

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

1 Q. STATE YOUR NAME.

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

5

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

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

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

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

9
10 Q. WHAT DID MR. WALL DO ABOUT THE INCIDENT?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 LARRY R. DAVISON CONCERNING MR. LANGLEY'S
ALLEGATION OF PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF NRC INSPECTIONS

1 Q. STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

2 A. My name is Larry R. Davison, and my business address is Catawba
3 Nuclear Station, P. O. Box 223, Clover, South Carolina 29710.

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

7 A. I am Project Quality Assurance Manager responsible for Quality
8 Assurance during construction of the Catawba Nuclear Station. A
9 detailed description of the nature of my job, as well as my
10 professional experience and qualifications, is set forth in my
11 previously filed testimony.

12
13 Q. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH MR. LANGLEY'S ALLEGATION THAT THE
14 COMPANY WAS AWARE OF WHEN THE NRC WAS COMING FOR SITE
15 INSPECTIONS?

16 A. Yes, I am familiar with Mr. Langley's allegation that inspectors
17 received prior notification of forthcoming inspections by the NRC or
18 the Authorized Nuclear Inspectors. To me, Mr. Langley's testimony
19 is unclear. He says that he knew when NRC was coming, and that

1 he got notes in his "pigeonhole" or message box that said a hold
2 point was going to be looked at, but he didn't know who was going
3 to look at it; he thought it might be the NRC.

4
5 Q. DESCRIBE YOUR ROLE AND RELATIONSHIP WITH NRC
6 INSPECTORS WHO VISITED THE CATAWBA SITE.

7 A. Most NRC inspections were unannounced. That is, no one at Duke
8 knew when they were coming until they arrived at the site. Upon
9 arrival, the NRC inspectors would generally hold an entrance
10 conference with site management to let them know they were there
11 and let them know what area of interest they would be looking into.

12
13 Once the NRC inspectors indicated the general areas they were
14 going to be looking at, the NRC inspector would be directed to the
15 people who handled that area. The areas to be inspected were not
16 secret and word of these areas was communicated by management so
17 that the appropriate people would know they would be seeing the
18 NRC inspectors. For example, if the NRC wanted to look at pipe
19 welding, they would be escorted to the field where they would
20 select what specific welds they wanted to see. If we knew the NRC
21 inspector was going to look into pipe welding it was not uncommon
22 to make craft, technical support, and QC supervisors aware that
23 the NRC would be looking into those areas. This was done so that
24 the appropriate people could be available to answer questions or
25 provide information to the NRC.

1 If the NRC wanted to inspect specific one time events, such as a
2 specific concrete pour or the setting of the reactor vessel, they
3 would ask us to notify them just prior to the event. In these
4 cases Duke did know in advance what the NRC might be inspecting,
5 but this knowledge did not have any effect on the work activity.
6 These inspections by the NRC were rare compared to the
7 unannounced visits.
8

9 Q. HAVE YOU INVESTIGATED THIS ALLEGATION?

10 A. Yes, I have reviewed his testimony and researched the allegation to
11 determine if it is valid. I have discussed the allegation of
12 prenotification with QC welding inspectors, and the first level
13 supervisor during Mr. Langley's employment. I have personal
14 knowledge of the practice of disseminating information to
15 inspectors.
16

17 I have also talked with other site personnel and these discussions
18 did not substantiate his allegations.
19

20 The inspectors usually learn of the presence of an NRC inspector
21 on site by word-of-mouth. Before the assignment of a resident
22 inspector in 1979, visits by the NRC were "news." When the NRC
23 inspector identifies to site personnel his area of interest, it has
24 been our practice to notify supervision in that area that they
25 will be visited by the NRC inspector.

1 Q. WHAT ARE YOUR CONCLUSIONS AS A RESULT OF THIS
2 INVESTIGATION?

3 A. I find no evidence that prior notification of NRC inspections of
4 items is or has been a practice at Catawba.

5
6 From discussions with inspectors and the welding inspector
7 supervision, prenotification to welding inspectors of specific
8 items to be inspected by the NRC did not occur unless the NRC
9 had an announced inspection. Even then the work and inspections
10 were not modified because of any notification.

11
12 Q. HAVE YOU FORMED AN OPINION OF WHAT MR. LANGLEY MAY BE
13 REFERRING TO IN THIS ALLEGATION?

14 A. Yes. Mr. Langley may have been referring to the Authorized
15 Nuclear Inspector (ANI), a resident inspector required by the
16 ASME Boiler & Pressure Vessel Code. They have the authority to
17 establish hold points on the work travelers (process control) to
18 indicate specific steps they may want to inspect. In such cases
19 the specific step is clearly indicated to the inspector and
20 craftsmen. ANI's also have the right to inspect work in progress
21 randomly, and they do so. The ANI might have indicated to an
22 inspector a specific step they wanted to witness by placing a
23 note in the inspector's box.

24

1 It appears that Mr. Langley is confused on what the notes were for
2 and he did not understand them. Mr. Langley probably did know
3 by word-of-mouth when the NRC was on site and looking at welding
4 and he probably incorrectly assumed the notes he saw were about
5 these inspections.

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 D. L. FREEZE CONCERNING MR. LANGLEY'S
ALLEGATION OF PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF NRC INSPECTIONS

1 Q. STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

2 A. My name is Dwight Lane Freeze and my business address is Duke
3 Power Company, Station Support Division South, Post Office Box
4 219, Seneca, South Carolina 29678.

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

8 A. I am the Station Support Division Manager, responsible for
9 construction of modifications and major capital additions to Oconee
10 Nuclear Station, Lee Steam Station and six hydroelectric stations.
11 My responsibilities also include providing maintenance support to
12 these same operating stations.

13
14 Q. DESCRIBE YOUR PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE AND
15 QUALIFICATIONS, INCLUDING YOUR PRIOR POSITIONS WITH
16 DUKE POWER.

17 A. I am a registered Professional Engineer in both North Carolina and
18 South Carolina. I received a Bachelor of Science degree in Civil

1 Engineering, from North Carolina State University in 1967. I
2 started working for Duke Power Company in 1967 as an Assistant
3 Field Engineer at the Oconee Nuclear Station. I was responsible for
4 assisting in preparation of schedules, providing technical assistance
5 to the craft organization and various office engineering functions.

6
7 In 1968, I was promoted to Field Engineer - Office, with
8 responsibility for office functions, scheduling, status information
9 and material delivery schedules at Oconee. In 1971, I was promoted
10 to Field Engineer - Civil, with responsibility for technical support
11 for all structural concrete and structural steel work at Oconee. In
12 addition, quality control inspection of structural work was part of
13 my responsibility. Later in 1971, I was promoted to Principal Field
14 Engineer with responsibility for technical support, scheduling,
15 budgeting and inspection of all civil, mechanical and electrical
16 installations for the construction of Oconee. With the completion of
17 Oconee, I was transferred to the Catawba Nuclear Station in 1974.
18 I was assigned as Project Engineer with responsibility for technical
19 support, scheduling, budgeting and inspection of all civil,
20 mechanical and electrical installations at Catawba. I remained in
21 that position until February, 1981, when I was assigned as
22 Manager, Construction Services of the Construction Department.
23 With this assignment, I was transferred from the Catawba site to
24 the Charlotte office. I held that position until February, 1982,
25 when I was transferred to the Oconee Station Support Division,
26 later renamed Station Support Division South.

1 I have attended schools involving welding and welding inspection,
2 including a one week course at the University of Tennessee dealing
3 with the technical aspects of welding and a one week course at Ohio
4 State University dealing with Quality Assurance requirements.

5
6 Q. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH MR. LANGLEY'S ALLEGATION THAT THE
7 COMPANY WAS AWARE OF WHEN THE NRC WAS COMING FOR SITE
8 INSPECTIONS?

9 A. I have read the portions of Mr. Langley's testimony dealing with his
10 allegation that the company knew in advance that the NRC was
11 coming for inspections.

12
13 Q. TO THE BEST OF YOUR KNOWLEDGE, IS THERE ANY BASIS FOR
14 THIS ALLEGATION?

15 A. I know of no basis for Mr. Langley's allegation that advance notice
16 was received for routine NRC inspections. The NRC inspectors
17 operated under a program of routine, unannounced inspections
18 except for special inspections. For special inspections, we actually
19 notified the NRC of approximate dates for special events, such as
20 particular concrete placements, major equipment handling (reactor,
21 steam generators, etc.). The NRC then may or may not have come
22 to inspect the particular activities. At no time did I ever receive
23 advance notification of a routine inspection. As Project Engineer
24 reporting directly to the Project Manager, if such advance
25 notifications had been given, I would have been in a position to
26 know about them. The primary contact with the NRC was the
27 Project Manager. However, as Project Engineer working directly

1 for the Project Manager, I would assist the NRC inspectors by
2 getting the information they needed during their inspections. I was
3 available to answer questions, direct them to the proper persons for
4 information and accompany them to look at areas of construction.

5
6 Q. DID NRC EVER SPECIFY WHAT THEY WANTED TO INSPECT?

7 A. When the NRC came to Catawba for inspections, our practice was to
8 meet with them upon their arrival in the Project Manager's office.
9 Those present usually included the Project Manager, Project
10 Engineer, General Superintendent of Crafts, Senior Quality Control
11 Engineer, Senior Construction Engineer and Senior Quality
12 Assurance Engineer. At this time, the NRC would advise us which
13 areas of construction they wanted to inspect during their visit. We
14 would advise them of the status of construction, current work in
15 progress and which individuals were available and knowledgeable in
16 the areas they intended to inspect. The individuals who were
17 knowledgeable in the areas to be inspected were then notified to be
18 available as needed by the NRC in order to enable the NRC to
19 complete their inspections.

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 ROBERT A. MORGAN CONCERNING MR. LANGLEY'S
ALLEGATION OF PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF NRC INSPECTIONS

1 Q. STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

2 A. My name is Robert A. Morgan and my business address is Catawba
3 Nuclear Station, P. O. Box 223, Clover, South Carolina, 29710.

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

7 A. I am presently Senior Quality Assurance Engineer at the Catawba
8 Nuclear Station. A complete description of my job, as well as my
9 professional experience and qualifications, is set forth in my
10 previously filed testimony.

11
12 Q. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH MR. LANGLEY'S ALLEGATION THAT THE
13 COMPANY WAS AWARE OF WHEN THE NRC WAS COMING TO THE
14 SITE FOR INSPECTIONS?

15 A. Yes, I was present when Mr. Langley testified about this allegation
16 in Rock Hill, South Carolina and I have also reviewed the transcript
17 of his testimony.

1 Q. TO THE BEST OF YOUR KNOWLEDGE, IS THERE ANY BASIS FOR
2 THIS ALLEGATION?

3 A. No. I have been on the project since 1976 and have never had any
4 prenotification of an NRC inspection. I am, and have been, the
5 primary NRC contact for the project QA organization. The
6 majority of the NRC inspections are unannounced, and to the best
7 of my knowledge, the company is not aware of the timing of
8 these visits. The NRC inspectors simply appear at the site when
9 they are ready to begin an inspection. "We have been asked by the
10 NRC Regional Office to advise them of our schedule on certain
11 activities. These activities are events that will occur only
12 once per project, like reactor vessel setting, and concrete
13 pours on the reactor dome. In these instances, we expected
14 an NRC inspection during these activities. Since a resident
15 has been assigned to the Catawba project we have not had to
16 advise the NRC regional office of these type events.

17
18 Q. DID NRC EVER SPECIFY WHAT THEY WANTED TO INSPECT?

19 A. Yes. Upon arrival at the site it is normal practice for the
20 visiting Region II inspector to advise the project management
21 of the major areas which he plans to examine during his
22 inspection. For example, if the visiting inspector told
23 management in the preinspection conference that he planned to
24 look at containment erection and welding, we advised supervision
25 in the affected area that a visiting inspector from NRC was on
26 site. We advised supervision in the area so that we could have
27 Construction and QA Technical Support personnel available

1 to answer procedural and code questions, QC inspection
2 supervision available to answer inspection questions, and Craft
3 supervision available to answer erection and welding questions.

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 LINDSAY HARRIS PERTAINING TO MR. LANGLEY'S
ALLEGATION OF PRENOTIFICATION OF NRC INSPECTIONS

1 Q. STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

2 A. My name is Lindsay Harris, and my business address is Catawba
3 Nuclear Station, P.O. Box 223, Clover, South Carolina 29710.

4

5 Q. STATE YOUR PRESENT JOB POSITION WITH DUKE POWER.

6 A. I am a welding inspector at Catawba. A description of my
7 experience and qualifications is set forth in my previously filed
8 testimony.

9

10 Q. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH MR. LANGLEY'S ALLEGATION THAT
11 INSPECTORS RECEIVED NOTIFICATION PRIOR TO NRC
12 INSPECTIONS?

13 A. Yes. I am familiar with Mr. Langley's allegations by reading his
14 testimony.

1 Q. HAVE YOU EVER RECEIVED NOTIFICATION OF NRC INSPECTIONS
2 AS DESCRIBED BY MR. LANGLEY?

3 A. No. I have never received any prenotification. I have never
4 received a note in my message box at the site dealing with NRC
5 inspections. Based on my experience at the site, we find out about
6 NRC being on the job by word-of-mouth after they get there.

7
8 Q. DESCRIBE YOUR INVOLVEMENT WITH NRC AND ANI INSPECTORS.

9 A. On the Catawba project the NRC inspectors are normally in
10 different areas on different jobs all the time. I see the NRC
11 inspectors regularly only because they are in the area I am
12 working. Also I know if I would like to talk with them, I am free
13 to at any time.

14
15 The ANI inspectors put hold points on the appropriate paperwork
16 and the craft notifies us and the ANI inspectors when the work is
17 ready. These hold points consist of cleanups, fitups, preheats,
18 final visual inspection of welds, NDE, etc. It is normal for the ANI
19 inspectors to accompany a welding inspector on his inspections.

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 THOMAS H. MULLINAX
CONCERNING MR. LANGLEY'S ALLEGATIONS PERTAINING
TO ALLEGED HARRASSMENT OF WELDING INSPECTORS

1 Q. STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

2 A. Thomas H. Mullinax, Duke Power Company, Catawba Nuclear
3 Station, P.O. Box 223, Clover, South Carolina, 29710.

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

7 A. I am a Steelworker Foreman. I supervise a crew of 14 - 20 men
8 involved in erecting structural steel, fabrication and installing
9 miscellaneous steel, and rigging and setting equipment. This work
10 includes erecting and fitting containment shell plate.

11
12 Q. WHAT OTHER JOBS HAVE YOU HELD WITH DUKE POWER?

13 A. I started working for Duke Power in 1956 as a steelworker. I left
14 the Company in 1968 for four years and returned in 1972 as a
15 steelworker. I became a foreman in 1973.

16
17 Q. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE ALLEGATIONS OF MR. LANGLEY
18 THAT HE AND ANOTHER INSPECTOR WERE INTIMIDATED BY THE
19 CRAFT FOREMAN WORKING ON THE PERSONNEL AIR LOCKS?

1 A. I do not recall any incident that a Mr. Langley was involved in. I
2 was involved in an incident with Lindsay Harris, another welding
3 inspector.

4
5 Q. DESCRIBE THE INCIDENT WITH LINDSAY HARRIS.

6 A. The men under my supervision engaged in fitting-up the personnel
7 air lock to the containment shell plate came to me and informed me
8 that an NCI was going to be written on the work they were
9 performing. I asked why, and to the best of my knowledge the
10 men informed me that the inspector (Lindsay Harris) said that they
11 had welded on the plate without preheating it. My crew claimed
12 that they had preheated it; had told the inspector they had
13 preheated; that the inspector had called them a liar; they were not
14 going to take that and would knock his teeth down his throat if he
15 did it again, or words to that effect.

16
17 I talked with Lindsay Harris, and to the best of my recollection,
18 he told me that the men had welded without preheating and that the
19 men had called him a liar first. Lindsay and I argued about the
20 incident. I cannot recall what was said during the argument, but
21 I believe it centered on who was right and who was wrong about
22 whether the preheat had been made. The inspector and I agreed to
23 go see each of our supervisors. We were walking to the offices
24 when I conveyed to Lindsay the feelings of the men about being
25 called a liar and told him, as best as I can recall, that if
26 he continued to call the men liars that he would get his teeth
27 knocked in. We continued to our respective supervisors' offices,

1 and I informed my supervisor, Mr. W. K. Henry, of the incident
2 and related to him what had taken place. Mr. Henry and I went
3 to the job superintendent's office and and to the best of my
4 recollection, informed Mr. Ralph Morrison of the events up to
5 that point.

6
7 As best as I can recall, we were told to come back the first thing
8 next morning due to the lateness of the hour. As best as I can
9 recall, Mr. Henry and I and one or both of the crew members
10 involved went to the superintendent's office the next morning to
11 discuss the incident. We related what had happened to the people
12 at the meeting, but I don't recall who was there. As best as I
13 can recall the incident was discussed but I can't recall exactly
14 what was said.

15
16 I believe it was the next day, I can't recall exactly, that I was
17 called to Mr. Cecil Wall's office. He was the Job Superintendent.
18 I was asked by him what had happened and I told him. I can't
19 recall whether Mr. Henry was with me at that meeting or not, but
20 Mr. S. O. Shelby, the Steelworker craft superintendent, was on
21 vacation. Mr. Wall had Mr. Shelby called to come in from vacation.
22 Mr. Wall, Mr. Shelby, and I met, but I can't recall who else was
23 there at the meeting. I don't recall exactly what Mr. Wall and
24 Mr. Shelby said to me, but the message I got from the meeting was
25 that is was a very serious matter to attempt to intimidate or to
26 threaten an inspector and that such things would not be tolerated.

1 I told Mr. Wall that I was not threatening or trying to intimidate
2 the inspector but was advising him of the way some of my men felt
3 about being called a liar. I informed my men that any questions
4 arising during the course of an inspection were to be brought to
5 me immediately and that there should be no arguing by the
6 craftsmen with the inspectors. I don't recall exactly when, but
7 later I informed the crew that arguments with inspectors were to
8 be avoided; that no threats or intimidation would be tolerated,
9 that all questions should be brought to me. I do not remember
10 whether I talked to the two craftsmen separately or with the
11 whole crew, but this message was give to them.

12
13 Q. WHAT INSTRUCTIONS HAVE YOU BEEN GIVEN CONCERNING THE
14 CRAFT'S RELATIONSHIP WITH INSPECTORS?

15 A. I have been instructed on numerous occasions that there was to be
16 no arguing with the inspectors. That any threats or intimidations
17 would be considered very serious and dealt with accordingly. That
18 any questions arising that could not be solved without arguing were
19 to be taken to higher management to be resolved.

20
21 I have been instructed to maintain an attitude of cooperation with
22 the inspectors as well as the other Crafts. I have been instructed
23 to work with and assist inspectors in performing their duties and
24 to perform rework if necessary to bring the work into compliance
25 with the inspection requirements.

- 1 Q. HAVE THESE SAME INSTRUCTIONS BEEN GIVEN TO YOUR CREW?
- 2 A. These same instructions have been given to the crew members.

R-all

RTI 83.A.0092

RESULTS OF INTERVIEW WITH HARRY F. LANGLEY
ON OCTOBER 25, 1983 AS PREPARED BY BRUNO URYC, JR.

On October 25, 1983, Harry F. LANGLEY, a former Quality Control (QC) Welding Inspector at the Duke Power Company's Catawba Nuclear Plant, Rockhill, SC, was interviewed by Bruno Uryc, Jr., Inspector, USNRC Region II, Atlanta, GA, with the assistance of Jack BRYANT, USNRC Region II Resident Inspector, Oconee Nuclear Plant, Seneca, SC. This interview was conducted at the Ramada Inn, Rockhill, SC in the presence of the following individuals: B. JONES, Regional Counsel, USNRC Region II; R. GUILD, Attorney for the Palmetto Alliance, Raleigh, NC; and B. GARDE, a representative of the Government Accountability Project, Washington, DC. These individuals were present at the interview at the request of LANGLEY, and he provided the following information in substance:

LANGLEY said he was formerly employed at the Catawba Nuclear Plant during the period April 6, 1977 to April 6, 1978. He said he was initially hired as a welder's helper and that he held this position until May 29, 1977, at which time he was certified as a welder. He said that in July 1977 he was assigned to the Pipe Fabrication Shop as a welder where he remained until mid-October 1977, at which time he was placed in a QC welding inspector's class. LANGLEY stated that prior to working at the Catawba Nuclear Plant, he worked as a welder at the Westinghouse plant in Charlotte, NC, during the period 1969 to 1974. LANGLEY stated that during the period 1974 to 1976, he was attending college and studying for a degree in business.

LANGLEY stated that when he was initially hired on at Catawba he was offered a job as a welding helper. He said that this job entailed helping on the welding crew and did not involve welding, although he did know how to weld from his previous employment at Westinghouse. LANGLEY stated that he was eventually permitted to take a welding test which he passed. He said that he attended only four hours of welding class and that he was given a practical test in only one welding position before he was certified. He said that on May 29, 1977, he was officially certified as a welder and his name appeared on the list of certified welders at the Catawba Nuclear Plant. He said that after his certification he was primarily involved in welding braces on fresh water tanks. LANGLEY stated that in early June 1977, he was assigned to the Pipe Fabrication Shop and that he worked for a foreman named Deacon JONES. He said he was welding various sections of pipe for use throughout the plant and that the pipe was primarily carbon steel for stainless steel pipe. LANGLEY said that he received many compliments about his work by the lead inspector, Larry RUDESEAL (phonetic), who began to talk to him about the possibility of becoming a welding inspector. LANGLEY stated that he eventually talked with another inspector named Bo ROSS who was able to get him assigned to a welding inspector class in mid-October 1977.

LANGLEY said that in mid-October 1977, he entered the QC Welding Inspector class with 11 other individuals from the plant. Three of these individuals were other welders and eight were mechanical inspectors. He declined to identify the other individuals by name, stating that a review of the class roster would identify all the individuals in the class. LANGLEY stated that to the best of his recollection the class lasted for approximately six to eight weeks. During the first week of the class, they were given instructions concerning the processing of

metals beginning with the ore being removed from the earth. The class went on through various metalurgical processes into an examination and study of weld defects. LANGLEY stated that at the end of each week of class they were given a written test covering the material presented in class during the previous week. He said that everyone did poorly on the first test which involved basic material and information. He said that on the Thursday before their second test which was to be given the next day, a Friday, the class returned to the classroom from lunch and as he was going through his class notebook, he found a copy of an examination with the answers filled in inside his notebook. He asked several of the other individuals in the class if they also had such an examination in their notebooks and when they looked they also found a copy of the test in their notebooks. LANGLEY stated that everyone in the class had a copy of the test and answers. He said that the next day they were tested and it was the same test that they had received a copy of on the previous day. LANGLEY stated that this continued for the rest of the weekly examinations in the course. He said that he did not know who put the copies of the test in the notebooks, but he assumed it was one of the instructors who he identified as Larry DAVISON, Charles BALDWIN and Bo ROSS. He said that inasmuch as everyone was getting copies of the test that everyone did very well in the class. He said that they (the students) needed at least a cumulative average of 80 percent to pass the course and overall the class far exceeded the minimum required score. The tests usually contained 30 to 40 questions and he assured that all the previous classes also received this help because he was occasionally asked by other QC inspectors who were certified, if he was getting any help. He said that judging from the way they asked, it appeared they knew the class was getting the test and answers.

LANGLEY stated that no one in the class ever questioned this practice and they assumed that it was common practice and they went along with it. LANGLEY stated that had it not been for this practice, several of the students in the class would not have finished the course. He said that they even intentionally lowered their grades during one phase of instruction (structural steel) so that they would not have grades which appeared too good. LANGLEY stated that at the end of the course they were also given an oral examination. He said that for this test, the first student tested came out and provided the questions and answers to the rest of the students. He said that the course ended sometime around Thanksgiving (1977) and in January 1978, he was officially certified as a welding inspector. During the period between the end of the course and the official certification, he accompanied certified inspectors for on-the-job training. LANGLEY stated that he did not know who placed the tests and answers in the classroom notebooks. He said that he never observed anyone doing it, nor did the class generally discuss the matter among themselves. He said that everyone just accepted it as being a routine thing. He also estimated that at least half of the class would have failed the course had it not been for the tests and answers they received before actually taking the tests. LANGLEY stated that after he was certified, he spent most of his inspection time working in the number two reactor on the day shift. He stated that to the best of his knowledge, he did not pass any welds that were not acceptable. He also added that he felt qualified to be an inspector based on his extensive welding experience, but he wondered about the other individuals in his class who did not have a welding background.

LANGLEY related that during the time he was a welding inspector he had occasion to write several nonconformance items (NCI). He explained that an NCI document ^{describes} those items that do not pass inspection and provides an explanation as to why the item did not pass inspection. He stated that sometime in January 1978 he was inspecting the stiffeners on the reactor walls. He said his inspection procedure involved checking the area where the weld would be made for cleanliness. He explained that stiffeners were strips of steel measuring on the average six to eight feet in length, four to six inches in width, and approximately a quarter to a half inch thick. He said that the stiffeners were tack welded to the containment wall to add strength to the walls. He said that the area of the weld was supposed to be cleaned a half inch on both sides of the weld and that the stiffener was to fit flush against the wall. He said his initial inspection activity involved an inspection of the fit-up prior to the weld being made around the entire stiffener. He said that after his inspection of the fit-up, the entire weld would be made around the stiffener. He said he did find some problems with the tack welds which included slag and voids at the tack welds. He said that initially he would help the welders clean up the slag, but after two or three days, he noticed that the fit-ups were getting worse. He said he found rollovers, bad undercuts, lack of fusion, and excessive tack welds. LANGLEY stated he then decided to write an NCI because the problem was continuing. He said that in addition to writing the NCI, he also placed red tags on all the stiffeners to stop additional work from being done. He said he wrote the NCI citing the M24 procedure on fit-ups as not being complied with. He said he recalled that trapped slag behind the stiffener was a particularly bad problem. LANGLEY said he took his NCI to Bo ROSS, his immediate supervisor, who reviewed it and said it was correct. LANGLEY said that ROSS told him to take the NCI to

STIFFENERS

(No. 1)

Larry DAVISON for review and approval, and when DAVISON reviewed the NCI he told him (LANGLEY) that it should not have been written because there could be gaps and slag on the stiffeners. LANGLEY said that he explained to DAVISON that there was more than a small problem with the stiffeners and he felt that the problem should be documented. LANGLEY stated that DAVISON had a habit of making the inspectors feel intimidated every time they took an NCI to him for review. LANGLEY said that he often felt as if DAVISON was trying to intimidate and harass him because he was doing his job. He said that DAVISON finally signed the NCI on the stiffeners and he (LANGLEY) took the signed NCI to Document Control and logged it into Quality Assurance (QA). LANGLEY stated that until the NCI was logged into QA, there was never any way to officially track the status of an NCI, in effect, it did not officially exist. He said that once it was logged, it was then an official record and had to be tracked. He said that within the hour after he logged the NCI into QA, a welding engineer (who LANGLEY believed to be an individual identified as LEWELLYN (phonetic)) came to the reactor and told him to remove the red tags and let the welders continue with their work. LANGLEY stated that LEWELLYN also told him to go to QA and clear the NCI he wrote from the log. LANGLEY stated that he did remove the red tags and subsequently went to QA and cleared the NCI by signing it off with his own signature. LANGLEY stated that, in effect, his signature meant that the NCI was cleared by him when it really was not. LANGLEY stated that he signed off the NCI because he was told to do so by the welding engineer, who should have been the person that signed off the NCI in the QA Document control log.

STIFFENERS (NO.1)

LANGLEY stated that DAVISON was the only QA manager who always gave the inspectors a hard time about NCIs. LANGLEY related that DAVISON told him that the number two reactor was not going to be like the number one reactor. He said that DAVISON said that it took a long time to clear the NCIs on number one reactor and that it was not going to take that long for number two reactor, even if he had to get different inspectors to do it. LANGLEY said that the meaning of this statement was very clear to him and he took it to mean that DAVISON was going to closely review every NCI he signed to see if it was really valid.

LANGLEY related another incident which occurred when he wrote an NCI. He said that there was a 30 inch pipe which came off the Auxiliary Building on the number two reactor side. He said that a pipe passed through a sleeve which was embedded in a concrete wall at the fourth level. He recalled that there was a problem with the concrete settling around the pipe sleeve and that the concrete did not completely settle behind a flange on the pipe sleeve. He said that when this problem was found, the flange was removed and the holes in the concrete were chipped and patched. He said that the removal of the flange caused some problems when they tried to put the flange back on the pipe sleeve. He said that when the construction welders tried to put the flange back on they could only weld the flange from the front because they could not get behind the flange because it was flush against the concrete wall. He said the construction drawings called for the flange to be welded from behind also, but this was impossible to do. He said he wrote an NCI on the problem because there was no weld on the back side of the flange. He said that when he took the NCI to DAVISON, he was told to forget it and DAVISON refused to sign the NCI. LANGLEY stated that to the best of his knowledge this incident occurred in February 1978.

PIPE FLANGE (No. 2)

LANGLEY related another incident where he wrote an NCI that was not approved by DAVISON. He stated that in early February 1978, he was inspecting in the containment on the second level where a walkway was being installed. He said he noted that there were some tears in the steel containment wall near the walkway. He said these tears were laminations in the steel which were detected when the area^{was} inspected with the magnetic particle test (MT). He said the area was approximately two inches square near a lug which was used to lower the steel containment wall section into place. He said the small area of lamination was subsequently ground out and filled with weld metal. He stated that he prepared an NCI because the ground out area was deeper than allowed by the specifications. He said that when he took the NCI to DAVISON, DAVISON would not permit him to file the NCI after giving him a lot of harassment over the NCI. LANGLEY said that he just threw the NCI away.

LANGLEY estimated that he took approximately five NCIs to DAVISON for approval. Of these five, he was able to get three of them approved and logged into QA; however, after some of them were logged, he was subsequently told that his NCI was incorrect or that it was not justified, so he was instructed to go back to QA to clear the log. LANGLEY stated that he cleared the QA log based on verbal instructions received from the welding engineers. He pointed out that when he was told that his NCIs were inappropriate, he had to clear them and not the individuals who told him to do so. In effect, when he signed the log clearing the NCI, his signature indicated that he resolved the problem, which was not the case. LANGLEY stated that the proper procedure would have been for the individual who told him to clear the NCI log to sign the log himself.

LAMINATIONS (No. 3)

LANGLEY related another incident which occurred in early 1978. He said this incident involved the air lock on the number two reactor which he identified as "PAL 215." He stated that the ring that was being installed in the containment wall was approximately one and a half inches thick, and the containment wall was approximately three quarters of an inch thick. The large ring was to be welded inside an opening to the containment wall and form the air lock. The specifications called for both sides of the weld area to be preheated. He said that the welders and steelworkers who were tacking the large ring into the opening in the containment wall were not preheating the surfaces for the tack welds and as a result the tack welds were cracking. LANGLEY said that they were supposed to be heating the back side of the metal when the tack welds were being made. LANGLEY said that when the QC inspectors were on the scene, the welders would preheat the surfaces, but when the inspectors left the area, the welders would stop preheating. He said that he knew this because when he came back to the area he would see that the welders were not preheating as required. LANGLEY stated that he was with another QC inspector named Lindsey HARRIS. LANGLEY estimated that a major portion of the required tack welds were not preheated. He said he wrote an NCI which identified the problem and when he took it to DAVISON for approval and signature, DAVISON asked him a lot of questions which he (LANGLEY) felt bordered on intimidation. LANGLEY said that he insisted that the NCI was correct and that it should be logged into QA. He said DAVISON finally signed the NCI "after a lot of hassle" and he took it to QA and logged it in. LANGLEY said that in only a matter of minutes (he estimated approximately 10 minutes), LEWELLYN, the welding engineer, came to see him and advised him that he had researched the problem in the welding procedures and found that the welders could weld at a minimum

PREHEAT (NO. 4) 11

temperature of 40 degrees and that they did not have to preheat. LANGLEY stated that LEWELLYN then told him to go to QA and clear the log of the NCI he entered. LANGLEY said that he did go to QA and clear the log based on the instructions of LEWELLYN. He said that this was another example of his having to sign off and clear an NCI on the instructions of another individual.

LANGLEY related an incident involving the forgery of a welding document. He said that this incident occurred in late February 1978 and he said he believed it was documented in NCI Number 2664. He said that a welder, who he would identify only by the individual's welding number k-34, came to him and asked him to change the date on a process control sheet because he (the welder) did not have an inspector sign off hold point on a preheat required for a weld. LANGLEY stated that he told the welder that he would not falsify a document that was already signed. LANGLEY stated that he observed the name of Charles D. CRISP on the document and when he told the welder to go and get CRISP to date the document, the welder told him that he signed CRISP's name to the document. He said he discussed the matter with the welder and they decided to inform construction management of the incident. LANGLEY stated that inasmuch as the welder went to management himself with the issue, he was given a "B" violation and an NCI was prepared to document the incident.

LANGLEY stated that the welder involved was a good worker and he just made a serious judgment error when he signed CRISP's name to the process control sheet. He stated that the welder was too concerned about getting into trouble for missing the preheat hold point. He stated that he was not aware of any other forgery issues.

LANGLEY related there were several instances when he was notified in advance that an inspector would be looking at a particular weld. He stated that he would find process control sheets in his mail box which were asterisked at a certain point which indicated a hold point for an inspector. He stated that sometimes these inspectors were insurance inspectors. He stated that he would also get notes in his mailbox that said an inspector would be looking at some welds. He stated that he never had information that an NRC inspector would be coming to examine a specific weld, although he was told on occasions that NRC inspectors would be at the site. He said that when he was told that NRC inspectors were coming he would usually see them that day or the next. He said he never received information in advance of two or three days. He said for example that he would be told that NRC would be at the site on a Monday and then he would see them on the following Wednesday.

PRENOTIFICATION RE NRC

RECEIVING OFFICE

1. Facility(ies) Involved:

(If more than 3, or if generic, write GENERIC)

(Name)

CATAWBA

Docket Number (if applicable)

0	5	0	0	0	4	1	3

2. Functional Area(s) Involved:

(Check appropriate box(es))

<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>

operations
construction
safeguards
other (Specify) _____

<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>

onsite health and safety
offsite health and safety
emergency preparedness

3. Description:

(Limit to 100 characters)

C	O	N	C	E	R	N	S		D	E	V	E	L	O	P	E	D		D	U	R	I	N	G
C	A	T	A	W	B	A		A	S	L	B		I	N	-	C	A	M	E	R	A		H	E
A	R	I	N	G	S																			

4. Source of Allegation:

(Check appropriate box)

<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

contractor employee
licensee employee
NRC employee
organization (Specify) _____
other (Specify) FORMER LICENSEE EMPLOYEE

<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>

security guard
news media
private citizen

5. Date Allegation Received:

MM	DD	YY
1	2	0
7	8	3

6. Name of Individual Receiving Allegation:

(First two initials and last name)

B. URYC

7. Office:

R	I	I
---	---	---

ACTION OFFICE

8. Action Office Contact:

(First two initials and last name)

B. URYC

9. FTS Telephone Number:

2	4	2	-	4	1	9	3
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

10. Status:

(Check one)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>

Open, if followup actions are pending or in progress
Closed, if followup actions are completed

11. Date Closed:

MM	DD	YY

12. Remarks:

(Limit to 50 characters)

A	L	L	E	G	A	T	I	O	N	S		B	E	I	N	G		E	X	A	M	I	N	E
D	A	T		R	E	Q	U	E	S	T		O	F		A	S	L	B						

13. Allegation Number:

Office	Year	Number
R	8	4
I	-	A
I	0	0
	0	2
		2

ALLEGATION DATA FORM

RECEIVING OFFICE

Docket Number (if applicable)

(Name) **CATAWBA**

0	5	0	0	0	4	1	3

1. Facility(ies) Involved:
(If more than 3, or if generic, write GENERIC)

2. Functional Area(s) Involved:
(Check appropriate box(es))

<input type="checkbox"/>	operations
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	construction
<input type="checkbox"/>	safeguards
<input type="checkbox"/>	other (Specify) _____

<input type="checkbox"/>	onsite health and safety
<input type="checkbox"/>	offsite health and safety
<input type="checkbox"/>	emergency preparedness

3. Description:
(Limit to 100 characters)

C	O	N	C	E	R	N	S		D	E	V	E	L	O	P	E	D		D	U	R	I	N	G
C	A	T	A	W	B	A		A	S	L	B		I	N	-	C	A	M	E	R	A		H	E
A	R	I	N	G	S																			

4. Source of Allegation:
(Check appropriate box)

<input type="checkbox"/>	contractor employee	<input type="checkbox"/>	security guard
<input type="checkbox"/>	licensee employee	<input type="checkbox"/>	news media
<input type="checkbox"/>	NRC employee	<input type="checkbox"/>	private citizen
<input type="checkbox"/>	organization (Specify) _____		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	other (Specify) Former licensee employee		

5. Date Allegation Received:

MM	DD	YY
1	2	0
7	8	3

(First two initials and last name)

B. Urye

6. Name of Individual Receiving Allegation:

R	I	I	
---	---	---	--

7. Office:

ACTION OFFICE

8. Action Office Contact:

(First two initials and last name)

B. Urye

9. FTS Telephone Number:

2	4	2	-	4	1	9	3
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

10. Status:
(Check one)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Open, if followup actions are pending or in progress
<input type="checkbox"/>	Closed, if followup actions are completed

11. Date Closed:

MM	DD	YY

12. Remarks:
(Limit to 50 characters)

A	L	L	E	G	A	T	I	O	N	S		B	E	I	N	G		E	X	A	M	I	N	E
D	A	T		R	E	Q	U	E	S	T		O	F		A	S	L	B						

13. Allegation Number:

Office	Year	Number
R	8	4
I	-	A
I		0
		0
		0
		3

Oct 01:30:54

ALLEGATION DATA FORM

Instructions on reverse side

RECEIVING OFFICE

Docket Number (if applicable)

(Name) **CATAWBA**

0	5	0	0	0	4	1	3

1. Facility(ies) Involved:
(If more than 3, or if generic, write GENERIC)

2. Functional Area(s) Involved:
(Check appropriate box(es))

<input type="checkbox"/>	operations
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	construction
<input type="checkbox"/>	safeguards
<input type="checkbox"/>	other (Specify) _____

<input type="checkbox"/>	onsite health and safety
<input type="checkbox"/>	offsite health and safety
<input type="checkbox"/>	emergency preparedness

3. Description:
(Limit to 100 characters)

C	O	N	C	E	R	N	S		D	E	V	E	L	O	P	E	D		D	U	R	I	N	G
C	A	T	A	W	B	A		A	S	L	B		I	N	-	C	A	M	E	R	A		H	E
A	R	I	N	G	S																			

4. Source of Allegation:
(Check appropriate box)

<input type="checkbox"/>	contractor employee	<input type="checkbox"/>	security guard
<input type="checkbox"/>	licensee employee	<input type="checkbox"/>	news media
<input type="checkbox"/>	NRC employee	<input type="checkbox"/>	private citizen
<input type="checkbox"/>	organization (Specify) _____		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	other (Specify) Former licensee employee		

5. Date Allegation Received:

MM	DD	YY
1	2	0
7	8	3

(First two initials and last name)

B. Uryl

6. Name of Individual Receiving Allegation:

R	I	I
---	---	---

7. Office:

ACTION OFFICE

8. Action Office Contact:

(First two initials and last name)

B. Uryl

9. FTS Telephone Number:

2	4	2	-	4	1	9	3
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

10. Status:
(Check one)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Open, if followup actions are pending or in progress
<input type="checkbox"/>	Closed, if followup actions are completed

11. Date Closed:

MM	DD	YY

12. Remarks:
(Limit to 50 characters)

A	L	L	E	G	A	T	I	O	N	S		B	E	I	N	G		E	X	A	M	I	N	E
D	A	T		R	E	Q	U	E	S	T		O	F		A	S	L	B						

13. Allegation Number:

Office	Year	Number
R	8	4
I	-	A
I		0
		0
		0
		4

01/01/84

MEMORANDUM TO CASE FILE

TYPE ACTION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RECORD OF CONVERSATION <input type="checkbox"/> CASE REVIEW / STATUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER		PARTICIPANTS <u>Judd, Billie J. Judd</u> CONFIDENTIALITY REQUESTED YES NO		FILE NO. <u>84-0002</u> DATE <u>12-15-83</u> TIME	
SUMMARY <u>Requested contact point w/ WRC regarding</u> <u>"in camera" witness remaining to be interviewed,</u> <u>"A" Said would be @ residence this date P.M.</u> <u>for WRC to call.</u> <u>Side issue:</u> <u>Stated she agreed w/ WRC that technical</u> <u>repairs could not be completed by 12/16 and</u> <u>that Kelly must be pulling something. Said</u> <u>she understood the complexity of issues and</u> <u>that technical inspectors (Ker) were</u> <u>physically tied up @ hearing and that @</u> <u>Catowba site.</u>					
PREPARED BY <u>J. Judd</u>				DATE <u>12-15-83</u>	
ACTION REQUIRED <u>Called WRC hotel and left message, called</u> <u>Norse hotel w/ same.</u>					
REVIEWED BY				DATE <u>12-15-83</u>	
DO NOT DISCLOSE Contains Identity of Confidential Source					

R-all

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

MEMORANDUM TO CASE FILE

TYPE ACTION

- (X) RECORD OF CONVERSATION
() CASE REVIEW / STATUS
() OTHER

PARTICIPANTS

MARY ELLEN

B. Uryc

FILE NO.

DATE

01.09.84

TIME

3:38 pm

CONFIDENTIALITY REQUESTED YES NO

SUMMARY

MARY ELLEN called to ask if I had LANGLEY's telephone number. I advised her I did not have the number.

PAGE OF

PREPARED BY

DATE

ACTION REQUIRED

REVIEWED BY

DATE

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DO NOT DISCLOSE

4

RTI-83-A-0091
NUNN
ALGR 1
SL: 12-05-83

1. Construction Procedure 88 / Laminations
2. TIG Wire / Welding rods
3. Falsification of Welder Certs
4. Foreman Override
5. Confusing Weld Symbols
6. Inadequate X-ray Department
7. Stiffeners

RTI-84-A-0002 ✓
[REDACTED] ✓
ALGR 2
SL: 12-19-83

1. [REDACTED]
2. [REDACTED]
3. [REDACTED]
4. [REDACTED]
5. [REDACTED]

RTI-84-A-0003
[REDACTED]
ALGR 3
SL: 01-09-84

1. [REDACTED]
 - a. [REDACTED]
 - b. [REDACTED]
 - c. [REDACTED]
 - d. [REDACTED]
 - e. [REDACTED]
 - f. [REDACTED]
 - g. [REDACTED]
2. [REDACTED]

TOTAL:
25

RTI-84-A-0004
LANGLEY
ALGR 4
SL: 01-09-84

1. Cheating on QC inspector exams
2. Stiffeners (poor welding)
3. Pipe flange not properly reinstalled
4. Laminations
5. Preheat not properly done

ASLB priority issues

1. LAMINATIONS (91-1)
2. FOREMAN OVERRIDE (91-4)
3. TIG WIRE (91-2)
4. X-RAYS (91-6)
5. HONEYCOMBING (02-4)

B/1

83-A-0091
NUNN
ALGR 1
12.05.83

1. Construction Procedure 88 / Laminations
2. TIG Wire / Welding rods
3. Falsification of Welder Certs
4. Foreman Override
5. Confusing Weld Symbols
6. Inadequate X-ray Department
7. Stiffeners

84-A-0002
[REDACTED]
ALGR 2
12.19.83

1. [REDACTED]
2. [REDACTED]
3. [REDACTED]
4. [REDACTED]
5. [REDACTED]

84-A-0003 ✓
[REDACTED]
ALGR 3
01.09.84

1. [REDACTED]
 - a. [REDACTED]
 - b. [REDACTED]
 - c. [REDACTED]
 - d. [REDACTED]
 - e. [REDACTED]
 - f. [REDACTED]
 - g. [REDACTED]
2. [REDACTED]

TOTAL:
25

84-A-0004
LANGLEY
ALGR 4
01.09.84

1. Cheating on QC inspector exams
2. Stiffeners (poor welding)
3. Pipe flange not properly reinstalled
4. Laminations
5. Preheat not properly done

ASLB priority issues:

1. LAMINATIONS (91-1)
2. FOREMAN OVERRIDE (91-4)
3. TIG WIRE (91-2)
4. X-RAYS (91-5)
5. HONEYCOMBING (92-4)

B/1

83-A-0009

REPAIR

1700

1700

1. Construction Procedure 88 / Laminations
2. TIG wire / Welding rods
3. Falsification of Welders Certs
4. Foreman Override
5. Confusing Weld Symbols
6. Inadequate X-ray Department
7. Stiffeners

84-A-0002

1200

1200

1. [REDACTED]
2. [REDACTED]
3. [REDACTED]
4. [REDACTED]
5. [REDACTED]

84-A-0003

1000

1000

1. [REDACTED]
 - a. [REDACTED]
 - b. [REDACTED]
 - c. [REDACTED]
 - d. [REDACTED]
 - e. [REDACTED]
 - f. [REDACTED]
 - g. [REDACTED]
2. [REDACTED]

TOTAL:
25

84-A-0004

LANGLEY V

1000

1000

1. Cheating on QC inspector exams
2. Stiffeners (poor welding)
3. Pipe flanges not properly reinstalled
4. Laminations
5. Preheat not properly done

ASCE priority issues

1. LAMINATION (91-1)
2. FOREMAN OVERRIDE (91-1)
3. TIG WIRE (91-2)
4. X-RAYS (91-6)
5. HONEYCOMBING (02-4)

B/1

MEMORANDUM TO CASE FILE

84-0002

TYPE ACTION

- (X) RECORD OF CONVERSATION
 () CASE REVIEW / STATUS
 () OTHER

PARTICIPANTS

B. GARDE

B. URYC

DO NOT DISCLOSE
 Contains Identity of
 Confidential Source

FILE NO.

RE-83-A-0044

DATE

12.05.83

TIME

10:30 pm

CONFIDENTIALITY REQUESTED

YES NO

SUMMARY I called B. GARDE (3rd# billing X5181) re setting up interviews with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. She stated we could interview [REDACTED] without her being present and that he could be contacted at [REDACTED]. She said that I should advise him that I talked with her and that she said it was OK for him to talk to NRC. Also that I had signed an affidavit.

B. GARDE also advised that she would contact [REDACTED] and call me on 12.06.83 with information about how he could be contacted.

PAGE 1 OF 1

PREPARED BY

B. Uryc

DATE

12.06.83

ACTION REQUIRED

DO NOT DISCLOSE
 Contains Identity of
 Confidential Source

REVIEWED BY

DATE

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DO NOT DISCLOSE

B/2

MEMORANDUM TO CASE FILE

84-0003

TYPE ACTION

- (X) RECORD OF CONVERSATION
() CASE REVIEW / STATUS
() OTHER

PARTICIPANTS

B. GARDE

B. URYC

DO NOT DISCLOSE
Contains Identity of
Confidential Source

FILE NO.

RE 83-A 0041

DATE

12.05.83

TIME

10:30 pm

CONFIDENTIALITY REQUESTED

YES NO

SUMMARY

I called B. GARDE (3rd # billing x5181) re setting up interviews with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. She stated we could interview [REDACTED] without her being present and that he could be contacted at [REDACTED]. She said that I should advise him that I talked with her and that she said it was OK for him to talk to NRC. Also that I had signed an affidavit.

B. GARDE also advised that she would contact [REDACTED] and call me on 12.06.83 with information about how he could be contacted.

PAGE 1 OF 1

DATE 12.06.83

PREPARED BY

B. Uryc

ACTION REQUIRED

DO NOT DISCLOSE
Contains Identity of
Confidential Source

REVIEWED BY

DATE

MEMORANDUM TO CASE FILE

DO NOT DISCLOSE

Contains Identity of
Confidential Source

TYPE ACTION

- (X) RECORD OF CONVERSATION
() CASE REVIEW / STATUS
() OTHER

PARTICIPANTS

B. URYC

CONFIDENTIALITY REQUESTED ☒ YES ☐ NO

FILE NO.

RIJ-83-A-0091

DATE

12-06-83

TIME

6:45am

SUMMARY

Contacted [REDACTED] this morning to set up meeting for interview. [REDACTED] advised he would be available on [REDACTED] evening. It was agreed that we would meet at the [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] at 7:30 pm.

PAGE 1 OF 1

PREPARED BY

B. Uryc

DATE

12.06.83

ACTION REQUIRED

REVIEWED BY

DATE

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DO NOT DISCLOSE

DO NOT DISCLOSE
Contains Identity of
Confidential Source

B/3

MEMORANDUM TO CASE FILE

84-0002

TYPE ACTION (X) RECORD OF CONVERSATION () CASE REVIEW / STATUS () OTHER	PARTICIPANTS	FILE NO.
	B. GARDE	83-0091
	B. URYC	DATE 12.12.83
CONFIDENTIALITY REQUESTED		TIME 10:28-10:38 pm

DO NOT DISCLOSE
Contains Identity of
Confidential Source

SUMMARY

Called B. GARDE at (704) 365-1913 re setting up mtg with [REDACTED]. She said she passed the information on to [REDACTED] that when he called her she was to say we wanted to contact him for an interview. She said she would follow up tomorrow on [REDACTED].

Also discussed possible reasons why [REDACTED] ✓ called the Judge and why he was not satisfied with our interview. She said she just heard about [REDACTED] comments an hour ago and that she did not know what was going on. She said she would find out tomorrow and call me.

PAGE 1 OF 1

PREPARED BY

B. Uryc

DATE

12.12.83

ACTION REQUIRED

DO NOT DISCLOSE
Contains Identity of
Confidential Source

REVIEWED BY

DATE

B/4

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DO NOT DISCLOSE

MEMORANDUM TO CASE FILE

84-0003

TYPE ACTION

- (X) RECORD OF CONVERSATION
() CASE REVIEW / STATUS
() OTHER

PARTICIPANTS

B. GARDE

B. URYC

DO NOT DISCLOSE
Contains Identity of
Confidential Source

CONFIDENTIALITY REQUESTED

CPS NO

FILE NO.

83-0094

DATE

12.12.83

TIME

10:28-10:38 pm

SUMMARY

Called B. GARDE at (704) 365-1913 re setting up MTS with [REDACTED]. She said she passed the information on to [REDACTED] that when he called her she was to say we wanted to contact him for an interview. She said she would follow up tomorrow on [REDACTED].

Also discussed possible reasons why [REDACTED] called the Judge and why he was not satisfied with our interview. She said she just heard about [REDACTED] comments an hour ago and that she did not know what was going on. She said she would find out tomorrow and call me.

PAGE 1 OF 1

PREPARED BY

B. Uryc

DATE

12.12.83

ACTION REQUIRED

DO NOT DISCLOSE
Contains Identity of
Confidential Source

REVIEWED BY

DATE

B/4

MEMORANDUM TO CASE FILE

84-0002

TYPE ACTION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RECORD OF CONVERSATION <input type="checkbox"/> CASE REVIEW / STATUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER	PARTICIPANTS MARY ELLEN (NFI) B. URYC	FILE NO. 83-0091 DATE 12.13.83 TIME 11:41am
	DO NOT DISCLOSE Contains Identity of Confidential Source	
	CONFIDENTIALITY REQUESTED YES NO	

SUMMARY MARY ELLEN called and said she was asked by B. GARDE to call and advise me that B. GARDE would call me tonight at home regarding contact [REDACTED] and information [REDACTED]

MARY ELLEN - 202+667-5223/7904

MARY ELLEN called at ± 3:30 pm to advise that B. Garde was ~~returning to DC~~ returning to DC tonight and requested I call her after 9:30 pm.

PAGE 1 OF 1

PREPARED BY B. Uryc	DATE 12.13.83
ACTION REQUIRED	
DO NOT DISCLOSE Contains Identity of Confidential Source	
REVIEWED BY	DATE B/S

MEMORANDUM TO CASE FILE

84-0003

TYPE ACTION
☒ RECORD OF CONVERSATION
☐ CASE REVIEW / STATUS
☐ OTHER

PARTICIPANTS MARY ELLEN (NFI)
 B. URYC
 DO NOT DISCLOSE
 Contains Identity of
 Confidential Source
 CONFIDENTIALITY REQUESTED YES NO

FILE NO. ~~83-0091~~
 DATE 12.13.83
 TIME 11:41 AM

SUMMARY MARY ELLEN called and said she was asked by B. GARDE to call and advise me that B. GARDE would call me tonight at home regarding contact w/ [REDACTED] and information re [REDACTED]

MARY ELLEN - 202+667-5223/7904

MARY ELLEN called at ± 3:30 pm to advise that B. Garde was ~~leaving~~ ~~leaving~~ ~~leaving~~ returning to DC tonight and requested I call her after 9:30 pm.

PAGE 1 OF 1

PREPARED BY B. Uryc

DATE 12.13.83

ACTION REQUIRED

DO NOT DISCLOSE
 Contains Identity of
 Confidential Source

REVIEWED BY

DATE

B/S

MEMORANDUM TO CASE FILE

84-0002

TYPE ACTION

- (X) RECORD OF CONVERSATION
 () CASE REVIEW / STATUS
 () OTHER

PARTICIPANTS

B. Uryc

B. GARDE

DO NOT DISCLOSE
Contains Identity of
Confidential Source

FILE NO.

~~83-0091~~

DATE

12.15.83

TIME

10:17-10:46 pm

CONFIDENTIALITY REQUESTED

YES NO

SUMMARY TC w/ B. Garde re contacting [REDACTED] for interview.

GARDE advised that ALGR is working somewhere in the [REDACTED] and that he is living [REDACTED] and can not be contacted directly. She went on to explain the problems involved in getting in contact w/ ALGR. She provided the following phone number for [REDACTED]. GARDE also discussed [REDACTED] and the mix up which resulted following our interview with him and she assumed [REDACTED] called Guild and that Guild was not aware NRC was using GAP to contact the ALGRS.

GARDE also related that she was concerned that RII DA was making stunts that there is no problem at Catawba when in fact RII is investigating some issues, — this could compromise the legitimacy of RII investigative effort.

PAGE 1 OF 1

PREPARED BY

B. Uryc

DATE

12.15.83

ACTION REQUIRED

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

1/4 race

DO NOT DISCLOSE

Contains Identity of

Confidential Source

REVIEWED BY

DATE

MEMORANDUM TO CASE FILE

84-0003

TYPE ACTION

- (X) RECORD OF CONVERSATION
 () CASE REVIEW / STATUS
 () OTHER

PARTICIPANTS

B. Uryc

B. GARDE

DO NOT DISCLOSE
Contains Identity of
Confidential Source

FILE NO.

83-0091

DATE

12.15.83

TIME

10:17-10:46 pm

CONFIDENTIALITY REQUESTED

YES NO

SUMMARY

TC w/ B. Garde re contacting [REDACTED] for interview. GARDE advised that ALGR is working somewhere in the southern part of [REDACTED] and that he is living [REDACTED] and can not be contacted directly. She went on to explain the problems involved in getting in contact w/ ALGR. She provided the following phone number for [REDACTED]. GARDE also discussed [REDACTED] and the mix up which resulted following our interview with him and she assumed [REDACTED] called Guild and that Guild was not aware NRC was using GAP to contact the ALGRs.

GARDE also related that she was concerned that RII DA was making stmts that there is no problem at Catawba when in fact RII is investigating some issues. — this could compromise the legitimacy of RII investigative effort.

PAGE 1 OF 1

DATE

12.15.83

PREPARED BY

B. Uryc

ACTION REQUIRED

left case

DO NOT DISCLOSE
Contains Identity of
Confidential Source

REVIEWED BY

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DO NOT DISCLOSE

B/6

MEMORANDUM TO CASE FILE

TYPE ACTION

- () RECORD OF CONVERSATION
() CASE REVIEW / STATUS
() OTHER

PARTICIPANTS

B Urye

FILE NO.

84-0003
83-0091

DATE

12.19.83

TIME

10:38am

CONFIDENTIALITY REQUESTED

YES NO

SUMMARY

Called [redacted] at [redacted] and she advised she could not contact her son. She said to call [redacted] (res: [redacted], work: [redacted]) who could possibly contact [redacted]

10:40am - Called [redacted] at her residence and she stated to call her back at 1:00pm. She said that [redacted] will call her tomorrow morning and that she could give him a message then.

12:53pm: [redacted] advised that [redacted] would call her in the morning and that she would give him my name & number. She also advised that he is working in [redacted] at [redacted]

PAGE 1 OF 1

DATE

12.19.83

PREPARED BY

B. Urye

ACTION REQUIRED

REVIEWED BY

DATE

DO NOT DISCLOSE
Contains Identity of
Confidential Source

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DO NOT DISCLOSE
Contains Identity of
Confidential Source

MEMORANDUM TO CASE FILE

84-0003

TYPE ACTION
☒ RECORD OF CONVERSATION
☐ CASE REVIEW / STATUS
☐ OTHER

PARTICIPANTS B. Urye

FILE NO. 83-0091
DATE 12.20.83
TIME 3:08

CONFIDENTIALITY REQUESTED YES NO

SUMMARY

Called [redacted] and she said that [redacted] did call this morning but she forgot to tell him that we wanted to call him. I again asked if there was any way we could contact him and she said that it would be better if he contacted me. She said she would give him the message. I advised her that it was important that we contact him as soon as possible.

PAGE 1 OF 1

PREPARED BY B. Urye

DATE 12.20.83

ACTION REQUIRED

REVIEWED BY

DATE B/8

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DO NOT DISCLOSE

DO NOT DISCLOSE
Contains Identity of
Confidential Source

MEMORANDUM TO CASE FILE

84-0003

TYPE ACTION

- (X) RECORD OF CONVERSATION
() CASE REVIEW / STATUS
() OTHER

PARTICIPANTS

B. Uryc

DO NOT DISCLOSE
Contains Identity of
Confidential Source

CONFIDENTIALITY REQUESTED

YES NO

FILE NO.

83-0091

DATE

12.21.83

TIME

8:20 am

SUMMARY

called collect and apologized for not con-
tact us sooner. I explained we wanted to discuss
his concerns and that we would travel to meet
with him. He said he would talk to us on his day
off, but that he would have to call back next week
to let me know when he would be available.

PAGE 1 OF 1

PREPARED BY

B. Uryc

DATE

12.21.83

ACTION REQUIRED

REVIEWED BY

DATE

DO NOT DISCLOSE
Contains Identity of
Confidential Source
B/9

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DO NOT DISCLOSE
Contains Identity of
Confidential Source

MEMORANDUM TO CASE FILE

84-0003

TYPE ACTION

- ☒ RECORD OF CONVERSATION
- ☐ CASE REVIEW / STATUS
- ☐ OTHER

PARTICIPANTS MARY ELLEN

B. GARDE

B. URYC

CONFIDENTIALITY REQUESTED YES NO

FILE NO.

83-0091

DATE

03 1984

TIME

3:00pm - 3:10 pm

SUMMARY

Mary Ellen (last name unknown) called and requested the correct spelling of my last name and title, to include address so GAP could forward copy of LANGLEY affidavit.

Also talked with GARDE and I advised her of my problems contacting [REDACTED]

General conversation about holidays.

DO NOT DISCLOSE
Contains Identity of
Confidential Source

PAGE 1 OF 1

PREPARED BY

B. Uryc

DATE

01.03.84

ACTION REQUIRED

DATE

B/10

REVIEWED BY

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DO NOT DISCLOSE

MEMORANDUM TO CASE FILE

84-0003

TYPE ACTION

- (X) RECORD OF CONVERSATION
() CASE REVIEW / STATUS
() OTHER

PARTICIPANTS MARY ELLEN

B. URYC

FILE NO.

~~83-0044~~

DATE

01.06.84

TIME

3:27-3:32 pm

CONFIDENTIALITY REQUESTED YES NO

SUMMARY MARY ELLEN called at the request of B. GARDE to determine if [REDACTED] had returned my call. I advised that he did not call. She stated that B. GARDE expected to have contact w/ [REDACTED] and that GARDE would tell him to contact NRC as soon as possible.

General chit chat re Atlanta.

DO NOT DISCLOSE
Contains Identity of
Confidential Source

PAGE 1 OF 1

PREPARED BY

B. Uryc

DATE

01.06.84

ACTION REQUIRED

REVIEWED BY

DATE

B/11

MEMORANDUM TO CASE FILE

TYPE ACTION
☒ RECORD OF CONVERSATION
☐ CASE REVIEW / STATUS
☐ OTHER

PARTICIPANTS

B. URYC

DO NOT DISCLOSE
Contains Identity of
Confidential Source

CONFIDENTIALITY REQUESTED

YES NO

FILE NO. 84-A-0003

DATE 01.16.84

TIME 3:05 pm

SUMMARY

[REDACTED] called to apologize for not returning his call as promised. He explained he had been under some personal pressure and had been unable to call. He said he would be willing to meet this [REDACTED] and I advised him that due to prior commitments it would be impossible for me to meet with him. He said he understood and I asked him to call me Monday or Tuesday of next week so we could make other arrangements to meet. He again apologized for not calling and assured me he would call next week.

PAGE 1 OF 1

PREPARED BY

B. Uryc

DATE

01.16.84

ACTION REQUIRED

DO NOT DISCLOSE
Contains Identity of
Confidential Source

REVIEWED BY

DATE

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

MEMORANDUM TO CASE FILE

TYPE ACTION

- (X) RECORD OF CONVERSATION
() CASE REVIEW / STATUS
() OTHER

PARTICIPANTS

B. Uryc

MARY ELLEN

DO NOT DISCLOSE
Contains Identity of
Confidential Source

CONFIDENTIALITY REQUESTED

YES NO

FILE NO.

84-0002

DATE

01.19.84

TIME

1:15 pm

SUMMARY

I called GAP to get address of [REDACTED] for B. Jones.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

PAGE OF

PREPARED BY

DATE

ACTION REQUIRED

DO NOT DISCLOSE
Contains Identity of
Confidential Source

REVIEWED BY

DATE

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DO NOT DISCLOSE

B/15

MEMORANDUM TO CASE FILE

TYPE ACTION
 (X) RECORD OF CONVERSATION
 () CASE REVIEW / STATUS
 () OTHER

PARTICIPANTS

B. URYC

FILE NO.

DATE 01.26.84

TIME 1:40 pm

CONFIDENTIALITY REQUESTED YES NO

SUMMARY

[REDACTED] called collect to advise that he would be travelling to [REDACTED] GA on [REDACTED] and that he would be able to spend some time there for an interview. I advised him that I would be unavailable on that date to interview because of prior commitments. I then asked if he would be available on [REDACTED] as I would be in the [REDACTED] area. He said he would and I advised him I would contact him on either 01.30.84 or 01.31.84 to make final arrangements. He said he could be reached at [REDACTED] or through [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]. He also requested I obtain the address of DOL for him.

Wage & Hour Division (DOL)

Mr. Jerry Stuckey

Federal Building

183 Assembly Street

Columbia, SC 29021

(803) 765-5981

FTS 677-5981

PAGE 1 OF 1

PREPARED BY

B. Uryc

DATE

01.29.84

ACTION REQUIRED

REVIEWED BY

DATE

B/16

MEMORANDUM TO CASE FILE

TYPE ACTION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RECORD OF CONVERSATION <input type="checkbox"/> CASE REVIEW / STATUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER	PARTICIPANTS <u>B. GARDE</u> <u>B. URYE</u>	FILE NO. <u>84-A-0003</u> DATE <u>01.28.84</u> TIME <u>7:30 pm</u>
	DO NOT DISCLOSE Contains Identity of Confidential Source	
	CONFIDENTIALITY REQUESTED YES NO NA	

SUMMARY B GARDE called me at my residence and advised that she had talked to [REDACTED] who told her he had been in contact with me. I explained my conversation w/ [REDACTED] on 01.26.84 and that we would be interviewing him on [REDACTED]. She requested she attend the interview and I advised her we could make such arrangements while at the ASLB hearings on 01.30/31.84.

PAGE 1 OF 1

PREPARED BY <u>B. Urye</u>	DATE <u>01.30.84</u>
ACTION REQUIRED 	DO NOT DISCLOSE Contains Identity of Confidential Source
REVIEWED BY	DATE

MEMORANDUM TO CASE FILE

TYPE ACTION

- ☒ RECORD OF CONVERSATION
- ☐ CASE REVIEW / STATUS
- ☐ OTHER

PARTICIPANTS ALGR ; B. GARDE
B. URYC ; N. ECONOMOS

FILE NO. 84-0003

DATE 02.01.84


TIME 11:10 am - 3:30 pm

CONFIDENTIALITY REQUESTED YES NO

SUMMARY In CAMERA ALGR interviewed at Holiday Inn, [REDACTED]

PAGE 1 OF 1

DATE 02.06.84

PREPARED BY 

ACTION REQUIRED

DATE

REVIEWED BY

MAR 13 1984


[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
SUBJECT: RII-84-A-0003

I am currently conducting an official inquiry concerning several allegations made during the Catawba Licensing Hearings. One of the individuals who expressed some concerns during the hearing suggested we contact you regarding the possibility that you may be able to add some additional information to his concerns. Let me assure you that you are involved in these matters only as an individual who might be able to verify some of the information provided by other individuals.

Would you please call me collect at (404) 221-4193 during the day, or collect at (404) 926-0364 after 7:00 p.m. in the evening, so that I can discuss these matters with you.

Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,


Bruno Uryc, Jr.
Investigative Coordinator

Reg/Cert Mail: [REDACTED]

OFFICE

SURNAME

DATE

B/19

GOOD COPY

MEMORANDUM TO CASE FILE

TYPE ACTION

- (☒) RECORD OF CONVERSATION
() CASE REVIEW / STATUS
() OTHER

PARTICIPANTS

B. URYC

FILE NO.

84-0003

DATE

TIME

7:00 pm

CONFIDENTIALITY REQUESTED YES NO

SUMMARY

[redacted] called me collect at my residence to advise he received my letter (03/13/84). I advised him who I was and why I needed to talk to him. He said he would try to help. I explained the concerns of the ALGR: 1) [redacted], 2) [redacted], 3) [redacted], 4) [redacted].

[redacted] stated that some [redacted] was normal and corrected within procedure. He was not aware of any minimum violations. He has never seen any excessive force applied to pipe to force fit the pipe. He has done several repairs, all of which were in procedure. He said the work was very good and that he was not aware of any problems.

[redacted] also stated that he was in the process of making and that he was calling collect from a phone booth. I asked him to call me back when he is settled in and has his phone. He said he would

PAGE OF

DATE

PREPARED BY

ACTION REQUIRED

REVIEWED BY

DATE

B/20



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION II
101 MARIETTA STREET, N.W.
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

JAN 06 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR: A. Herdt, Chief, Engineering Program Branch
FROM: B. Uryc, Investigation/Allegation Coordinator
SUBJECT: CATAWBA: IN CAMERA HEARINGS
CASE NO: RII-84-A-0002

This refers to my letter dated December 19, 1983 (Case No. RII-83-A-0091) which set forth five allegations which we received during an interview of an in camera allegor. For reasons which would facilitate the administrative handling of the allegations of all of the in camera allegors, I have assigned the above case number (RII-84-A-0002) to those allegations set forth in my December 19th letter. Please make a pen and ink change to that letter eliminating the case number RII-83-A-0091 and substituting RII-84-A-0002. For your information, the following case numbers have been assigned to the in camera allegations/allegors as indicated below:

RII-83-A-0091	NUNN
RII-84-A-0002	[REDACTED]
RII-84-A-0003	[REDACTED]
RII-84-A-0004	LANGLEY

Your assistance is always appreciated.

Bruno Uryc, Jr.

-N O T I C E-
THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS INFORMATION
RELATIVE TO ASLB IN CAMERA HEARINGS.
IT CAN BE RELEASED ONLY TO AUTHORIZED
AFFIANTS.

~~8404040028~~ (1p)

B/12