

A-29  
11/3/83

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 WILLIAM H. BURR

1 Q. STATE YOUR NAME AND YOUR WORK ADDRESS.

2 A. William Heyward Burr, Catawba Nuclear Station, P.O. Box 223,  
3 Clover, SC 29710.

4 Q. WHAT IS YOUR PRESENT JOB WITH DUKE POWER COMPANY?

5 A. I am a welding inspector with Duke Power Company assigned to the  
6 Catawba Nuclear Station. I have chosen to work on the second  
7 shift and I have periodically inspected practically all types of work  
8 in most of the plant areas.

9 Q. SUMMARIZE YOUR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS, INCLUDING  
10 OTHER NON-DUKE JOBS, EDUCATION, CERTIFICATIONS, AND  
11 COMPANY SPONSORED COURSES AND TRAINING.

12 A. My primary education was in the North Augusta School systems,  
13 North Augusta, South Carolina. I attended Clemson University  
14 from 1965-1968, and Augusta College from 1969-1970. I have had  
15 the following welding courses through Duke Power, gas-tungsten  
16 arc welding and shielded metal arc welding. I was certified in  
17 carbon, stainless, and aluminum welding (GTAW), and carbon  
18 (SMAW). I am certified at Level I and II for liquid penetrate  
19 testing and magnetic particle testing, and visual welding inspection.  
20 I have worked with Daniel Construction Company, at the Fairfield

8405240088 831103  
PDR ADOCK 05000413  
G PDR

1 Pumped Storage Project in 1976, and at the Fiber Industries Project  
2 in 1977.

3 Q. WHAT OTHER JOB POSITIONS HAVE YOU HELD WITH DUKE POWER  
4 COMPANY?

5 A. I started working for Duke Power as a welder at Catawba in 1978.  
6 I became a welding inspector in 1979.

7 Q. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH WHAT IS COMMONLY REFERRED TO AS  
8 THE WELDING INSPECTOR CONCERNS WHICH WERE EXPRESSED IN  
9 LATE 1981/EARLY 1982?

10 A. Yes, I was directly involved. I expressed concerns of my own.

11 Q. WHAT IS YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT THESE CONCERNS  
12 WERE?

13 A. We, as Welding Inspectors, were not getting support from QA  
14 Management in trying to assure that the requirements of Duke's QA  
15 Procedures, which we were employed to enforce, were being  
16 adhered to by construction.

17 Q. DID YOU EXPRESS ANY CONCERNS AS A WELDING INSPECTOR TO  
18 ANY OF THE TASK FORCES OR TO DUKE POWER MANAGEMENT?

19 A. Yes, I have in the past, voiced my concerns many times to Duke's  
20 QA Management and finally, to the special task forces.

21 Q. TO WHOM DID YOU EXPRESS YOUR CONCERNS?

22 A. I talked to one of the task forces, but I do not remember which  
23 one. I did talk to Gail Addis.

24 Q. WERE YOUR CONCERNS WRITTEN?

25 A. Yes, at Duke's request, our concerns which pertained to specific  
26 safety-related problems were written.

1 Q. DESCRIBE EACH DOCUMENT WHICH CONTAINS YOUR EXPRESSION  
2 OF CONCERNS, AND INDICATE WHO IT WAS SUBMITTED TO.

3 A. The only document in which my concerns were expressed is  
4 attached to my testimony as Attachment A.

5 Q. DOES THIS DOCUMENT ATTACHED TO YOUR TESTIMONY INCLDUE  
6 ALL OF YOUR TECHNICAL CONCERNS?

7 A. Yes, it includes all of my concerns that involved specific work  
8 which was traceable by documentation or was safety related.

9 Q. DID YOU FEEL FREE TO EXPRESS ALL OF YOUR CONCERNS? IF  
10 NOT, PLEASE INDICATE WHY?

11 A. No. One of my concerns was caused by a statement made to me by  
12 my supervisor concerning my future with Duke. I was caused by  
13 this statement to believe that future advancement for me with the  
14 Duke system would be limited, if not nonexistent, if I did not  
15 "ease-off" on the craft. As we were requested by  
16 management only to list specific problems of a safety related nature,  
17 I did not feel free to express a concern which would not be  
18 traceable by documentation. Several years ago when some  
19 inspectors allegedly went to the NRC, the inspectors as a group  
20 were reprimanded in pairs by Mr. Larry Davison for not having  
21 brought the problem to the attention of Duke management first.  
22 This situation caused me to believe that a disclosure of my concern  
23 over the statement made to me by my supervisor could possibly  
24 jeopardize my job with Duke Power Company. The statement to  
25 "ease off the craft" was made to me about a year after this meeting  
26 with Larry Davison.

1 Q. DID YOU EASE OFF ON THE CRAFT OR ACCEPT ANY WORK THAT  
2 DID NOT CONFORM TO THE DUKE QA STANDARDS AND  
3 PROCEDURES AS A RESULT OF THIS INCIDENT?  
4 A. No. I have continued to do my job as an inspector to the best of  
5 my ability.  
6 Q. HAS YOUR JOB OR YOUR EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES BEEN  
7 AFFECTED BY THIS INCIDENT?  
8 A. No, to the best of my knowledge.  
9 Q. HAVE YOU DISCUSSED YOUR CONCERNS WITH ANYONE ELSE?  
10 A. I have also discussed these problems with my supervision, other  
11 inspectors, and from time to time with Kim Van Doorn of the NRC.  
12 Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE AND EXPLAIN WHAT YOU WERE TRYING TO  
13 COMMUNICATE BY YOUR CONCERNS.  
14 A. I was trying to communicate the lack of support that the welding  
15 inspectors were continually experiencing. It was difficult to get  
16 management to listen to my views when interpretation of procedures  
17 was involved.  
18 Q. WERE YOUR CONCERNS INVESTIGATED BY THE TASK FORCES?  
19 A. Yes, to the best of my knowledge.  
20 Q. DID YOU ATTEND ANY MEETINGS WITH TASK FORCE AND/OR QA  
21 MANAGEMENT MEMBERS WHERE THE TASK FORCE FINDINGS,  
22 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS WERE DISCUSSED?  
23 A. I did attend a meeting with a task force. They explained what  
24 they did about my concerns, and as I recall, I basically agreed  
25 with the task force. I do not remember the specific details of the  
26 meeting.



1 Q. WERE THERE ANY CHANGES MADE IN THE QA PROGRAM AFTER  
2 THE WELDING INSPECTOR CONCERNS AND THE TASK FORCE  
3 INVESTIGATION OF THESE CONCERNS?  
4 A. Yes, but we did not have a problem with the program, just the  
5 implementation of it.  
6 Q. DESCRIBE THE CHANGES OF WHICH YOU ARE AWARE IN THE QA  
7 PROGRAM.  
8 A. The major change of which I am aware is that the Welding Inspector  
9 can utilize the recourse procedure if he should not agree with a  
10 resolution to a specific problem.  
11 Q. TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THESE CHANGES ADDRESSED ISSUES  
12 RAISED BY THE WELDING INSPECTOR CONCERNS AND TO WHAT  
13 EXTENT HAVE THESE CHANGES ADDRESSED YOUR PARTICULAR  
14 CONCERNS?  
15 A. I am not aware of any changes in the program that could have  
16 prevented any of these problems which I expressed in my concerns.  
17 I am however, aware of changes in the approach of QA management  
18 that has eliminated the problem of getting management to realize  
19 when violations of the QA Procedures have occurred, and getting  
20 management to act on these violations.  
21 Q. THE WELDING INSPECTOR CONCERNS HAVE BEEN  
22 CHARACTERIZED AS CONCERNS ABOUT THE QUALITY AND  
23 SAFETY OF CONSTRUCTION AT CATAWBA. DO YOU AGREE OR  
24 DISAGREE WITH THAT CHARACTERIZATION?  
25 A. As a welding inspector, my job is to be concerned about the quality  
26 of the work at the plant. All of the problems which I documented  
27 were on work involving safety related systems within the plant. By

1       expressing my concerns, I was indicating that the QA procedures  
2       were not being followed. If these concerns had not been expressed  
3       and resolved, there may have, in my opinion, been some adverse  
4       effect on the quality and safety of the plant.

5   Q.   DID THE EXPRESSION OF YOUR CONCERNS INDICATE YOUR  
6       BELIEF THAT THERE WAS A BREAKDOWN IN THE QA PROGRAM  
7       OR INDICATE THAT THE QA PROGRAM WAS NO LONGER  
8       WORKING?

9   A.   There was a definite breakdown in the QA Program, but I feel it  
10       was at the management level and not with the inspectors. I believe  
11       the inspectors continued to identify problems that needed to be  
12       corrected. Management was not following the QA procedures. The  
13       very fact that the Welding Inspectors at Catawba went to such  
14       extremes to point out problems within the system is testimony to the  
15       fact that we were determined to see the program function properly  
16       and to its full potential to insure the safety of the plant.

17   Q.   DID YOUR CONCERNS REFLECT A BELIEF ON YOUR PART THAT  
18       THE CATAWBA PROJECT IS NOT BEING CONSTRUCTED SAFELY?

19   A.   If these problems had not been brought to the attention of the  
20       Duke off site management and had been allowed to continue,  
21       there would have been a compromise in the safe  
22       construction of Catawba.

23   Q.   IN YOUR VIEW, HAS THE QA PROGRAM BEEN EFFECTIVE WHILE  
24       YOU HAVE WORKED AS AN INSPECTOR AT CATAWBA?

25   A.   Yes. However, in the past, having discrepancies recognized and  
26       resolved has been far too difficult for the inspector.

27

1 Q. ARE YOU AWARE OF ANY DEFICIENCIES IN CONSTRUCTION OR IN  
2 THE QA PROGRAM WHICH WOULD CAUSE YOU TO QUESTION  
3 WHETHER CATAWBA IS SAFELY BUILT?

4 A. None.

5 Q. IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE YOU WOULD LIKE TO ADD TO YOUR  
6 TESTIMONY?

7 A. No.

8

9

10

11

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

14

15

16

17

*William Heyward Burr*  
William Heyward Burr

18

19

20 Sworn to and subscribed before me  
21 this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of September, 1983.

22

23

24

25


*Herrie A. Williams*  
Notary Public

26

27 Commission Expires March 7, 1993

8.6.81

①

During the course of inspection on banger 1-A-SM-1563, D-C welding discovered that the design drawing called for a  $\frac{3}{4}$ " lamper from both sides on the retainer ring material, which was only  $1\frac{1}{2}$ " thick. Craft prepared this fit, which was on an NF weld, with a D land . This material was "buttered-up" and welded, I believe, with the L-350 F.W.D.S. M-51 states that all full penetration NF welds should be documented on an M-7A, in order for D-C checks to be made on "clean-up", "fit-up", "preheat" and "final". An M-7A was never generated for this joint and as a result we have a full penetration weld existing that received no D-C checks and was fit in violation of the process control. D-C documented this problem in the form of an NCI; however, the problem was turned over to banger technical support, who were allowed to rewrite the NCI that D-C had generated. The final wording of the problem did not reflect the full extent of the violation. I have not been able to read a final resolution of this NCI and I concede that it may be correct, but I do not believe that problems D-C finds and documents should be allowed to be rewritten by departments that directly connected to construction.



8.12.81

②

after discovering a problem on weld 1-FW-22-6, this was a three week period where I tried to show Q-C supervisors that welding outside of the weld zone without proper process control was a violation of M-4. No clean-up was ever performed on this area. No one agreed with my assessment of this problem. Finally, after three weeks, I was allowed to write this NCI. I do not believe that it should have taken me three weeks to document a relevant problem which was a clear violation of QAP. The resolution to NCI 12459 states that process control will be generated to correct this situation, however, no one in the Q-C department could verify clean-up of the area prior to welding. Only welding inspectors should be allowed to determine if the work meets the Q-C program. There have been several instances where craft supervisors have been allowed to verify Q-C hold pts. after a violation. I was called on 8.14.81 to inspect this pipe again and found the NCI tag I had hung to be missing. Craft had the pipe shot and rejected, they had already moved to a new column and cut through the pipe again. NCI 12459 was not resolved until 8.18.81.

9.3.81

(3)

durate NCI 12682 to document a  $\frac{1}{8}$ " lack of fusion on the root of weld # INV-177-8. Lich. support resolved the problem by sending two representatives to evaluate the situation. They both agreed that no lack of fusion was evident or existed in the root of this weld. I, once again, feel that no one directly under the control of the construction department should be allowed to override the decisions of the D-C department where defects are involved. Much has been said about five welding inspectors having looked at this defect. I never requested anyone, other than my 2<sup>nd</sup> shift supervisor to examine the defect. There was no need for anyone, other than us, to have examined it from our department. No more emphasis should be placed on a defect witnessed by five welding inspectors than a defect to which one capable inspector attests.

8.6.81

(4)

NCI 12420 was written to document what was believed, by D-C inspector, to be a  $\frac{3}{4}$ " crater crack in the root face of weld # INV-23-7. Mr. Cavender resolved it by saying he had visually examined the area and determined the problem to be insignificant. I could not determine if it was indeed cracked by visual examination and I do not believe that Mr. Cavender could either. He goes on, in its resolution, to state that once a weld is accepted &

X-ray it meets the code requirements and is final. He fails to realize that welds may be altered after X-ray by stresses or other conditions. He further instructs the welding inspectors not to inspect the roots of welds accepted by X-ray and made accessible by cut outs. I do not agree with this evaluation as it obviously could allow problems, which could be easily repaired, to be incorporated into the plant.



NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
Docket No. 50-413 NRC E.S. No. 29  
In the matter of Catawba  
Staff ✓  
Assistant ✓  
Inspector ✓  
Licensee ✓  
Comptroller ✓  
Clerk ✓  
Referred ✓  
Revised ✓  
Date 11/3/83  
Signed Ben Graham