

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
DUKE POWER COMPANY, <u>et al.</u>	)	Docket Nos. 50-413
	)	50-414
(Catawba Nuclear Station,	)	
Units 1 and 2)	)	

TESTIMONY OF LARRY R. DAVISON CONCERNING  
MR. LANGLEY'S ALLEGATIONS PERTAINING TO ALLEGED  
HARASSMENT OF WELDING INSPECTOR LINDSAY HARRIS

1 Q. STATE YOUR NAME.

2 A. My name is Larry R. Davison. My business address, job  
3 description, and statement of professional experience and  
4 qualifications are set forth in my previously filed testimony.

5

6 Q. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH AN INCIDENT INVOLVING WELDING  
7 INSPECTOR LINDSAY HARRIS AND CRAFT FOREMAN TOM  
8 MULLINAX?

9 A. Yes. I was informed by QC Supervision, Charles Baldwin, that a  
10 steelworker foreman, Tom Mullinax, had threatened to knock out the  
11 teeth of welding inspector Lindsay Harris. I was told this occurred  
12 when Mr. Harris had rejected some work on the personnel air lock  
13 because of lack of proper preheat. The craftsman involved had felt  
14 they had the proper preheat. I am not aware of any incidents of  
15 this nature involving Mr. Langley.

1 Q. WHAT DID YOU DO AFTER YOU BECAME AWARE OF THIS  
2 SITUATION?

3 A. I don't recall all the people I notified of this incident; but I do  
4 recall notifying the Craft Superintendent at that time, Mr. Cecil  
5 Wall. Mr. Wall's position was four levels of supervision above Mr.  
6 Mullinax. I told Mr. Wall that this type of thing could not be  
7 tolerated and I asked him to look into it and let me know what he  
8 did about it.

9

10 Q. WHAT DID MR. WALL DO ABOUT THE INCIDENT?

11 A. To the best of my knowledge he investigated the incident. Shortly  
12 after that Mr. Wall called me to a meeting he had set up in his area  
13 conference room to discuss the incident. I do not remember  
14 everyone who was present for this meeting, but I believe that  
15 members of craft supervision above Mr. Mullinax, and Charles  
16 Baldwin, Technical Supervisor over Welding Inspection, were  
17 present. We met and discussed the information Mr. Baldwin and I  
18 had about the incident, and all basically agreed on what had  
19 occurred, and that clearly the foreman needed to be counseled.  
20 After this discussion, Mr. Mullinax was brought into the room and  
21 he described the incident. Mr. Mullinax stated that he had not  
22 threatened Mr. Harris, but had made the statement to him that if  
23 he continued to call craftsmen liars, he would get his teeth knocked  
24 out. He indicated he told Mr. Harris this simply to warn him of  
25 what might happen if he continued to give people the impression  
26 that he was calling them liars. Mr. Mullinax stated that he was  
27 very upset emotionally when he made the statement.

1 After Mr. Mullinax described what happened, Mr. Wall reprimanded  
2 Mr. Mullinax and told him in no uncertain terms that this type of  
3 statement from him to any inspector would not be tolerated; that  
4 Mr. Mullinax was responsible for his crew's actions in this type  
5 situation; that statements like that from them would not be  
6 tolerated; and that Mr. Mullinax's position as a supervisor, and  
7 quite possibly his job with Duke Power, was on the line if this type  
8 incident occurred again.

9  
10 Q. DID YOU AGREE THAT THE ACTION TAKEN WAS SUFFICIENT?

11 A. Having witnessed this clear disciplining of Mr. Mullinax by Mr.  
12 Wall, I was satisfied that appropriate action had been taken, and  
13 that Mr. Mullinax understood what was expected of him. I was also  
14 satisfied that the inspector in question and others would not let  
15 incidents such as this affect their carrying out their inspection  
16 duties.

17  
18 Q. IN YOUR VIEW, DID THIS INCIDENT REPRESENT A PATTERN OF  
19 THREATS OR HARASSMENT DIRECTED TOWARD THE INSPECTORS?

20 A. Having been responsible for QC inspection at Catawba since 1974, I  
21 believe the number of incidents such as this have been very few  
22 compared to the number of times craftsmen and inspectors must  
23 interact. As with any inspection situation, there is potential for  
24 disagreement and confrontation. Given the hundreds of thousands  
25 of inspections performed at Catawba and the small number of  
26 occasions where the interaction between inspector and craftsman  
27 have reached this level, I believe that Catawba has an excellent  
28 record in terms of QA relations with craft. I know management has

1        taken prompt action when such situations did occur and I believe  
2        inspectors have always felt free to perform their duty. For all  
3        these reasons, I believe there is no significance to Mr. Langley's  
4        allegation.