

342

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

In the matter of:

Interview of Russell A. Rehfeld

Docket No.

Location:

Pages: 1 - 37

Date: June 30, 1982

8506030200 831110
PDR FOIA
BERNABEB3-A-9 PDR

TAYLOE ASSOCIATES

Court Reporters
1625 I Street, N.W. Suite 1004
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 293-3950

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

2 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

3
4
5
6
7
8 Interview of Russell A. Rehfeld

9
10
11
12 June 30, 1982

13 Palo Verde Nuclear Station

14
15 Investigators: E. J. Power

16 Owen Shackleton

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 INVESTIGATOR: This is an interview of
3 Mr. Russell -- first name is spelled R U S S E L L --
4 middle initial A. -- Rehfeld, spelled R as in Roger
5 E H F E L D.

6 Mr. Rehfeld is an Electrical Quality Control
7 Engineer employed by the Bechtel Power Corporation at
8 the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station.

9 This interview is taking place in the NRC office
10 at the Palo Verde site in the Construction Building on
11 June 30, 1982, and the interview began at 1:48 p.m.

12 Present to conduct this interview from the U.S.
13 Nuclear Regulatory Commission is Mr. E.J. Power and
14 myself, Owen C. Shackleton. Both of us are investigators
15 for the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, assigned to
16 the Region 5 office in Walnut Creek, California.

17 Now prior to tape recording the interview,
18 Mr. Rehfeld agreed to be placed under oath and was advised
19 prior to that time of the applicable Federal Statutes.

20 Mr. Rehfeld, do we have permission to tape
21 record your interview?

22 MR. REHFELD: Yes, sir.

23 INVESTIGATOR: Okay, Russ, one of the
24 allegations we have is that there are times when
25 terminations are being made, and the QC Inspector is not

mgc-3

1 present and supervision goes ahead and has the termination
2 completed, and then the QC Inspector either has to buy it
3 off without having seen the work completed, or he has to
4 ask that it be terminated and terminated in his presence.

5 Now I don't know if that is true. We just
6 learned today that approximately two weeks ago, they
7 changed how you fellows were to operate, and you were to
8 be present during a termination.

9 Would you give us some background, so that we
10 know what has been going on.

11 MR. REHFELD: You are primarily interested in
12 those that are safety-related.

13 INVESTIGATOR: Safety-related.

14 MR. REHFELD: (Inaudible.) That is what we
15 work on. As far as witnessing an actual termination, the
16 only time we need to be present, physically present, is
17 when they're doing a lugging of a -- crimping a lug that
18 will not be visible after the termination is complete, if
19 they are going to put a shrink over it or something like
20 that, where we can witness and physically see that the
21 conductor is going into the lug and that it is secure and
22 that it's not split.

23 As far as other terminations, we don't really
24 have to physically be there when the electrician does
25 the work, because it is visible to us after the work is

mgc 4

1 complete. We do inspect, to the best of my knowledge,
2 every termination before we accept it.

3 INVESTIGATOR: Okay. So the allegation, the
4 party who made it, may not have been clear on what your
5 job responsibility was, because they were making an
6 inference that you people were being forced to accept it
7 without being able to witness the termination.

8 So by your testimony, by the procedure you
9 are following, that's not correct.

10 MR. REHFELD: No.

11 INVESTIGATOR: So the other question, I guess,
12 I would have at this point, which is another allegation,
13 is that there have been times when your people and possibly
14 yourself have been intimidated by supervision, the foremen
15 or superintendents.

16 Have you ever had any problems like that?

17 MR. REHFELD: Never.

18 INVESTIGATOR: For the record, would you express
19 in your own words what the working conditions and
20 relationships are that you experience out on the job.

21 MR. REHFELD: The only ones I can speak for are
22 my own, and I feel that I have a very good rapport with
23 all the craft that I work with, and they believe in my
24 judgment. If I feel something is incorrect, they very
25 rarely will question it or doubt it. And I have the

mgc-5

1 fullest cooperation from all the electricians, from their
2 foremen, from the supervisors, all the way up and down the
3 line. And I really have had absolutely no trouble with
4 anyone.

5 INVESTIGATOR: Gene, do you have --

6 INVESTIGATOR: Yes. Are you aware of any
7 situations where there is the possibility of a (inaudible)
8 or damaged condition that has occurred?

9 MR. REHFELD: I imagine that those things do
10 happen, because we're dealing with --

11 INVESTIGATOR: Yes, okay.

12 MR. REHFELD: -- a thousand assumptions.

13 INVESTIGATOR: Have you ever had any problems
14 to go back and relook at something that you have previously
15 inspected?

16 MR. REHFELD: Yes.

17 INVESTIGATOR: Under what circumstances?

18 MR. REHFELD: Well, either there was a change,
19 an engineering change, in a termination and/or a rework
20 of part of the raceway where they've had an on-land
21 determination.

22 INVESTIGATOR: This would be under the normal
23 procedure for filing of changes.

24 MR. REHFELD: Yes.

25 INVESTIGATOR: Have you ever specifically had

1 an occasion here, say, a card was, in fact, lost, it

5 back to the craft, they then prepared a new card
subsequently it goes to QC for signing off.

Have you ever heard of that situation?

MR. REHFELD: No, that's -- no. I don't even
how that would work.

INVESTIGATOR: No, I don't either. But you see
that is occurring under certain circumstances, because
there are a number of termination cards, being estimated
at somewhere around forty thousand --

INVESTIGATOR: 44,000.

INVESTIGATOR -- from what I'm told --

INVESTIGATOR: Or 50,000.

INVESTIGATOR: 44,000, six thousand of which
are last year, --

MR. REHFELD: Right.

INVESTIGATOR: -- because of the volume of
those cards, even after QC is finished, they go back
(inaudible) to the system, for whatever reason, one or
two get lost, in those situations, they regenerate or
make a new card, which means now we need all the necessary
signatures and signing off (inaudible)...

MR. REHFELD: Well, for myself, I haven't had
any situation like that, and now I'm experiencing working
with the cards in the office, and sometimes there is

mgc-5

1 fullest cooperation from all the electricians, from their
2 foremen, from the supervisors, all the way up and down the
3 line. And I really have had absolutely no trouble with
4 anyone.

5 INVESTIGATOR: Gene, do you have --

6 INVESTIGATOR: Yes. Are you aware of any
7 situations where there is the possibility of a (inaudible)
8 or damaged condition that has occurred?

9 MR. REHFELD: I imagine that those things do
10 happen, because we're dealing with --

11 INVESTIGATOR: Yes, okay.

12 MR. REHFELD: -- a thousand assumptions.

13 INVESTIGATOR: Have you ever had any problems
14 to go back and relook at something that you have previously
15 inspected?

16 MR. REHFELD: Yes.

17 INVESTIGATOR: Under what circumstances?

18 MR. REHFELD: Well, either there was a change,
19 an engineering change, in a termination and/or a rework
20 of part of the raceway where they've had an on-land
21 determination.

22 INVESTIGATOR: This would be under the normal
23 procedure for filing of changes.

24 MR. REHFELD: Yes.

25 INVESTIGATOR: Have you ever specifically had

mgc-6

1 an occasion where, say, a card was, in fact, lost, it
2 went back to the craft, they then prepared a new card
3 and subsequently it goes to QC for signing off.

4 Have you ever heard of that situation?

5 MR. REHFELD: No, that's -- no. I don't even
6 know how that would work.

7 INVESTIGATOR: No, I don't either. But you see
8 what is occurring under certain circumstances, because
9 there are a number of termination cards, being estimated
10 at somewhere around forty thousand --

11 INVESTIGATOR: 44,000.

12 INVESTIGATOR -- from what I'm told --

13 INVESTIGATOR: Or 50,000.

14 INVESTIGATOR: 44,000, six thousand of which
15 are last year, --

16 MR. REHFELD: Right.

17 INVESTIGATOR: -- because of the volume of
18 those cards, even after QC is finished, they go back
19 (inaudible) to the system, for whatever reason, one or
20 two get lost, in those situations, they regenerate or
21 make a new card, which means now we need all the necessary
22 signatures and signing off (inaudible)...

23 MR. REHFELD: Well, for myself, I haven't had
24 any situation like that, and now I'm experiencing working
25 with the cards in the office, and sometimes there is

mgc-7

1 difficulty in traceability, but we haven't had any that,
2 you know, are just gone.

3 INVESTIGATOR: No, I'm not inferring -- but
4 I was very much interested in, how does it get back to
5 QC, so that, you know -- you didn't do the termination;
6 John Doe did it -- apparently now, a new card, in some
7 cases -- we've talked to some of the electricians where
8 this occurred. They get a card, they go look at it,
9 (inaudible). Now they don't want their name (inaudible)
10 on that termination card, so they reterminate it.

11 Now if they reterminate it, that means it has
12 to be re-QC'd.

13 MR. REHFELD: If they re -- are you talking
14 about reterminating or rebanding?

15 INVESTIGATOR: Well, the physical --

16 MR. REHFELD: Well, banding would be not to change
17 the actual crimp that is on the wire at that point. It
18 would merely be if there was a screw connector onto a
19 terminal block, lifting the screw, removing the wire,
20 putting the wire back on and screwing it back down. That
21 would not require the electrician's crimp (inaudible),
22 because he hasn't changed the configuration of anything
23 that was done prior.

24 INVESTIGATOR: Under what circumstances can the
25 electrician perform that?

mgc-8

1 MR. REHFELD: Well, if, in routing, if there
2 was a -- he would not perform it without a card, okay,
3 but the card would just instruct to terminate or reterminate
4 for raceway rework or for replacement of a terminal block,
5 something like that.

6 INVESTIGATOR: Okay, now I'm actually referring
7 to an actual retermination where the other termination was
8 cut off, (inaudible), and they do it all over again.

9 MR. REHFELD: Uh-huh.

10 INVESTIGATOR: Have you heard any facts, rumors
11 or anything --

12 MR. REHFELD: I have never heard of anyone doing
13 anything like that without -- as far as I know, without,
14 you know, the right paperwork, the right card, because
15 to do that, there would have to be a reason. The
16 electrician would have to be given a reason why he --

17 INVESTIGATOR: He's given the reason that the
18 cards are lost, see, and therefore you would have, the
19 end result, the electrician would sign the card.

20 MR. REHFELD: Uh-huh.

21 INVESTIGATOR: You know, (inaudible) a card
22 for termination you knew you effected yesterday (inaudible).
23 "I didn't do it, but it's done. What do you want me to do
24 with it?" Well, you either sign the card, or (inaudible)...

25 But in either situation, you now have a new

mgc-9

1 card for work previously completed, all finished and QC'd.

2 Now I'm interested in how they get back into the
3 system. (Inaudible). And then the cards have got to go
4 back, so (inaudible)... I would assume somebody would
5 make a comment, you know, "It appears that we're going back
6 and redoing work..."

7 MR. REHFELD: With all the work that I've
8 handled, all the cards I've handled, I've never run across
9 that situation.

10 INVESTIGATOR: Do you maintain any type of
11 informal log?

12 MR. REHFELD: Yes, sir. We have logs in my
13 office. We have logs in the field office.

14 INVESTIGATOR: By the system?

15 MR. REHFELD: By start-up systems, in the main
16 office, and in the field we keep a log of terminations by
17 equipment.

18 INVESTIGATOR: If I come up with a card, can
19 you tell me who did it and (inaudible)?

20 MR. REHFELD: I can sure try.

21 INVESTIGATOR: I'm not trying to put you
22 through a lot of work. I am interested in (inaudible).

23 Hopefully I am conveying to you a correct
24 situation.

25 Have you ever heard of any situation -- well,

mgc-10

1 (inaudible) if you didn't know they were doing it,
2 then you wouldn't have any knowledge of anyone ever
3 generating a termination card for work previously done,
4 still existing, where the electrician signs it under protest.

5 MR. REHFELD: No.

6 INVESTIGATOR: Okay, then for all intents and
7 purposes, that would be (inaudible). If you look at the
8 card, then, there would be no reason to question any entry
9 for QC (inaudible) to go back and look at it, it would be
10 a normal, completed termination. There would be no
11 reason to question that card. (Inaudible.)

12 MR. REHFELD: Well, the only thing that's
13 missing on this is the revisions for the 306 and the 303
14 specifications.

15 INVESTIGATOR: I'm not familiar with those.
16 Those are the tech specs?

17 MR. REHFELD: Yes, sir.

18 INVESTIGATOR: Are they normally written down?

19 MR. REHFELD: Yes.

20 INVESTIGATOR: Does Engineering do that, or does
21 QC do that?

22 MR. REHFELD: QC can do it. Engineering can do it.

23 INVESTIGATOR: Either way.

24 MR. REHFELD: They are always working on the
25 same provisions, always keeping (inaudible).

mgc-11

1 INVESTIGATOR: And the way I understand it, then,
2 in this case, this would be Joe Crawford -- (inaudible)
3 -- he would be --

4 MR. REHFELD: That wasn't Joe Crawford.

5 INVESTIGATOR: That wasn't Joe, okay.

6 MR. REHFELD: He's on vacation.

7 INVESTIGATOR: So either way, by the time
8 (inaudible) is finished off, it should be entirely
9 complete.

10 MR. REHFELD: Yes. When the card is totally
11 bought off, the termination should be totally complete.

12 INVESTIGATOR: Let us burn us a copy before
13 you go, and I would appreciate it if you can (inaudible)
14 you have.

15 MR. REHFELD: Is that Unit 1 or Unit 2?

16 INVESTIGATOR: These are Unit 1.

17 MR. REHFELD: Unit 1, okay.

18 INVESTIGATOR: The allegations almost are all
19 on Unit 1 that we have now.

20 INVESTIGATOR: In reference to termination cards,
21 do you have any knowledge of any QC inspector ever actually
22 putting his signature on a termination card for work that
23 he did not do?

24 MR. REHFELD: You hear a lot of rumors.

25 INVESTIGATOR: I know you do. But I am interested

mgc 12

1 in those, other than joking, that are considered a valid
2 card.

3 Are you knowledgeable of any incidents where
4 quality plan, safety-related people have been improperly
5 or incorrectly signing out (inaudible).... That would be
6 contrary to some procedure. I'm not interested in (inaudible)
7 ...overall, any procedure?

8 MR. REHFELD: No, nothing outside of (inaudible).

9 INVESTIGATOR: Are you familiar, from a QC
10 point of view, where individuals that could include (inaudible)
11 personnel, that are improperly determinating, contrary to
12 determination procedures?

13 MR. REHFELD: This, I have to say, is strictly
14 from what I have heard, because most of my work was
15 conducted in Unit 2, and now I'm in the main office. But
16 I have heard some of our QC personnel from Unit 1 say that
17 they have found start-up going in and determinating and
18 without --

19 INVESTIGATOR: Without the card?

20 MR. REHFELD: Without an SWP.

21 INVESTIGATOR: Yes. What is an SWP?

22 MR. REHFELD: A start work permit.

23 INVESTIGATOR: Oh, start work permit, okay.
24 That word is a new terminology.

25 MR. REHFELD: I'm sorry.

mgc 13

1 INVESTIGATOR: No, that's all right.

2 MR. REHFELD: That's the way we are.

3 INVESTIGATOR: Just bear with some of our questions.
4 We're investigators; we're not electricians, and we're not
5 engineers, (inaudible).

6 Who could we possibly talk to, QC personel, who
7 might be able (inaudible)? You say some people have made
8 comments about this.

9 MR. REHFELD: I think the other gentlemen that
10 you have down there, Bill Burdick, he might be able to give
11 you some information on that, because he works on a lot
12 of those systems.

13 INVESTIGATOR: You did indicate that you have
14 a responsibility for QC, (inaudible), inspecting these bolts
15 on (inaudible) for terminations, correct?

16 MR. REHFELD: Yes.

17 INVESTIGATOR: You have done that yourself?

18 MR. REHFELD: Yes.

19 INVESTIGATOR: And you are physically present,
20 I mean --

21 MR. REHFELD: Yes. They torque it, and we're
22 there when they tape it. We're there when they heat shrink
23 it. We're there --

24 INVESTIGATOR: Okay. Is that true of everything,
25 (inaudible).

mgc 14

1 MR. REHFELD: When it's torqued?

2 INVESTIGATOR: No. For the whole process. Is
3 a QC representative there, to the best of your knowledge,
4 for all bolting of lugs?

5 MR. REHFELD: Yes. Anything that's torqued,
6 we must witness, --

7 INVESTIGATOR: Yes.

8 MR. REHFELD: -- if we do it. If they torque it
9 without us being there, I have them report it.

10 INVESTIGATOR: All right.

11 MR. REHFELD: That's --

12 INVESTIGATOR: Are you aware of any situation
13 where a QC engineer should not necessarily have been
14 present when --

15 MR. REHFELD: No, I'm not.

16 INVESTIGATOR: Are you aware that they have
17 situations in which they -- electricians, now -- have put
18 a one-bolt lug onto a two-bolt lug? Have you (inaudible)....

19 MR. REHFELD: A one-bolt lug?

20 INVESTIGATOR: Yes. For instance, say, one
21 coming off of, as I understand, off a motor to a particular
22 head, and because of the construction of it, they have a
23 one-bolt lug to begin with and, okay, you've got a field
24 cable coming in there with a two-bolt lug, have you ever
25 witnessed a termination (inaudible)?

mgc 15

1 MR. REHFELD: The only ones I've witnessed are
2 one-bolt and one-bolt.

3 INVESTIGATOR: One-bolt and one-bolt.

4 Have you been aware or been present when, say, they
5 did have a two-bolt lug, as I understand, (inaudible)
6 procedural requirements where they can go through and sever
7 or cut it and shorten a two-bolt lug to a one-bolt lug by
8 meeting the necessary parameters and establishing --

9 MR. REHFELD: I have seen that.

10 INVESTIGATOR: But you haven't actually seen them
11 take a two-bolt lug and put it together with a one-bolt lug?

12 MR. REHFELD: No, I haven't.

13 INVESTIGATOR: Has QC ever been involved in an
14 inspection of O-rings for a field cable entering a cabinet
15 beginning (inaudible)?

16 MR. REHFELD: An O-ring?

17 INVESTIGATOR: Yes. It would be a conduit
18 entering into, say, a motor-controlled --

19 MR. REHFELD: Are you talking about a nipple
20 entering the cabinet?

21 INVESTIGATOR: I don't know. What's a nipple?

22 MR. REHFELD: Well, for instance, if you have
23 a conduit or flex entering a cabinet through the top or
24 the bottom, where we allow them to pull wire, it has to have
25 a bushing, a nylon bushing, or some facsimile to a nylon

mgc 16

1 bushing, to make a soft edge so the cable will not be
2 damaged.

3 INVESTIGATOR: No, those are not specifically --
4 they are very similar. We are interested in those systems
5 where cabinets are located in water systems where they
6 must maintain water integrity to the electrical paneling
7 and therefore require some type of an O-ring.

8 MR. REHFELD: Okay, I know what you're talking
9 about. I understand.

10 I -- again, this was down in Unit 1, and I was
11 pulled out of Unit 1 and put in Unit 2 before we got really
12 involved in it. But there was a yellow sealer type bushing
13 that they would use, and in cabinets that were already
14 sealed, they would use RTV, room temperature vulcanizer,
15 which is waterproof, stays flexible, and that would be
16 used as a sealant around the --

17 INVESTIGATOR: Is that a QC function to ensure
18 that they use that?

19 MR. REHFELD: We don't have any (inaudible).
20 For our particular staff?

21 INVESTIGATOR: Yes.

22 MR. REHFELD: We are electrical cable pull and
23 termination. Then it goes into raceway, and raceway
24 would have final buy-off on that.

25 INVESTIGATOR: Have you ever been involved in

mgc 17

1 the evaluation of damaged conduit where they, in fact, have
2 had a requirement to splice a safety-related cable?

3 MR. REHFELD: No.

4 INVESTIGATOR: Are they allowed to splice
5 safety-related cable?

6 MR. REHFELD: No. The only place where anything
7 similar to that can be done is inside a cabinet itself.

8 INVESTIGATOR: (Inaudible.)

9 INVESTIGATOR: Have you ever heard any rumors to
10 the effect that any quality class cable being damaged by
11 slag, by rollers (inaudible), and what would be his
12 disposition of the cable?

13 MR. REHFELD: Well, any time we find any damaged
14 cable, we red-tag it, write an NCR specifying what the
15 damage is, what the nonconformance is, to the best of our
16 ability --

17 INVESTIGATOR: Right.

18 MR. REHFELD: -- and send it to the field for
19 discipline, field engineering, and the resident engineers
20 for disposition, either spare that cable or we pull another
21 cable over it or pull that cable out and pull another cable
22 in. But it would not be used if it was damaged.

23 INVESTIGATOR: In reference specifically then to
24 roller slag, had that been a common occurrence or
25 infrequent or --

mgc 18

1 MR. REHFELD: Unfortunately all too common,
2 because --

3 INVESTIGATOR: How frequent?

4 (Pause.)

5 INVESTIGATOR: I'm just trying to get an idea.
6 I'm not trying to pin you down now.

7 INVESTIGATOR: One a week?

8 INVESTIGATOR: One a week, two a month?

9 We're interested in the safety aspect of it.
10 We're trying to get an idea of the size of the problem
11 (inaudible).

12 MR. REHFELD: I would say maybe two or three a
13 month that are located -- first of all, it is extremely
14 difficult to locate every foot of wire that has been run,
15 because where some of the welders work, accessibility is
16 so remote, and we have instructed everyone that whenever
17 they weld (inaudible), they should have welding blankets
18 laid out, and they do cooperate. However, sometimes the
19 welding blanket might not be in the best configuration
20 either. It might have a hole in it, you know, and we're
21 all human and (inaudible).

22 INVESTIGATOR: To the best of your knowledge,
23 then, they are all (inaudible).

24 MR. REHFELD: Yes, yes.

25 INVESTIGATOR: And properly dispositioned.

mgc 19

1 MR. REHFELD: Yes.

2 INVESTIGATOR: For our own, particularly my own,
3 understanding, could you go through the sequence of the
4 history of a termination card?

5 Now I'll start it off, and you stop me if I'm
6 wrong.

7 I understand Engineering first -- it comes out
8 of Engineering initially.

9 MR. REHFELD: Well, it is first generated by the
10 computer.

11 INVESTIGATOR: Okay. Okay.

12 MR. REHFELD: And then it's sent to Engineering.
13 They receive the whole card, which has a tear-off tab which
14 contains (inaudible).

15 INVESTIGATOR: We've seen that (inaudible) with
16 some tags on it.

17 Then that goes to the Superintendent for Electrical
18 for the disposition of who is going to do the work.

19 MR. REHFELD: Yes.

20 INVESTIGATOR: Then it goes to the GF, and the GF
21 then gives it to one of his -- I'm talking about
22 terminations, of course -- one of his three foremen they
23 now have. And then the foreman gives it to the journeyman
24 electrician who performs the work. And when the work is
25 completed and the journeyman has signed it off, then I

mgc 20

1 underst and it goes back to the foreman.

2 What's the next step after that, Russ?

3 MR. REHFELD: After the foreman gets it, he
4 turns it back -- it just goes back up the line again until
5 it goes back into Engineering.

6 INVESTIGATOR: So it goes back to the
7 Superintendent?

8 Where do you folks get into it? Where does QC
9 come in?

10 MR. REHFELD: We can come in anywhere. We can
11 do an in-process. In other words, if we're walking through
12 the unit and we see a terminator working, we can ask him
13 if he has any cards that are done, and we can inspect them
14 right there, in which case we would leave on item open.
15 We won't buy the entire card. We will leave one item open
16 to ensure that we will get the card back into our office
17 for our records, so we can log it in.

18 Also when the termination is totally complete,
19 it goes back to the engineers.

20 INVESTIGATOR: Pardon me for interrupting. But
21 when it comes to your office and you folks then log it in
22 your records, then it goes to Engineering from your office?

23 MR. REHFELD: No. Once we log the card, once
24 we log it off, if it's accepted, it doesn't go back to
25 Engineering. Once we accept the card, it goes to the

mgc 21

1 vault, okay.

2 INVESTIGATOR: (Inaudible.)

3 INVESTIGATOR: So Engineering doesn't come into
4 it again --

5 MR. REHFELD: Well, they will --

6 INVESTIGATOR: -- normally?

7 MR. REHFELD: -- they will receive the card under
8 several circumstances. If there is a reject on the card,
9 we give it back to Engineering. If there was some sort of
10 a change, we would attach the cards. If there was a hold
11 on it, or say there was a system that had a red tag on it,
12 Engineering would hold that card, --

13 INVESTIGATOR: Okay.

14 MR. REHFELD: -- because we couldn't buy it off.
15 If there's a red tag on it, we can't buy it off, and
16 Engineering can't do anything with it, so they just hold it.

17 But everybody gets the card back and forth. But
18 once we accept the card and we buy it off, it doesn't go
19 back to Engineering. It goes to the vault. It's all
20 logged into our records, and it goes to the vault.

21 INVESTIGATOR: Now you folks in Quality Control,
22 you would never get a card until it's been processed?

23 MR. REHFELD: I don't know what you mean by
24 "processed."

25 INVESTIGATOR: Well, I mean it's gone through

mgc 22

1 the steps, and the electrician has signed it off.

2 MR. REHFELD: Oh, we can get a card before the
3 electrician signs it off. We can stand there and watch
4 the electrician do the work, which is what I was talking
5 about by an in-process.

6 INVESTIGATOR: Okay.

7 MR. REHFELD: Which is not uncommon.

8 INVESTIGATOR: Well, one of the things I'm fishing
9 at, one of the problems that turned up in this investigation
10 is that the computer program, as Bechtel has it set up now,
11 the computer was not programmed to maintain an audit of
12 every card. And by that, I mean a card will be issued, and
13 the computer will show the date of issuance, and if the card
14 is lost and then Engineering requests a second card to
15 replace it, the record of the first card is erased forever,
16 and the record only shows the date of issuance of the second
17 card.

18 So we found that Bechtel and ourselves, the
19 investigators, we have no way to know how many cards were
20 issued. There is no written record. And what I was
21 pursuing with you is an attempt to see whether maybe there
22 was a way, and no one thought of to tell how many cards
23 were issued, whether you folks maintained any record of the
24 initial issuance and any sequential records.

25 MR. REHFELD: Well, the only thing that we have

myc 23

1 started, and we've been doing it now for several months,
2 is we updated our log, where we would log in the terminations,
3 and every termination card --

4 INVESTIGATOR: Okay, we will pull a card. Right
5 here it has a Revision Number.

6 INVESTIGATOR: Uh-huh.

7 MR. REHFELD: We are now entering that Revision
8 Number in our log, along with the Determination Number,
9 so that we would know -- let's say we got an updated
10 revision, we would know --

11 INVESTIGATOR: Uh-huh.

12 MR. REHFELD: -- okay, we've had Rev. 10, now
13 we've got Rev. 11, and we can bump the two and see if it's
14 just a paper change, or if there's a physical change in
15 the landing points, we'll go back out and take a look at it.

16 INVESTIGATOR: If there's a physical change.

17 INVESTIGATOR: Well, if I understand you
18 correctly, can you tell whether or not you have a repeat
19 with any loggings?

20 MR. REHFELD: It depends on when those were
21 issued. As I said, we've only started doing this for
22 a couple of months.

23 INVESTIGATOR: Oh, okay. This one goes back to
24 23 November '81.

25 MR. REHFELD: Not to my knowledge. We wouldn't

mgc 24

1 have a Revision Number on it.

2 INVESTIGATOR: (Inaudible.)

3 INVESTIGATOR: Again, we're only talking about
4 Class Q.

5 INVESTIGATOR: (Inaudible.)

6 INVESTIGATOR: I have another area I wanted to
7 address with you, Russ, and that was your comments and
8 your experience -- you've been here two years -- what type
9 of training do they give to the Electrical Quality Control
10 Engineers?

11 MR. REHFELD: Well, when you first come in, they
12 give you all the work plan procedures and quality control
13 instructions, which lays out step-by-step how to perform
14 each unction. Then you read the specifications. Then
15 you're introduced step-ly-step to each section of the
16 functions that you'll be doing. You're taken into the field
17 and shown around, how to read raceway, what to look for,
18 what's correct, what's incorrect, and design details and
19 things like that, and how to pull cable, how to prevent
20 cable damage, things to watch out for.

21 And after awhile it just becomes second nature.

22 INVESTIGATOR: How long is this on-the-job type
23 training -- take place before you're turned loose as a
24 regular inspector? Is there a set time, or --

25 MR. REHFELD: I don't believe there is a set time.

mgc 25

1 I believe it's as the individual learns.

2 INVESTIGATOR: As he or she grasps --

3 MR. REHFELD: Right. I don't think anybody, you
4 know, learns at the same rate.

5 INVESTIGATOR: Are you a Level 1?

6 MR. REHFELD: Level 2.

7 INVESTIGATOR: Do the QC Inspectors belong to a
8 union, or is it a non-union?

9 (Pause.)

10 INVESTIGATOR: We have some areas where we work --
11 this is as a sideline -- where the QC Inspectors belong to
12 the same union as the craft.

13 MR. REHFELD: That's interesting.

14 (Pause.)

15 INVESTIGATOR: I don't have any further questions.

16 INVESTIGATOR: I have a couple.

17 INVESTIGATOR: Okay.

18 INVESTIGATOR: I might have missed it when you
19 went over the termination cards.

20 As a general rule, do QC Inspectors take the cards
21 with them to inspect?

22 MR. REHFELD: Yes.

23 INVESTIGATOR: In all cases? Are there ever
24 any situations where they might go out looking and
25 come back -- (end of tape, Side 1).

mgc 26

1 MR. REHFELD: As a rule, you're going to take the
2 card with you, because that's what you're going by. You're
3 buying what's on that card.

4 INVESTIGATOR: But there is nothing in that
5 procedure as far as when you -- (inaudible) --

6 MR. REHFELD: No, no.

7 INVESTIGATOR: You said you've been here three
8 years.

9 MR. REHFELD: Yes.

10 INVESTIGATOR: Have you ever -- are you aware of
11 any situation in which an electrician allegedly was told
12 to splice a quality class cable, and now or subsequent,
13 a QC Inspector determined, yes-or-no, he could or could
14 not?

15 MR. REHFELD: No.

16 INVESTIGATOR: (Inaudible.)

17 MR. REHFELD: No.

18 INVESTIGATOR: If that question was directed to
19 you now by an electrician, "Can we --

20 MR. REHFELD: You can't splice Q cable.

21 INVESTIGATOR: Do you feel that the training
22 for QC Inspectors or Engineers is adequate?

23 MR. REHFELD: Yes.

24 INVESTIGATOR: In reference to executing
25 nonconformance reports, is that done by Engineering, or

mgc 27

1 is that done by QC, or both?

2 MR. REHFELD: I'm sorry?

3 INVESTIGATOR: The execution of nonconformance
4 reports.

5 MR. REHFELD: You mean in writing?

6 INVESTIGATOR: Yes, right.

7 MR. REHFELD: It's done by Engineering and Quality
8 Control.

9 INVESTIGATOR: Have you had any problems as far
10 as when you feel it should be done? I realize we got to,
11 before we started, intimidation. But you feel like
12 you're qualified -- not hindered by, in executing your work
13 by putting a red tag on (inaudible).

14 MR. REHFELD: No.

15 INVESTIGATOR: Anyone else? Has there ever been
16 any situation where someone felt that he was taken
17 advantage of by Production by overriding a QC Engineer on a
18 red tag?

19 MR. REHFELD: I'm not quite sure that I understand
20 the question.

21 INVESTIGATOR: Okay. Are you aware of any
22 situation where any of the other QC Engineers had red-tagged
23 an item and then Production simply, either going through
24 Engineering overriding a decision which had been made by the
25 Quality Control Engineer, which would (inaudible)?

mgc 28

1 MR. REHFELD: If you mean like if there was a red
2 tag hung on something, and Engineering or craft --

3 INVESTIGATOR: Yes.

4 MR. REHFELD: -- disregarded the tag --

5 INVESTIGATOR: Well, not disregarded, no.

6 (Inaudible.) But in lieu of the QC Engineer -- we're
7 screwing around -- or I'm screwing around, and I put it in,
8 and you come along and say, "No, that's improper," and
9 you red-tag it, and he comes along with a Construction
10 Foreman, Superintendent, and says, "The hell with that noise.
11 Take off the red tag," and we have to go to Engineering to
12 get you to remove the red tag. That's the type of situation
13 I'm talking about.

14 MR. REHFELD: If there is something that we feel --
15 or I feel is wrong, I speak for myself. If there is something
16 that I feel is wrong to the point where it requires a
17 nonconformance and a red tag, then that is what is done.

18 INVESTIGATOR: And you get support from both sides?

19 MR. REHFELD: Yes, I do. The nonconformances
20 that I've written, I don't believe I've had one that was
21 invalidated.

22 INVESTIGATOR: Do they -- this is aside -- do
23 they account for all nonconformance reports?

24 MR. REHFELD: Yes.

25 INVESTIGATOR: They have someone review it, and

mgc 29

1 then (inaudible).

2 MR. REHFELD: From the moment that you write
3 the NCR, before he can audit it, before it's --

4 INVESTIGATOR: (Interposing.)

5 MR. REHFELD: -- you've seen the violation and
6 you write it up, and before anybody else sees it, you take
7 it to the NCR log, and it gets a number. And then they
8 get the original plus two copies, and then they generate
9 it from there.

10 INVESTIGATOR: I don't have any more questions.

11 INVESTIGATOR: There is only one area that
12 I wanted to cover, because you've been around a lot and
13 checking cable.

14 One of the allegations we have, Russ, is that
15 there was more than the usual use of controlled drugs on
16 this site. I'm talking about marijuana and hashish,
17 cocaine and the different amphetamines.

18 What has been your observation over the last
19 two years?

20 MR. REHFELD: Well, I don't know what you
21 consider as a normal amount, but --

22 INVESTIGATOR: Well, just whatever you have
23 observed or heard.

24 MR. REHFELD: Compared to what goes on in other
25 places, I don't feel that's true. I mean, once and awhile

mgc 30

1 you walk around a corner, and you might get a strange smell
2 or something, but I have never seen anybody that I would
3 even think was remotely under the influence of drugs or
4 alcohol or anything else that was working out here, during
5 working hours.

6 INVESTIGATOR: We've been told a couple areas
7 that are supposed to have been areas -- or are supposed to
8 be areas where the smoking of marijuana has been the most
9 common. One of them was in Unit 1, and you worked in Unit 1
10 until relatively recently; is that correct?

11 MR. REHFELD: Well, about ten months ago.

12 INVESTIGATOR: So you worked for approximately
13 fourteen months in Unit 1.

14 One of the areas -- and I'm not familiar with
15 the plant, so bear with me a little bit with my maybe
16 inadequate description -- but there is a cable tray area,
17 apparently, underneath the control room, and there are
18 apparently penetrations from the cables that run up into
19 the control panels through there, and the smoke seeped up
20 through there pretty strongly at different periods of time,
21 we've been told. And the users of the marijuana apparently
22 were laying in the cable trays.

23 Do you know the area I'm talking about?

24 MR. REHFELD: The only place that you're
25 describing would be the 120 spreader room, because that's

mgc 31

1 where your cable tray is underneath the equipment. You know,
2 you have vertical risers that will go up to the floor
3 penetrations and the (inaudible).

4 INVESTIGATOR: Have you ever heard of QC
5 Inspectors going down to the -- is it called Sun Acres?
6 What's it called? They laydown area.

7 INVESTIGATOR: Sunshine Acres.

8 INVESTIGATOR: Sunshine Acres.

9 INVESTIGATOR: Or Sunshine Park.

10 MR. REHFELD: I don't even know where it is.
11 I've been here two years, and I don't know where it is.

12 (Laughter.)

13 INVESTIGATOR: We've been told that that's been
14 a relatively popular spot for engineers to smoke pot, and
15 some QC Inspectors.

16 MR. REHFELD: I don't know. I don't even know
17 where it is.

18 INVESTIGATOR: Okay.

19 From your observations, Russ, on this plant and
20 being responsible for a very important part of the QC
21 inspection, how would you characterize the work that you
22 see being done?

23 MR. REHFELD: Very professional.

24 INVESTIGATOR: You're satisfied?

25 MR. REHFELD: Ninety percent of everything that

mgc 32

1 I inspect, ninety-five percent of everything that I inspect,
2 I would say is done in a very professional, very good, safe
3 manner.

4 Now whatever we find that does not fit that is sent
5 back until it does meet that remark.

6 INVESTIGATOR: How would you characterize the
7 amount of time you have to do your work? Is it adequate,
8 inadequate? Are you pushed?

9 MR. REHFELD: No, I'm not pushed. Depending again
10 on what functions of work you are talking about, --

11 INVESTIGATOR: I'm talking about the inspections.

12 MR. REHFELD: Of determinations?

13 INVESTIGATOR: Right.

14 MR. REHFELD: There's no pressure. There is
15 no rush. There is no, "You have to do so many today."
16 There's no quota system. You can take as long as it takes
17 you to do the job right.

18 INVESTIGATOR: How about your observations on the
19 part of the journeymen wiremen? Are they under great
20 pressure, or do they have adequate time?

21 MR. REHFELD: I feel that they have adequate time.

22 INVESTIGATOR: Have you ever heard them complain
23 to you about it?

24 MR. REHFELD: You're always going to hear complaints.

25 (Laughter.)

mgc 33

1 MR. REHFELD: They always complain that they feel
2 that they have to do too much, but it's everybody's
3 judgment, what is too much, and if you, you know, stand
4 around for a couple hours and smoke cigarettes and drink
5 coffee, I don't think you're being pushed.

6 INVESTIGATOR: Right.

7 And you're working at -- you've been assigned to
8 Unit 2.

9 MR. REHFELD: Well, now I'm assigned to the main
10 office.

11 INVESTIGATOR: The main office.

12 Is it Unit 2, Gene, where we had the problem of
13 the unistruts?

14 INVESTIGATOR: Unstruts, yes.

15 INVESTIGATOR: In the lower levels of Unit 2,
16 we've been given an allegation that there is some animosity
17 that has grown up between some of the craft people and QC
18 and some of the craft people and their supervision. And
19 what -- the story given to us is that there are unistrut
20 brackets that are put in to support the cable trays and
21 the piping around them, and these are welded to embedded
22 plates.

23 I haven't been over to see it, Russ, so if my
24 description is inadequate, you'll understand -- and the
25 QC Inspectors that inspect the unistruts, they have a die

mgc 34

1 that is their inspector's symbol, which apparently they
2 take and strike, I assume with a hammer, and it makes
3 their mark on the embed plate.

4 Have you ever seen what I'm talking about?

5 MR. REHFELD: No, I've never seen that. I've
6 never seen that.

7 INVESTIGATOR: Well, the story we're getting is
8 that some of these craftsmen are coming along and changing
9 the unistrut after it's been bought off, and setting it up
10 so it doesn't meet design in an attempt to get the QC
11 Inspector fired or a couple of the foremen that they're
12 teed off at, because they have reportedly terminated
13 craftsmen for too many early-outs, too long coffee breaks.

14 Have you ever heard any scuttlebutt about this
15 type of allegation.

16 MR. REHFELD: This is the first time I've heard
17 of it. To my knowledge, there is no -- the only QC stamp
18 that I know of are the stamps that we carry in our pockets
19 that are rubber.

20 INVESTIGATOR: Well, these could be QC Inspectors
21 for welding.

22 MR. REHFELD: Well that's a whole different
23 ballgame. I know a friend of mine who is a welding
24 inspector, he carries the same stamp I do.

25 INVESTIGATOR: And as far as -- does he stamp on

mgc 35

1 the embed plates with it, then?

2 MR. REHFELD: Not to my knowledge.

3 INVESTIGATOR: Okay.

4 INVESTIGATOR: Are you familiar with an individual
5 by the name of (inaudible), a general foreman?

6 MR. REHFELD: Yes.

7 INVESTIGATOR: What is (inaudible). What
8 is his job (inaudible)?

9 MR. REHFELD: Is he --

10 INVESTIGATOR: (Interposing).

11 MR. REHFELD: Yes, he's electrical

12 INVESTIGATOR: Okay. (Inaudible) GF.

13 MR. REHFELD: He might be a GF. I don't believe
14 he is.

15 INVESTIGATOR: Well, a foreman at least.

16 MR. REHFELD: I thought he was a Superintendent.

17 INVESTIGATOR: Okay, maybe he is. I don't know.
18 I'm going by GF. I'm just giving you what we have. That's
19 why (inaudible).

20 Have you ever had any direct relations with him?

21 MR. REHFELD: I know the man, I mean to say hello
22 to him.

23 INVESTIGATOR: What is his reputation among the
24 other people?

25 MR. REHFELD: As far as I know, it's okay.

mgc 36

1 INVESTIGATOR: Is there any reason that you
2 would know or anybody in any QC-type would like to get even
3 with him for a revenge-type motive or anything that you --

4 MR. REHFELD: Nothing that I know of.

5 INVESTIGATOR: How about anything (inaudible) --
6 Yashimoto. He's supposed to be the foreman.

7 MR. REHFELD: Yashimoto, yes.

8 INVESTIGATOR: Do you know what his first name is,
9 by any chance?

10 MR. REHFELD: No. He's not a foreman anymore.

11 (Simultaneous conversation.)

12 MR. REHFELD: Now he's back to carrying tools.

13 INVESTIGATOR: Is he an electrician?

14 MR. REHFELD: Yes, he is.

15 INVESTIGATOR: Okay. Again, what would be his
16 general reputation?

17 MR. REHFELD: I have no idea. I've never had
18 any personal dealings with him.

19 INVESTIGATOR: You haven't heard any adverse
20 comments relative to people getting irritated because
21 he was (inaudible)?

22 MR. REHFELD: No.

23 INVESTIGATOR: Any reason that someone was
24 attempting to get back at him for revenge or --

25 MR. REHFELD: No, I haven't.

mgc 37

1 INVESTIGATOR: From your observations, do you
2 have any concerns, Russ, that you think are being overlooked
3 in the field that you work in or that we, the Nuclear
4 Regulatory Commission, is responsible to see the plant is
5 built so that it will be safely built and safely operated,
6 that is not getting enough attention?

7 (Pause.)

8 MR. REHFELD: No, I can't say that I do.

9 INVESTIGATOR: Okay. I have no additional
10 questions, and we thank you very much for your patience
11 and sitting through this questioning with us and supplying
12 us with helpful information.

13 We will close this interview at this time. The
14 time is now approximately 2:39 p.m., and the date is
15 June 30, 1982.

16 (Whereupon, at the time stated, the investigatory
17 interview was concluded.)

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25