

A-15
10/18/83

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD



In the Matter of)
DUKE POWER COMPANY, et al.)
(Catawba Nuclear Station,)
Units 1 and 2))

Docket Nos. 50-413
50-414

TESTIMONY OF WAYNE O. HENRY

1 Q. STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

2 A. Wayne O. Henry, Duke Power Company, 422 South Church Street,
3 Charlotte, North Carolina 28242.

4 Q. STATE YOUR PRESENT POSITION WITH DUKE POWER COMPANY
5 AND DESCRIBE THE NATURE OF YOUR JOB.

6 A. I am QA Manager, Technical Services. My primary responsibility is
7 to develop, modify, review and maintain the Company's Quality
8 Assurance procedures.

9 Q. DESCRIBE YOUR PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE AND
10 QUALIFICATIONS, INCLUDING PRIOR POSITIONS HELD WITH DUKE
11 POWER COMPANY.

12 A. 1967 Graduate U.S. Naval Academy, Commissioned Ensign,
13 USN.

14 1968 Graduate U.S. Navy Nuclear Power School,
15 Bainbridge, MD. Graduate U.S. Navy S1C Reactor,
16 Windsor, CT. Qualified as Engineering Officer of
17 the Watch and licensed to operate the S1C reactor

18 1969 Graduate U.S. Navy Submarine School, New London,
19 CT.

1 1969-1972 Officer on board USS Nautilus, SSN571. Qualified
2 Engineering Officer of the Watch, Officer of the
3 Deck underway and in port, Diving Officer,
4 Qualified in Submarines. Served as Reactor Controls
5 Officer, Auxiliary Division Officer, 1st Lieutenant,
6 Weapons Officer, Nuclear Weapons Safety Officer.
7 1972-1978 Joined Duke Power Company as Engineer-Associate,
8 later promoted Assistant Design Engineer, and
9 Design Engineer, all within the Design Engineering
10 Department.
11 1979-1981 QA Manager, Construction.
12 Dec., 1981 MBA, University of North Carolina, Charlotte.
13 Feb., 1981 QA Manager, Technical Services.
14 Member, American Nuclear Society
15 Member, American Society of Mechanical Engineers
16 Registered Professional Engineer, State of North
17 Carolina.
18 Q. WHEN DID YOU FIRST BECOME AWARE OF THE QUALITY OR
19 SAFETY CONCERNS EXPRESSED BY WELDING INSPECTORS AT
20 CATAWBA?
21 A. I became aware of the nature of the welding inspector concerns
22 upon reading the Task Force I Report in December, 1981, or
23 January, 1982.
24 Q. WERE YOU INVOLVED IN THE MANAGEMENT DECISIONS TO
25 INITIATE THE VARIOUS TASK FORCE INVESTIGATIONS?
26 A. No.
27 Q. DESCRIBE YOUR INVOLVEMENT WITH THE INITIAL TASK FORCE,
28 WHAT IS NOW REFERRED TO AS TASK FORCE I.

1 A. I had no involvement with Task Force I.

2 Q. DESCRIBE YOUR INVOLVEMENT WITH THE TECHNICAL TASK
3 FORCE.

4 A. My involvement with the Technical Task Force was as follows: At
5 the request of J. R. Wells, I agreed to allow L. M. Coggins, who is
6 on my staff, to serve on the Technical Task Force and to make him
7 available in order to complete the work of the Task Force. I also
8 knew the approximate schedule under which the Task Force was
9 working. I worked on formulating the Management Implementation
10 Plan, and I carried out the actions assigned to me to implement the
11 recommendations of the Technical Task Force.

12 Q. DESCRIBE YOUR INVOLVEMENT WITH LEWIS ZWISSLER OF
13 MANAGEMENT ANALYSIS COMPANY.

14 A. I worked primarily as an administrative coordinator with Mr.
15 Zwissler to assure that he had office space, clerical help,
16 transportation and ready access to all people he needed to
17 interview.

18 Q. DESCRIBE YOUR INVOLVEMENT WITH THE NONTECHNICAL TASK
19 FORCE.

20 A. I had no involvement with the Nontechnical Task Force. However,
21 I was aware that the group was carrying on its work. I also
22 attended meetings and training sessions which may have resulted
23 from the recommendations of the Nontechnical Task Force.

24 Q. WERE YOU INVOLVED IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF
25 RECOMMENDATIONS BY ANY OF THE TASK FORCES?

26 A. Yes. I was involved with implementing the recommendations of the
27 Technical Task Force.

1 Q. DESCRIBE YOUR ROLE IN IMPLEMENTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS
2 OF THE TECHNICAL TASK FORCE, INCLUDING YOUR ROLE IN
3 THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MANAGEMENT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
4 USED TO IMPLEMENT THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE TECHNICAL
5 TASK FORCE.

6 A. My role involved (1) reviewing recommended items whose
7 implementation might require QA procedural modifications, (2)
8 reviewing QA procedures associated with these recommendations,
9 and (3) satisfying myself as to the adequacy of those procedures I
10 reviewed, making modifications as necessary.

11 Q. ARE YOU RESPONSIBLE FOR DEVELOPING PROCEDURES
12 ASSOCIATED WITH NCI'S AND OTHER MEANS FOR IDENTIFYING
13 AND DOCUMENTING CONSTRUCTION DEFICIENCIES?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. EXPLAIN THE RELEVANT PROCEDURES AND THE REVISIONS TO
16 THESE PROCEDURES.

17 A. The relevant procedures are Q-1, R-2, and various procedures
18 which contain process control inspection points. Revisions to Q-1
19 are described in the testimony of L. R. Davison (page 33), which I
20 have reviewed and subscribe to. The R-2 procedure was not
21 changed as a direct result of the Technical Task Force
22 recommendations. Revisions to R-2 are described in the testimony
23 of L. R. Davison (pages 36-37), which I have reviewed and
24 subscribe to.

25 Q. DESCRIBE THE CHANGES IN PROCESS CONTROL PROCEDURES AS
26 A RESULT OF THE TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS?

27 A. Yes. The significant changes are described in the testimony of L.
28 R. Davison (page 33), which I have reviewed and subscribe to. In

1 addition, procedures F-9, M-21, and M-51 were changed to
2 incorporate Task Force recommendations.

3 Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE PRECISE CHANGES IN PROCESS CONTROL
4 PROCEDURES.

5 A. QA Procedure F-9, Rev. 6 was revised to require craft to review
6 process control documents prior to beginning work, to ensure that
7 there were no conflicts between process control documents and the
8 design drawings. Craft was also to check the process control to
9 make certain they understood the instructions, and identify any
10 discrepancies to Construction Technical Support.

11 QA Procedure M-21, Rev. 13 was revised to clarify the
12 requirements for verification of filler material on structural steel
13 welds requiring NDE. Prior to Rev. 13, there was a space on the
14 Form M21-A for the inspector to sign which indicated the
15 acceptability of the filler material used in the joint. Since this
16 inspection was conducted periodically, the inspectors felt that their
17 signature in this block was misleading, indicating 100% inspection.
18 The M-21A form and procedure were revised to clarify that filler
19 material verification was a periodic inspection point, not 100%
20 verification. Also, QA Procedure M-21, Rev. 14 was revised to
21 require random inspection where nonsafety related welds are
22 attached to safety related structural steel.

23 QA Procedure M-51, Rev. 6 was revised to add additional
24 spaces for welding inspectors to sign when non-Code welds were
25 cut-out and rewelded after they had been accepted by an inspector.

26 Q. HAVE THERE BEEN OTHER CHANGES TO QA PROCEDURES AS A
27 RESULT OF THE TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THESE CHANGES.

3 A. In the material control area, QA procedures H-4 and H-5 were
4 revised, as follows:

5 a) Both H-4 and H-5 were revised to clarify the fact that they
6 only apply to Conditions 1 and 4.

7 b) H-5 was revised to clarify the point that craft is responsible
8 for making sure they do not make material identification
9 markings inaccessible prior to inspection by QA.

10 c) H-5 was revised to allow fabricated assemblies to be identified
11 by piece number after fabrication inspection by QA.

12 d) H-5 was revised to provide requirements for separate
13 identification for special properties.

14 e) H-5 was revised to require transfer of markings prior to
15 cutting material.

16 f) H-4 was revised to clarify the requirements for NDE piece
17 mark traceability.

18 g) H-4 was revised to preclude material issued for non-Code
19 applications from being returned to stock for Code work
20 without QA approval.

21 Also, QA Procedure L-80, Rev. 13 was revised to add weld
22 acceptance criteria for rounded indications (porosity) detected
23 visually.

24 Finally, QA Procedure QA-1 was initiated to provide for
25 immediate changes to QA procedures.

26 Q. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE NONCONFORMANCE EVALUATION
27 TEAM?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR ROLE IN THE NONCONFORMANCE
3 EVALUATION TEAM.

4 A. I had no role in the NCI evaluation team. I was not a member of
5 the team and did not attend their meetings. I was at times asked
6 to supply information if the team needed additional information on
7 specific NCI's.

8

9

10

11 I hereby certify that I have read and understand this document, and
12 believe it to be my true, accurate and complete testimony.

13

14

15

16

Wayne O. Henry

17

18

19 Sworn to and subscribed before me
20 this _____ day of October, 1983.

21

22

23

24

Notary Public

25

26 Commission Expires _____

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
Decree No. 50-413 Catawba 15
In the matter of Catawba 15
Staff ✓
Appointee ✓
Inspector ✓
Com. # 1017
Contractor ✓
Other ✓
Reported ✓
NAME 10/18/83
ALL NOS Ron Graham