFIDAVIT OF R. W. CINK

I Ricky W. Cink, being duly sworn, say as follows:

1. I am currently employed by Houston Lighting & Power Company (HL&P) as a Senior Investigator in the South Texas Project Electric Generating Station (STPEGS) SPEAKOUT program.
2. The HL&P SPEAKOUT program is a confidential employee safety concern program. Its purpose is to identify and investigate employee nuclear safety concerns while protecting the confidentiality of the identity of the employees raising the concerns.
3. On the morning of February 20, 1992 Mr. William J. Jump, Manager-Nuclear Licensing, requested me to interview Mr. Thomas J. Saporito, Jr. concerning alleged safety concerns at STPEGS which Mr. Saporito had raised with the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). Mr. Don Bohner, to whom I report, was present at this time.
4. On the morning of February 20, 1992 I arranged an interview meeting with Mr. Saporito, scheduled for 12:30 p.m. that afternoon. At approximately 12:30 p.m. I received a phone call from Mr. Saporito. He stated that he did not wish to attend this meeting with me unless the NRC also participated, and that he was waiting for the NRC to decide whether to participate. I informed him that I would be pleased to have the NRC participate, but that if they decided not to I still needed to speak with him regarding his safety concerns.
5. At approximately 12:50 p.m. Mr. Saporito arrived at my office and informed me that he would not discuss his safety concerns with me, that he had filed a 10 CFR 2.206 petition with the NRC, and that he could not discuss specifics involved in the petition because he did not want to interfere with an official NRC investigation. He also requested a meeting with Mr. D.P. Hall, Executive Vice President-Nuclear. I explained HL&P's SPEAKOUT program to Mr. Saporito and stated that, with his permission, I would report the contents of our conversation, including his request to meet with Mr. Hall, to my management. At no time during this meeting did Mr. Saporito state that he had informed the NRC of a Technical Specification violation at STPEGS concerning work performed in the boric acid system. My notes of this meeting are attached as Exhibit A to this Affidavit.
6. I next saw Mr. Saporito at approximately 4:15 p.m. on February 20, 1992 in the elevator lobby of the Nuclear Support Center building. I was leaving to go home from work at the time. Mr. Saporito asked me to attend a meeting between him and Mr. Watt Hinson, Administrator-Investigation/ Compliance. which I did.

7. I was not aware that a meeting between Mr. Saporito and Mr. Hinson had been scheduled, nor was I aware of any question concerning Mr. Saporito's access authorization to STPEGS. I had not had any discussions with Mr. Hinson concerning Mr. Saporito.
8. Upon Mr. Saporito's request and with the agreement of Mr. Hinson, I witnessed the interview meeting between Mr. Hinson and Mr. Saporito. I did not participate in the interview. My notes of this interview are appended as Exhibits B1 and B2 to this Affidavit. Mr. Saporito requested that the interview not be videotaped, and Mr. Hinson complied with this request (Mr. Hinson also at this time asked me to witness the interview, and I agreed to do so).
9. At the beginning of the interview, Mr. Hinson asked Mr. Saporito to sign an interview consent form. Mr. Saporito voluntarily signed the form without any pressure or duress from myself or Mr. Hinson. Mr. Hinson then explained that the interview was part of an investigation related to Mr. Saporito's request for unescorted access to STPEGS and that the interview would consist of questions concerning the information Mr. Saporito had supplied on his access authorization data form and screening affidavit.
10. At no time prior to, during, or subsequent to this meeting did I inform Mr. Hinson that Mr. Saporito had raised safety concerns or filed a 2.206 petition with the NRC. I do not recall any instance in which Mr. Saporito informed Mr. Hinson that he had raised safety concerns regarding STPEGS with the NRC.
11. During the interview, Mr. Hinson provided Mr. Saporito with his access authorization data form and screening affidavit and asked Mr. Saporito to verify them and determine whether they were the same forms he had submitted for unescorted access. After reviewing both documents, Mr. Saporito confirmed that the documents were those which he submitted previously, and identified some areas where the information he provided might be inaccurate or incomplete. Mr. Hinson then asked Mr. Saporito if those items were the only ones that were inaccurate or incomplete. Mr. Saporito stated that those were the only areas that were not answered completely.
12. Mr. Hinson then asked Mr. Saporito to go through the form with him "block-by-block". After being further questioned by Mr. Hinson on each specific area of the two documents, Mr. Saporito acknowledged that:
 - a. He had been employed by ATI Career Training Center (ATI) and was terminated.

- b. He had been a complainant in a Department of Labor (DOL) proceeding against Florida Power & Light Company (FPL) and ATI and had been involved in other legal disputes.
- c. He had been employed previously as a full-time engineer at the Double Tree hotel in Miami, Florida from January - April 1990 and had been terminated "because he offered an opinion regarding the location of a pool shower."
- d. He had been employed previously as a full-time engineer at the Jupiter Hilton Hotel for three months in 1991 and was also terminated from that position.
- e. He noted various other respects in which the information he provided was inaccurate or incomplete.

He did not mentioned these items until questioned on the form "block-by-block" by Mr. Hinson.


- 13. At the conclusion of the interview, Mr. Hinson informed Mr. Saporito that the information he provided would be given to the Access Program Director, who would make a decision regarding the continuation of his unescorted access. Mr. Saporito was told to report to work according to his normal schedule and that his management would inform him of any further actions.
- 14. At no time during the interview did Mr. Saporito indicate that he was hungry, thirsty or in need of a break.
- 15. Following the interview with Mr. Saporito, I attended a discussion at which Mr. Hinson, Mr. Richard Balcom, the STPEGS Security Manager, and Mr. Jump were present. Mr. Hinson reported the results of his interview with Mr. Saporito to Mr. Balcom and Mr. Jump. The bearing of the facts obtained during the interview upon Mr. Saporito's access authorization was discussed between Mr. Hinson and Mr. Balcom. Mr. Balcom then stated that he had decided to withdraw Mr. Saporito's access authorization. During this meeting, I do not recall any discussion to the effect that Mr. Saporito had filed a 10 CFR 2.206 petition or had otherwise raised safety concerns to the NRC or HL&P. Neither Mr. Jump nor I counselled Mr. Balcom as to whether Mr. Saporito's unescorted access to STPEGS should be continued or withdrawn.
- 16. On February 21, 1992 at approximately 8:55 a.m. I attended an exit interview of Mr. Saporito conducted by Daniel P. Sanchez, Jr., Director of Maintenance at STPEGS, and Mr. D. W. Bohner, Manager-SPEAKOUT program. Exit interviews are a normal practice at STPEGS and provide exiting employees an opportunity to raise any

safety concerns the employee may have concerning STPEGS. Mr. Saporito refused to describe specific safety concerns unless several additional individuals were called to attend, including the HL&P Vice President-Nuclear, the STPEGS QA Manager, and several others. Mr. Bohner informed Mr. Saporito that this was not standard practice, that the individuals already present were there to record and investigate his concerns, and that this demand would not be met. Mr. Sanchez informed Mr. Saporito that his unescorted access had been revoked by the STPEGS Security Department and that following standard practice, he was released from STPEGS to his representing company, Sun Technical Services. Mr. Sanchez further notified Mr. Saporito of his right to appeal this decision and informed Mr. Saporito that the exiting process included Mr. Saporito receiving a Whole Body Count at STPEGS's Central Processing Facility. In response to a query by Mr. Saporito, Mr. Sanchez informed him that he did not know why Mr. Saporito's site access had been revoked. In response to a request for a written explanation of the reasons for the revocation of his site access, Mr. Sanchez informed Mr. Saporito that he should ask the STPEGS Security department for that information. My notes of this interview are attached as Exhibit C to this Affidavit.

17. The February 21, 1992 interview concluded at approximately 11:00 a.m. I then followed Mr. Saporito to his car. I asked Mr. Saporito to accompany me to my office so that we could arrange for him to go through out processing, including receiving a whole body count. Mr. Saporito agreed to do so, and came to my office. At about 11:15 a.m., I called D. Bohner to arrange an escort to take Mr. Saporito through outprocessing, and Mr. Bohner agreed to arrange it. After about 15 minutes, I called Mr. Bohner again to ask where the escort was, and Mr. Bohner said that Mr. Sanchez was arranging one. Shortly thereafter, at approximately 11:30 p.m. Mr. Saporito said that he was going to lunch, and that he would leave if there was no escort to take him through outprocessing by the time he was through with lunch. I followed Mr. Saporito to the cafeteria. At approximately 11:45 a.m., he abruptly finished lunch and exited the station. When I returned to my office at about 11:45 or 11:50 a.m., Mr. Sanchez was waiting there with a foreman to escort Mr. Saporito through outprocessing.
18. On February 27, at approximately 12:00 noon, I received a telephone call from Mr. Saporito, who said he needed to meet with me. He arrived at the STPEGS site and we met at approximately 12:30 p.m. At that time, he presented me with a list of financial and other demands, and told me that if these demands were met, he would drop his labor complaint and would not participate in any activities with the news media. He also requested a

meeting with the Director, Quality Assurance. I told Mr. Saporito that I would pass on his demands to STPEGS management, and that I would try to arrange the requested meeting. I then informed Mr. Saporito that he really needed to get his whole body count and go through outprocessing, and accompanied him to the Central Processing Facility, where he did so.


19. I arranged the meeting that Mr. Saporito requested. The meeting commenced at approximately 2:00 p.m. on February 27, 1992, with Messrs. R. J. Rehkugler, Director, Quality Assurance, R. A. DeLong, Division Manager, Instrumentation and Control (I&C) Maintenance, Mr. Saporito, and myself present. My notes of this meeting are attached as Exhibit D to this Affidavit. During the meeting, Mr. Saporito raised various concerns regarding alleged inadequacies of STPEGS work processes and procedures, and procedural and Technical Specification violations. Mr. Saporito stated that he had no specific examples of instances in which operation of STPEGS was unsafe or operational Technical Specifications were violated.


Ricky W. Cink
SPEAROUT Investigator

STATE OF TEXAS)
)
)

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a Notary Public in and for the State of Texas this 2nd day of April, 1992




Minnie Gonzales
Notary Public in and for
the State of Texas

Houston Lighting & Power Company

Exhibit A to
Affidavit of
R. W. Cink

OFFICE MEMORANDUM

To W.J. Jump

February 25, 1992

From R.W. Cink *RWC*

Subject 10CFR2.206 Petitioner First Contact

Per your request, on 02-20-92, I scheduled an interview with the 10CFR2.206 Petitioner who recently registered problems relating to Security, Technical Specifications, and Work Process/Procedures. I scheduled the interview through P. Travis, I&C Technical Supervisor, at approximately 10:45 A.M., with a request to Travis that I interview the individual at 12:30 P.M. Travis called back to indicate that the individual had been informed that he was to meet me at 12:30 P.M.

At 12:30 P.M., I received a phone call from the individual. The individual indicated that he was currently at the NRC Sr. Resident Inspector's Office awaiting a phone call from the NRC Region IV office. He indicated that he did not wish to attend this meeting with me unless the NRC participated also. He was waiting for a phone call from the Region to ascertain their position on allowing the NRC to participate in the meeting. I informed the individual that I would wait to hear from him.

I then told the individual that even if the NRC did not wish to participate in the meeting that I still needed to speak with him. He then indicated that he was hesitant about speaking with me after he had read one of the recent concern postings relating to an individual (contractor) who claimed that he had been terminated for registering problems with SPEAKOUT. I then informed him that I was aware of that particular case and that I wished to speak with him to clear up any misconceptions about the case.

At approximately 12:50 P.M., the individual arrived at my office (NSC, Room 4215). He immediately informed me that the NRC would not participate in the meeting. He then indicated he had filed a 10CFR2.206 Petition and that he could not discuss specifics involved in the Petition because he did not want to interfere with an official NRC investigation.

I then explained the concern posting that he had reservations about. I then explained that I wanted to investigate the issues identified in the Petition but could not because the issues were too generic in nature. Once again he reiterated that he could not provide specific information regarding the issues for fear of interfering with an official NRC investigation.

He then indicated that the problems identified in the Petition were still occurring today. He commented that he would volunteer to meet with Mr. Hall and discuss the issues but felt that he (Mr. Hall) would not discuss the issues because he (the individual) had, through someone within the NRC, requested Mr. Hall to be present when he met with the NRC to discuss the issues. He then indicated that he was in the process of writing a letter to Mr. Don Jordan, and informing him of his problems. The individual indicated that he was disturbed because Mr. Hall had not taken any action related to the Petition.

4-92-003

6 25

Houston Lighting & Power Company

OFFICE MEMORANDUM

To W.J. Jump

February 25, 1992
Page 2

From R.W. Cink

Subject 10CFR2.206 Petitioner First Contact

I inquired as to what action the individual expected Mr. Hall to implement. The individual indicated that he expected Mr. Hall to implement the requests found on his petition. I then asked the individual if he really expected Mr. Hall to implement the requests based on the brief information supplied on the Petition. He then indicated that the Palo Verde Plant directed a Maintenance "Stand Down" with even less information than identified on his Petition.

The conversation was then concluded with the individual indicating that he would not send the letter to Mr. Jordan until he heard back from me regarding his request to meet with Mr. Hall. I then told the individual, with his "permission", that I would report the contents of our conversation, including his request to meet with Mr. Hall, to my management. The interview was completed with the individual at approximately 1:30 P.M.

RWC/jkf

cc: SPEAKOUT Concern #12266

Houston Lighting & Power Company

Exhibit B1 to

Affidavit of

R. W. Cink

OFFICE MEMORANDUM

To NSD File #92-1271

February 21, 1992

From J. W. Hinson/R. W. Cink

Subject Adjudication: Thomas J. Saporito

On February 20, 1992 an interview was conducted with Saporito by J. W. Hinson and witnessed by R. W. Cink. This interview commenced at about 1615 and concluded at about 1730. The interview was conducted in the interview room of the Nuclear Security Department Investigations Section.

Prior to commencing the interview Hinson explained to Saporito that the interview was part of an adjudication investigation regarding his request for unescorted access to the STPEGS and that the interview would consist of questions concerning the information he had supplied on his data form and screening affidavit. Saporito did sign a Preliminary Interview Form.

During the interview Saporito was provided the data form and screening affidavit from his nuclear file and was asked to verify that they were the same forms as he submitted for unescorted access. After reviewing the two forms he stated that they were the same forms that he had submitted for unescorted access.

Saporito was asked to review both forms and determine if any of the requested information had not been answered completely. After his review he stated:

- o He was not sure if he had provided the correct dates for his employment at RCA. (data form)
- o He was not sure if he had been denied access at FPL. He had been injured while repairing his house and was prescribed a muscle relaxer. Upon notifying his supervisor FPL had him remain in training for awhile, during which his access may have been suspended or denied, but he was not sure. (data form)
- o Prior to his listed previous address in Glendale, Arizona he had resided for about one month in Avondale, Arizona. (data form)
- o He was not sure if he had answered Questions #2 & 3 completely in light of his information about the muscle relaxer. (affidavit)
- o He was not sure if he had answered Question #6 correctly, but had indicated on Question #4 that he had been arrested and the charges were dismissed. (affidavit)

Having provided the above information, Saporito stated those were the only areas on either of the two forms that were not answered completely.

4-92-003

96
8 25

Huston Lighting & Power Company

OFFICE MEMORANDUM

To NSD File #92-1271

February 21, 1992

Page 2

From J. W. Hinson/R. W. Cink

Subject Adjudication: Thomas J. Saporito

Hinson then interviewed Saporito over each specific area of the two forms. During this review Saporito indicated:

Employment Area

He was employed by ATI in Miami, Florida for about three months as a part time electronics instructor. He could not remember the name of his supervisor. He was terminated from ATI because they were concerned about becoming involved in the litigation he had initiated against FPL through the DOL and ASLB.

He was employed by the Doubletree Hotel in Miami, Florida from about January, 1990 to April, 1990 as a full time chief engineer. His supervisor was Tom Goodwin, General Manager. He was terminated from the hotel because he offered an opinion regarding the location of a pool shower. No specific reason was given to him as to why he was being terminated.

He was employed by the Jupiter Hilton Hotel in Jupiter, Florida for about three months in 1991 as a full time engineer. He reported to the chief engineer, but could not remember his name. He was terminated because he could not work a day shift.

He stated the reason he did not provide the above employers on the data form was because these jobs were not full time, even though he did put in forty hours per week. He indicated he did not accept the jobs with the idea of remaining at them forever. He stated when he was completing the data form he copied from his resume, which did not list these jobs. He stated he understood the data form was requesting all jobs for the past five years.

General Information - Litigation, Legal Dispute, Claim Area

He stated he was a complainant in a DOL proceeding against FPL and ATI, which is still pending appeal. He stated his understanding was this proceeding was not a lawsuit, but an Administrative Law Hearing.

He stated he filed a complaint against FPL in 1989 or 1990 with the ASLB regarding their license to operate the Turkey Point Nuclear Plant. He stated he is not sure of the status of this complaint.

He stated he was involved in a divorce in 1991.

Houston Lighting & Power Company

OFFICE MEMORANDUM

To NSD File #92-1271

From J. W. Hinson/R. W. Cink

Subject Adjudication: Thomas J. Saporito

February 21, 1992
Page 3

He stated his daughter was injured at a neighbors house and, while he did retain an attorney, he was not sure if a lawsuit was actually filed. He indicated he received a settlement.

He stated he did not indicate the above information on the data form, because he did not believe they were litigations.

General Information - Unescorted Access Suspension/Denial Area

He stated while employed at Turkey Point he began to experience chest pains. He was examined by three physicians who diagnosed his condition as severe gastritis. He was prescribed Zantex, a stomach medication.

He stated upon reporting this to his FPL supervisor he was sent to a company physician, Dr. Dolsey, for examination. He stated he requested an IBEW steward accompany him during the exam. He stated Dolsey became upset during the exam and reported to FPL that he was not cooperating. He was returned to the plant where he was questioned for three days regarding information he had provided to the NRC. He stated he was told that security had pulled his badge, but he does not know if they suspended/denied his access. He was told that he could not go into the plant, but not because of a FFD violation.

He did not indicate this information because he was not sure it was a FFD issue.

Organization Membership Area

He indicated he was a board member of the Nuclear Energy Accountability Project for about one year.

He stated he did not provide information for this area because he missed it. He did state that he is not sure if the project organization was a social, civic, fraternal, or honorary organization.

Previous Address Area

He stated for about one month in September, 1991 he resided at the [REDACTED] Avondale, Arizona.

Saporito stated the only areas on the screening affidavit he did not answer completely were those areas also addressed by the information he provided regarding the data form.

Houston Lighting & Power Company

OFFICE MEMORANDUM

To NSD File #92-1271

From J. W. Hinson/R. W. Cink

Subject Adjudication: Thomas J. Saporito

February 21, 1992
Page 4

At the conclusion of the interview Saporito was informed that the information he provided would be given to the Access Program Director, who would make a decision regarding the continuation of his unescorted access. Saporito was told to report to work according to his normal schedule and his management would inform him of any further actions.

JWH/jwh

PRELIMINARY INTERVIEW FORM


SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT

The Houston Lighting & Power Company (HL&P) desires to interview you relative to an official investigation it is conducting. In that regard, HL&P expects your full and complete cooperation in the investigation. Any refusal or failure by you to cooperate fully in the investigation may result in your discharge from the employ of HL&P. Failure to cooperate on your part may include but not be limited to:

- 1) Your not answering truthfully any question asked of you.
- 2) Your not telling the complete truth.
- 3) Your withholding any facts material to this investigation.
- 4) If a subsequent appointment is scheduled for future interview, your failure to keep that appointment.
- 5) Your failure to respond truthfully to a polygraph examination conducted in accordance with the Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988.
- 6) Your discussing this interview with other employees.

Nothing herein is in any way intended to restrict you from presenting information or concerns regarding nuclear quality or safety to the NRC or any other regulatory authority, SPEAKOUT, or any other person.

I have read and I understand the above.



Signature

02-20-92

Date



Witness

CONTRACTOR / VENDOR / UTILITY DATA FORM

(For Unescorted Access Authorization)

YOU MUST COMPLETE THIS FORM CAREFULLY, COMPLETELY, IN YOUR OWN HANDWRITING, AND IN BLACK INK. Please do NOT abbreviate. Failure to do so may result in a delay or possible rejection.

PERSONAL:

NAME		LAST	FIRST	MIDDLE	SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER	
		<i>Saporito Thomas J</i>			[REDACTED]	
ALIASES OR OTHER NAMES PREVIOUSLY USED (EXAMPLE: MAIDEN NAME), ALONG WITH DATES USED.					SEX	
					(M) F	
PRESENT ADDRESS			CITY	STATE	ZIP	
[REDACTED]			[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	
TELEPHONE NUMBER	ARE YOU A CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES?			IF NO, PLEASE LIST:		
[REDACTED]	YES (YES) NO			COUNTRY <i>U.S.A.</i>		
CONTRACTOR/VENDOR/UTILITY		ADDRESS				
<i>SUN TECHNICAL SERVICES</i>		<i>27285 Las Ramblas, Suite 280</i>				
<i>MR. Rich DeLong</i>		<i>Mission Viejo, CA 92691</i>				
BIRTHDATE		PLACE OF BIRTH				
[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]				
DRIVER'S LICENSE NUMBER		STATE		EXPIRATION DATE		
[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]		

PERSONAL REFERENCES:

LIST FOUR PERSONS WHO WILL VOUCH FOR YOUR CHARACTER AND WHO HAVE KNOWN YOU WELL FOR AT LEAST FIVE YEARS. DO NOT INCLUDE RELATIVES OR FORMER EMPLOYERS. ALL REFERENCES LISTED MUST COVER THE PRECEDING FIVE YEAR PERIOD.

NAME	ADDRESS	OCCUPATION	PHONE
1. <i>OSCAR De MIRANDA</i>	<i>101 Marietta St. NW Atlanta, GA 30323</i>	<i>NRC COORDINATOR</i>	DAY <i>404-331-4193</i> NIGHT
2. <i>Billie GARDE</i>	<i>101 E. College Ave Appleton, WI 54911</i>	<i>ATTORNEY</i>	DAY <i>414-234-5111</i> NIGHT
3. <i>Ms. SABARA</i>	[REDACTED]	<i>housewife</i>	DAY [REDACTED] NIGHT
4. <i>MS. B. [REDACTED]</i>	[REDACTED]	<i>housewife</i>	DAY [REDACTED] NIGHT

4-92-003

13 25

EDUCATION: YOU MUST LIST EVERY HIGH SCHOOL, TRADE SCHOOL, BUSINESS SCHOOL, COLLEGE AND OTHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS. LIST ONLY DEGREES ACTUALLY RECEIVED AND GRADES SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED.

SCHOOL	NAME AND LOCATION	ATTENDED		GRAD? YES/NO OR LAST GRD. COMP.	MAIN SUBJECTS OF STUDY
		FROM YEAR	TO YEAR		
GRADE	EDISON - W. Mifflin, PA	1964	1968	8	
HIGH	NORTH High - W. Mifflin, PA	1968	1971	12 YES	collego. prep.
BUSINESS					
TRADE	Penn Tech - Pittsburgh, PA	1971	1973	2 YES	Electronics
OTHER					
(HIGH SCHOOL GED EQUIVALENCY)	YES NO	WHEN _____		WHERE _____	

COLLEGE LEVEL INFORMATION ONLY

LEVEL	NAME AND LOCATION	ATTENDED		GRAD? YES OR NO	DEGREE REC'D AND MAJOR
		FROM	TO		
UNDER GRADUATE (ASSOC., BACH., TECH.)	N/A				
GRADUATE					

IF YOU HAVE OBTAINED HOURS OR CREDITS TOWARD A DEGREE NOT YET COMPLETED, PLEASE GIVE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

NUMBER OF HOURS/CREDITS COMPLETED N/A NUMBER OF HOURS REQUIRED FOR DEGREE N/A

EMPLOYMENT: YOU MUST LIST EVERY JOB FOR THE PAST FIVE YEARS. START WITH YOUR PRESENT OR MOST RECENT JOB PLEASE INDICATE ALL PERIODS OF UNEMPLOYMENT, IF NECESSARY, ATTACH ADDITIONAL SHEETS OF PAPER AND NOTE THAT YOU HAVE DONE SO. _____ ADDITIONAL SHEET(S) ARE ATTACHED.

FROM MO YR	TO MO YR	NAME AND COMPLETE ADDRESS OF COMPANY	LIST: (1) TITLE (2) REASON FOR LEAVING
9-91	12-91	Atlanta Group - 5426 Robin Hood Rd NORFOLK, VA 23513 - Pak Leads NSC & BG	1 Instrument Control Tech 2 Reduction in Force
1-89	9-91	AIRFLOW Service Corp - 1252 Sioux St Jupiter, Florida	1 OWNER OPERATOR 2 UNSTABLE INCOME
3-82	1-89	FLORIDA Power & Light Co - Miami, Florida	1 Instrument Control Tech 2 Employment Terminated
1-77	3-82	B.C.A. Corporation - Palm Beach Gardens Florida	1 Instrument Control - Electronics 2 Better Job
1-92	Present	Sea Technical - Mission Viejo, CA STP Plant - Host Lighting & Power	1 Instrument Control Tech 2 New hire
			1 2

MILITARY EXPERIENCE:

BRANCH OF SERVICE N/A DATES OF SERVICE FROM _____ TO _____

REASON FOR DISCHARGE _____ DISCHARGE TYPE _____ LAST RANK _____

TRAINING RECEIVED AND DUTIES PERFORMED WHILE IN THE MILITARY SERVICE _____

ARE YOU NOW A MEMBER OF THE ACTIVE RESERVE OR NATIONAL GUARD? 96

BRANCH OF SERVICE _____ DATES OF SERVICE FROM 14 25

4-92-003

ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP:

LIST SOCIAL, CIVIC, FRATERNAL, AND HONORARY ORGANIZATIONS. INDICATE WHETHER YOU ARE A PAST OR PRESENT MEMBER, LENGTH OF MEMBERSHIP, AND ANY OFFICE HELD. (YOU NEED NOT INCLUDE ANY ORGANIZATION WHICH MIGHT EITHER DIRECTLY OR BY IMPLICATION INDICATE YOUR RACE, RELIGION, NATIONAL ORIGIN OR SEX.)

CONVICTION RECORD:

HAVE YOU EVER BEEN CONVICTED, PLED GUILTY, RECEIVED DEFERRED ADJUDICATION, OR HAD A CONVICTION SET ASIDE IN A CRIMINAL MATTER (INCLUDING DWI OR TRAFFIC OFFENSE OTHER THAN NON-INJURY TRAFFIC OR PARKING)? IF YES, EXPLAIN ALL OCCURRENCES IN DETAIL:

NO

GENERAL INFORMATION:

HAVE YOU EVER BEEN REFUSED A BOND OR HAD ONE CANCELLED? NO

LIST ANY LITIGATION, LEGAL DISPUTE OR CLAIM IN WHICH YOU HAVE BEEN INVOLVED (LAWSUITS OR CLAIMS AGAINST ANY PERSON OR CORPORATION) AND DISPOSITION OF SAME:

NONE

HAVE YOU EVER BEEN DISCHARGED OR ASKED TO RESIGN BY A PREVIOUS EMPLOYER? Yes

IF SO, LIST EMPLOYER, DATE AND CIRCUMSTANCES: Florida Power & Light Co -

12-22-88 - Terminated because of my participation in a NCR investigation of Turnley Point.

HAVE YOU EVER BEEN SUBJECT TO A PLAN FOR TREATING SUBSTANCE ABUSE (EXCLUDES SELF-REFERRAL) OR HAD UNESCORTED ACCESS SUSPENDED OR DENIED FOR VIOLATION OF A FITNESS FOR DUTY POLICY? NO

IF SO, PROVIDE COMPLETE DETAILS.

PLEASE PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION ABOUT ALL PLACES YOU HAVE RESIDED FOR THE PAST FIVE YEARS, BEGINNING WITH YOUR PRESENT ADDRESS. ALL PERIODS OF TIME MUST BE ACCOUNTED FOR, AND ALL MULTIPLE RESIDENCES MUST BE LISTED.

FROM - TO	STREET ADDRESS	COUNTY	CITY	STATE/ZIP
10/91 - Present	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
1/77 - 10/91	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

I CERTIFY THAT ALL INFORMATION PROVIDED ON THIS DATA FORM IS CORRECT, AND I UNDERSTAND THAT ANY MISSTATEMENT, MISREPRESENTATION OR OMISSION MAY CONSTITUTE CAUSE FOR ACCESS DENIAL.

DATE 01-02-92
4-92-003

SIGNATURE

[Signature]

96
25

STP 611 (01/90)				SOUTHERN TEXAS PROJECT ELECTRIC GENERATING STATION		DATE	
SCREENING AFFIDAVIT							
LAST NAME (TYPE OR PRINT)		FIRST	MIDDLE	MAIDEN	HOME PHONE NO.		
SAPARITO		Thomas	J		[REDACTED]		
EMPLOYER	DATE OF BIRTH	SOCIAL SECURITY NO.	DRIVERS LICENSE NO.		STATE & EXPIRATION DATE		
SUN TECHNICAL	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]		

1. Have you ever been granted unescorted access to any other nuclear facility? ☒ yes ☐ no
2. Have you ever had a security clearance denied or revoked? ☐ yes ☒ no
3. Have you ever been subject to a plan for treating substance abuse (excludes self-referral) or had unescorted access suspended or denied for violation of a fitness for duty policy? ☐ yes ☒ no
4. Have you ever been arrested, indicted, or charged for violating any law, regulation or ordinance? ☒ yes ☐ no
5. Are you currently charged with, under indictment or pending trial on any matter? ☐ yes ☒ no
6. Have you ever been convicted, pled guilty, received deferred adjudication, or had a conviction set aside in any matter? ☐ yes ☒ no
7. Have you ever been charged with Driving While Intoxicated or Driving Under the Influence? ☐ yes ☒ no
8. Have you ever been refused a bond or had one cancelled? ☐ yes ☒ no
9. Have you ever been fired, discharged or asked to resign by a previous employer? ☒ yes ☐ no
10. Have you ever been a defendant in a court martial proceeding while in the military service? ☐ yes ☒ no
11. Have you ever, in the past, tested positive for drugs or use of alcohol resulting in on-duty impairment? ☐ yes ☒ no
12. Have you ever received treatment for alcohol abuse? ☐ yes ☒ no
13. Have you ever received treatment for drug abuse? ☐ yes ☒ no
14. Have you ever been treated for mental, emotional or adjustment problems? ☐ yes ☒ no
15. Have you ever been associated with any organization or combination of persons which you knew advocated the overthrow of any government? ☐ yes ☒ no
16. Have you ever committed or attempted to commit, or willingly aided or abetted another who committed or attempted to commit acts of violent or unlawful protest against the use of nuclear energy by public utilities? ☐ yes ☒ no
17. Have you ever participated in the publication of written material encouraging others to violently or unlawfully protest the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes? ☐ yes ☒ no
18. Is there anything in your background not mentioned above which may affect your ability to be granted access to a nuclear plant or anything which may require further explanation? ☐ yes ☒ no

IF YOU ANSWERED "YES" TO ANY OF THESE QUESTIONS, PLEASE REFERENCE THE QUESTION NUMBER AND PROVIDE COMPLETE DETAILS ON THE REVERSE SIDE

Question #


Complete Details

1. Palo Verde nuclear generating station - Phoenix, AZ
St. Lucie nuclear plant - Ft. Pierce, FL
Turkey Point nuclear plant - Miami, FL

4.

9. Employment with Florida Power & Light - Turkey Point plant terminated as a direct result of my participation in a N.R.C. investigation of the Turkey Point nuclear plant.

I understand that any misstatement, misrepresentation, or omission on any documentation used to process unescorted access will constitute cause for denial of access at any time.

 01-13-92
Applicant Signature / Date

Informed applicant to report all arrests by law enforcement agencies, including DWI or offenses other than non-injury traffic or parking, to the Nuclear Security Department within 72 hours of the arrest

Andrew Woods 1/13/92
Security Representative / Date

Houston Lighting & Power Company

Exhibit B2 to
Affidavit of
R.W. Cink

OFFICE MEMORANDUM

To W.J. Jump

February 25, 1992

From R.W. Cink *RWC*

Subject 10CFR2.206 Petitioner Second Contact

At approximately 4:15 P.M. on 02/20/92, as I exited the elevators on the first floor of the NSC, I met the Petitioner. The individual had a yellow "sticky" note that identified J.W. Hinson, Administrator Investigations and Compliance, and his (Hinson's) room number. The individual asked if I knew what Hinson wanted to speak to him about. I informed him that I did not know the purpose of Hinson's request. He then asked if the meeting with Hinson related in any way to our conversation earlier that day. I informed him that I had no idea.

I then escorted the individual to Hinson's office. After introductions in the aisleway outside of Hinson's office, Hinson asked the individual to proceed to the NSD Interview Room (Room No. 4104). At this time, the individual asked if I would witness the conversation, of which Hinson agreed. In the Interview Room, Hinson explained that the interview was part of an adjudication investigation related to the individual's station unescorted access. Before finishing the introduction, the individual recognized the camera installed in the room and asked Hinson if it was turned on. Hinson indicated that it was turned on and it is the normal practice to utilize the camera for interviews.

The individual insisted that the camera be turned off. Hinson told the individual that he (Hinson) would have to get authorization before he could turn the camera off. Hinson then exited the room to apparently get authorization from R. Balcom, Manager, NSD. Approximately 30 seconds later I exited the room to attempt to contact R. Stauber, SPEAKOUT Investigator, and inform him that I would be a few minutes. (NOTE: I rode to work with Stauber that morning. When I met the individual on the first floor at 4:15 P.M., Stauber and myself were leaving for the day.) While out of the Interview Room, I met Hinson, who indicated that he could not find Balcom and that he had made the decision to turn off the camera. He then indicated that he wanted me to witness the interview also, and subsequently informed the individual of this request. The interview was completed at approximately 5:50 P.M.

RWC/jkf

cc: SPEAKOUT Concern #12266

Houston Lighting & Power Company

Exhibit C to
Affidavit of
R. W. Cink

OFFICE MEMORANDUM

To SPEAKOUT Concern File No. 12266
From R.W. Cink *RWC*

March 6, 1992

Subject 10CFR2.206 Petitioner Separation Interview (Third Contact)

On 02/21/92, I was contacted by D. Bohner, Manager, SPEAKOUT Program, and informed that the Petitioner had called for me. Bohner indicated that the Petitioner was in the NRC Office and requested my presence. Bohner requested that I ask the individual if he would be willing to participate in an employee separation interview. I then proceeded to the NRC office. I told the individual that it was his right to participate in an Employee Separation Interview and that an interview had already been arranged if he wished to participate. He then inquired as to who would participate. I then informed him that D. Bohner, (acting as designee for T. Jordan, General Manager, Nuclear Assurance), and D. Sanchez, (acting as designee for J. Sharpe, Manager, Maintenance), would participate. He then indicated that he wanted me to participate in the interview. I told him that I did not have a problem with his request if Bohner and Sanchez did not.

The interview began at approximately 8:55 A.M. Present were Bohner, Sanchez, the Petitioner, and myself. The following are topics that I recall from the interview:

Sanchez began the interview by explaining the Separation Interview policy. He also explained that in accordance with IP-7.2Q the Petitioner has the right to appeal the revoking of his access within 15 days. The Petitioner asked Sanchez what the reason was for his denial of access. Sanchez explained that he did not know the specific reason. Later in the interview the Petitioner "officially" requested that he be informed in writing of the reason for the revoking of his access and that the 15 day appeal time not begin until he receives the written reason.

Sanchez explained that he had the right to interview with SPEAKOUT if he wished.

The Petitioner then requested that his tools and personal belongings be brought to him and explained where they were located in the I&C Shop.

The Petitioner then indicated that he will pursue his termination through the Department of Labor under 42USC5851 and explained his rights under this law. He then explained that the access related interview of the day before was a violation of the "Act" and that the subsequent revoking of access was also a violation of the Act. Later during the interview he indicated that he felt his access was denied to keep him from identifying more violations of NRC requirements.

Houston Lighting & Power Company

OFFICE MEMORANDUM

To SPEAKOUT Concern File No. 12266

March 6, 1992
Page 2

From R.W. Cink

Subject 10CFR2.206 Petitioner Separation Interview (Third Contact)

The Petitioner then indicated that after he returned to his residence in Bay City after the access related interview the day before, he discovered that he was missing personal documents related to what he had discussed with the NRC. He indicated that he had reported the "burglary" to the Bay City police. He suspected that J. Hinson, Administrator, Investigations and Compliance, had something to do with the missing documents. He also indicated that TWC employs ex-FBI agents that had the capability to break in and take the documents.

The Petitioner indicated he was a "heartbeat" away from calling a news conference.

The Petitioner then indicated that he was aware of a Technical Specification violation relating to an activity related to the Boric Acid Level Control. He indicated that the Foreman and Craftsmen assigned to the activity did not know they were doing wrong but were only doing what they were trained to do. When questioned about specific details about the activity, the Petitioner indicated that he would not comply unless the following conditions were satisfied:

- 1) He requested a copy of the work package, OPGP03-ZA-0090, OPGP03-ZA-0040, OPGP03-ZA-0010, and a PMP that he could not specifically identify but thought the last two numbers of the procedure ended with "21".
- 2) He requested that Mr. Hall, the Director of QA, Sanchez, Bohner, Cink, J. Springfield, (I&C Foreman), R. Duran, I&C Technician, and Norman (did not know his last name) attend the discussion.

After the Petitioner stated his conditions, Bohner and Sanchez exited Bohner's office. When they returned they offered the Petitioner that they would provide the procedures and work package but would not arrange the meeting the individual had requested. They explained that we (Bohner, Sanchez, and Cink) were the three individuals at this time at the Station that were responsible for discussing his concerns.

The individual refused to discuss the issue then exited (somewhat irritated) the office carrying his tools and personal belongings. I followed him down the stairwell to his car, parked on the north side of the NSC

Houston Lighting & Power Company

OFFICE MEMORANDUM

To SPEAKOUT Concern File No. 12266 March 6, 1992
From R.W. Cink Page 3
Subject 10CFR2.206 Petitioner Separation Interview (Third Contact)

I asked the individual to come to my office and arrange for someone to escort him through out processing (turn in badges, whole body count, etc.). The Petitioner agreed. I then contacted Bohner from my office and informed him that the Petitioner was waiting for someone to escort him through out processing. Bohner indicated that he would arrange it. This was at approximately 11:15 A.M.

After approximately 15 minutes of waiting, I again contacted Bohner to ask him the status. He indicated that Sanchez was arranging for an escort.

During the waiting time in my office, the Petitioner expressed (without much detail) a concern about a violation of the Access Control Procedure. He indicated that the procedure requires personnel inside the Protected Area to have their badges clipped in two places. He indicated that he could walk out into the Protected Area "right now" and identify "violation after violation" of this requirement.

At approximately 11:30 A.M. the individual indicated that he was going to lunch and commented that if "they" would have really wanted to "process him out" they would have already been here. He then indicated that if someone did not come by the time he was done with lunch he was leaving.

I followed him to the cafeteria. Approximately 15 minutes later (11:45 A.M.), the Petitioner abruptly finished lunch and exited the Station.

I returned to my office where I met Sanchez and an I&C Foreman (identity unknown) who were waiting for the Petitioner to return from lunch. I informed them that he had already left the Station.

At approximately 12:50 P.M., I received a phone call from the Petitioner. The Petitioner wanted me to call Attorney Billie Garde and gave me her phone number. I informed him that I would inform my Management but warned him that I probably would not call her. He then indicated that he did not know why, "she was only going to go through me to save" my "Company". He then commented that he could not talk anymore because he had to go contact the Associated Press.

RWC/jkf

cc: W.J. Jump
4-92-00396
21 25



SPEAKOUT INTERVIEW NOTES

CONCERN NO. 12266DATE: 2-27-92INTERVIEWEE: T. SaporitoINVESTIGATOR: R.W. Cink

2A-90 procedure → Rev. 2 → approved in Sept

Plant Bulletin 180 1-29-92 → comply with 2A-90
117pps to be learned in two days. Did not consider a Tech Spec violation

TS did receive training. 1/2 day. Went to library made copy of Rev. 3
Had been given Rev. 2 by Phil Bottley Burflow
Procedure is complicated. Foreman, planners → demands
Procedure is not well written. Authority changes throughout procedure.
Training consisted of instructors interpretation of procedure. Were given a
43 page handout developed by instructor. Open book exam → anybody could
pass off the street. Did not challenge what you are supposed to have learned.
Not enough time allotted by Training to adequately
Question on exam → Who is responsible for unplanned radiation exposure?
TS said HP. Instructor said no → each individual. TS disagrees. Core detectors
vs. pressurizer. Question did not belong on exam.

Does not belong on test.

Wanted question clarified. Refused to sign sheet. Next day instructor
asked was TS satisfied. No. Wanted to talk to instructor later.



SPEAKOUT INTERVIEW NOTES

CONCERN NO. _____

DATE: _____

INTERVIEWER: _____

INVESTIGATOR: _____

Instructor said now. Went to instructor's office. Called HP. HP said unplanned. Took TS position. Never heard any feedback.

EQ equipment ^{training} EPR film. 90 of oil based vs additives. (oil/additive ratio. Missed question. Instructor teaching different than film. Instructor would not change position)

~~There~~ JOC were not aware of new forms supposed to be in packages after 1-31-92. Packages that were not pulled back.

TS feels increases admin load on craftsmen vs Bulletin 180; ^{compared to old plants}

(1) keep track of 15 minutes of time Document in military time. Black ink.

(2) pre job briefing. exactly what Foreman said → exactly what craftsman says.

Can violate procedures by complexity alone of procedures. Overly restricted. Planners are not walking down their jobs.

96
23 25



SPEAKOUT INTERVIEW NOTES

CONCERN NO. _____

DATE: _____

INTERVIEWER: _____

INVESTIGATOR: _____

p. 18 → Section 3.11

p. 31 → " 4.8 → craftsmen determine if scaffolding is required.

Craftsmen end up getting frustrated. Don't give a damn. Hands are tied as craftsmen.

Sharpe said I don't know how to fix backlog.

February 18 → talked to NRC.

No repeatability of readings. Calibration inaccurate.

Fluid source vs. Air source

After the fact signatures on documents. Sometimes 1 or 2 days after. Back dating issue

Training Dept thinks self verification is a joke.

Was on job on which self verification was not used

7300 cabinets need to be identified / labelled on both sides 96

Craftsmen working on wrong units

24 25



SPEAKOUT INTERVIEW NOTES

CONCERN NO. _____

DATE: _____

INTERVIEWER: _____

INVESTIGATOR: _____

Planners should prepare data sheets

Heavy fellow walked on plant equipment to check numbers. Started a system cycling. Non Q.

Replacement of coolers in water plant. ECO involved. No one could find docum. to determine which breakers would disable equipment. Operator ~~tripped~~ tripped wrong breaker. Did another trial + error method until right one found. Horn went off. Undid wires to turn off. DW Plant.

Degree of frustration in J&C dept. Craftsman disregarded all instructions. Went to troubleshoot. Frustrated. Threw away documents did not even sign on package. Did not want anyone to know he had worked on package. Non Q.