

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

COUNTY OF *Philadelphia*

)  
)  
)

ss:

AFFIDAVIT OF JOSEPH J. LIPINSKY

1. My name is Joseph J. Lipinsky. I am employed by O.B. Cannon & Sons, Inc., 5600 Woodland Avenue, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19143.

2. I first visited the Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station on July 26-28, 1983. As I understand it, O.B. Cannon had been retained to evaluate certain aspects of the Comanche Peak coatings program.

3. During the first two days of my visit to the site (July 26 and 27), I spoke with several persons regarding the coatings program and conducted limited tours of the project to observe activities relating to the coatings program.


4. On July 28, I participated in a exit interview in which I summarized my initial observations about the coatings program based on my limited visit to the site. Later that day I returned to Philadelphia, which is my principal place of business.

5. After returning to Philadelphia, I prepared Trip Report OBC Job No. H8301 (Comanche Peak Unit 1 - Glen Rose, TX), which is dated August 8, 1983. This memorandum was intended for internal use by O.B. Cannon only, was not intended to be

disclosed publicly, did not and does not represent the views of O.B. Cannon & Sons, and simply reported my impressions based upon a very short visit to the site.

6. I do not know how my Trip Report became public. I understand that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has concluded that the Trip Report was "surreptitiously" taken by someone who provided it to the NRC. I assume that the word "surreptitiously" means that it was stolen. If the Report was taken from me, it was taken without my knowledge or consent.

7. Since I prepared my Trip Report, I have conducted an additional site visit and have participated in extended conferences with site management to address the concerns identified in the Trip Report. These in-depth discussions have demonstrated to me that my initial impressions which were based on limited data, were incorrect. The Trip Report does not represent my current assessment of the coatings program at Comanche Peak and should not be relied upon as my position or that of O.B. Cannon & Sons, Inc.

  
Joseph J. Lipinsky

Subscribed to and sworn to before  
me this 15<sup>th</sup> day of February, 1984.

  
Notary Public

DANIEL F. ECKMAN, NOTARY PUBLIC  
PHILADELPHIA, PHILADELPHIA COUNTY  
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES APRIL 2, 1987  
Member, Pennsylvania Association of Notaries

# OLIVER B. CANNON & SON, INC.

## DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

QAD-84-0164

DATE May 14, 1984

SUBJECT H8301 Trip Report

TO H8301 QA File cc: R. B. Roth, R. A. Trallo, J. J. Norris

FROM J. J. Lipinsky

On May 9, 1984, the writer met with McNeil Watkins II (Bishop, Liberman, Cook, Purcell & Reynolds) and C. Thomas Brandt (EBASCO), in M. Watkins Washington, D.C. office (6th floor conference room).

The meeting started at approximately 0930 hours (EST) and ended at approximately 1315 hours (EST) (working through lunch).

C. T. Brandt provided JJL back-up information to satisfy concerns raised by JJL (see QAD-83-0096 dated August 8, 1983). The information provided by C. T. Brandt was along the lines of the information provided to OBC during the November 10/11, 1983, meeting at the H8301 site, and satisfied concerns raised by the writer.

The writer did suggest to C. T. Brandt that Carboline be contacted to get a more up-to-date evaluation of repair procedures to the coatings applied at the H8301 project.

M. Watkins indicated that JJL's comments to the NRC testimony can still be incorporated.

M. Watkins stated that JJL's testimony will be changed from a question and answer format to an affidavit format. Hopefully, OBC will not have to testify in front of the ASLB. If testimony is required, then in all probability only RAT and/or JJL will be needed. A rough draft of the affidavit format will be provided to JJL for review and comment (as well as a copy of testimony of C. T. Brandt).



H8301 Trip Report  
H8301 QA File cc: RBR, RAT, JJN  
J. J. Lipinsky


-2-

QAD-84-0164  
May 14, 1984

M. Watkins pointed out that JJL need not be concerned about the facts or details behind statements made by C. T. Brandt.

M. S. Reynolds came in briefly and talked in general about the status and progress of the meeting. Also, N. S. Reynolds discussed with C. T. Brandt reports (by EBASCO and Gibbs and Hill) that would dequalify all coating in containment. Later JJL discussed this briefly with C. T. Brandt and M. Watkins.

The writer has advised all concerned about the discussion during the course of the meeting, however if there are any questions or need for additional information, do not hesitate to contact the writer.

  
Joseph J. Lipinsky

JJL:cf

# OLIVER B. CANNON & SON. INC.

## DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

QAD-84-0210

DATE July 5, 1984

SUBJECT Telephone Conversation with McNeil Watkins II

File cc: R. B. Roth, R. A. Trallo, J. J. Norris

FROM J. J. Lipinsky

On this date at approximately 1116 hours (EST) the writer had a telephone conversation with Mr. Mc Neil Watkins II (Bishop, Liberman, Cook, Purcell, and Reynolds). The following was discussed:

- MW asked JJL if JJL had been contacted by GAP (Government Accountability Project) or CASE. JJL replied in the negative. Briefly discussed GAP and its role in the H8301 project.
- A separate board (made up of two members from the licensing board) is looking into HIT's (Harrassment, Intimidation, and Threats) and JJL has been scheduled to testify during the week of July 23, 1984.

At this point the conversation was terminated due to problems with the phone connection. JJL tried repeatedly to reestablish the phone link with M. Watkins @ 817-897-2941 EXT 43. At 1135 hours (EST) phone company operators could not get through to above number.

The phone conversation continued when M. Watkins called back.

- This hearing would try to determine if JJL was harrassed, threatened and/or intimidated.
- GAP/CASE have about forty (40) witnesses scheduled and specifically want to question a Gordon Purdy and C. Tom Brandt regarding JJL. GAP/CASE have asked the NRC to make Mr. F. Hawkins and C. Johnson available (NRC's failure to follow up on allegations).

File

-2-

QAD-84-0210  
July 5, 1984

SUBJECT: Telephone Conversation with McNeil Watkins II

- GAP/CASE should contact JJL today, tomorrow or early next week at the latest.
- MW suggested that JJL tell GAP/CASE that JJL would be happy to tell them (GAP/CASE) anything that they want, but JJL would prefer a subpoena (as well as cash for air fare, ground transport, meals, lodging). MW pointed out that OBC would not be reimbursed by H0301 for JJL testimony on behalf of GAP/CASE.
- JJL should feel free to mention that OBC/JJL still have a working relationship with TUGCO. Additionally, that JJL has been dealing with MW and mentioned law firm.
- If GAP/CASE still want JJL to testify then JJL could testify only on two aspects regarding harrassment, intimidation and threats. The first area would be hearsay as a result of JJL's trips to the site. GAP/CASE would be able to call anyone JJL says talked to JJL. The second area would be any harrassment, intimidation and threats against JJL since release of JJL's trip report.
- MW told JJL that if GAP/CASE do not contact JJL then JJL has no responsibility to appear for hearing. JJL would not get into trouble if not contacted by GAP/CASE.
- MW and JJL briefly discussed a study prepared by Gibbs and Hill/Ebasco that would dequalify coatings as a safety related item. This study has been submitted to the Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR) for evaluation/approval. MW said that Jerry Fertell (Ebasco) felt that approximately 75% of the coatings will be eliminated. His reasoning is that the NRC would not eliminate 100% because of the politics involved.




QAD-84-0210  
July 5, 1984

File

-3-

SUBJECT: Telephone Conversation with McNeil Watkins II

- JJL revised affidavit is on "hold" until C. T. Brandt is happy with his testimony.
- JJL should send comments to NRC regarding JJL 1/84 testimony before the NRC.

  
Joseph J. Lipinsky

JJL:cf

LAW OFFICES OF  
BISHOP, LIBERMAN, COOK, PURCELL & REYNOLDS

1200 SEVENTEENTH STREET, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

(202) 857-0800

TELEX 440574 INTLAW UI

IN NEW YORK

BISHOP, LIBERMAN & COOK

1155 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS

NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10036

(212) 704-0100

TELEX 222767

VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS

CONFIDENTIAL

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL  
(202)

September 26, 1984

Mr. Joseph J. Lipinsky  
Oliver B. Cannon & Son, Inc.  
5600 Woodland Avenue  
Philadelphia, PA 19143

Dear Joe:

I enclose for your review the following:

1. Copy of executed affidavit of C. Thomas Brandt, along with Attachments A through N.
2. The original of the affidavit of Joseph J. Lipinsky.
3. Copies of a draft motion for summary disposition and accompanying statement of material facts.

Please review the Lipinsky affidavit carefully to ensure that all factual statements accurately represent either your recollection of facts, or your current understanding. Where appropriate, confirm that the basis for any of your conclusions appears either in Brandt's affidavit or in the attachments to his affidavit. Keep in mind that you cannot, and are not expected to, vouch for the accuracy of Brandt's statements; he will be responsible for that task, should it arise.


Please give a call when you have reviewed the affidavit. We will need copies of your current statement of qualifications and a copy of your original trip report.



Joseph J. Lipinsky  
Page Two  
September 26, 1984

Thank you for your work on this matter.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "McNeill Watkins II", with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

McNeill Watkins II

Enc

MW:dh



*Corrosion  
Control Services*

# OLIVER B. CANNON & SON, INC.

*Industrial Painting Specialists*

5600 WOODLAND AVENUE • PHILADELPHIA, PA 19143  
AREA CODE (215) 729-4600

## QWIP LOG SHEET

To: McNeill Watkins, II

Of: \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Pages following  
Cover Sheet: \_\_\_\_\_

From: J. Lipinsky

Of: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 9/28/84

Qwip #: (215) 729-1670

Subject: \_\_\_\_\_

Message: Mac - I COULDN'T LOCATE THE  
TWO PAGE VERSION. *Joe*

Operator: K. McMullen

Company : O.B. Cannon

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of:	)	
	)	
TEXAS UTILITIES ELECTRIC	)	Dockets Nos. 50-445 and
COMPANY, <u>et al.</u>	)	50-446
	)	
(Comanche Peak Steam Electric	)	(Application for
Station, Units 1 and 2)	)	Operating License)

AFFIDAVIT OF JOSEPH J. LIPINSKY

My name is Joseph J. Lipinsky. I am employed by O.B. Cannon & Son, Inc., 5600 Woodland Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19143. A statement of my educational and professional qualifications is attached to this affidavit.

On July 26, 27 and 28, 1983, I visited Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station to evaluate certain aspects of the Applicants' coatings program. After that short site visit, I prepared a Trip Report. I understand that a copy of the Trip Report has been submitted to the Board in this proceeding. Because the observations and conclusions in the Trip Report no longer represent my views or the views of O.B. Cannon & Son, this affidavit will discuss in some detail each of the areas mentioned in the Trip Report.

84-10020723



CIRCUMSTANCES OF MY VISIT  
TO COMANCHE PEAK

I understand that Applicants retained O.B. Cannon during the summer of 1983 to evaluate certain aspects of the Comanche Peak coatings program, including observation and analysis of production, work procedures, scheduling, training and painter qualification, quality assurance, management, and specifications. In early July, the president of O.B. Cannon, Mr. Roth, instructed me to become involved in Cannon's efforts and to visit the site to provide additional input.

My initial visit to Comanche Peak was July 26 through July 28, 1983. On July 26, I met Mr. C.T. Brandt and several other individuals involved with the coatings program. We briefly discussed the purpose of my visit and I described how we would proceed. I then proceeded to tour the site and observe various activities related to the coatings program. I talked with several individuals to familiarize myself with the activities. We discussed the job status, project conditions and work activities. The majority of my time on July 26 was spent in the containment building for Unit 1.

On July 27, I returned to the site and continued with my review of the containment building for Unit 1. I observed work on the polar crane and dome. I then had about a 10-minute meeting with Messrs. Tolson and Brandt.

On July 28, I met with Mr. John Norris, who is an O.B. Cannon Vice-President in Houston, to discuss my observations. I then reviewed the FSAR commitments and other documentation. Finally, I participated in an exit interview. I expressed a few concerns regarding material storage, painter qualification, compliance with ANSI requirements and possible coatings integrity. Mr. Tolson asked me to provide specifics on these points, and I told him that I was unable to do so without conducting an in-depth review. The meeting was then concluded, and Mr. Norris, Mr. Merritt and I met with Mr. Joe George, the TUSI Vice President in charge of construction. (I mistakenly identified Mr. George as Mr. Church in my August 8 memorandum.) Mr. Merritt summarized the exit interview for Mr. George.

#### THE TRIP REPORT

On July 28, I returned to my office in Philadelphia and drafted Trip Report OBC Job No. H8301 (Comanche Peak Unit 1--Glen Rose, TX). I provided copies of the report to Mr. Roth and Mr. Norris. This document was intended for use strictly in-house, by O.B. Cannon. To my knowledge, Applicants did not become aware of the existence of my Trip

Report until mid-October, when Mr. Merritt called Mr. Roth and asked for a copy. Mr. Roth sent Mr. Merritt a copy of the Trip Report on October 12.

When I prepared the Trip Report, I was not aware that the Report would be distributed publicly or that it would be submitted as evidence in hearings before the NRC. Had I been more aware of the pendency of this case and the ramifications of my Trip Report, I would have more carefully and aggressively pursued the concerns I expressed in that report before memorializing those concerns in writing. I also would have been more assertive in my dealings with site management so that my concerns were known and addressed to my satisfaction at that time. Finally, had I known that the Trip Report might be considered to be my final views on the adequacy of the Comanche Peak coatings program, I would not have prepared the Report because I did not have sufficient information to make final judgments. In fact, at the time I received my assignment to visit the site in late July, I believed that three days was insufficient time for me to evaluate adequately the coatings program.

I do not know how my Trip Report became public. I understand that the NRC has concluded that it was "surreptitiously" taken by someone who provided it to the NRC. I assume that the word "surreptitiously" taken means that it was stolen. If the Report was taken from me it was so taken without my knowledge or consent.



CURRENT STATUS OF THE  
TRIP REPORT

I conducted an additional site visit in early November, at which time, in extended conferences, Applicants provided me with detailed information relating to each of the issues that I had earlier identified in my August 8 Trip Report. Applicants have subsequently provided me with additional information and documentation as to those issues. The specific issues identified in my Trip Report are materials storage, workmanship, coatings integrity, and inspector morale. Based on the information that has been presented to me, I believe today that the concerns expressed in my Trip Report are unfounded, and I am satisfied, based on my understanding of the situation, that the quality of the coatings program at Comanche Peak is adequate. This affidavit discusses each of the issues and statements identified or contained in the Trip Report.

MATERIALS STORAGE

When I first visited the Comanche Peak site I was looking at certain things that, to me, would indicate good materials storage practices. I looked for such things as status indicator tags (accept tags), reject areas and hold areas. Reject areas are locations where coating materials that have been rejected are stored. Hold areas are

locations where coating materials of indeterminate quality are stored. I saw no indications of the use of status tags, and I saw no reject areas or hold areas. Further, regarding the control of coating materials in general, I saw no system of tracking for control of mixed materials.

I have reviewed the affidavit of C. Thomas Brandt regarding the Comanche Peak procedures for coatings storage and control. Having reviewed his affidavit and supporting documentation, I am satisfied that the procedures at Comanche Peak used to track and document satisfactory coating materials satisfies the requirements of ANSI 101.4 and Appendix B. Had I been familiar with these procedures at the time of my site visit, I would not have criticized these aspects of materials storage and traceability in my August 8 Trip Report.

Specifically, I now know that the reason that I did not see reject areas or hold areas was because these areas are located at the Receiving Warehouse, which I did not visit while on site. With respect to traceability, I now understand that storage, mixing, and use of coating materials are fully overseen and documented by QC personnel. Again, had I been familiar with these procedures at the time that I wrote my August 8 memorandum, I would have had no basis on which to criticize Applicants' methods of handling mixed coating materials. Based on my current understanding

of the Comanche Peak storage and traceability program, I have no criticisms of practices and procedures utilized by Applicants.

#### WORKMANSHIP

My August 8 Trip Report identified workmanship as a problem at Comanche Peak. The only basis for this criticism was my observation of sags and runs in applied film. What I saw was, however, really was no different from what I have seen at most other job sites involving construction of nuclear power plants. Sags and runs are typically encountered in cured films. They may be acceptable or unacceptable, depending on the requirements of the relevant procedures and specifications.

I have reviewed Mr. Brandt's affidavit regarding the Comanche Peak procedural requirements for dry film thickness (DFT) readings. According to Mr. Brandt, areas that include sags and runs are routinely inspected by QC inspectors for compliance with the relevant requirements. If, therefore, a sag or run would cause rejection of the coatings work in question, Comanche Peak procedures would require either rework or disposition by engineering as acceptable. I am satisfied that Applicants have addressed any problems that sags or runs might present in procedures.



PAINTER QUALIFICATION AND  
INDOCTRINATION

During my site visit in July, 1983, I was told by one or more QC inspectors that Applicants did not qualify painters by actually requiring the application of coating material as a test for competence. This information, however, was erroneous. On a subsequent visit to Comanche Peak I observed craft personnel undergoing testing by applying zinc primer to test panels. I have also reviewed Mr. Brandt's affidavit regarding qualification of painters. Based on his discussion, I am satisfied that my original misapprehension was without basis.

I was also concerned, when I prepared my Trip Report, that the QA/QC organization did not monitor qualification processes for craft painters. I now understand from Mr. Brandt's affidavit that QC inspectors conduct visual examination of the test panels coated by the craft during the qualification and indoctrination program. I believe that this overview by QC is appropriate and important because it assures that the craft painters can apply the film in a manner that meets quality requirements.

In sum, I am now satisfied that my original impressions regarding the qualification and indoctrination of craft painters was erroneous.

ADEQUACY OF DOCUMENTATION

My August 8 Trip Report also mentioned documentation deficiencies as a problem. The areas on which I had focused were painter qualification forms and Inspection Reports (IRs). In order to meet ANSI standards the program must assure that pertinent data is recorded regarding both painter qualification and daily inspections. My conversations with a few individuals made me concerned that Applicants' painter qualification forms and IRs did not provide for a recording of all pertinent information. I do not recall whether this concern was triggered by actual review of these documents; my impression is that this observation was based on discussions with QC inspectors.

I have reviewed Mr. Brandt's affidavit with respect to Applicants' painter qualification forms and IRs. I have also reviewed the sample painter qualification forms and IRs attached to his affidavit. I am satisfied that Applicants' use of both forms fully complies with ANSI standards, and that my impression to the contrary, based on a very short visit to the site without any in-depth review of this documentation, was erroneous.

COATINGS INTEGRITY

My August 8 Trip Report indicated possible concerns with coating integrity. My specific concerns are listed in Paragraphs E and F of Page 4 of the Report, which address Applicants' practice of power grinding CZ-11, and applying new Phenoline 305 over old Phenoline 305 without extensive surface preparation. These observations were not based on a study of the specifications for the coatings systems, and were simply my observations based upon what I saw in the field. I now understand from Mr. Brardt's affidavit that Applicants have raised each of these issues with the coatings manufacturer, and I note that the manufacturer has approved these practices in writing. The manufacturer's approval of these practices fully satisfies any concerns that I might have had.

MORALE PROBLEMS

The basis for my concern that morale problems existed at Comanche Peak was my discussion with several QC inspectors. Management at the site acknowledged that morale was not high, and stated that they were taking steps to rectify the matter. I have no basis for concluding that



morale at the site was detrimental to quality. I believe that the most important thing is that management is aware of the situation and is taking steps to rectify it.

MANAGEMENT'S COMMITMENT  
TO QUALITY

When I prepared my August 8 memorandum, my impression was that Comanche Peak management was disinterested in quality and actually attempted to discourage efforts to report quality problems. I have concluded that my initial impression was based on misinformation and was erroneous.

I had a brief discussion with TUGCO's quality assurance manager, Ronald G. Tolson, on July 27, 1983. I attempted to discuss with him a few concerns regarding quality matters. I learned later that he understood my comments to relate to licensing questions. Mr. Tolson stated that he was not concerned with licensing questions, but my impression was that he was expressing disinterest in quality matters. I was frankly very surprised with his comment (as I then interpreted it) but did not pursue it with him at that time. Subsequent discussions with Mr. Tolson convinced me that my original impression (as reflected in the Trip Report) was incorrect and that he is in fact sincerely concerned about the quality of the project without regard to the licensing proceeding.

My impression that management at Comanche Peak discouraged efforts to report quality programs was principally based on my understanding (from what I was told by QC inspectors) that coatings inspectors were not permitted to use non-conformance reports (NCRs). As noted above, I further believed at the time that the IRs used at Comanche Peak did not adequately document non-conformance conditions. I did not review the Comanche Peak quality procedures to verify the inspectors' claims. I now understand, however, based on Mr. Brandt's affidavit, that inspectors are not precluded from using NCRs in appropriate circumstances, and further that the IRs used at Comanche Peak are fully adequate to document non-conformance conditions. In my judgment, this approach is acceptable from a quality assurance standpoint. Indeed, O.B. Cannon & Son uses a similar program in its work at other nuclear plants.

Based on my discussions with site management subsequent to August 8, I now believe that management is concerned and dedicated to maintaining quality as to the project coating program and that management encourages the reporting of non-conforming conditions or any other quality concerns.

BROWN AND ROOT'S  
HOSTILITY TO AUDITS

When I wrote the Trip Report, I perceived that Brown & Root was hostile to the idea of an audit and that no action would be taken by Brown & Root even if problems were detected in an audit. This impression was largely based on comments made by Mr. Tolson in an exit interview on July 28, 1983, during which he repeatedly stated that an audit by O.B. Cannon would be redundant. I took this to mean that he was hostile to an audit.

I should explain, first of all, that I was under the impression at the time that Mr. Tolson was employed by Brown & Root. I now know that he is employed by TUGCO. Thus, references to Brown & Root should have been references to TUGCO, with respect to audits.

I now understand more fully the basis and intent of Mr. Tolson's statements that an audit by me or by O.B. Cannon would not be productive. He has reconfirmed his view to me as recently as November 10, 1983. The basis for his belief, I now know, is the fact that during the period 1981 to 1983, the Comanche Peak QA/QC program has been subjected to repeated internal and external audits. In particular, as discussed in detail in Mr. Brandt's affidavit, Texas Utility's corporate QA department has conducted several audits, and the program has been audited further by external agencies, including the NRC itself. In view of these audits



and ongoing NRC review of the coating program, I agree with Mr. Tolson that an additional audit at this point would be redundant and unnecessary.

COMPARISON OF COMANCHE  
PEAK TO ZIMMER

My August 8 memorandum stated that "to some extent a parallel can be drawn with Comanche Peak and Zimmer." This unfortunate observation was my feeling at the time, based on my limited familiarity with the program, that Comanche Peak might be developing into a Zimmer-type situation. The poor quality of the coatings at Zimmer would have required a complete rework of that plant's coatings. Based on the information with which I have been provided by site personnel subsequent to my August 8 memorandum, I believe that this conclusion was in error. Based upon my understanding of the program and the procedures in place at Comanche Peak I now believe that there is no parallel between Comanche Peak and Zimmer and I regret having made such a comparison. My current belief is that no rework activities are necessary as to the Comanche Peak coatings program. My concerns have proven to be unfounded and I am satisfied, based on my current understanding of the program, that the quality of the coatings at Comanche Peak fully satisfies the requirements of ANSI and Appendix B.

MISCELLANEOUS CONCERNS

My Trip Report stated that "if quality work is put in place then they will be a long way to resolving site problems." That statement simply reflected my belief that if craft is careful in its application of coatings then the QC inspectors' job becomes routine and simple. If craft is careless, then the inspectors' job becomes more difficult. Obviously, the more desirable approach is to have the craft apply coatings in a quality-conscious manner. I did not intend for this statement to imply that the practices at Comanche Peak are not compatible with my philosophy, nor did the statement imply that coatings at Comanche Peak have been improperly applied or applied without regard to quality.

My Trip Report also referred to a "no win" situation on site between craft and QC inspectors. My impression was that the craft and inspectors were not functioning as a team but rather each seemed to be doing its job without regard for an integrated approach. My philosophy is that craft and inspectors should work together in a harmonious relationship to accomplish the objective. I questioned whether that objective was being met at Comanche Peak based upon my assessment at the time that the morale of the inspectors was low and that the attitudes of the craft and inspectors were in conflict. As I noted above, I expressed this point to

site management, which acknowledged that morale was not high and stated that they were taking steps to rectify the matter.

My Trip Report also discussed air supply problems experienced by the craft. The craft was experiencing problems on site with the air supply for spray painting or sand blasting. The air apparently contained water or oil, and the craft was spending a great deal of time correcting the problem, without being able to sandblast or apply coatings. Mr. Norris later provided site management with a description of equipment that would solve the problem, and my understanding is that the equipment was purchased. I have no reason to believe that the air supply problem adversely affected the quality of applied coatings because management was aware of it and took appropriate steps to rectify it.


The summary of my Trip Report includes the statement that Brown and Root wanted to "buy the 'right' answer." That statement relates back to my initial impression that Mr. Tolson was disinterested in quality matters. Again, my reference to "B&R" in the Trip Report was erroneous. Further, I am now convinced that my original impression of Mr. Tolson's attitude was also erroneous.




CONCLUSION

My August 8, 1983 Trip Report reflected my initial impressions conveyed during a very short visit to the site during which I had little opportunity to discuss my concerns with site management. My subsequent in-depth discussions with site management have demonstrated to me that my initial impressions were incorrect. I have not been induced in any way to retract my Trip Report, and I have not been subjected to any harassment, intimidation or threats by my employer, the Applicants or anyone associated with this proceeding. Indeed, I was asked by the intervenor, Mrs. Ellis, to testify on her behalf in this proceeding, and I tentatively agreed. My testimony would have been the same had I testified for Mrs. Ellis. It is unfortunate that a Trip Report innocently prepared by me to advise my superior of my observations and concerns in early August has apparently become the basis for a challenge to the adequacy of the Comanche Peak coatings program. As I have stated earlier, the Trip Report was based on incomplete information. Further, it was not, nor was it intended to be, a final view

of me or my company. It was merely input to the broader deliberations that my company needed to undertake in order to fully evaluate the adequacy of the Comanche Peak coatings program.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph J. Lipinsky

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 28<sup>th</sup> day of September, 1984.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public