

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
2 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

3  
4 OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS

5 REGION IV

6 611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 1000

7 Arlington, Texas 76011

8  
9 INTERVIEW OF

10 MYRON G. (CURLY) KRISHER

11  
12 Nuclear Operations Support  
13 Facility

14 Comanche Peak Steam Electric  
15 Station (CPSES)

16 Glen Rose, Texas 76043

17 Monday, November 28, 1983

18 The Interview was convened at 1:20 p.m.

19 PRESENT:

20 DONALD D. DRISKILL, Investigator

21 H. BROOKS GRIFFIN, Investigator

22  
23  
24 8410310252 840726  
PDR ADOCK 05000445  
25 Q PDR

## P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. DRISKILL: This is an interview of Myron G. (Curly) Krisher, K R I S H E R, who is employed by EBASCO Services, Incorporated, as a Quality Control Supervisor of Non-ASME Activities in Reactor Building 1, at Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Glen Rose, Texas.

Mr. Krisher, would you have any objection to standing and allowing me to administer an oath?

MR. KRISHER: No.

Whereupon,

MYRON G. (CURLY) KRISHER

having first been duly sworn by Investigator Driskill, was examined and testified as follows:

BY MR. DRISKILL:

Q Okay, Mr. Krisher, how long have you been employed by EBASCO Services, Incorporated?

A January 2nd, to date.

Q And how long have you been employed at Comanche Peak?

A The same.

Q I'll begin my questioning with a discussion regarding the matter pertaining to the termination of Ron Dunham, who was employed by Brown & Root as a Quality Control Lead Inspector in the Protective Coatings Department.

1 A Is "Ronald" Dunham "Bill" Dunham?

2 Q I'll correct the record: it's William Dunham.

3 Did you attend a meeting held on approximately  
4 August the 23rd or 24th--August the 24th--wherein two  
5 EBASCO protective coatings engineers conducted a class with  
6 the Comanche Peak Protective Coatings Inspectors?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Would you be good enough to describe the purpose  
9 of that meeting, please?

10 A Well, the two engineers were a part of a task  
11 force, engineering task force, involved in review and  
12 modification to the Protective Coatings Procedures  
13 Specifications. And they had approached the quality  
14 management that they felt an information meeting with the  
15 inspectors would make them more comfortable with the changes  
16 and things that were taking place both in the specification,  
17 quality procedures and construction procedures.

18 Q Just to digress a moment, were you a supervisor  
19 of William Dunham at that time?

20 A His direct supervisor of record at that time was  
21 Harry Williams. I was then assigned as the Quality  
22 Engineering Supervisor and acted for Mr. Brandt as the  
23 QA-QC Supervisor during any absences from the job site.

24 Q Okay, that was Tom Brandt who was the supervisor  
25 of non-ASME activities?

1           A     Right.

2           Q     Would you be good enough to describe William  
3 Dunham's conduct during the course of that meeting?

4           A     The--Mr. Dunham dominated the conversation, and  
5 he allowed no one to communicate with the engineers relative  
6 to the changes, other than himself; with one exception:  
7 Jerry Artrip did override that dominance, and discussed a  
8 point about the difference between what the engineers had  
9 said and what the disposition to a nonconformance report  
10 had been.

11                   He interrupted the engineers on almost every  
12 point. He was totally negative in all the changes, indicat-  
13 ing that what was really happening was that engineering  
14 was collapsing to the pressure of the schedule and manage-  
15 ment to make changes not warranted, and shouldn't be made  
16 in order to meet schedule.

17           Q     So, aside from Artrip, while you were present at  
18 the meeting, no other persons were really able to ask any  
19 questions?

20           A     To the best of my recollection, no one was able  
21 to address those two speakers other than Mr. Dunham.

22           Q     Did anyone attending that meeting, including  
23 Dunham's supervisor, attempt to get him to refrain from  
24 dominating the meeting, or ask him to sit down and allow  
25 others to talk?



1 A No, sir.

2 Q Were there other supervisors present?

3 A Supervisors--Harry Williams was there; and I  
4 was there.

5 Q Subsequent to that meeting what, to your knowledge,  
6 steps were taken to notify management of Dunham's attitude  
7 and conduct during the course of that meeting?

8 A After the meeting I took care of a couple of items  
9 at the area where the meeting took place, and returned to  
10 the office which I shared, essentially, with Mr. Brandt;  
11 and informed him that Dunham was a negative influence,  
12 and some type of a turn-around had to be accomplished; or  
13 he was going to hold up anybody from participating in the  
14 new program.

15 Q Okay, when you say a "turn-around," you're talking  
16 about changing his attitude?

17 A Right.

18 Q And, basically, what resulted from your meeting  
19 with Mr. Brandt?

20 A He, while I was there, called Mr. Towlson to  
21 advise him of what I had reported back from that meeting.  
22 And no action was discussed at that time, other than that  
23 he would get with Ron about Towlson.

24 Q In other words, based on what you were able to  
25 ascertain from his telephone conversation with Mr. Towlson,

1 they intended to discuss the matter later on?

2 A (Nodding affirmatively.)

3 Q Was there any determination, to your knowledge,  
4 made at the time to have a counseling session with Dunham,  
5 or anything of that sort?

6 A No.

7 Q But you did get the indication that they were  
8 going to do something?

9 A Yuh, Brandt and I discussed it some, the conversa-  
10 tion, what had happened at the trailer; but we didn't  
11 make any conclusions other than something had to be done  
12 to turn that around. The dominant, negative, influence  
13 was not in the best interest of the Protective Coatings  
14 Program.

15 Q Okay. On the day following this meeting and  
16 subsequent conversation with Mr. Brandt, were any other  
17 meetings held pertaining to what should be done about  
18 Dunham's conduct during the previous day's meeting?

19 A No specific meetings that I am aware of were held  
20 to discuss Dunham's conduct and/or what should be done about  
21 it.

22 Q Okay. Was the matter discussed at any time on the  
23 following day?

24 A On the following morning, Harry Williams,  
25 Everett Mouser, myself were in Mr. Brandt's office discussing

1 the protective coatings daily problems, problems of yester-  
2 day, resolutions of the day--just business as normal.

3 About 9:30, roughly, Mr. Purdy came in; he  
4 indicated that he had just came from Mr. Towlson's office,  
5 subject: Dunham. And that there would need to be a  
6 counseling and the potential existed that counseling and  
7 three days off without pay would possibly alert Mr. Dunham  
8 to the program.

9 Q Okay. And so at that time was it discussed what  
10 might occur with Dunham when an attempted counseling session  
11 and three days off were given to him?

12 A I don't--I don't think at any point in time  
13 anybody discussed anything about what might happen. All  
14 I perceived was counseling was a normal part of being a  
15 supervisor.

16 Q Was there any discussion relating to the termina-  
17 tion of Dunham?

18 A No, sir.

19 Q So on that particular day were there--did you  
20 attend any other meetings, or were you present during any  
21 other discussion relating to Dunham's conduct?

22 A I--Purdy left Brandt's office and we discussed  
23 Dunham in general; but based on his experience and back-  
24 ground, et cetera, he should be a positive influence as  
25 opposed to a negative influence. And essentially what we

1 wanted to accomplish was to take him to the other side of  
2 the pole, essentially; to get him to be the leader that  
3 at least on paper and experience-wise he should have been  
4 able to be, to be the positive influence as opposed to the  
5 negative influence.

6 Q Would I be correct in assuming, then, that your  
7 next participation in this sequence of events culminated  
8 by his termination would have been on the day of his  
9 termination?--which would have been on Friday, I believe,  
10 August the 26th?

11 A Yes. It was.

12 Q Would you tell me what particular things occurred  
13 on that particular day?

14 A Mr. Brandt was off-site. I think he was in  
15 Dallas at a licensing hearing; I don't specifically know--  
16 recall--where he was at.

17 Mr. Towlson called me over to his office; Purdy  
18 was present. We discussed the counseling, and it was  
19 determined that three days off was not appropriate due to  
20 the time delay since the event; but that we did want to  
21 continue with--go ahead with the counseling.

22 Q Did you have any involvement or participation  
23 in the preparation of the letter of reprimand or counseling  
24 report?

25 A Brown & Root has a standard counseling form for

1 employees. Due to other commitments, Mr. Purdy asked if I  
2 would prepare it. I did so in Mr. Towlson's office; had  
3 it typed by Mr. Brandt's secretary; didn't discuss it with  
4 anybody. Told Gordon I had it.

5 And he said, okay, that he would be tied up in  
6 the other matter until about, I think, 3:30, quarter to  
7 4:00 I should meet him in his office at that point in time.

8 And that--I think I was supposed to meet him at  
9 quarter-till, and to schedule Dunham to be in his office at  
10 four o'clock.

11 Q I see.

12 A That's memory, I'm not sure; I don't know.

13 Q Yuh, that's good.

14 Was the document that you prepared a Brown & Root  
15 counseling form?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Did you rough-draft this document on the three-  
18 part memo?

19 A I worked it up on a piece of lined notebook  
20 paper similar to what you're taking the minutes on.

21 Q So are you aware of this counseling report  
22 statement ever being typed, or printed, or handwritten onto  
23 a three-part memo?

24 A No, sir.

25 Q Okay. Did you attend the meeting at four o'clock



1 in Gordon Purdy's office?

2 A Yes, I did.

3 Q With Mr. Purdy and William Dunham?

4 A He was brought to Mr. Purdy's office by  
5 Everett Mouser, who was acting as the Supervisor of  
6 Protective Coatings direct, because Harry Williams was off  
7 with a back injury.

8 Q Okay.

9 Would you tell me what occurred when Dunham came  
10 into the room?

11 A I'd been there about ten minutes. I showed the  
12 prepared form to Mr. Purdy. He--asked him if it was  
13 all right? He said it was fine.

14 The door was closed. Everett and Bill showed up,  
15 rapped on the door, and Gordon essentially waved them in;  
16 and Bill popped the door open with a "Hi, here I am."

17 And they exchanged pleasantries--"haven't seen you  
18 for a while," you know. Gordon asked him to sit down.

19 And Bill sat across the table from me. And  
20 Everett took a chair in the corner adjacent to the desk.

21 And Gordon told Bill, it seemed like we had a  
22 problem, "I'd like you to look at this." He handed the  
23 form to him.

24 In seconds, Bill slammed it down, set it back;  
25 "This is a bunch of bullshit, no fucking way am I going to

1 change. You know this is a lie." Very agitated, upset.  
2 A statement to the fact that, "I'm not going to change.  
3 You might as well get my time and take me to the gate,  
4 get my money."

5 Gordon told him, "settle down, let's talk about  
6 it."

7 And Bill responded with, "No, to hell with it.  
8 I've had it. This is enough of this shit. You don't have  
9 to worry about me. I got another job to go to. I know  
10 what's going on here, and I've got mine. And you might as  
11 well give me the gate."

12 And Gordon again attempted to settle him down.

13 Bill again indicated vehemently that he was  
14 not going to accept counseling. He wasn't going to change.  
15 It was all a lie. And again he said, "Get my time."

16 And Mr. Purdy said, "That's what you want?"

17 "That's what I want."

18 Gordon said, "Okay, I can take care of that."

19 And he left the office for about a minute; came  
20 back; asked us to escort Bill to get his personal belongings;  
21 that he would take care of the appropriate actions at the  
22 time office.

23 Q So did you accompany Dunham to the time office?

24 A Gordon left and Everett and I went out of the  
25 building with Bill, and started towards his area. And I

1 told Everett that I was going to go to the time office.  
2 And I got about halfway there and I thought, "No, that's  
3 not too cool with things the way they are; I probably  
4 better stay where the action might be in case there's a  
5 problem and I could maybe correct it."

6 So we went by parallel but different routes to  
7 the trailer. They got there maybe 30 seconds before I  
8 did.

9 And Dunham went in, made some disparaging remarks  
10 about, "Well, they finally got me," this-that-and-the-  
11 other; gathered up his stuff; and we started back out.

12 I told Everett to stay put, to settle the troops  
13 down, get everybody back to work.

14 And I walked roughly five paces behind Dunham  
15 back towards the personnel gate. He stopped and talked to  
16 one fellow employee enroute. He indicated to me I didn't  
17 need to go with him, he knew the way. And I didn't  
18 respond, just went along; stayed between he and the  
19 return back to the site until they collected his badge and  
20 brass.

21 And then I left the area and went back to  
22 Mr. Towlson's office to report what the situation was,  
23 and Mr. Purdy was already there.

24 Q Did you discuss with him what had occurred?

25 A With who?

1 Q Mr. Purdy and Mr. Towlson?

2 A I only indicated that I'd been with him to the  
3 gate and until they collected his brass badge, and then I  
4 left.

5 Q Did any of you, meaning yourself, Mr. Purdy,  
6 or Mr. Towlson, go to the time shack to fill out any document  
7 pertaining to his termination?

8 A That's where Mr. Purdy went when we came off the  
9 hill while--he went there while Dunham, Mouser and myself  
10 were down the other end.

11 Q What seemed to be the consensus of opinion in  
12 Mr. Towlson's office when Purdy explained what had occurred?

13 A That Dunham had in fact quit, refused to accept  
14 counseling; that was my perception.

15 Q Was there any determination that this was good,  
16 bad, or indifferent?

17 A No. I was only in there for, I think, about two  
18 minutes.

19 I think Mr. Towlson called downtown to notify  
20 his supervisor of the situation.

21 Q During the course of this two-or-three-days,  
22 did you ever hear anyone mention or refer to something like  
23 a "48-hour rule" in relation to what action should be taken  
24 with respect to Dunham's conduct during the course of the  
25 meeting on Tuesday or Wednesday?

1 Do you know what that means?

2 A No, sir.

3 What's it mean?

4 Q Later.

5 A Okay.

6 (Laughter)

7 Q Were you acquainted with Dunham prior to attending  
8 the meeting on the Tuesday or Wednesday? Had you been  
9 previously acquainted with him?

10 A By "acquainted," did I know who he was?

11 Q Yes?

12 A Approximately two weeks prior to that there had  
13 been a meeting called by Project Management to address the  
14 protective coatings problems. It was an effort to gather  
15 both Craft and Quality together as a cohesive unit each to  
16 do their own thing, accomplishing, you know, the work in a  
17 workman-like and timely manner, as a part of the revisions  
18 to the Protective Coatings Procedures, and et cetera.

19 Mr. Towlson was scheduled to speak at that meeting.  
20 That's a date that we can pin down definitely, because that  
21 was also the day that the ANI's shut-down the ASME operation  
22 for cause, which tied Towlson up with management in a  
23 review of what were the problems.

24 Brandt was off-site. Towlson asked me to go as  
25 his representative and to speak on behalf of the quality



1 program.

2 After the meeting several inspectors--several,  
3 three, maybe four--came to me to talk about the protective  
4 coatings problem. Two of the people were quite vehement  
5 that they were being intimidated and harassed, and the  
6 problem was that applicators were just absolutely not trying  
7 to do a good job; they didn't care.

8 I didn't know who the people were. One of them  
9 had his name on his hat, I recognized. Afterwards I asked  
10 who the primary speaker was. And by describing the indivi-  
11 dual and comparing him to somebody else, they told me it  
12 was Bill Dunham.

13 And that was my first acquaintance with Mr.  
14 Dunham and my only conversation with him, other than  
15 possibly we passed in the hall, you know, "Hi, what's going  
16 on?"

17 Q I understand.

18 A Between those two times.

19 Q But on that occasion he did discuss with you the  
20 fact that he believed that the protective coatings QC  
21 personnel were being intimidated, harassed or something to  
22 that effect?

23 A Yes, he did.

24 Q On that particular occasion did you agree?

25 A I told him that I was very concerned with what

1 they were telling me; and that I would investigate it.

2 Q What was the result of your investigation?

3 A I talked to numerous other inspectors, several  
4 craftspersons and superintendents involved in the activities;  
5 to the degree that I was able to get to, it was still going  
6 on when the Dunham situation went up: that the intimidation  
7 and harassment was, as usual, a matter of perception--  
8 different for each of us.

9 Some of the protective coatings inspectors felt  
10 that nobody should observe them while they were doing their  
11 inspections. By "observe," I mean not even from an adjacent  
12 area; that there should be no discussion about whether they  
13 had made a good judgment or a poor judgment in a reject-  
14 inspection condition.

15 That there was probably a little too much  
16 personality involved between applicators, foremen, and  
17 inspectors; as opposed to being objective, people were taking  
18 it personally.

19 Q So you didn't find what you believed to be  
20 any occurrences of intimidation or harassment?

21 A I did not--I asked people at the meeting--both  
22 meetings--to come to me when they had a specific incidence,  
23 so that I could act on that instance, as opposed to  
24 generalities and hearsay.

25 To date, I have not yet received the first

1 specific instance.

2 Q Would this first meeting with Dunham have occurred  
3 on an occasion where there was a barbeque?

4 A There was a barbeque after work that afternoon at  
5 Mr. Frankum's farm, ranch. All protective coatings people  
6 were invited, inspectors, applicators, engineers,  
7 superintendents--everybody.

8 Q Was that the occasion that you talked with Dunham?

9 A It was that afternoon; yes, earlier that after-  
10 noon--in the rain.

11 Q On having this meeting with, or this chat with  
12 Dunham, where he initially told you about the alleged  
13 intimidation--

14 A Um-huh?

15 Q --did you later meet with coatings inspectors to  
16 discuss this matter with them?

17 A My only conversation with coatings inspectors  
18 about any subject was when I perceived that that information  
19 meeting wasn't going any place, and took command of the  
20 meeting to discuss quality relative to changes and to  
21 assure the people that they were to inspect only to the  
22 procedures, to make no changes in inspection based on the  
23 information they were given until the procedures were  
24 changed.

25 I did address the fact at that meeting that I

1 had looked into, to some extent, intimidation and  
2 harassment; and that without specific examples, that there  
3 was very little anybody could do.

4 I discussed the fact that--with supervisors,  
5 craft--that it would not be tolerated. And I told the  
6 people in that meeting if they ever felt physically  
7 intimidated that they were to immediately leave the area,  
8 come back to their supervisor, or come to my area and talk  
9 to myself or Brandt.

10 Okay, and that was the only time that I talked  
11 about it.

12 Q Okay.

13 I'd like to, if I could, get you--are you familiar  
14 with the Lipinski memo?

15 A I am now familiar with it. I was not at the time  
16 of any of the previous activities; but, yes, I am now.

17 Q Have you had the opportunity to look at it?

18 A Have I had the opportunity to look at it?

19 I've read it; yuh.

20 Q Do you recall a statement being made in that memo  
21 which said something like 35 out of 450 coatings craft  
22 personnel were qualified to do ASME work?

23 A I recall the statement, numbers; I don't.

24 Q It was very small, less than ten percent?

25 A Okay.

1           Q     Indicated less than ten percent of the painters  
2     were qualified to ASME standards; do you recall the state-  
3     ment?

4           A     Yes.

5           Q     Do you know whether, in fact, that's an accurate  
6     statement?

7           A     I cannot say. I do not know.

8           Q     Do you know where Mr. Lipinski may have come up  
9     with that figure?

10          A     I don't know what records Mr. Lipinski was  
11     privy to. I--whether it was based on records of certifica-  
12     tion of applicators, or whether it was from field observa-  
13     tions on his part, apparently from the memo he had seen and  
14     looked at an awful lot of things while he was here.

15                 So I don't know.

16          Q     So you have no knowledge regarding how he came  
17     into possession of that particular information?

18          A     I do not.

19          Q     Do you have any previous experience in coatings?

20          A     A little.

21          Q     Have you had the opportunity since you've been  
22     here to do your own personal evaluation of the craft  
23     protective coatings group?

24          A     To a limited extent, yes; not to the depth I'd  
25     like to and that I'm soon going to be able to, I think.



1           My impression is they're like everybody else:  
2     some are trying very hard and want to do an excellent job;  
3     but there are always a few who will do a little less than  
4     what's expected, and possibly substandard, just because  
5     that's the way they are.

6           They are being policed very closely by their  
7     foremen superintendents to correct that attitude. My  
8     understanding is there have been a few of them reduced in  
9     grade because they were not producing an acceptable stan-  
10    dard.

11           Q     Have you hired any new protective coatings QC  
12    personnel recently?

13           A     Recently? How recent?

14           Q     Last couple of months? Three months?

15           A     Um-huh.

16           Q     How many have you hired, or have been hired?

17           A     Well, we hired a new quality engineer.

18           Q     Was that in addition to the one that you had  
19    previously, or--do you now have two?

20           A     We had--we had one who was doing multiple  
21    activities. We now have one who is doing nothing but  
22    protective coatings.

23           Q     What's his name?

24           A     Well, actually we have two. We have Mr. Jerry  
25    Fertell, who is an EBASCO employee, Protective Coatings

1 Corrosion Engineer, who is acting as a quality engineer,  
2 assisting in developing our program and making changes.

3 We have hired Mr. Tim Mason, who is also an  
4 EBASCO employee, to act as a quality engineer full-time.

5 And, let's see, I think there are two, and maybe  
6 three, protective coatings inspectors that have come from  
7 off-site.

8 Q Okay.

9 Were some inspectors hired who formerly--

10 A Okay.

11 Q --were painters?

12 A Due to the length of time it was taking to  
13 accomplish inspections, we were lagging behind production  
14 substantially in inspections.

15 We have taken 16 protective coating applicators  
16 or helpers who could meet the AMSE minimum or better for  
17 inspection.

18 Q That's a requirement, AMSE requirement?

19 A Yes.

20 We interviewed, I don't know, about--I did the  
21 interviewing--25 men; and selected, I think 20; four of  
22 the 20 selected declined; and the other 16 have now comp-  
23 leted a limited certification program to do in-process  
24 steel, miscellaneous steel, excluding containment lining,  
25 inspections.

1           They served prescribed OJT and the classroom  
2 training and quality indoctrination, and were certified  
3 about three weeks ago as a limited inspector. They can do  
4 all the in-process; they can't do final work.

5           Q     On steel--such as hangers, cable trays, that sort  
6 of thing?

7           A     Right.

8           Q     Okay.

9                 I'd like to discuss--

10          A     Can I expand upon that?

11          Q     Sure, certainly.

12          A     When that program came up I was pretty doubtful,  
13 okay? I had personal reservations.

14                 I've had a lot of success in 30-some-years in this  
15 business, taking craftspeople, which I have been--an  
16 ex-crafts-type, and making them inspectors.

17                 But not being directly involved in the intimate  
18 quality arena for protective coatings, on this site I'd  
19 heard a lot of bad, negative, things; and I was very  
20 concerned about this program.

21                 Of the 25 people I interviewed, I found numerous  
22 college educations, several master's degrees, and a sincere  
23 interest in becoming inspectors as a way to self-improvement  
24 on their part.

25                 At the end of the interviews, I felt pretty

1 positive about it, having addressed the group and talked to  
2 them one-on-one during the interviews, and collectively  
3 during their training, overall, I feel very positive about  
4 their attitude, their belief in the quality program; that  
5 they are sincerely interested in the quality of the coatings  
6 system, and sincerely interested in quality control as a  
7 career objective.

8 Q So you believe that all of these individuals  
9 are qualified for the training program which they have  
10 been placed, and that they will all make good inspectors?

11 A When you say "all," that's a big word.

12 16 of them, I would say; there are probably two or  
13 three that, like any time you get 16 people together,  
14 possibly are less motivated than the balance.

15 Yet,--and a couple of those are a little bit  
16 slower-thinking and learning; but they may end up being  
17 the best inspectors overall.

18 Overall I think it was an excellent choice.

19 Q Okay.

20 A I think they did well.

21 Q Okay.

22 A As a matter of fact, I think I'm going to do it  
23 again.

24 Q Hire some more?

25 A We would like to get up to balance, basically an

1 inspector per crew of painters.

2 Q So you're still, yet, short of an adequate number  
3 of coatings inspectors?

4 A Yes, sir.

5 Probably be--depends where--we have a lot of  
6 documentation reviews we're putting together to clear up  
7 the past inspection activities; and we're going to need to  
8 put two or three people into that activity who know about  
9 all the documents and what went on.

10 And I would say offhand probably we're going to  
11 be six or seven people short, roughly.

12 Q How are your coatings inspectors which you had  
13 prior to hiring these, how do you rate their performance  
14 overall?

15 A Overall? Good.

16 Q I don't suppose that it would be unfair to ask  
17 what--or I suppose it's been discussed, and it's understood  
18 by those in supervisory capacities over these individuals,  
19 that a number of them have talked with NRC on occasions,  
20 and registered their personal complaints with respect to  
21 the coatings program here with the NRC?

22 A I am not personally aware of any inspector who  
23 has talked to the NRC.

24 Q You have no knowledge that they have ever talked  
25 to the NRC?



1 A No, sir.

2 Q None of them have ever told you that?

3 A No, sir.

4 Q Has anyone in a management capacity ever discussed  
5 that matter with you?

6 A Not by name.

7 Q Would you explain what you mean by that?

8 A To the best of my knowledge I am aware that there  
9 have been inspectors who've gone to the NRC with concerns.

10 To the best of my knowledge, I do not know  
11 the names of those individuals.

12 Q Okay.

13 And going back to the question I asked you a few  
14 minutes ago, are you relatively well-satisfied with the  
15 performance of the individuals who were in the protective  
16 coatings quality control group, prior to hiring the new  
17 people you hired?

18 A Overall and in general, yes.

19 Q Do you have any of them who are causing any  
20 problems or where you feel that their work is inadequate?--  
21 and I think that's a fair question.

22 A We have several inspectors in protective coatings  
23 who seem to be unable to determine whether they are the  
24 engineer, the inspector, the quality engineer. They want  
25 to make their own determination whether an item is

1 acceptable or rejectable to their own standards and not  
2 necessarily to the quality instructions.

3 Q So with respect to these particular one or several  
4 individuals, you believe that they are utilizing a stricter  
5 standard than may in some cases be required by the proce-  
6 dures?

7 A Some of them are unwilling to accept the  
8 engineering determination as to what is an acceptable stan-  
9 dard.

10 And in coatings, areas such as interface onto  
11 adjacent sites, slight spatter are not, in general, a  
12 specific science; it's more to an art. In other words,  
13 how much scattered overspray, for example, adjacent to,  
14 is acceptable?

15 Q Okay.

16 A That can be interpreted as from three spots in  
17 100 feet to one spot in a half a mile.

18 And that's almost the same exaggeration that  
19 we experience with some of the inspectors.

20 Q Okay.

21 A They want everything in black-and-white: you can  
22 have ten spots; or, no, you can have one and it's got to be  
23 an inch-and-a-half not an inch-and-nine-sixteenths.

24 Q At this time are you considering taking any  
25 adverse action against any of these individuals--without

1 asking names?

2 A No, sir.

3 MR. DRISKILL: Okay, I don't have any further  
4 questions with respect to that.

5 Can we go off the record for just a minute,  
6 please?

7 (Discussion off the record.)

8 MR. DRISKILL: Okay.

9 BY MR. DRISKILL:

10 Q Another area I'd like to ask a couple of questions  
11 about relatés--we'll go back to the point at which you came  
12 here, but I'm interested in the changes that have occurred  
13 procedurally in the coatings program in the last ten or  
14 eleven months since you've been here.

15 My own look at the procedures for quality control  
16 inspection of protective coatings leads me to believe that  
17 there's been a lot of thinking and re-thinking of what  
18 is going on procedurally, due to the large number of changes  
19 which have occurred in the procedures, an unusually high  
20 number of procedural changes in the last six, eight, ten  
21 months.

22 Is that not correct?

23 A Yuh.

24 Q Okay.

25 One of the areas, one of the specific areas--I

1 don't want to go into anything technical--

2 A All right.

3 Q --I recognize that some of these changes have  
4 related to technical changes.

5 One of the areas that I'm interested in has to do  
6 with the use of the NCR's.

7 A Okay.

8 Q Would I be correct in assuming that NCR's were--  
9 the use of NCR's--was included in the QC procedures at the  
10 time you arrived?

11 In other words, inspectors were, per procedure,  
12 instructed to write an NCR on nonconforming conditions  
13 identified during the course of inspections?

14 A That would be correct.

15 Q During the--I guess during the summer of this  
16 year, procedures were changed over a period of time to  
17 reflect that NCR's were no longer to be written, but the  
18 inspection report was to be the vehicle used to report  
19 nonconforming conditions?

20 Is that correct?

21 A Unless otherwise directed by the supervisor.

22 Q Could you give me the rationale or reasons that  
23 were used to make this procedural change?

24 A About 90 percent of your nonconformance reports  
25 in all disciplines are disposition, "standard repair," or

1 "rework with standard repair procedures."

2 If you have--if you can repair or rework with a  
3 standard repair-rework procedure on a singular document  
4 beginning upon the day or the hour or even the minute of  
5 the unsatisfactory or nonconforming condition--both being  
6 used in the same text--you save timewise maybe three days  
7 or longer.

8 That, essentially, was the reason why it was  
9 changed.

10 It was specifically changed in procedures to  
11 some of these same over-zealous people felt that they  
12 needed to write a nonconformance report, you know, in order  
13 to demonstrate their stroke, their position in the  
14 hierarchy in existence on the nuclear site. They were  
15 unwilling to accept the normal standard for allowing rework,  
16 which is if you have a repair procedure, just as if you  
17 fail an X-ray on a critical weld, you don't have a  
18 nonconformance; you have a substandard condition for which  
19 you have an established repair procedure. And that also  
20 exists in the coatings arena.

21 Q In other words, they were second-guessing the  
22 disposition of the NRC's they were writing?

23 A No. Second-guessing, I don't think, is--

24 Q Well, disagree with the disposition?

25 A Yuh.



1           What's the best way to put it?

2           Using it as a whipping-post, okay? I don't like  
3 this, you're agitating me, you're harassing, intimidating  
4 me, saying things I don't want to say or talk about. I'll  
5 fix your ass, I'll write an NCR on you--that type of a thing.  
6 Plus lack of confidence in possibly the craft repair  
7 procedures; they felt they couldn't document it adequately.  
8 Again, what--over-zealous, or something.

9           Q     So then this was part of the reason that  
10 reference to 16.0, the nonconformance procedure, was deleted  
11 from the protective coatings procedures? I say, now, in  
12 part?

13          A     That was the primary reason that the paragraph in  
14 the two main instructions were changed. I won't quote  
15 numbers because I would probably have the wrong ones--but  
16 they were changed to substantially to read, on an "unsat  
17 IR" or as directed by the QA-QC supervisor, I think is what  
18 they say.

19                I know that's in there because one of your  
20 counterparts was--

21          Q     Okay, well, let me ask this question:

22                Was that recently changed back to its original,  
23 the original writing, so that now, once again, NCR's are  
24 completed as part of the procedure for coatings?

25          A     I don't know.

1           Q     Basically what I saw was that six, eight, ten  
2 months ago, protective coatings QC procedures Reference  
3 16.0; then we move away from that through one or more  
4 changes to where 16.0 is not any longer included as a part  
5 of the coatings QC procedures; and now, I believe--I  
6 looked at them last week, effective November the 15th--  
7 and 16.0 was again referenced in the coatings QC procedures,  
8 indicating that NCR's can be written on nonconforming  
9 conditions?

10           A     I'd have to look at the back issues of that,  
11 I'd have to look at the historical file to tell you  
12 exactly.

13                     At no time was it ever the intent to prevent  
14 anyone from writing a nonconformance report on a noncon-  
15 forming condition, specifically something that there was not  
16 and is not a approved repair-rework procedure for. That  
17 was not the intent at any time in the protective coatings  
18 procedures.

19                     The intent of procedures in that procedure  
20 relative to reporting of nonacceptable conditions, as  
21 opposed to nonconforming conditions, was to report them on  
22 the IR, which would then cause--it would document the  
23 unacceptable condition or unsatisfactory condition; and  
24 allow the craft to repair or rework that to approved repair  
25 procedures.

1           It was not to restrict. It was done to--a  
2 nonconforming condition is a serious, and needs to be  
3 recognized for what it is--nonconforming; it's something  
4 that, if it was not corrected or addressed, could be  
5 deleterious to the plant, cause severe problems..

6           However, no unit of work in protective coatings  
7 included can ever be done without some unsatisfactory  
8 work, just as a part of the dialy activity. Our inspection  
9 corps, a few, were insistent that anything substandard--  
10 no matter how insignificant and routine, down to as far as  
11 lint and dust on the item, or what-have-you--would be  
12 recorded on a nonconformance condition.

13           And when you do that, two things result:

14           You are delaying the completion of the project,  
15 and that's certainly also you tend to cover up--if you are  
16 looking at 1,000 nonconformance reports--you get pretty  
17 bored looking at nonconformance reports; and you may miss  
18 a very substantial, detrimental, problem--which has  
19 happened on a couple of places.

20           Q     Okay.

21           Did you attend sometime several months ago a  
22 meeting where Ron Towlson tried--had a meeting with the  
23 coatings QC inspectors--to encourage them to use the IR's  
24 as a vehicle for reporting unsatisfactory inspections?

25           Did you attend that meeting?

1 A I go to so many meetings, I don't know.

2 Q This particular meeting would have included  
3 probably most of the day-shift coating inspectors?

4 And I'm guessing, it would probably have happened  
5 in July?

6 A I can't recall. I don't recall that.

7 MR. DRISKILL: Do you have any questions with  
8 respect to this?

9 MR. GRIFFIN: I have a few.

10 BY MR. GRIFFIN:

11 Q Going back to the meeting with Mr. Dunham where  
12 you said he was disrupting--

13 A Um-huh.

14 Q Besides being disruptive, did he pose any questions  
15 to these engineers?

16 A Productive questions, I don't recall any, do not  
17 recall, did not see any productive.

18 Questions that I recall him asking were more  
19 like, "What you really mean is Craft can do what they want  
20 to do"; or, "Craft doesn't have to do this".

21 Q So he didn't really ask any questions of those  
22 engineers?

23 He just commented on their statements? Is that  
24 more--

25 A Yes.

1           He asked some questions, but they were--what--  
2       they were negative-type questions; you know, "What you  
3       mean is..."; or, "Is this what you mean?" And the general  
4       trend of that was that, "What you mean is that we can't  
5       do this, and the Craft can do what they want to do; is that  
6       what you mean?"--that type of a question. And the specifics,  
7       I don't recall.

8           Q     Did his concerns in these negative questions  
9       he put to the engineers, do you think they reflected the  
10      concerns of the other inspectors around?

11          A     Based on my conversation with several of the  
12      inspectors in the room at that time, I don't--based on  
13      there being 20 inspectors, I think he was probably asking  
14      the questions of about four or five; the same four or five  
15      that are going to be on this list.

16          Q     Other than this talk that you had with Dunham  
17      on the day of that barbeque--

18          A     Um-huh.

19          Q     --was there any other behavior that you personally  
20      witnessed or that you heard of from third-parties that  
21      would indicate or explain Dunham's behavior during that  
22      meeting with the engineers?

23          A     I, previous to the meeting with--the day of the  
24      barbeque--I don't recall ever discussing Dunham, or, you  
25      know, even knowing what a Dunham was, or who he was, anything



1 about him.

2 After the Friday in which his services were no  
3 longer required at Comanche Peak; a man who shares my  
4 office--shared my office--I think I asked possibly, you  
5 know, "Was Dunham always this way?"

6 And he responded that he had heard that maybe  
7 the man had a personal problem. And other than that, I don't  
8 know anything about Mr. Dunham.

9 Q I'm going to change subjects:

10 As relates to these 16 inspectors that have  
11 recently been hired from Craft--

12 A Um-huh.

13 Q --were they hired for the purposes of ongoing  
14 inspections, or were they going to participate in the  
15 backfit?

16 What is their--why were they brought on at this  
17 particular time?

18 A We did a statistical analysis of the inspection  
19 results of the backfits, and with the exception of  
20 containment liner, it was found that statistically 95  
21 percent of the items were acceptable.

22 And we discontinued doing backfit on anything but  
23 the containment liner.

24 Q Well, with 16 new inspectors hired, what are  
25 they inspecting?

1 A To participate in in-process, ongoing inspections.

2 Q Is there a whole lot of painting taking place  
3 right now?

4 A Yuh, there's about 150 painters out there working.

5 Q Okay, were these 150 painters working two months  
6 ago?

7 A Yuh, roughly about the same number were working.

8 Q Well, my question to you is: what has occurred  
9 that all of a sudden you need so many new inspectors?

10 A We've had an open requisition for inspectors for  
11 a long time.

12 Q So is it these positions were just allotted at  
13 this particular time?

14 A It's very difficult to hire level-2, which is  
15 what we're attempting to recruit, inspectors in the coatings  
16 arena.

17 Q Well, the difficulty--I still don't quite under-  
18 stand your answer.

19 What events have occurred in the last month or  
20 two that about this new need?

21 A We've had the need.

22 Q And what did you all--give more money, or new  
23 positions allotted in this area; or, why were these people  
24 hired at this time?

25 What was the impetus for hiring them?

1           A     We were--"we"--inspection--were continuing  
2 to lag behind and delay Craft. We weren't staying abreast  
3 of them.

4                     In other words they may work an area and then  
5 move on to another area, and we'd get there three days  
6 later to the inspections; and they'd have to come back  
7 to repair and do corrections.

8                     A lot of time--inspection time--is spent looking  
9 at the substrate preparation, and the primer application;  
10 then the general protective coatings application; and,  
11 ultimately, the final coat; and final acceptance of the  
12 area and/or the item.

13                    And--which, the final proof-of-the-pudding is  
14 the total system.

15           Q     Who authorized this new hiring? At what level?  
16 Who would that be?

17           A     Well, I--specifically, I don't know. I know that  
18 it was discussed probably at the vice-presidential-level,  
19 between Brown & Root, the Texas Utility, whichever, I don't  
20 know in the company, specifically. It was handled at levels  
21 higher than this job site.

22           Q     Do you know the answer to the question: why at  
23 this particular time all these people were hired in  
24 coatings?

25           A     Yuh. I thought I just gave it to you.

1           Q     Well, you said the need had been ongoing for a  
2 long time. And I'm talking about: why, all of a sudden  
3 it was authorized?

4           A     I think the Craft was able to demonstrate to their  
5 management trail that they had umpteem-square-feet and  
6 hundreds of items that were awaiting inspection, that they  
7 couldn't close-out and move off an area; and that the  
8 inspectors that the call-board was wanting daily, items  
9 were placed two, three days, maybe longer, before the  
10 inspector could respond.

11          Q     Okay.

12                Let's switch subjects again:

13                Since you've been on-site in your role as a  
14 supervisor, did you ever attend any meeting at which  
15 coatings inspectors were told, specifically told, that they  
16 could not write NCR's?

17          A     I don't think so.

18          Q     Have you ever attended a meeting or counseling  
19 sessions with coatings inspectors at which you were present  
20 when other supervisors told inspectors they were not  
21 allowed to write NCR's?

22          A     No.

23          Q     Have you ever heard from third-parties, other  
24 supervisors--that inspectors were not allowed to write  
25 NCR's?

1           A     I imagine I have, yuh.

2           Q     Do you recall who was putting out the word to  
3 inspectors that they could not write NCR's? Which  
4 supervisors?

5           A     Pick anybody who's not here, anybody that's no  
6 longer on the job-site. It's a standard procedure any  
7 place you go.

8                     Anybody that's gone, you can attribute anything  
9 to.

10          Q     Well, I'm going to ask you to be more straight-  
11 forward with me than that.

12                     Can you name any names of supervisors who speci-  
13 fically told coatings inspectors they could not write  
14 NCR's?

15          A     It was attributed to Harry Williams. It was  
16 attributed to Bob Wallace. It was attributed to somebody  
17 else who was there previous to that; I don't recall the  
18 name right now. I'm not real good on names.

19          Q     Did Tom Brandt ever tell coatings inspectors  
20 they could not write NCR's?

21          A     When the changes took place in the instructions,  
22 Mr. Brandt and myself told people that they could not  
23 write an NCR on a coating system without the approval of  
24 a supervisor, which is per the instruction.

25          Q     Well, as Mr. Driskill said earlier, one of the



1 provisions of the coatings inspection--the QI's, quality  
2 instructions--was took out, 16.0, nonconformances, and  
3 that left only inspection reports. The QI did not reference  
4 nonconformances at all.

5 And during that time were these inspectors told  
6 they could write nonconformances based on verbal instruc-  
7 tions?

8 A I personally did not have any conversations with  
9 those types that I recall. I was not aware of any, nor  
10 am I aware of any Tom Brandt had to that effect; okay?

11 Again, all I can tell you is that the intent  
12 of any change that I'm aware of in those instructions,  
13 was relative to reference to CBQP 16.0.

14 Q Okay.

15 But if, say, for a period of six or eight months  
16 16.0 was not in the QI's--

17 A Um-huh.

18 Q --were they allowed to write them despite the  
19 fact it wasn't?

20 A Were there any written during that period of  
21 time?

22 Q I do not know?

23 A I suspect there were several written during that  
24 period of time.

25 Q And those would have been with the authorization

1 of a supervisor?

2 A In general.

3 Q Does that mean the supervisor was the one that  
4 was the originator of those written?

5 A No.

6 Q Would it have been that the supervisor upgraded  
7 an "unsat" on an IR to an NCR, and then instructed the  
8 coatings inspectors to write an NCR?

9 A Normally that's how the dialogue goes. I wasn't  
10 there. I mean, I didn't have a dialogue, as you and I are  
11 having, with the inspector; and tell him to write them up.

12 Q Okay.

13 Since 16.0 has been put back in the QI--

14 A Um-huh.

15 Q --are inspectors authorized at this time to write  
16 nonconformance reports?

17 A With the approval of their supervisor.

18 Q So, are you saying that even though it was not  
19 in the QI for a while, it was never really--it was never  
20 really not permitted to write them?

21 A That's right.

22 Q Why was it put back in? Why was 16.0 put back  
23 in?

24 A I'd have to go look at the historical; we've  
25 made a lot of changes to a lot of procedures.

1 Q Okay.

2 Well, if you'd just accept for the moment the  
3 fact that for a period of months it was not there; it had  
4 been specifically removed by a revision. And then a specific  
5 revision reinstated it in the QI's.

6 And do you have any personal knowledge of the  
7 reason that it was reinstated?

8 A No.

9 BY MR. DRISKILL:

10 Q Another question:

11 We were just discussing the fact that during  
12 the period that QCQP 16.0 was deleted from the Protective  
13 Coatings QI's--

14 A Um-huh.

15 Q --and, however, inspectors were allowed to write  
16 a few NCR's with the permission and approval of their  
17 supervisors, are you aware of any inspectors who wrote  
18 NCR's during this period?

19 A I'm not sure of the time frame.

20 One particular instance that may fit into that that  
21 I am aware of was a nonconformance report about some chairs,  
22 rebar chairs, that protruded from a wall, the plastic  
23 coverings on the feet or something--I believe that may have  
24 been written during that period of time.

25 Q Were, to your knowledge, inspectors ever refused

1 the permission to write NCR's during this period of time,  
2 for whatever reason?

3 A Not to my knowledge; no.

4 Q So to your knowledge no requests were ever made  
5 by any individual to write an NCR regarding a particular  
6 finding, and his request was refused?

7 A No.

8 Q Or deid any guys, inspectors, go out and write  
9 an NCR without permission and get in trouble for it?

10 A Well, I think were some, possibly, some NCR's  
11 written during that period of time and--when you say,  
12 "did somebody get in trouble for it?"--well, you know, you  
13 say, according to your instruction. There was nobody to the  
14 best of my knowledge disciplined, laid-off, given time-off.  
15 I'm not even aware of any record of counseling at that  
16 point in time.

17 I know that there were several, what--people that  
18 were very concerned about, that they couldn't write an NCR;  
19 and to the best of my knowledge, nobody has ever been told  
20 he can't write an NCR. It's not in the instruction. And  
21 nobody has said: "if you write it, I'll fire your ass."

22 If that's what you mean or not, I don't know.  
23 Or do something else equally detrimental.

24 Q Well, what I was getting at was, were there any  
25 instances where an individual wrote up an NCR and got in

1 trouble for it because the--what he was calling a  
2 "nonconformance" was in fact something that should have  
3 been on an inspection report, rather than an NCR?

4 A There is only one instance that I'm aware of,  
5 and that's the rebar chair, written by Walter Elliott.

6 Q Okay.

7 A Whether that falls in that same time frame, I'd  
8 have to go look and see what the instructions said.

9 My only involvement in that was to find out  
10 why in the hell he had to keep writing an NCR on the same  
11 subject when it was standard, and you find them all the  
12 time.

13 Q So he wrote an NCR on it more than once?

14 A Yuh. I think three.

15 Q Separate instances, or--

16 A Yuh, yes.

17 Q So he was counseled regarding this matter?

18 A He was talked to. I don't--I wouldn't say he  
19 was "counseled". I talked to him at that point in time.

20 It--that's type of thing is part of why it reads  
21 as it now reads, that each of the--every individual out there  
22 should report an item that is truly nonconforming.

23 But if it is an item that has a--has not been  
24 finally accepted, and there is a standard repair procedure,  
25 the "unsat IR" is a viable means of reporting the



1       unsatisfactory condition.

2               MR. DRISKILL: I don't have any other questions.

3               BY MR. GRIFFIN:

4               Q     I want to expand my previous question to you.

5               Were you present when Ron Towlson instructed the  
6       coatings inspectors not to write NCR's?

7               A     I don't think so.

8               Q     Were you ever present when anybody attributed  
9       that statement that coatings inspectors were not allowed  
10      to write NCR's to Ron Towlson?

11              A     No officials conversations around that, no.  
12      I have not, was not present when anybody else in a super-  
13      visory position told coatings inspector, "you can't write  
14      a nonconformance because Towlson says you're not to," no.

15              Q     Okay.

16              What is the hierarchy from coatings inspector  
17      to Mr. Towlson? Is it the immediate supervisor and then  
18      you're the next up?

19              A     Normally they have a lead.

20              Q     Okay.

21              A     A lead supervisor, then you, then Brandt, then  
22      Towlson; is that--

23              A     Today, or then?

24              Q     --the hierarchy, say, three months ago?

25              A     Their supervisor direct, Brandt.

1           Q     So you were not supervising the coatings  
2 supervisor?

3           A     Not three months ago. I'd have to go look at  
4 the letter. I honestly don't know at what time I was  
5 officially the QC supervisor.

6           Q     Okay.

7                     The questions I had for you were based on an  
8 understanding that you were during the last three months?

9           A     Beginning with some place around about the time  
10 of the first meeting or in which was my first chat with  
11 Mr. Dunham, which would have been the day of the barbeque;  
12 some place just subsequent to that I was designated QC  
13 supervisor. Okay. What date that is, I don't recall.

14                    BY MR. DRISKILL:

15           Q     You were over Harry Williams? Or he was--Harry  
16 Williams worked for you?--for a while?

17           A     What time did Harry leave? What day?

18           Q     The 29th of August, I believe, something like  
19 that?

20           A     Harry used to come to me for guidance relative  
21 to quality engineering problems and procedural changes. I  
22 acted for Tom when Tom was gone. At some point in time--  
23 there's a letter about it on file as to when I was officially  
24 designated the QC supervisor.

25                    It was probably after Mr. Williams' transfer to

1 California or wherever he's at now, that I specifically  
2 in writing was assigned those duties.

3 MR. DRISKILL: I have no more questions.

4 Do you want to read this?

5 MR. GRIFFIN: Yes, to wrap it up.

6 BY MR. GRIFFIN:

7 Q Mr. Krisher, have I, or any other NRC representa-  
8 tive here threatened you, or offered you any rewards in  
9 return for this statement?

10 A No.

11 Q Have you given the statement freely and  
12 voluntarily?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Is there anything further that you care to add  
15 to it?

16 A No.

17 MR. GRIFFIN: Thank you.

18 (Whereupon at 3:30 p.m., the interview was  
19 concluded.)  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATE OF PROCEEDINGS

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the  
NRC COMMISSION

In the matter of: INTERVIEW OF MYRON G. (CURLY) KRISHER

Date of Proceeding: Monday, November 28, 1983

Place of Proceeding: Glen Rose, Texas

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original  
transcript for the file of the Commission.

Jim Burns

Official Reporter - Typed

Official Reporter - Signature