

REPORT OF INTERVIEW

Report Number: Q-1-84-020

Commencing at 0900 on August 24, 1984 a telephone interview was conducted with an anonymous individual using the pseudonym of "David DAY". The interview was conducted by R. K. CHRISTOPHER, Director, OI:RI, Stewart EBNETER, Chief, Engineering Programs Branch, Region 1, and Deborah EVANS, Investigative Aid, OI:RI. The alleged elected to remain anonymous despite being offered confidentiality and would consent only to a telephone interview.

The alleged said he worked at Seabrook Station as a carpenter from August 1978 to September 1980 and from October 1980 to June 1983 as a prefitter. He said the time period involving his concerns extended from August 1981 until his resignation. He said his primary area of concern during this time was the Pullman Higgins (P-H) Welding and Quality Assurance Program. The alleged stated he worked in various areas of the plant during his employment, including waste processing, containment, turbine room, diesel generators, radioactive steam tunnel and the FAE (Furr Auxiliary Building).

The interview was conducted by asking detailed questions to the alleged about statements made by him in a letter dated July 24, 1984 to Commissioner James ASSELSTINE. Numerous technically oriented questions concerning pipe and weld locations and code requirements were asked by EBNETER; the responses to which are not recorded in this interview, but are recorded separately by EBNETER. This Report of Interview is concerned primarily with knowledge in the possession of the alleged concerning any wrongdoing, records falsification and/or Quality Control Inspector intimidation.

In his letter, the alleged stated that piping was being grinded down to thickness below those required by the codes and that it was "illegal as hell, but everyone did it". During the interview the alleged referred to a specific CBS line. He stated there was a mismatch on the line (E253C-283-1-CBS1211) requiring extensive grinding and that the P-H field supervisor (Mike SECASCIA)

(phonetic) and the Quality Assurance (QA) supervisor (John MARTIN) were aware of the mismatch and subsequent grinding.

The alleged said that in the Containment Building Spray System, welding crews frequently encountered pipe mismatches and it was common knowledge that the way to correct the problem was thru grinding the pipe walls. The alleged was concerned that the grinding would result in a significant reduction in pipe wall thickness. He said the QA supervisor, John MARTIN, and the other trade and craft supervisors such as Don WELSH and Geno "LAFEVE" (phonetic) were aware of these problems. The alleged said no one ever specifically directed him to do anything improper and that it was just the general working philosophy at the site. The alleged was unable to provide names of other potential witnesses to support his concerns. He also advised that he never actually raised the issue with his supervisors and also stated he was not aware of any acts of intimidation or threats by management, other individuals, or groups.

In the alleged's letter to Commissioner ASSELSTINE, he made reference to instances concerning a lack of proper documentation of faulty welds in the pipe tunnel. When questioned regarding this concern, he said there was a lack of paper work to document the cutting out and repairing of welds. He said he was not aware of documentation concerning poor welds being purposely destroyed to prevent NRC identification of problems nor was he aware of weld and/or inspection records and documentation being falsified. The alleged said his primary concerns is that he thought the QC Inspector who was examining welds performed with Diametric welding machines was ordered not to continue inspecting welds after he began documenting problems due to a lack of fusion and "suck back". The alleged said the QC Inspector (David BAKER) was ordered by his foreman not to inspect any more welds. The alleged said he knew BAKER stopped the inspections because he (the alleged) had been assigned to work with BAKER to cut out the unacceptable welds identified by BAKER. The alleged said BAKER's foreman, Dennis CLARK, was the individual responsible for stopping BAKER's inspections. The alleged surmised that CLARK did this because of instructions he received from the area foreman (Dan EVANS). The alleged stated that EVANS was heard to comment that they had over 100 suspect welds in

the pipe tunnel. The allegor also said he felt BAKER was being harassed and intimidated because he (BAKER) was transferred to a less desirable job on the second shift. The allegor clarified that it was his personal opinion that BAKER was harassed even though BAKER had not made such a concern known to him or anyone else. The allegor said the incident in question occurred sometime in January 1982. The allegor said, to his knowledge, all 100 welds were supposed to be inspected but he is not aware of any of the inspection records actually being falsified because the final inspection only required visual inspection and since the inspectors could not see the inside of the weld by then they could have legitimately accepted the welds.

In his letter, the allegor stated that on May 11, 1982, while working on field weld No. 108, he noticed a Dravo shop weld defect. He said this was located in the No. 1 Turbine Building where many Dravo fabricated welded pipes were installed. The allegor said he informed a P-H QA Inspector (Brian KENNEDY) who advised him a Dravo shop weld was not their (P-H) concern and not to worry about it.

The allegor stated that in the Waste Processing Building he had observed instances of improperly welded pipes to valves. He said many of the valves had become discolored and rusted because of exposure to excessive heat. He said he "heard" an unidentified QA Inspector had written numerous NCR's on this condition but was told by Dan EVANS, the area supervisor, that the NCR's were overridden and the work was "accepted as is". He said EVANS had told him that the inspector had gotten overzealous and improperly evaluated the nonconformance.

The allegor also made reference in his letter to electronically activated valves stored near the Waste Processing Building that had been exposed to the rain and were rusting and that the NRC Inspector overlooked this condition. When questioned on this issue, he clarified that the NRC Inspector had in fact cited the licensee for improper storage. He said he was not alleging any improprieties on the part of the NRC Inspector but that he was concerned about the disposition of the citation since the valves were ultimately installed.

The alleged concluded that he could provide no additional specific information and said he could identify no individuals who would be potential witnesses to any instances of intimidation, (other than possibly BAKER), harassment, falsification of records, and/or other acts of wrongdoing. The interview concluded at 10:30 AM.

This Report of Interview was formally recorded on August 27, 1984.

Reported by:

RKC Christopher
R. K. Christopher, Director
Office of Investigations
Field Office, Region I

Deborah L. Evans
Deborah L. Evans, Investigative Aid
Office of Investigations
Field Office, Region I