



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS FIELD OFFICE REGION II
101 MARIETTA STREET, SUITE 2100
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

DATE: July 12, 1984

Report of Investigation

TITLE: DUKE POWER COMPANY: CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION
ALLEGED CHEATING ON QC WELDING INSPECTORS
EXAMINATIONS

RELATED DATA: Investigation Report No. 2-E3-039

CASE NUMBER: 2-E3-039

CONTROL OFFICE: OI:R11 STATUS: CLOSED

REPORTING OFFICE: OI:R11

PERIOD OF INVESTIGATION: November 28, 1983 - April 13, 1984

REPORTING INVESTIGATOR: E. L. Williamson
E. L. Williamson, Investigator
Office of Investigations Field Office, Region II

PARTICIPATING PERSONNEL: James Y. Vorse, Field Office Director
Office of Investigations Field Office, Region II

APPROVED BY: James Y. Vorse
James Y. Vorse, Field Office Director
Office of Investigations Field Office, Region II

CONCURRED BY: Ben B. Payes FOR
Ben B. Payes, Director
Office of Investigations

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
Summary	1
Purpose of Investigation	1
Background	2
Review of NRC Regulations and Licensee Commitments	3
Interview of Harry E. LANGLEY (ALLEGER)	4
Interview of Welding Inspectors in LANGLEY's Class	5
Interview of Additional Welding Inspectors	6
Interview of the Course Instructors	7
Status of Investigation	1
Exhibits	1

SUMMARY

Summary

On or about October 20, 1983, during an open public meeting in Rock Hill, South Carolina where the construction and licensing of Duke Power Company's (DPC) Catawba Nuclear Station was being discussed, a former DPC welding inspector alleged that Quality Control (QC) welding inspectors had cheated on an examination by being provided questions and answers prior to taking the examination.

The alleged was initially interviewed by an NRC Senior Resident Inspector, who was attending the public meeting, and encouraged the alleged to provide additional amplifying information.

A subsequent meeting was arranged on October 25, 1983 with members of the NRC Region II staff, a representative of the Palmetto Alliance and a representative of the Government Accountability Project (GAP). The alleged's concerns were discussed in detail and the specific issue of the alleged cheating by QC welding inspectors was referred to the Office of Investigations Field Office, Region II (OI:RII) for further review.

This investigation was conducted concurrently with OI Report Number 2-83-038 (Alleged Harassment and Intimidation of QC Welding Inspectors), during which time a total of 33 individuals were interviewed. There were four welding inspectors in the alleged's class including the alleged. All of these inspectors were interviewed and two provided signed, sworn testimony denying knowledge of or complicity in cheating on the examinations provided during this training. A third inspector also denied receiving any assistance while in the course and this was documented in a Results of Interview. All of the instructors of the course were interviewed and adamantly denied providing any student with test questions, answers or assistance in passing the examination. They too provided sworn testimony to support their denials. The other inspectors were interviewed to determine if any such incidents could have occurred in other classes either before or after the alleged's class was given. All those interviewed denied knowledge of or participation in the alleged cheating in the QC course.

Based on interviews, there is not sufficient evidence to support the allegation that cheating on QC examinations occurred. No information was developed that would suggest or support the allegation and therefore, the allegation appears to be without merit.

DETAILS

Purpose of Investigation

The purpose of this investigation was to determine and document the events and circumstances surrounding the allegation that QC Welding Inspectors were provided questions and answers to examinations prior to taking the examination. The alleged indicated that assistance in passing the course was provided by the instructors and was given to all the welding inspectors who took the course.

Background

On or about October 20, 1983, during an open public meeting in Rock Hill, South Carolina, Harry F. LANGLEY, a former Quality Control (QC) Welding Inspector at DPC's Catawba Nuclear Station, alleged among other things, that QC welding inspectors had cheated on QC examinations by being provided with copies of the test and the answers prior to taking the examination. He said this assistance enabled all inspectors to pass the course.

The alleged was immediately talked to by Jack BRYANT, NRC Senior Resident Inspector, who was desirous of scheduling an interview with LANGLEY. According to BRYANT, LANGLEY failed to show up at the first scheduled meeting. In a subsequent contact with LANGLEY, he disclosed that he had been contacted by representatives of the Palmetto Alliance and the Government Accountability Project (GAP) and he wanted them present at any subsequent meeting.

On October 25, 1983, a meeting was arranged with LANGLEY, Bruno URYC, NRC Investigations/Allegation Coordination Staff, Region II (IACS:P11), Jack BRYANT, NRC Senior Resident Inspector at Oconee Nuclear Plant, Brad JONES, NRC Regional Counsel, Robert GUILD, Counsel for Palmetto Alliance and Billie Pirner G4 DE, Director of the Citizens Clinic, GAP. The alleged's concerns were discussed in detail and the issue of the alleged cheating was subsequently discussed with OI:P11.

On October 27, 1983, the cheating concerns were discussed with the Regional Administrator, Region II along with other concerns discussed in OI Report Number 2-83-038. On November 1, 1983, the Regional Administrator requested that OI conduct a formal investigation into the allegation that QC welding inspectors were involved in cheating on examinations that qualified them to be QC welding inspectors. A copy of the Regional Administrator's request for investigative assistance is EXHIBIT (1).

Review of NRC Regulations and Licensee Commitments

A review of pertinent NRC regulations and licensee commitments were conducted concurrently with this investigation. This review disclosed the following regulations and licensee documents which are deemed pertinent to this investigation.

It is stated at 10 CFR 50, Appendix B under Criterion I that the applicant shall be responsible for the establishment and execution of the quality assurance program. Additionally, under Criterion II, the applicant, while establishing a quality assurance program, will provide for indoctrination and training of personnel performing activities affecting quality as necessary to assure that suitable proficiency is achieved and maintained.

The Duke Power Company's Catawba Nuclear Station PSAR in Section 17, entitled "Quality Assurance," commits itself for full responsibility to assure that the Catawba Nuclear Station Units 1 and 2 will be designed, constructed, tested and operated in a manner to protect the public health and safety. Additionally, DPC commits to assure that Catawba Nuclear Station will be designed, constructed, tested and operated in conformance with applicable regulatory requirements and design bases specified in the license application.

Interview of Harry E. LANGLEY (ALLEGER)

On October 25, 1983, Harry E. LANGLEY, former Quality Control (QC) Welding Inspector at Duke Power Company's (DPC) Catawba Nuclear Station was interviewed by Bruno URYC, IACS:RII. URYC was interviewing LANGLEY regarding technical issues which were to be reviewed by Region II technical staff.

LANGLEY provided biographical data to URYC, stating that he had worked at Catawba from April 1977 until April 1978. He said that in October 1977 he entered a QC welding inspector class with eleven other site employees. Three of these individuals were welding inspectors, the other eight were mechanical inspectors. LANGLEY stated that the class was six to eight weeks in duration and he said they covered different subjects each week. He said at the end of each week they were given a test to see if they were learning the material. He said the class was not doing that well and one day before a test he discovered a copy of a test with answers inside his notebook. He stated the other students had the same test and on the following day they were given the exact same test to take for score. He said this practice continued for the duration of the course. He stated he assumed the answers came from the instructors Larry DAVISON, Charles BALDWIN, and Beau ROSS. He said he was given assistance on both the written and oral examinations. A Results of Interview with HARRY E. LANGLEY is EXHIBIT (2).

INVESTIGATOR'S NOTE: LANGLEY provided other information during his interview. Some was technical information and is being addressed by the Region II Technical Staff. Additional information on harassment and intimidation was investigated as part of OI Report Number 2-83-038. During the course of the investigation it was learned that Ray HOLLINS, a welding engineer, was also an instructor in the course.

Interview of Welding Inspectors in LANGLEY's Class

During the conduct of subject investigation it was learned that the three other welding inspectors in LANGLEY's class were: Charles CRISP, Pon KIRBY and Lamar SHERIFF. All three are still employed by DPC. CRISP is at Catawba and KIRBY and SHERIFF are working at the DPC Oconee Nuclear Station, Seneca, SC.

All three were interviewed regarding their knowledge of or participation in cheating on the welding inspectors examinations. All three denied they cheated on any examination. They all acknowledged that they had to study to pass and that the course was difficult but they did not receive any assistance from anyone in passing the course. CRISP and KIRBY provided signed, sworn statements which are EXHIBITS (3) and (4). SHERIFF did not want to provide a signed sworn statement and his interview was reported on a Results of Interview which is EXHIBIT (5).

Interview of Additional Welding Inspectors

During the conduct of this investigation in addition to the welding inspectors and instructors in LANGLEY's class, other welding inspectors who had taken the QC welding inspector course at Catawba were interviewed. All of these interviewed categorically denied cheating on the welding inspector examinations or knowing anyone who cheated. Several mentioned that they felt LANGLEY was disgruntled because he had been terminated for gambling on site, adding that he was being vindictive by alleging that people cheated on the examinations. Many suggested that LANGLEY may have confused the daily quizzes, which were given to assist the students in learning the material, with the final examinations. These daily quizzes were corrected and discussed with the students and returned to them to use in preparation for their final examinations. Other students said they were allowed to keep the quizzes as study guides. The following welding inspectors were interviewed:

John ROCKHOLT
William H. BURR
Tom BUMGARDNER
Phil EDWARDS
Harold E. EUBANKS, Jr.
Eddie FEEMSTER
Scott GANTT
Vernon GODFREY
William Keith DAVIS
Lindsay H. HARRIS, Jr.
Richard IPEY
Larry JACKSON
Richard A. JONES
Ken KAPRIKER
Ron KIRKLAND
John MCCOY
Carl SOUSA

Interview of the Course Instructors

The four instructors of the QC Welding Inspector Course were interviewed during the course of the investigation. All four, Beau ROSS, Supervisor/-Welding Inspection, Larry DAVISON, Project QA Manager, Charles BALDWIN, QA Technical Supervisor and Ray HOLLINS, Manager, Construction Services, vehemently denied assisting any welding inspector students on their examinations by providing copies of the test and answers or by any other means. When asked about the daily quizzes, Ray HOLLINS stated the questions on the daily quizzes were "designed to highlight the areas he felt were important." HOLLINS said he thought the daily quizzes were retrieved from the students after discussion but he could not be sure. All four individuals provided detailed sworn statements or testimonies wherein they discussed the class instruction and their role in the welding inspector course. These statements are EXHIBITS (6) through (9).

STATUS OF INVESTIGATION

Status of Investigation

In the absence of additional logical or practical investigation leads, no additional investigative effort is warranted. This investigation is submitted as CLOSED.

EXHIBITS

Exhibits

- (1) Memorandum from O'REILLY to OI, dated 11/4/83 requesting investigative assistance
- (2) Results of Interview with Harry E. LANGLEY, dated 10/25/83
- (3) Sworn Statement of Charles D. CRISP, dated 1/19/84
- (4) Sworn Statement of Ronnie S. KIRBY, dated 2/23/84
- (5) Results of Interview with Lamar SHERIFF, dated 3/2/84
- (6) Sworn Statement of Garry E. ROSS, dated 4/10/84
- (7) Sworn Testimony of Larry R. DAVISON, dated 4/12/84
- (8) Sworn Testimony of Charles R. BALDWIN, dated 4/12/84
- (9) Sworn Statement of Roy HOLLINS, Jr., dated 4/13/84