

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of)		
)		
DUKE POWER COMPANY, <u>et al.</u>)	Docket No:	50-413
)		50-414
(Catawba Nuclear Station,)		
Units 1 and 2))		

TESTIMONY OF VERNON C. GODFREY, JR.

1 Q. STATE YOUR NAME AND YOUR WORK ADDRESS.

2 A. Vernon C. Godfrey, Jr., Duke Power Training Center.

3 Q. WHAT IS YOUR PRESENT JOB WITH DUKE POWER COMPANY?

4 A. I now work in Mechanical Maintenance in the Nuclear Production
5 Department.

6 Q. SUMMARIZE YOUR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS, INCLUDING
7 OTHER NON-DUKE JOBS, EDUCATION, CERTIFICATIONS, AND
8 COMPANY SPONSORED COURSES AND TRAINING.

9 A. I went to Fort Mill High School in Fort Mill, SC. I worked as a
10 loomfixer, weaver, slubber tender, card tender, and drawing
11 tender, for Springs Mills Company, Inc.

12 I am certified as a Level II QC/QA Welding Inspector. Also, I
13 am certified as a welder with 200-300 process specifications. I went
14 to Duke sponsored welding, inspecting and mechanical maintenance
15 training courses. I have worked for Duke for approximately 8
16 years. I was a welding inspector for about 3 years. I am
17 presently attending the mechanical maintenance course.

18 Q. WHAT OTHER JOB POSITIONS HAVE YOU HELD WITH DUKE POWER
19 COMPANY?

1 A. I have worked in construction in the utility area and as a welder,
2 and as a QC Inspector.

3 Q. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH WHAT IS COMMONLY REFERRED TO AS
4 THE WELDING INSPECTOR CONCERNS WHICH WERE EXPRESSED IN
5 LATE 1981/EARLY 1982?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. DID YOU EXPRESS ANY CONCERNS AS A WELDING INSPECTOR TO
8 ANY OF THE TASK FORCES OR TO DUKE POWER MANAGEMENT?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. TO WHOM DID YOU EXPRESS YOUR CONCERNS?

11 A. I talked with Task Force I, the Technical Task Force, the
12 Non-Technical Task Force, and Gail Addis of the Duke personnel
13 office.

14 Q. WERE YOUR CONCERNS WRITTEN?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. DESCRIBE EACH DOCUMENT WHICH CONTAINS YOUR EXPRESSION
17 OF CONCERNS, AND INDICATE WHO IT WAS SUBMITTED TO.

18 A. My concerns are set forth in Attachment A to my testimony, which
19 is an eight page handwritten statement. I submitted this to my
20 supervisor who submitted it to the Task Force.

21 Q. DID YOU FEEL FREE TO EXPRESS ALL OF YOUR CONCERNS?

22 A. I did not feel that I could express my concerns to the NRC.
23 During one of the first meetings with L. R. Davison and J. R.
24 Wells concerning the pay reclassification and recourse, someone

1 asked if these issues could be taken to the NRC. We were told by
2 either Mr. Davison or Mr. Wells, I do not remember which, that it
3 would be to our best interest not to take these issues to the NRC.
4 Although this occurred during the pay recourse meetings, I felt
5 that this applied to the specific concerns that were later turned in
6 to the Task Force. Several weeks later we received a memo stating
7 that we could talk to the NRC without any fear of retaliation.

8 Q. DID YOU EXPRESS ALL OF YOUR CONCERNS?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. ARE ALL OF YOUR CONCERNS INCLUDED IN THE DOCUMENT
11 ATTACHED TO YOUR TESTIMONY?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE AND EXPLAIN WHAT YOU WERE TRYING TO
14 COMMUNICATE BY YOUR CONCERNS.

15 A. The intent of some of the QA Procedures was not being met. We
16 were trained to follow the QA Procedures to the letter. There were
17 times when we were told not to follow certain procedures, but we
18 were not given an adequate explanation for not following the
19 procedures. These deviations from procedure were not frequent,
20 but the deviations were not explained to us. I did not feel
21 comfortable signing-off on an item where there was a deviation from
22 procedures that was not fully explained to me. This is what I was
23 trying to communicate to management.

1 Q. WERE YOUR CONCERNS INVESTIGATED BY THE TASK FORCES?
2 A. Yes, to my knowledge.
3 Q. DID YOU ATTEND ANY MEETINGS WITH TASK FORCE AND/OR QA
4 MANAGEMENT MEMBERS WHERE THE TASK FORCE FINDINGS,
5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS WERE DISCUSSED?
6 A. Yes, but I can't provide you with the names of people or dates.
7 Q. WERE THERE ANY CHANGES MADE IN THE QA PROGRAM AFTER
8 THE WELDING INSPECTOR CONCERNS AND THE TASK FORCE
9 INVESTIGATION OF THESE CONCERNS?
10 A. I wasn't an Inspector long after this so, I can not answer this
11 question. I transferred back to the Construction Department.
12 Q. THE WELDING INSPECTOR CONCERNS HAVE BEEN
13 CHARACTERIZED AS CONCERNS ABOUT THE QUALITY AND
14 SAFETY OF CONSTRUCTION AT CATAWBA. DO YOU AGREE OR
15 DISAGREE WITH THAT CHARACTERIZATION?
16 A. To my knowledge the concerns that have been brought up would
17 not effect the safe operation of this plant.
18 Q. DID THE EXPRESSION OF YOUR CONCERNS INDICATE YOUR
19 BELIEF THAT THERE WAS A BREAKDOWN IN THE QA PROGRAM
20 OR INDICATE THAT THE QA PROGRAM WAS NO LONGER
21 WORKING?
22 A. I feel that at one time there were definite problems in the QA
23 program, but the QA Program was working in terms of identifying
24 construction deficiencies.

1 Q. DID YOUR CONCERNS REFLECT A BELIEF ON YOUR PART THAT
2 THE CATAWBA PROJECT IS NOT BEING CONSTRUCTED SAFELY?

3 A. No, the job is safe.

4 Q. IN YOUR VIEW, HAS THE QA PROGRAM BEEN EFFECTIVE WHILE
5 YOU HAVE WORKED AS AN INSPECTOR AT CATAWBA?

6 A. The inspectors have been effective, but I feel that some parts of
7 the QA Program were not. Specifically, adequate explanations were
8 not provided when we were told to deviate from procedures.

9 Q. ARE YOU AWARE OF ANY DEFICIENCIES IN CONSTRUCTION OR IN
10 THE QA PROGRAM WHICH WOULD CAUSE YOU TO QUESTION
11 WHETHER CATAWBA IS SAFELY BUILT?

12 A. No.

13 Q. IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE YOU WOULD LIKE TO ADD TO YOUR
14 TESTIMONY?

15 A. I would like some follow-up to NCI #9085. In my concern of NCI
16 #9085, I stated that the long piece of pipe had three (3) different
17 heat numbers on it. One at each end and one in the center.

18 The class of the system was Class E. The class of the pipe
19 used was Class B. Granted that heat traceability numbers are not
20 required in a Class E system, there was a possibility that some of
21 the pipe could be cut out and used elsewhere, due to the revision
22 of that system.

23 If this piece of pipe that had the wrong heat number was used
24 in a Class B, high pressure system, and it had a defect causing an

1 accident, how would or could it be found; who made the pipe; when
2 they made it; what it was made of in order to justify or even try to
3 explain the accident.

4
5
6
7 I hereby certify that I have read and understand this document, and
8 believe it to be my true, accurate and complete testimony.

9
10
11 Vernon C. Godfrey, Jr.
12 Vernon C. Godfrey, Jr.

13
14
15 Sworn to and subscribed before me
16 this 22nd day of September, 1983.

17
18 Lierre D. Williams
19 Notary Public
20

21
22 Commission Expires March 7, 1993

NCI # 9085

This NCI was written by Lindsey Harris which stated that there were two Lt. no's on a piece of pipe. The resolution said accept as is.

When I went to remove the NCI tags I found that there was yet another Lt. no. on the pipe. I brought this to the attention of Beau Ross and he put a note on the NCI. This is when Larry Davison informed me that it was not my responsibility to check the resolution on an NCI.

This problem clearly violates M-4 + H-4 but this portion of pipe still remains out in the field somewhere with three different Lt. no's on it.

This is one problem of a few that I have. I would like to see the action on this problem before I submit any more problems.

V.C. Godfrey, Jr.
1-18-82

F-40

NCI # 9085

NCI was written because of piping material having two heat numbers on it. When called to take the NCI tags off of the pipe OC Welding found that there were three heat numbers on the pipe. When brought to the attention of Larry Davison he was informed that the resolutions on NCI's were of no concern of mine and to remove the Q1-B tags. This clearly violates M-4 & H4 and it is of my concern as a Duke Power employee and a resident of one of the surrounding towns.

NCI # 9358

When called for fit-up inspections on five welds it was found that the heat number CA 72 had two SA numbers on these fits. This was also found by another fellow inspector John Bryant. M-4 clearly stated that the SA number would match the bill of materials and the RPMH at that present time. The NCI was voided by Larry Davison and he

said that he did not see a problem with the problem that I had.

(3)

NCI # 10,187

When called for a fit-up inspection on INC 86-4 "class A" it was found that there was not a piece number on the reducer or on the M-4A. This violates M-4 & H4. Resolution on this NCI stated accept as is and bought off per memo on NCI.

(W)

NCI # 9119

During routine pre heat inspection it was found that welding had violated pre-heat by exceeding 500°F. Resolution stated accept as is. This violates all of the process spec. that we have to go by.

(W)

NCI # 7850

Lower Pressureizer Support. Welder overlapped weld to another without getting the pre-heat signed off. It (the weld) overlapped about seven inches, but the NCI stated only one inch (this was written by tech. support). David Gadd stated that he took the welding

foreman's word on the amount of
over lapped weld. He also stated that
he had no problem with the non-pre-heat
material. Charles Baldwin told
QC Welding to remove tag but
then removed tag himself and then
told QC Welding to sign off weld.
Beau Ross also has a note of this
action.

(A)

I have had several NCI's that
I have written, got approval from
Beau, but yet trash caned by
Charles Baldwin or Larry Davison.
In Q1 procedure it states that
after an NCI has been written a
number may be obtained. They
never let me get a number on
these items.

Harassment:

(B)

Harassment has been a problem
in the past with craft and Q.A..
Threats made to inspectors in the
course of doing their jobs by angry
craftsmen have not been handled

by upper QA management to help protect the inspector from future incidents. A most recent incident of harassment was Ed McKenzie and Larry Jackson. Larry Jackson was totally in order with the procedure but was told that he instigated the problem. (He did not)

Welder, Howard Beard, threatened to push John Bryant off of a scaffold if he rejected his work. John was told by Larry Davison that it was part of our job to take occasional abuse from irate craftsman.

(C) I have been called a S.O.B. by Lewis Lowery for rejecting some of his work. I was told by Charles Baldwin just to push it aside.

These are some things I have record of but I feel sure that other inspectors have some of the same problem.

(D) This also shows me a lack of Support for us when we try to do our jobs but can not.

(1) Upper management does not seem to want to retain good help. I personally have been told that someone off the street could fill my job with less money. If that is the case, do it; but let it be clearly known that the quality of the QA department went to the dogs and that the NRC & the press of news will be interested to know of this.

(2) This was done at Cherokee and by doing so, some/most of the inspectors have not received but half of the last general increase and this year we will be at less money than Top Craftman. This is also a lack of support of the upper QC/QA management as they did not think we were worth the money. (per Larry Davison)

At one time I was told that I could go back to welding, this has not happened as of yet. If we as a QC/QA Welding inspector group could get support I would not want to go back.

(G)

Larry Davison has informed me that as an inspector it is of no concern of mine as to what a resolution says. He has also told me and other inspectors in the past that he was as far as the problem (what ever it was) would go.

Larry Davison held a meeting with all of the welding inspectors on 1-12-82 and one question that was asked is if he were on the committee that did our job analysis, he never answered.

(H)

I believe that Larry Davison and Charles Baldwin want to show the procedures as being followed but does not mind changing things if they seem to hamper production or cause waves with construction department.

The inspectors in general have had hard time trying to implement the procedures which we were taught, and charged with the responsibility of seeing the job done correctly is still ours. This is to me another way of showing a lack of support for the inspectors when they try to do their job.

1-19-82

MR. R.A. MORGAN

(A)

MY CONCERN IS, THE LACK OF SUPPORT THAT I AND OTHER WELDING INSPECTOR'S HAVE EXPERIENCED, WHILE WORKING ON THE 2ND SHIFT. THE ONLY SUPPORT THAT WE GET ON THE 2ND SHIFT, IS FROM A SENIOR MAN. WE DO NOT HAVE ANYONE TO GIVE US AN NCI NUMBER, AND WE DO NOT HAVE ANYONE TO SIGN OFF A QI-A FORM. IF A PROBLEM SHOULD ARISE WHILE WE'RE ON THE 2ND SHIFT, WE HAVE TO WAIT UNTIL WE COME IN THE NEXT DAY TO GET IT RESOLVED. THE CRAFTSMEN ON THE 2ND SHIFT, THEY HAVE A TECH. SUPPORT GROUP THAT THEY CAN TAKE THEIR PROBLEMS TO, TO GET THEM RESOLVED. WHY IS IT THAT THE WELDING INSPECTOR'S DO NOT HAVE A TECH. SUPPORT GROUP FROM QA TO DEAL WITH THEIR PROBLEMS THAT MAY ARISE ON THE 2ND SHIFT.

Sincerely,
Ronald Kirkland