CASE No. 2-84-021

United States
Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Report of Investigation

Shearon Harris Nuclear Plant:

Alleged Harassment/Intimidation and Falsification of Documentation Commitments

Office of Investigations

Reported by OI:

RII

8508230053 850814
PDR FOIA
GUILD85-173 PDR

B11

Title: SHEARON HARRIS NUCLEAR POWER PLANT

ALLEGED HARASSMENT AND INTIMIDATION AND FALSIFICATION OF DOCUMENTATION

Licensee:

Carolina Power and Light Company
411 Fayetteville Street
Raleigh, NC 27602

Docket No: 50-400

Case Number: 2-84-021

Report Date: 5/16/85

Control Office: OI:RII

Status: CLOSED

Reported by:

Larry L. Robinson
Investigator, OI:RII

Reviewed by:

James V. Vorse
Director, OI:RII

Approved by:

Ben B. Hayes, Director
Office of Investigations

WARNING

The attached document/report has not been reviewed pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.79(a) exemptions nor has any exempt material been deleted. Do not disseminate nor discuss its contents outside NRC. Treat as "OFFICIAL USE ONLY."

SYNOPSIS

By memorandum dated October 24, 1984, the Regional Administrator, USNRC, Region II requested investigative assistance from the Office of Investigations Field Office, Region II (OI:RII) in the conduct of a joint interview with OI:RII and the Region II Technical Staff, of an alleger who claimed he had been harassed and intimidated by Carolina Power and Light Company (CP&L) supervision because he had expressed safety concerns to them regarding the construction of the Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant (SHNPP). This alleger also claimed that critical construction documentation was falsified.

This alleger had already filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) claiming discrimination by his CP&L supervision because of his race (oriental). The alleger had also filed with the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL), charging that CP&L had fired him in violation of the Whistleblower Act. DOL determined that the alleger had not engaged in any activity that was protected by the Whistleblower Act, but CP&L settled out of court with the alleger on the EEOC complaint. The CP&L legal staff advised that the alleger's attorney had initiated the suggestion of the possibility of a settlement. CP&L legal also stated that they did not settle because they felt they would lose the case, but because the settlement amount was relatively insignificant as compared to the anticipated resources, time, and expense required to take the case through litigation.

At the initial interview of the alleger, it was preliminarily apparent that the construction concerns that the alleger had brought to his supervision were not nuclear safety-related, and that he had no actual indication of intentional wrongdoing on the part of the licensee with respect to his concerns about construction documentation. These documentation concerns pertained to the purchase of steel under a cancelled purchase order number, and the discarding, into a trash can, of QC pipe hanger inspection documents.

The construction concerns, the purchase order concern, and the inspection document concern were addressed by Region II Technical Staff.

Although the alleger was not in a QA/QC capacity, and although the construction concerns that he claimed to have been harassed for bringing up were not nuclear safety-related, OI conducted an investigation to determine if the alleger had been harassed by his CP&L supervision for any reason.

A total of thirteen of the alleger's co-workers were interviewed, as well as the two CP&L employees who were alleged to have committed the harassment and/or intimidation. None of the co-workers interviewed ever observed any harassment or intimidation of the alleger by either of the CP&L supervisors. Both CP&L supervisors denied harassing and intimidating the alleger. The alleger's immediate supervisor was generally described by the alleger's co-workers as being professional, unemotional, hard-working, and impartial. Six of the thirteen had

some problems with this immediate supervisor's leadership ability and lack of nuclear construction experience.

Seven of the thirteen stated that the alleger had the attitude that he was superior to everyone, that he was emotional and excitable, and had some degree of a communication problem due to a language difference. Three of thirteen made negative remarks about the alleger's engineering competence. Two of thirteen indicated acceptable competence. The remainder did not feel qualified to judge the competence of the alleger's work.

Both CP&L supervisors commented on their gradual realization that the alleger was not performing satisfactorily. They outlined the progression from informal counselling, to formal counselling, to probation, to termination.

The alleger permitted himself to be deposed before representatives of both CP&L and the NRC at Raleigh, NC on February 25, 1985. At this time, both his technical and his harassment concerns were addressed, explained, and resolved.

The status of this investigation is CLOSED.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

SYNOPSIS 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS 3

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS 4

INTERVIEWEES 5

DETAILS OF INVESTIGATION 6

Predication 6
Purpose of Investigation 6
Background 6
Results of Investigation 7
Conclusion 9

LIST OF EXHIBITS 10

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS

1. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, Section 210a.
2. 10 CFR 50.7
3. Title 18, U.S. Code, Section 1001, (False Statements).
4. 10 CFR 50, Appendix B (Maintenance of QA Documentation).

INTERVIEWEES

CHRISCOE, William Patterson, Engineer, CP&L, Mechanical Hanger Section, Exhibit 7

DiBLASI, Theodore Anthony, Lead Hanger Engineer, Daniels Construction Company, Exhibit 9

_____, Exhibit 8

FULLER, Alexander Graham, Principal Engineer, CP&L, Exhibit 21

GERMANY, Charles Regan, Systems Hanger Engineer, Tompkins and Beckwith Company, Exhibit 12

GLASS, Margaret, CP&L Staff Attorney, Exhibit 6

HARTLEY, William Carl, Engineer, CP&L, Exhibit 19

_____, Exhibit 18

JACKSON, Johnny, Hanger Engineer, Daniels Construction Company, Exhibit 17

JOHNSON, James P., Engineer, Tompkins and Beckwith, Exhibit 15

JONES, Richard, CP&L Staff Attorney, Exhibit 6

LEE, Jerry Dedge, Hanger Engineer Supervisor, Daniels Construction Company, Exhibit 20

NASH, Larry Wayne, Hanger Engineer, Tompkins and Beckwith Company, Exhibit 10

NEWTON, Leslie Eugene, Engineer, Tompkins and Beckwith Company, Exhibit 14

POLLARD, Gary Allen, Hanger Engineer, CP&L, Exhibit 16

PRUITT, Michael L., Hanger Engineer, Tompkins and Beckwith Company, Exhibit 11

_____, Exhibit 13

WILLETT, Edwin Eugene, Manager of Piping and Instrumentation, CP&L, Exhibit 22

DETAILS OF INVESTIGATION

Predication

This investigation was predicated upon receipt of a memorandum, dated October 24, 1984, from James P. O'REILLY, Regional Administrator, Region II, USNRC to the Office of Investigations Field Office, Region II (OI:RII), which requested investigative assistance in an interview of Chan Van VO to be conducted jointly with representatives of the Region II Technical Staff (Exhibit 1).

Purpose of Investigation

The purpose of this investigation was to determine if, as alleged by VO in his affidavit received by the Region II Staff on October 10, 1984; (1) VO was harassed and intimidated by his CP&L supervisors for bringing safety concerns to their attention, and (2) critical construction documentation was falsified.

Background

Chan Van VO was terminated from his employment as an engineer for CP&L at the Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant (SHNPP) on February 29, 1984. The reason cited on the official termination documentation was "Unsatisfactory Performance" (Exhibit 4, Page 26).

On August 6, 1984, VO filed race discrimination charges against CP&L with the Raleigh, NC area office, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) (Exhibit 4, Pages 57 and 58). CP&L settled with VO, and the EEOC complaint was dismissed on November 15, 1984 (Exhibit 4, Page 53). CP&L Staff Attorneys Richard JONES and Margaret GLASS advised OI:RII that the suggestion of a possibility of a settlement in the VO matter was initiated by VO's attorney. JONES advised his recommendation to settle with VO was not based upon any thought of possibly losing in litigation, but was based upon the settlement amount being relatively insignificant as compared to the cost of CP&L in manpower and resources to take the case through the full litigative process (JONES and GLASS Results of Interview is Exhibit 6).

On September 13, 1984 (approximately one month after VO's submission of his EEOC complaint, but prior to its disposition), the Department of Labor (DOL) received a complaint from VO, alleging that he had been terminated by CP&L in violation of the Employee Protection Provisions of the Energy Reorganization Act (ERA) (Exhibit 4, Pages 59-62). On October 10, 1984, CP&L was notified by DOL of their (DOL's) determination of no violation on the part of CP&L with respect to this ERA complaint (Exhibit 4, Page 1, Para. 10).

Additional extensive investigation into the circumstances surrounding the termination of VO was done by CP&L personnel and a consultant from Duke Power Company (Exhibit 24).

Results of Investigation

On November 1, 1984, VO was interviewed by NRC Investigator Larry L. Robinson and William P. ANG, Region II Staff (Exhibit 2). VO was accompanied by his attorney, Robert GUILD. This interview centered on four main concerns by VO. (1) That a voided purchase order number had been used by CP&L to purchase steel that was to be used in plant construction; (2) A steam generator feedwater pump discharge pipe was improperly "cold pulled" and welded onto one of the pump nozzles, causing unacceptable stresses in the nozzle; (3) That portions of pipe support inspection records had been apparently discarded into a trash can, and (4) That when VO brought these and other safety-related items to the attention of his supervisors at CP&L, his concerns were ignored and/or discredited, and he was subsequently harassed and intimidated by CP&L supervision and management, primarily Alex FULLER, because he voiced these concerns.

In this interview, VO provided no evidence of any indication or knowledge that there was any intentional wrongdoing in connection with concerns (1), (2), or (3) above. He stated that he had no indication that CP&L intentionally used a cancelled purchase order number to order steel. He stated that he thought it was just lack of communication and coordination between the field and the purchasing department. He also stated that, although he found portions of pipe support inspection records in a trash can, he had no indication that anyone from CP&L was intentionally destroying required inspection documentation. These concerns were addressed by the Inspection Staff of Region II and were itemized in Inspection Report No. 50-400/84-43 (Exhibit 5).

In response to VO's allegation of harassment, thirteen of VO's fellow engineers in the piping/hanger section, who were either presently, or at one time under the supervision of FULLER, were interviewed regarding their knowledge of any harassment or intimidation of VO by FULLER. These engineers were also questioned about their knowledge of anyone in CP&L supervision or management ignoring or "stonewalling" any nuclear safety concerns brought to CP&L supervision by VO, or anyone else. These engineers, some employed by CP&L, some by Daniels Construction Company, and some by Tompkins and Beckwith Company, were also questioned regarding FULLER's supervisory style, and whether FULLER had ever harassed or intimidated any of them. The following personnel were interviewed: William Patterson CHRISCOE, Engineer, CP&L, Mechanical Hanger Section (Exhibit 7); Theodore Anthony DiBLASI, Lead Hanger Engineer, Daniels Construction Company (Exhibit 9); [redacted] (Exhibit 8); Charles Regan GERMANY, Systems Hanger Engineer, Tompkins and Beckwith Company (Exhibit 12); William Carl HARTLEY, Engineer, CP&L (Exhibit 19); [redacted] (Exhibit 16); Johnny JACKSON, Hanger Engineer, Daniels Construction Company (Exhibit 17); James P. JOHNSON, Engineer, Tompkins and Beckwith (Exhibit 15); Larry Wayne NASH, Hanger Engineer, Tompkins and Beckwith Company (Exhibit 10); Leslie Eugene NEWTON, Engineer, Tompkins and Beckwith Company (Exhibit 14); Gary Allen POLLARD, Hanger

Engineer, CP&L (Exhibit 16); Michael L. PRUITT, Hanger Engineer, Tompkins and Beckwith Company (Exhibit 11);

(Exhibit 13)

None of the engineers interviewed ever observed any harassment or intimidation of VO by FULLER. None of these engineers knew of any nuclear safety-related concerns that VO had brought to FULLER's attention that had been ignored or "stonewalled" by FULLER. Most of these engineers described FULLER's supervisory style as being professional, unemotional, unbiased and hard-working.

One described FULLER as having a tendency to "talk-down" to his people. Two said FULLER's inexperience in nuclear construction supervision, added to his tendency to "blindly follow the company (CP&L) line," made him unreceptive to engineering suggestions from subordinates with prior nuclear construction experience.

The remaining majority of the thirteen either praised FULLER's management style, or they had no problems with FULLER. Two thought FULLER was too lenient with his people. One thought that Van VO received preferential treatment by FULLER because Van VO was a minority (Exhibit 19, Page 1).

Seven of these thirteen engineers stated that VO had the attitude that he was superior to everyone in the section that he was emotional and excitable, and that he had a problem communicating and understanding because of his language difference. One of the thirteen had been in a verbal and physical confrontation with VO (Exhibit 12).

Alex FULLER and Ed WILLETT were both interviewed (Exhibits 21 and 22) and categorically denied any harassment or intimidation of Chan Van VO. Both stated that they could not recall VO ever coming to them with a true nuclear safety-related concern.

WILLETT stated that VO's personal problems of having some of his family remaining in Vietnam, plus VO's refusal to recognize a backlog of problems in his area of responsibility in waste disposal, and VO's refusal to accept constructive criticism of his job performance, all led to an eventual level of unsatisfactory performance on VO's part and thus his termination.

FULLER advised that what he initially thought was a language problem of communication and understanding with VO eventually surfaced as inadequacies in engineering judgment and an inability to organize and accomplish his work.

FULLER also advised that what VO may have interpreted as inaction on his (FULLER's) part when VO brought construction concerns to him was the fact that FULLER had knowledge of documentation and/or corrective action in process on that concern that VO was not aware of.

On February 26, 1985, Chan Van VO permitted himself to be deposed by representatives of CP&L with NRC representatives also present. At this time, VO's technical concerns and supervisory conflict concerns were explained and resolved (Exhibit 23).

Conclusion

There was no evidence developed to indicate a pattern of harassment, intimidation, or pressure to resign resulting from VO bringing safety concerns to his supervisors, which ultimately resulted in the termination of VO's employment by the licensee.

Based on VO's testimony on November 1, 1984, there was no evidence or indication of intentional destruction of required QA documentation by CP&L, and no evidence or indication that the misuse of the purchase order number was anything other than a lack of communication and/or coordination between the field and purchasing (Exhibit 2). VO's concerns regarding construction deficiencies, discarded inspection documentation, and the misuse of a purchase order number were addressed and will be resolved by NRC Region II inspection personnel (Exhibit 5).

LIST OF EXHIBITS

1. Memorandum of request for investigative assistance and affidavit of Chan Van VO, dated October 24, 1984, 18 pages
2. Transcript of Interview of Chan Van VO, dated November 1, 1984, 114 pages
3. Letter from Chan Van VO, citing his corrections to his transcript of November 11, 1984, 20 pages
4. Copies of Documents from review of Department of Labor investigative files, 66 pages
5. Copy of Region II, NRC Inspection Report No. 50-400/84-43, dated December 14, 1984, 9 pages
6. Results of Interview of Richard JONES and Margaret GLASS, dated February 13, 1985, 1 page
7. Results of Interview of William P. CHRISCOE, dated February 14, 1985, 2 pages
8. Results of Interview of , 3 pages
9. Results of Interview of Theodore A. DiBLASI, dated February 15, 1985, 2 pages
10. Results of Interview of Larry W. NASH, dated February 15, 1985, 2 pages
11. Results of Interview of Michael L. PRUITT, dated February 15, 1985, 1 page
12. Results of Interview of Charles R. GERMANY, dated February 15, 1985, 2 pages
13. Results of Interview of 3 pages
14. Results of Interview of Leslie E. NEWTON, dated February 20, 1985, 2 pages
15. Results of Interview of James JOHNSON, dated February 20, 1985, 2 pages
16. Results of Interview of Gary A. POLLARD, dated February 20, 1985, 2 pages
17. Results of Interview of Johnny JACKSON, dated February 20, 1985, 2 pages
18. Results of Interview of 2 pages
19. Results of Interview of William C. HARTLEY, dated February 21, 1985, 3 pages
20. Results of Interview of Jerry D. LEE, dated February 21, 1985, 3 pages
21. Results of Interview of Alexander G. FULLER, dated February 21, 1985, 3 pages
22. Results of Interview of Edwin E. WILLETT, dated February 22, 1985, 3 pages
23. Transcript of CP&L Deposition of Chan Van VO, dated February 26, 1985, 316 pages
24. Quality Check Program Report by CP&L on quality issues raised by Chan Van VO, dated January 15, 1985, with attachments, 49 pages

RESULTS OF INTERVIEW WITH RICHARD JONES AND
MARGARET GLASS ON FEBRUARY 13, 1985, AS PREPARED BY
INVESTIGATOR LARRY L. ROBINSON

On February 13, 1985, Richard JONES and Margaret GLASS, Staff Attorneys for Carolina Power and Light Company (CP&L), were interviewed by NRC Investigator Larry L. Robinson, in JONES' office at CP&L Headquarters, Raleigh, NC.

The nature of the interview was explained to JONES and GLASS as pertaining to their knowledge of any facts and circumstances regarding allegations of harassment and intimidation of Chan Van VO by his former CP&L supervision.

JONES stated, with GLASS' concurrence, that regarding CP&L's decision to settle with Van VO regarding his allegations, the following events took place:

JONES stated that CP&L, as well as the U.S. Department of Labor, had done extensive investigative work into these allegations of harassment by Van VO, and the situation was about to come to the hearing point. JONES stated that prior to the hearing, Van VO's attorney, Robert GUILD, called JONES' office and discussed an extension to the hearing date. JONES stated that also during this telephone conversation, GUILD "opened the door" regarding the possibility of a settlement with Van VO prior to the hearing.

JONES stated that at a later date, he had a meeting with GUILD and GLASS in his office and the broad aspects of a possible settlement with Van VO were discussed.

JONES advised that in no way was the decision to settle with Van VO influenced by the thought that CP&L was at fault in these allegations. He stated that the decision to settle with Van VO was made strictly upon the economics and the manpower and resources utilization required in taking these allegations through the full hearing process. He stated that the amount of the settlement to Van VO was relatively small as compared to the expenses and resources that would have been required to take the case through the full process.

This Results of Interview was prepared on February 19, 1985.

Larry L. Robinson

Larry L. Robinson, Investigator

B11/6

EXHIBIT (6)
Page 1 of 1 Pages

RESULTS OF INTERVIEW WITH WILLIAM P. CHRISCOE
ON FEBRUARY 14, 1985 AS PREPARED BY INVESTIGATOR
LARRY L. ROBINSON

On February 14, 1985, William P. CHRISCOE, Engineer, Mechanical Hanger Section, Carolina Power and Light Company (CP&L), was interviewed by NRC Investigator Larry L. Robinson on site at the Shearon Harris Nuclear Plant.

The nature of the interview was explained to CHRISCOE as pertaining to his knowledge of any facts and circumstances regarding allegations of harassment and intimidation of Chan Van VO by his former CP&L supervision.

CHRISCOE stated that he graduated from North Carolina State University in May 1981 with a Civil Engineering Degree, and was employed with CP&L in June 1981, and has been so employed since.

CHRISCOE stated that when he went to work for CP&L, he worked in the same building with Van VO, but VO was in the piping section and he was in the hanger section. He stated that approximately a year after he was working with CP&L, Chan Van VO was transferred to the hanger section. CHRISCOE stated that he did not know why Van VO was transferred from piping to hangers.

CHRISCOE stated that his relationship with Van VO was primarily professional, but he had some non-work related conversations. He stated that at no time did Van VO confide in him about any personal matters that were related to either work or Van VO's personal situation. CHRISCOE stated that he had a slight language communication problem with Van VO, but nothing that he could not overcome.

CHRISCOE advised that Van VO seemed to change personalities when he was transferred from piping to hangers. He said that he had heard Van VO making the statement that he was discriminated against. CHRISCOE stated that to the contrary, he felt that most people went out of their way to make Van VO feel comfortable in his work situation.

CHRISCOE stated that his and Van VO's supervisor, Alex FULLER, would hold group meetings with the hanger engineers, and would look for suggestions on solving engineering problems. He stated that if the suggestions were not utilized, FULLER would fully explain the reasons for not taking this suggested action to all the engineers, including himself and Van VO. CHRISCOE stated that Van VO seemed to think that FULLER was not as competent as he (Van VO) was.

CHRISCOE stated that in his opinion, both FULLER and Ed WILLETT were both fair and competent engineers. He stated that he never saw FULLER single out Van VO, or any other CP&L engineer for any harsh criticism of performance.

CHRISCOE described FULLER as a dedicated, hard-working manager that leads by example, and does a large amount of overtime work himself, without getting paid for it. He stated that he did not feel intimidated at all by FULLER, but that VO could have possibly felt that way. He reiterated that

B11/7

through his observations and association with Van VO, he could not see any reason why Van VO would feel intimidated by FULLER, but that he (CHRISCOE), obviously was not a witness to all the interaction between FULLER and Van VO.

CHRISCOE stated that, from his observations, Van VO seemed to have trouble accepting the fact that he was being supervised in the performance of his job at all. He stated that an example of one of the problems that Van VO had was that Paul HOWARD, who was in the same job classification as Van VO, was given the responsibility to review pipe hanger problems, and Van VO resisted the fact that HOWARD was in a position to review Van VO's work.

CHRISCOE stated that he carpooled with FULLER from about July 1981 through April 1984, and that during that time FULLER never made any negative or derogatory comments in the car about Van VO.

CHRISCOE stated that he was not aware of the date when Van VO went on probation for his work performance. CHRISCOE stated however that during the last six months of Van VO's employment, he was spending a lot of time writing a paper on how to build a nuclear plant, instead of doing his assigned work.

CHRISCOE stated that, regarding the distribution of the workload among the hanger engineers by FULLER, that Van VO was working in the turbine building, where the pipe hangers were non-seismic. He stated that the problems over there in the turbine building were easier. He stated that Van VO may have had more problems in the turbine building, and he may not have. CHRISCOE advised that he did not think that Van VO had a heavier workload than any of the other engineers.

CHRISCOE stated, in closing, that he knew of no specific problems where Van VO brought a problem to FULLER and got no response or feedback pertaining to that problem.

This Results of Interview was prepared on February 19, 1985.

Larry L. Robinson

Larry L. Robinson, Investigator

RESULTS OF INTERVIEW WITH

AS PREPARED BY
INVESTIGATOR LARRY L. ROBINSON

was interviewed by NRC Investigator Larry L. Robinson on site at the Carolina Power and Light Company's (CP&L) Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant.

The nature of the interview was explained to as pertaining to his knowledge of facts and circumstances regarding allegations of harassment and intimidation of Chan Van VO by his former CP&L supervision.

stated that his relationship with Van VO was basically professional. and that he only had two or three contacts with Van VO in the field from October 1983 until two months before Van VO was terminated. He stated that maybe, at most, he had a total of five one-on-one conversations with Van VO at lunch when everyone came in from the field to eat. He stated that he has had no other contact with Van VO.

described FULLER as intelligent, and borderline egotistical. He stated that FULLER pretends to listen, but does not really hear. He stated that FULLER did not satisfy him as to why he did not accept one of his suggestions as a procedure for utilization in the hanger department. He stated that FULLER's answer to him was that he did not understand "the CP&L program."

stated that in the group engineering meetings, Van VO always asked a lot of questions. He stated that he could not tell whether the questions were bothersome to FULLER or not. He stated that the questions did not bother him advised that Van VO did have a communication problem, due to the language barrier, and that many times he would not understand Van VO.

advised that Van VO appeared to be very excitable. stated that in his opinion, Van VO thought that he (Van VO) was smarter that the rest of the engineers. stated that as an example of that, he remembered that in one of these meetings an engineer asked FULLER a question about a hanger and Van VO interrupted, answered the question himself, and said "anyone should know that."

stated that he has no knowledge that FULLER stonewalled or blocked any of Van VO's safety concerns regarding the Shearon Harris plant.

stated that he did not see any difference in the feedback from FULLER to the on problem

B 11/8

EXHIBIT (E)
Page 1 of 3 Pages

solving suggestions. He stated, however, that FULLER was naturally more lenient with stated that FULLER would reject, without giving any feedback, suggestions of all the other engineers.

advised that in his opinion, FULLER was not a good "leader of men." He stated that his (FULLER's) lack of nuclear experience probably was one of the causes of this. stated that FULLER is very intelligent, professional, and unemotional. He stated that he thought FULLER's previous experience was at a hydroelectric plant.

stated that he had no indication that FULLER discriminated, harassed or intimidated Van VO in any way. advised that Van VO never told him that FULLER discriminated against him in any way. He also stated that he never saw FULLER harassing or intimidating Van VO.

stated that he had seen examples of poor pipe hanger paperwork done by Van VO, specifically inspections. He stated that the problems were not that complicated, but that he had to correct some inspections that had been done by Van VO. further explained this by stating that Van VO had done some paperwork indicating that he (Van VO) had done an inspection, when in fact, he had not done a proper inspection. stated that the problem would have possibly been a cursory inspection of hangers by Van VO. He stated that he routinely had problems with Van VO's inspection paperwork.

stated that FULLER has no particular favorites within the engineering section. He stated that FULLER is stoic and that FULLER has good potential, but not as a manager of people. He stated that he has never seen or heard of FULLER harassing or intimidating Van VO, or anyone else.

advised that he did not think that FULLER mistreated Van VO in any way. He advised that Van VO would have been "gone" from a long time ago, meaning would have fired Van VO for poor performance long before CP&L had done it.

stated that Van VO tended to be emotional and temperamental. He cited the incident in which Van VO got into a argument and fight with Charlie GERMANY. He stated that FULLER gave Van VO every benefit of the doubt in his job performance.

This Results of Interview was prepared on February 25, 1985.

Larry L. Robinson, Investigator

EXHIBIT (F)
Page 3 of 3 Pages

~~DO NOT DISCLOSE~~
~~Contains Identity~~
~~Confidential Source~~

I have information that I wish to provide in confidence to the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). I request an express pledge of confidentiality as condition of providing this information to the NRC. I will not provide this information voluntarily to the NRC without such confidentiality being extended to me.

It is my understanding, consistent with its legal obligations, the NRC, by agreeing to this confidentiality, will adhere to the following conditions:

(1) The NRC will not identify me by name or personal identifier in any NRC initiated document, conversation, or communication released to the public which relates directly to the information provided by me. I understand the term "public release" to encompass any distribution outside of the NRC with the exception of other public agencies which may require this information in futherance of their responsibilities under law or public trust.

(2) The NRC will disclose my identity within the NRC only to the extent required for the conduct of NRC related activities.

(3) During the course of the inquiry or investigation the NRC will also make every effort consistent with the investigative needs of the Commission to avoid actions which would clearly be expected to result in the disclosure of my identity to persons subsequently contacted by the NRC. At a later stage I understand that even though the NRC will make every reasonable effort to protect my identity, my identification could be compelled by orders or subpoenas issued by courts of law, hearing boards, or similar legal entities. In such cases, the basis for granting this promise of confidentiality and any other relevant facts will be communicated to the authority ordering the disclosure in an effort to maintain confidentiality. If this effort proves unsuccessful, a representative of the NRC will attempt to inform me of any such action before disclosing my identity.

I also understand that the NRC will consider me to have waived my right to confidentiality if I take any action that may be reasonably expected to disclose my identity. I further understand that the NRC will consider me to have waived my rights to confidentiality if I provide (or have previously provided) information to any other party that contradicts the information that I provided to the NRC or if circumstances indicate that I am intentionally providing false information to the NRC.

Other Conditions: (if any)

I have read and fully understand the contents of this agreement. I agree with its provisions.

I _____
DATE

~~DO NOT DISCLOSE~~
~~Contains Identity~~
~~Confidential Source~~

AGREED TO ON BEHALF OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

_____
INVESTIGATOR, OFFICE OF INVESTIG

RESULTS OF INTERVIEW WITH THEODORE A. DiBLASI
ON FEBRUARY 15, 1985 AS PREPARED BY INVESTIGATOR
LARRY L. ROBINSON

On February 15, 1985, Theodore A. DiBLASI, Lead Hanger Engineer, Daniels Construction Company, was interviewed by NRC Investigator Larry L. Robinson on site at the Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant.

The nature of the interview was explained to DiBLASI as pertaining to his knowledge of any facts or circumstances regarding allegations of harassment and intimidation of Chan Van VO by his former Carolina Power and Light Company (CP&L) supervision.

DiBLASI stated that he has been employed by Daniels Construction Company since February 1979. He advised that he has been at the Harris Nuclear Power Plant since October 1983, having come on board as a System Engineer in charge of monitoring piping systems.

DiBLASI stated that Van VO was a field engineer in the turbine building. He advised that his relationship with Van VO was strictly professional, and not personal, and that he had dealt directly with Van VO in a one-on-one discussion, maybe once or twice during the whole time Van VO was there. DiBLASI stated that he observed Van VO's participation in the group engineering meetings that were held by Alex FULLER occasionally.

DiBLASI stated that he has no knowledge of any harassment or intimidation by FULLER of Van VO. He also stated that he has no knowledge of Van VO bringing any safety concerns to FULLER and getting stonewalled with these concerns.

DiBLASI stated that Van VO was not a bother or a "pain in the neck" to FULLER. He advised that Van VO asked a lot of questions at the group meetings, but a lot of the other engineers also did. He stated that some of Van VO's questions in these group meetings were legitimate. DiBLASI stated that Van VO should have known the answers to some of these questions, but that the questions were not unreasonable. DiBLASI stated that FULLER treated Van VO fairly.

DiBLASI described FULLER's management style as being competent, and very professional. He stated that he had no problems with FULLER's management style, and that FULLER played no favorites. DiBLASI advised that FULLER may not call on the knowledge of his subordinates as much as DiBLASI would do in a management situation, but that he (DiBLASI) was still comfortable with FULLER's management style.

DiBLASI stated that Van VO has neither complained nor complimented FULLER in any conversation that he (DiBLASI) has had with Van VO. DiBLASI stated that he has never had any non-professional, or non-business conversation with Van VO.

B11/9

This Results of Interview was prepared on February 19, 1985.

Larry L. Robinson

Larry L. Robinson, Investigator

EXHIBIT (9)
Page 2 of 2 Pages

RESULTS OF INTERVIEW WITH LARRY WAYNE NASH ON
FEBRUARY 15, 1985, AS PREPARED BY INVESTIGATOR
LARRY L. ROBINSON

On February 15, 1985, Larry W. NASH, Hanger Engineer, Tompkins and Beckwith Company, was interviewed by NRC Investigator Larry L. Robinson on site at the Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant.

The nature of the interview was explained to NASH as pertaining to his knowledge of any facts and circumstances regarding allegations of harassment and intimidation of Chan Van VO by his former Carolina Power and Light Company (CP&L) supervision.

NASH stated that he has been employed by Tompkins and Beckwith since February 1982, and has been on site at the Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant project since August 1983. He stated that he has 13 years nuclear construction experience.

NASH stated that Van VO was already working at Shearon Harris when he (NASH) came on board. He stated that he thought that Van VO was working in the turbine building at that time.

NASH stated that originally he and Van VO were handling problems in the office, and when the pipe hanger work stoppage occurred, both he and Van VO went out to do work in the field.

NASH stated that he had a slight communication problem with Van VO, but that that was natural in dealing with someone that was not conversant in the English language.

NASH advised that he never observed any harassment or intimidation of Van VO by Alex FULLER or Ed WILLETT. He stated that FULLER was very hard line, but was equal to everyone. He stated that FULLER appeared to have no favorites or no "whipping boys." NASH stated that one of the problems that FULLER had, as well as other CP&L supervisors, was CP&L's inexperience in the construction field. He stated that he did not get any feedback on his suggestions to improve the construction process, but that FULLER was good at making procedure and policy changes. NASH advised that at first, FULLER was a little bit too "hard line," due to his inexperience.

NASH stated that he has no knowledge of FULLER "stonewalling" any safety concerns that had been brought to him by Van VO.

NASH stated that he has not been under FULLER's supervision for approximately six to nine months, but that after he had been on site for about two or three months, he saw that Van VO's desk was moved close to FULLER's office so that FULLER could see everything that Van VO did.

NASH stated that an example of FULLER's inexperience was that at one time, FULLER was anxious to turn over a piping system that had only cable supports, rather than the permanent hangers. He stated that the cables supporting this piping system would not even hold up the piping with the added weight of the water that would be flowing through the pipes.

B11/10

NASH stated that he had heard that FULLER did not really give good ratings or interviews of prospective employees. He stated that FULLER never rated him. NASH advised that he had heard that FULLER had given bad ratings because of a incident involving an employee by the name of Bruce DEESE. He stated that DEESE was a slow, methodical worker, but very good. NASH advised that DEESE resigned however, when FULLER told him at one point that he better do his job more quickly or he would be terminated. NASH stated that this incident had happened about nine months ago.

NASH stated that after DEESE had resigned, he (NASH) had been told by a co-worker, whom NASH preferred not to identify, that DEESE had called this co-worker and told him that he (DEESE) had been blackballed. NASH stated that this unidentified co-worker found out that there was a note in DEESE's personnel file indicating that DEESE should not be eligible for rehire. NASH stated that somehow this note eventually got removed from DEESE's file, but he (NASH) was not sure whether DEESE ever got the job that he had applied for at the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant.

NASH stated, in closing, that although FULLER and many of the other CP&L supervision were inexperienced in nuclear construction, he had never had any direct knowledge of any harassment or intimidation of Van VO by FULLER.

This Results of Interview was prepared on February 19, 1985.

Larry L. Robinson

Larry L. Robinson, Investigator

EXHIBIT (VC)
Page 2 of 2 Pages

RESULTS OF INTERVIEW WITH MICHAEL L. PRUITT ON
FEBRUARY 15, 1985, AS PREPARED BY INVESTIGATOR
LARRY L. ROBINSON

On February 15, 1985, Michael L. PRUITT, Engineer, Tompkins and Beckwith Company, was interviewed by NRC Investigator Larry L. Robinson on site at the Carolina Power and Light Company's (CP&L) Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant.

The nature of the interview was explained to PRUITT as pertaining to his knowledge of any facts and circumstances regarding allegations of harassment and intimidation of Chan Van VO by his former CP&L supervision.

PRUITT stated that he has been employed by Tompkins and Beckwith since June 1982, and has been on site at Shearon Harris since September 1983. PRUITT advised that he has six years nuclear construction experience, and was at the Waterford site with Tompkins and Beckwith prior to coming to Shearon Harris. He stated that he was employed by Daniels Construction Company prior to working with Tompkins and Beckwith.

PRUITT stated that since he has been at the Shearon Harris site, he has always been under Alex FULLER's supervision. He stated that he was a pipe restraint engineer, and Chan Van VO was working in "baby hangers," so he was not directly associated with Van VO.

PRUITT stated that on one occasion, he asked Van VO his opinion about one of PRUITT's restraint designs, and Van VO answered competently and professionally. PRUITT stated that Van VO was a loner, and that he (PRUITT) saw the animosity between Van VO and FULLER when Van VO knew he was going to be terminated.

PRUITT stated however, that he has never seen FULLER harass or intimidate Van VO. He also stated that he has no knowledge of FULLER blocking or ignoring any safety concerns that were brought to him (FULLER) by Van VO.

PRUITT stated that his office was close to FULLER's, and that he has heard Van VO making general statements, as he came out of FULLER's office, about FULLER's incompetence.

PRUITT stated that FULLER was also kind of a loner. He stated that FULLER played no favorites, and did not single out any particular person as a non-favorite.

PRUITT stated that he has had some "strong, opinionated, discussions" with FULLER. PRUITT, however, described Van VO as also being very strong-willed, hot-headed, and emotional.

This Results of Interview was prepared on February 19, 1985.

Larry L. Robinson

Larry L. Robinson, Investigator

B11/11

EXHIBIT (V)
Page 1 of 1 Pages

RESULTS OF INTERVIEW WITH CHARLES REGAN GERMANY
ON FEBRUARY 15, 1985, AS PREPARED BY INVESTIGATOR
LARRY L. ROBINSON

On February 15, 1985, Charles R. GERMANY, Systems Hanger Engineer, Tompkins and Beckwith Company, was interviewed by NRC Investigator Larry L. Robinson on site at the Carolina Power and Light Company's (CP&L) Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant.

The nature of the interview was explained to GERMANY as pertaining to his knowledge of any facts and circumstances regarding allegations of harassment and intimidation of Chan Van VO by his former CP&L supervision.

GERMANY stated that he has been employed by Tompkins and Beckwith for approximately three years, and has been on site at Shearon Harris since the end of October 1983.

GERMANY stated that when he came on board at Shearon Harris, Chan Van VO was already employed on site.

GERMANY stated that, one day, he and Van VO had an argument over a hanger problem in the office. He stated that Van VO would not change his mind about how to handle the problem, and the argument persisted. GERMANY stated that Van VO got louder and more emotional, and finally he (GERMANY) said "f--- it, Chan, go ahead and do it your way." GERMANY stated that he turned away from Van VO and went back to sit down at his desk. He stated that a few seconds later Van VO grabbed him from behind and said "you can't talk to me like that." GERMANY stated that Alex FULLER intervened, and sent both he and Van VO home for the rest of the afternoon without pay.

GERMANY stated that Van VO seemed not to be able to understand why we had so many procedures to do the engineering items that were required to be done. He stated Van VO would have liked to have done things the short way.

GERMANY stated that he has never seen FULLER harass or intimidate anyone, especially Chan Van VO. He stated that FULLER treats everyone equally, and is very straightforward and helpful. He stated that FULLER does a lot of researching and checking for his engineers.

GERMANY stated that he has no knowledge of FULLER stonewalling any safety concerns that were brought to him by Van VO.

GERMANY stated that Van VO did cause a lot of problems within the engineering section. He stated that Van VO was always arguing and was very "hard-headed." GERMANY stated that he did not think Van VO understood his (Van VO's) position in the chain of command.

GERMANY stated that in his observation, both FULLER and Paul HOWARD were very receptive to suggestions made by the engineers in group meetings. He stated that FULLER and HOWARD would explain why they did not use the suggestions, if the suggestions were not used.

B11/12

GERMANY stated that he heard rumors that Van VO was copying classified documents sometime just before he (Van VO) got fired.

GERMANY described FULLER's management style as very professional and business like. He stated that FULLER did not want to get too friendly or personal with any of his engineers. GERMANY stated that a lot of the engineers that worked around Van VO did not really like him. GERMANY gave the name of Ed BULLARD as an example.

This Results of Interview was prepared on February 19, 1985.

Larry L. Robinson

Larry L. Robinson, Investigator

RESULTS OF INTERVIEW WITH
AS PREPARED BY INVESTIGATOR
LARRY L. ROBINSON

was interviewed by NRC Investigator Larry L. Robinson at the Carolina Power and Light Company's (CP&L) Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant.

The nature of the interview was explained to as pertaining to his knowledge of any facts and circumstances regarding allegations of harassment and intimidation of Chan Van VO by his former CP&L supervision.

stated that he was in the same engineering group with Van VO for a period of five to six months. He stated that he had a casual personal relationship with Van VO and almost no professional relationship. He stated that he never got into any specific technical problems with Van VO.

stated that Van VO told him that he (Van VO) was being treated unfairly by CP&L management, because they were not listening to his suggestions. stated that Van VO had submitted a suggestion about construction or operations management of a nuclear plant, and that this suggestion was not given any attention by CP&L management.

stated that in his opinion, Van VO felt that he had something to offer CP&L, and Van VO did not think he was being taken seriously by them. stated that Van VO had a language problem with the crafts in the field. He stated that they could not ever understand what Van VO was saying, much less work with him.

advised that he and Van VO talked about the higher level management suggestions together, and that he and Van VO did not really discuss any day to day technical problems.

stated that Van VO never told him that Alex FULLER threatened him (Van VO) or intimidated him in any way. also stated that he had no knowledge of Van VO bringing any safety concerns to the attention of FULLER that were disregarded or not heeded.

B11/13

EXHIBIT (V3)
Page 1 of 3 Pages

stated that he did not specifically remember Van VO asking any intentionally inflammatory questions during the group meetings of the engineers. He reiterated that he had difficulty understanding Van VO's questions because of the language difference.

stated that FULLER's demeanor in the group was meek and mild, and that there was no evidence of any intimidation of anyone in public.

This Results of Interview was prepared on February 19, 1985.

Jerry L. Robinson, Investigator

EXHIBIT (V3)
Page 3 of 3 Pages

(Original to source of information, ~~DO NOT DISCLOSE Contents Identity of Confidential Source~~ signed copy of duplicate original)

I have information that I wish to provide in confidence to the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). I request an express pledge of confidentiality as a condition of providing this information to the NRC. I will not provide this information voluntarily to the NRC without such confidentiality being extended to me.

It is my understanding, consistent with its legal obligations, the NRC, by agreeing to this confidentiality, will adhere to the following conditions:

(1) The NRC will not identify me by name or personal identifier in any NRC initiated document, conversation, or communication released to the public which relates directly to the information provided by me. I understand the term "public release" to encompass any distribution outside of the NRC with the exception of other public agencies which may require this information in furtherance of their responsibilities under law or public trust.

(2) The NRC will disclose my identity within the NRC only to the extent required for the conduct of NRC related activities.

(3) During the course of the inquiry or investigation the NRC will also make every effort consistent with the investigative needs of the Commission to avoid actions which would clearly be expected to result in the disclosure of my identity to persons subsequently contacted by the NRC. At a later stage I understand that even though the NRC will make every reasonable effort to protect my identity, my identification could be compelled by orders or subpoenas issued by courts of law, hearing boards, or similar legal entities. In such cases, the basis for granting this promise of confidentiality and any other relevant facts will be communicated to the authority ordering the disclosure in an effort to maintain my confidentiality. If this effort proves unsuccessful, a representative of the NRC will attempt to inform me of any such action before disclosing my identity.

I also understand that the NRC will consider me to have waived my right to confidentiality if I take any action that may be reasonably expected to disclose my identity. I further understand that the NRC will consider me to have waived my rights to confidentiality if I provide (or have previously provided) information to any other party that contradicts the information that I provided to the NRC or if circumstances indicate that I am intentionally providing false information to the NRC.

Other Conditions: (if any)

I have read and fully understand the contents of this agreement. I agree with its provisions.

Date

~~DO NOT DISCLOSE Contents Identity of Confidential Source~~

Agreed to on behalf of the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Date

Signature

Typed or Printed Name and Title

INVESTIGATOR, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATION

Revision 1.

RESULTS OF INTERVIEW WITH LESLIE EUGENE NEWTON ON
FEBRUARY 20, 1985, AS PREPARED BY INVESTIGATOR
LARRY L. ROBINSON

On February 20, 1985, Leslie E. NEWTON, Engineer, Tompkins and Beckwith Company, was interviewed by NRC Investigator Larry L. Robinson on site at the Carolina Power and Light Company's (CP&L) Shearon Harris Nuclear Plant.

The nature of the interview was explained to NEWTON as pertaining to his knowledge of any facts and circumstances regarding allegations of harassment and intimidation of Chan Van VO by his former CP&L supervision.

NEWTON stated that he has been employed by Tompkins and Beckwith since March 1982, and that he has been at the Harris site since May 2, 1983. He stated that when he first came on board, he was in the piping section for about two or three weeks under Ed WILLETT's supervision, and then transferred under Alex FULLER in pipe hangers. NEWTON stated that he has approximately 13 years nuclear construction experience, to include working at the Waterford, Bellefonte and Midland plants.

NEWTON stated that he only knew Van VO on a professional basis, and that there was no personal relationship between the two. He stated that Van VO never confided in him or talked to him about being mistreated by CP&L supervision. NEWTON stated that Van VO naturally had a communication problem and that he (NEWTON) could not understand Van VO too well.

NEWTON stated that Van VO had a very bad attitude, "carrying a chip on his shoulder," so NEWTON stated that he stayed away from Van VO.

NEWTON stated that FOSCOLO, who was in the chain of management over WILLETT and FULLER, suggested that NEWTON help set up some computer operations in the engineering group. He stated that FOSCOLO had suggested, through WILLETT, to FULLER, that NEWTON set up this computer system because FOSCOLO had known NEWTON's work at the Waterford plant. NEWTON stated that FULLER did not really accept this idea, and did not put NEWTON on the computer job right away because CP&L, in the person of FULLER, wanted to do it their own way. He stated that eventually they recognized his (NEWTON's) expertise with the computer, and used his talents properly.

NEWTON stated that FULLER was one of the nicest guys you would ever want to meet, but that he was a little indecisive about what he wanted done. He stated that FULLER never spoke harshly to anyone, and would not hurt anyone's feelings, even when he probably should have. He stated that he never saw or heard of FULLER harassing or intimidating Chan Van VO or anyone else in the section.

NEWTON stated that he never had any occasion to write-up a non-conformance report (NCR) at Shearon Harris, but that he felt perfectly free to write one if he felt it was necessary. He stated that he was never told that he had to try to get a non-conforming condition resolved at a lower level prior to writing a NCR.

B11/14

NEWTON stated that he always got feedback on any suggestions that he made for improving the systems whether they were used or not. He stated that if his suggestions were not utilized, the feedback usually was that "we don't do that in our program."

NEWTON stated that he had some questions about Char Van VO's engineering competence, mainly from his design review of some of Van VO's work. He stated that Van VO asked a lot of "stupid" questions.

NEWTON stated that no one had ever told him that he had to discuss any internal problems with CP&L people before he went to the NRC resident. He stated however that he probably would discuss problems internally first, and that it had to be a pretty serious problem to go to the NRC over CP&L's head.

This Results of Interview was prepared on February 25, 1985.

Larry L. Robinson

Larry L. Robinson, Investigator

RESULTS OF INTERVIEW WITH JAMES P. JOHNSON ON
FEBRUARY 20, 1985, AS PREPARED BY INVESTIGATOR
LARRY L. ROBINSON

On February 20, 1985, James P. JOHNSON, Engineer, Tompkins and Beckwith Company, was interviewed by NRC Investigator Larry L. Robinson on site at the Carolina Power and Light Company's (CP&L) Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant.

The nature of the interview was explained to JOHNSON as pertaining to his knowledge of any facts and circumstances regarding allegations of harassment and intimidation of Chan Van VO by his former CP&L supervision.

JOHNSON stated that he has been employed at Tompkins and Beckwith since October 1981, and that he has been at Shearon Harris since May 23, 1983. He stated that prior to this he worked in the engineering office at the Farley plant from 1973-1976, and at the Bellefonte plant in 1979. He stated that after about one month at Shearon Harris site, he went into system engineering under Alex FULLER's supervision.

JOHNSON stated that he only knew Chan Van VO from a professional basis. He stated that he had no personal conversations with Van VO, and that Van VO never complained to him about being harassed or intimidated.

JOHNSON stated that Van VO was always asking questions and making comments in the group meetings. He said that in his opinion, Van VO had a little bit of an attitude problem. He stated that some of the questioning by Van VO were legitimate but that some of the questions appeared to be just testing FULLER's knowledge.

JOHNSON stated that he never saw FULLER lose his temper with Van VO or anyone else in the section. He stated that he (JOHNSON) usually went to Paul HOWARD or Rick FICHERA with any of his engineering problems, but that if he did have to go to FULLER, FULLER was helpful and would go in-depth in researching the problem with him. JOHNSON stated that both HOWARD and FULLER were responsive to Van VO's questions.

JOHNSON stated that no one ever told him whether he could or could not write up a non-conformance report (NCR) if he wanted to. He stated that he never had an occasion to do it, so he is not sure as to whether it would have been a problem.

JOHNSON advised that at the time, he had no indication that FULLER would ever stonewall, or block any safety concerns that were brought to him by Van VO, or anyone in the section. JOHNSON stated that he had heard since that time, through reading the paper and through the rumor mill, that Van VO wrote some letters to FULLER that FULLER had just thrown in the trash can. He stated that he had no knowledge of the content of these rumored letters.

JOHNSON stated that he had seen no indication of FULLER harassing or intimidating Van VO. He also advised that FULLER never harassed or intimidated him.

B11/15

EXHIBIT (VS)
Page 1 of 2 Pages

JOHNSON stated that FULLER was consistent in his management of everyone in the group. He advised that if anything, FULLER was kind of relaxed on the length of lunch period that he allowed his people to take, and also permitted people taking off a little bit early and coming in late. JOHNSON stated that he was not in contact with Van VO enough to say whether or not Van VO intentionally made himself an irritant to FULLER.

JOHNSON stated that some of the other men in the section did not really care for Van VO, giving the example of Charlie GERMANY and William HARTLEY.

JOHNSON advised that Van VO was generally competent, but would sometimes come up with some inadequate engineering decisions. JOHNSON did not specify any of these inadequate decisions.

This Results of Interview was prepared on February 25, 1985.

Larry L. Robinson

Larry L. Robinson, Investigator

RESULTS OF INTERVIEW WITH GARY ALLEN POLLARD ON
FEBRUARY 20, 1985, AS PREPARED BY INVESTIGATOR
LARRY L. ROBINSON

On February 20, 1985, Gary Allen POLLARD, Hanger Engineer, Carolina Power and Light Company (CP&L), was interviewed by NRC Investigator Larry L. Robinson on site at the Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant.

The nature of the interview was explained to POLLARD as pertaining to his knowledge of any facts and circumstances regarding allegations of harassment and intimidation of Chan Van VO by his former CP&L supervision.

POLLARD stated that he has been employed by CP&L since June 20, 1983. He stated that prior to that time, he was a co-op student with CP&L for one year and four months, while he was attending school at North Carolina State. He stated that he has no prior nuclear construction experience.

POLLARD advised that he knew Chan Van VO since he was doing co-op work with CP&L. He stated at that time Van VO was in the piping section. He advised that Van VO was transferred from piping to hangers while POLLARD was still in his co-op status.

POLLARD advised that at the time, Van VO was going to school in Fayetteville, NC. He stated that Van VO would occasionally call him over and ask him about integrals or pump problems. He stated that Van VO showed him some copies of some type of educational degrees from schools in France or Vietnam.

POLLARD stated that Van VO never complained to him about being harassed or intimidated by Alex FULLER.

POLLARD advised that in his opinion, Van VO thought that he (Van VO) was more qualified than the position in which he was working. POLLARD stated that he never got the impression that Van VO was testing FULLER by asking questions to determine FULLER's competence. He stated that Van VO was not trying to be a "thorn in the side" of FULLER.

POLLARD stated that FULLER was openly receptive to suggestions, always responsive, and had a good attitude toward discussing any problems that were brought to him.

POLLARD stated that no one at Shearon Harris had never told him that he could not write a non-conformance report (NCR), or that he had to "run it by supervision" before he wrote it. POLLARD stated that as a matter of fact, he had recently written an NCR without "running it by anyone."

POLLARD stated that he has never had any conversation with anyone about not taking any problems to the NRC Resident Inspector without checking with CP&L supervision first. He advised that he feels that he could go to the NRC without any management repercussions.

B 11/16

POLLARD stated that FULLER treated all of his engineers alike, singling out no favorites or non-favorites. He stated that Van VO kind of kept to himself before he was terminated. He stated that Van VO was in the turbine building and he (POLLARD) was in the auxiliary building. He stated that most of his contact with Van VO was when he (POLLARD) was co-oping.

POLLARD stated that he did not feel that he was qualified to judge the competence of Van VO's engineering work. He stated that he was not really aware of any problem situation between Van VO and FULLER.

POLLARD stated that he never saw any indication of any harassment or intimidation of Van VO by FULLER, or any indication of FULLER blocking any safety concerns that were brought to him by Van VO.

This Results of Interview was prepared on February 25, 1985.

Larry L. Robinson

Larry L. Robinson, Investigator

RESULTS OF INTERVIEW WITH JOHNNY JACKSON ON
FEBRUARY 20, 1985, AS PREPARED BY INVESTIGATOR
LARRY L. ROBINSON

On February 20, 1985, Johnny JACKSON, Hanger Engineer, Daniels Construction Company, was interviewed by NRC Investigator Larry L. Robinson on site at the Carolina Power and Light Company's (CP&L) Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant.

The nature of the interview was explained to JACKSON as pertaining to his knowledge of any facts and circumstances regarding allegations of harassment and intimidation of Chan Van VO by his former CP&L supervision.

JACKSON stated that he has been employed by Daniels Construction Company since March 1982, having come to the Shearon Harris site at the same time. He stated that he worked at the Brunswick plant for about a year and a half to two years for A&M Company of Wilmington, NC.

JACKSON stated that most of his contact with Van VO was strictly on a professional basis, but he remembered Van VO talking to him about his children in Vietnam on one occasion.

JACKSON stated that he heard Van VO make a comment about wanting a transfer out of the hanger section, but that he could not get out. JACKSON advised that his desk was near Van VO's desk, and some personnel man came down and talked to Van VO one day about the transfer problem.

JACKSON stated that he never saw or heard Alex FULLER harass or intimidate Van VO. He stated, as a matter of fact on one occasion, he saw FULLER spend approximately 45 minutes with Van VO discussing a hanger problem. He stated it was a normal discussion, just like FULLER would have had with him (JACKSON).

JACKSON stated that he had never had any problem with FULLER, and that FULLER had been his immediate supervisor for two years. He advised that he never had any problem with Van VO, and he never saw or heard Van VO trying to make FULLER look bad.

JACKSON stated that FULLER's management style was fine. He stated that he was a "company man," serious, but friendly. JACKSON stated that he never felt harassed or intimidated, and that he felt FULLER was fair and thorough in his performance evaluation of JACKSON.

JACKSON stated that he always felt that he could initiate a formal non-conformance report (NCR) if he wanted to. He stated that no one had ever told him that he had to do a speed letter, or talk to someone about it before he wrote up an NCR.

JACKSON advised that he has always felt that he could go to the NRC with a problem if he wanted to, but that on his own he would probably run it by his immediate supervision before he did go to the NRC.

B11/17

This Results of Interview was prepared on February 25, 1985.

Larry L. Robinson

Larry L. Robinson, Investigator

RESULTS OF INTERVIEW WITH
AS PREPARED BY INVESTIGATOR
LARRY L. ROBINSON

was interviewed by NRC Investigator Larry L. Robinson on site at the Carolina Power and Light Company's (CP&L) Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant.

The nature of the interview was explained to as pertaining to his knowledge of any facts and circumstances regarding allegations of harassment and intimidation of Chan Van VO by his former CP&L supervision.

stated that he had only a professional relationship with Chan Van VO and no personal relationship.

stated that about a month before he was terminated, Van VO told him that he (Van VO) had gone to Alex FULLER with safety concerns and was turned back. He stated that Van VO indicated that there was no harassment and intimidation involved, just that FULLER would not listen to his safety concerns. could not specify the nature of these safety concerns.

stated that he always felt that if he wanted to write a non-conformance report on a non-conforming condition at the Shearon Harris Plant, he could have. He stated that he never had an occasion to do so, but that no one at Shearon Harris had ever told him that he could not write a non-conformance report.

also stated that no one at Shearon Harris ever told him that he had to discuss any problems that he discovered with CP&L supervision prior to going to the NRC with the problem. He stated that the situation never occurred.

stated that Van VO asked a lot of questions at the group engineer meetings that were conducted by FULLER. He stated that maybe the reason that there was some confusion over these questions was because of the language barrier, and that he did not feel that Van VO was testing FULLER's competence by asking these questions.

stated that he has never seen or heard of FULLER harassing or intimidating Van VO. He stated that he has never seen FULLER lose his temper with anyone. stated, however, that FULLER does "talk down" to his people, as if they were third graders.

B11/18

EXHIBIT (12)
Page 1 of 2 Pages

stated that FULLER was consistent in his management approach to all of the engineers. He stated that he had no favorites or non-favorites. He stated that FULLER listens to suggestions and gives feedback, but that it usually boils down to doing it the way FULLER wants it done.

in closing, stated that if anything, Van VO was just like all the other orientals that he knew. They were proud and did not like to be talked down to.

This Results of Interview was prepared on February 25, 1985.

Larry L. Robinson

Larry L. Robinson, Investigator

(Original to source of information, one to Relief Right Copy of Our Audit Whole

DO NOT DISCLOSE
Contains Identity of
Confidential Source

I have information that I wish to provide in confidence to the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). I request an express pledge of confidentiality as a condition of providing this information to the NRC. I will not provide this information voluntarily to the NRC without such confidentiality being extended to me.

It is my understanding, consistent with its legal obligations, the NRC, by agreeing to this confidentiality, will adhere to the following conditions:

(1) The NRC will not identify me by name or personal identifier in any NRC initiated document, conversation, or communication released to the public which relates directly to the information provided by me. I understand the term "public release" to encompass any distribution outside of the NRC with the exception of other public agencies which may require this information in futherance of their responsibilities under law or public trust.

(2) The NRC will disclose my identity within the NRC only to the extent required for the conduct of NRC related activities.

(3) During the course of the inquiry or investigation the NRC will also make every effort consistent with the investigative needs of the Commission to avoid actions which would clearly be expected to result in the disclosure of my identity to persons subsequently contacted by the NRC. At a later stage I understand that even though the NRC will make every reasonable effort to protect my identity, my identification could be compelled by orders or subpoenas issued by courts of law, hearing boards, or similar legal entities. In such cases, the basis for granting this promise of confidentiality and any other relevant facts will be communicated to the authority ordering the disclosure in an effort to maintain my confidentiality. If this effort proves unsuccessful, a representative of the NRC will attempt to inform me of any such action before disclosing my identity.

I also understand that the NRC will consider me to have waived my right to confidentiality if I take any action that may be reasonably expected to disclose my identity. I further understand that the NRC will consider me to have waived my rights to confidentiality if I provide (or have previously provided) information to any other party that contradicts the information that I provided to the NRC or if circumstances indicate that I am intentionally providing false information to the NRC.

Other Conditions: (if any)

I have read and fully understand the contents of this agreement. I agree with its provisions.

DO NOT DISCLOSE
Contains Identity of
Confidential Source

DATE

AGREED TO ON BEHALF OF THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Investigator Office of Inspection

RESULTS OF INTERVIEW WITH WILLIAM C. HARTLEY ON
FEBRUARY 21, 1985, AS PREPARED BY INVESTIGATOR
LARRY L. ROBINSON

On February 21, 1985, William C. HARTLEY, Hanger Engineer, Carolina Power and Light Company (CP&L), was interviewed by NRC Investigator Larry L. Robinson on site at the Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant.

The nature of the interview was explained to HARTLEY as pertaining to his knowledge of any facts and circumstances regarding allegations of harassment and intimidation of Chan Van VO by his former CP&L supervision.

HARTLEY stated that he has been employed by CP&L since July 23, 1979. He advised that he spent three weeks at CP&L headquarters in Raleigh, NC and three months working at the Brunswick site in Southport before he came on site at Shearon Harris. He advised that he graduated from Virginia Western Community College in June 1979.

HARTLEY stated that when he came to the Shearon Harris plant, Van VO was working for a man named Ed McLEAN. He stated that at that time there were only about seven people in the section. HARTLEY advised that McLEAN had a definite language problem with Van VO. He advised that he worked with Van VO in the piping section and not only did Van VO have language problems with people in the section, but Van VO's pipe modifications were not working.

HARTLEY stated that after McLEAN left, Ed WILLETT became the manager of both the piping and hanger sections. He stated that at some point in time after WILLETT came, Van VO transferred from piping to hangers because of the problems Van VO was having in the piping section. HARTLEY stated that Alex FULLER was the lead in the hanger section when Van VO was transferred.

HARTLEY stated that he remembered, at the first group meeting after Van VO was transferred, that Van VO made a definite effort to try to impress everyone at the meeting with how much he knew.

HARTLEY advised that Chase THOMAS transferred from hangers to piping when Van VO came from piping to hangers. He stated that THOMAS was supposed to teach Van VO about hangers, but THOMAS gave up because Van VO would not let THOMAS fully explain anything to him.

HARTLEY stated that Van VO was always doing irrelevent calculations to try to solve simple engineering problems.

HARTLEY advised that he has never seen FULLER harass or intimidate Van VO or anyone else. He stated, to the contrary, that Van VO would make mistakes in calculations, but FULLER would not correct or discipline him. He stated that he felt that Van VO got away with a lot of mistakes because he was a minority.

HARTLEY stated that Van VO was always talking about being a Major in the Vietnamese army, owning two Mercedes automobiles, owning a construction company, and being a very wealthy man in Vietnam. HARTLEY advised that

B11/19

EXHIBIT (A)
Page 1 of 3 Pages

Van VO always was of the opinion that he (Van VO) should be in charge of the operation.

HARTLEY advised that about a year after he knew Van VO, Van VO started to "go off the deep end," and really started to think he should take over. He stated that Van VO was always working on some kind of large scale plan during working hours instead of working on the hangers that he was supposed to be working on.

HARTLEY stated that FULLER was a hard worker, set a good example, and would never criticize individual employees in public. He advised that if FULLER was going to criticize or discipline anyone he would always call them privately into his office. He stated that FULLER was always fair in his dealings with people, and worked many overtime hours without being paid for them.

HARTLEY added that FULLER did not have a hard-line attitude. He stated that he was friendly, and receptive to suggestions. He advised that an example of this was FULLER's initiation of a "hanger of the week" program. HARTLEY stated that the bottom line was that FULLER was a hard worker, and just wanted everyone else to work as hard as he did.

HARTLEY stated that he has never heard of Van VO bringing any safety concerns to FULLER, and FULLER "stonewalling," or blocking these concerns from going any further.

HARTLEY stated that approximately six to nine months ago a procedure entitled "QCA-3" was issued, and it stated that anyone could write a non-conformance report (NCR). He stated that back when WILLETT was in charge of piping and hangers, his verbal instructions were contact a QA man if you felt NCR needed to be written, and have QA write up the report.

HARTLEY stated that no one has ever told him that it was mandatory to contact CP&L management and discuss any type of problem prior to contacting the NRC about it. He stated, however that when WILLETT was in charge, he told him (HARTLEY) that if he talked to the NRC, of if the NRC talked to him, he should brief CP&L's management about the discussion.

HARTLEY stated that the situation with respect to Van VO was not really as it was pictured in the media around the Raleigh area. He stated that the Van VO case was a "classic case" of a disgruntled employee causing problems.

HARTLEY stated that years before Van VO was terminated, Van VO would say things like "if they (CP&L) ever fire me, I'll sue them."

HARTLEY stated that Van VO was always "bad mouthing" FULLER, WILLETT, and anyone else that graduated from North Carolina State. He advised that Van VO used to quiz new North Carolina State graduates on engineering flow problems.

HARTLEY stated that he thinks about the time that Van VO got into the shoving incident with Charlie GERMANY was the time Van VO went on probation. He stated that he did not know definitely if that incident

was definitely related to Van VO's probation, but that it probably had something to do with it. HARTLEY stated he remembered that during that confrontation between GERMANY and Van VO, Van VO made a statement like "I engineer, you pipefitter."

This Results of Interview was prepared on February 25, 1985.

Larry L. Robinson

Larry L. Robinson, Investigator

RESULTS OF INTERVIEW WITH JERRY DEDGE LEE ON
FEBRUARY 21, 1985, AS PREPARED BY INVESTIGATOR
LARRY L. ROBINSON

On February 21, 1985, Jerry Dedge LEE, Hanger Engineering Supervisor, Daniels Construction Company, was interviewed by NRC Investigator Larry L. Robinson on site at the Carolina Power and Light Company's (CP&L) Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant.

The nature of the interview was explained to LEE as pertaining to his knowledge of any facts and circumstances regarding allegations of harassment and intimidation of Chan Van VO by his former CP&L supervision.

LEE stated that he has been employed by Daniels Construction Company for a total of 16 years. He stated that he first came on site at Shearon Harris on April 15, 1984. LEE stated that he has eight years nuclear construction experience.

LEE stated that he never knew a man name Chan Van VO, as he (LEE) had come on board at the Harris site after Van VO had left.

LEE stated that he had been at the Harris site about six weeks when Alex FULLER initiated at "shape up or ship out program." LEE advised that FULLER asked him to pick three men from the section that were the poorest performers of the group and give these names to FULLER. LEE stated that he did not feel that he had been there long enough to make this choice and that FULLER would have to make the choice. LEE stated that at that time there were about seven or eight people in the hanger section. He stated that there were three in whip restraints, and four or five hanger systems engineers.

LEE advised that the three names that FULLER finally chose were Bruce DEESE, Buddy WEST and Jim FAIRRIS.

LEE advised that when FULLER called DEESE into his office and counselled him about his performance, he talked about DEESE needing to do more inspections and having a better knowledge of procedures. LEE stated that Jim JOHNSON, who was DEESE's supervisor before LEE became his supervisor, was the one that gave FULLER some of the negative aspects about the performance of DEESE. He stated that he did not really know whether JOHNSON really had any problems with DEESE's performance or not.

LEE stated that he thought that FULLER had received orders from his management to initiate this "shape up or ship out program" but that FULLER did not seem to be reluctant about carrying out the program. He seem to be doing it willingly. LEE stated that WEST was a little more verbal about making suggestions on how to improve the operations in the section, so he talked FULLER out of including FAIRRIS in the program and "substituted" WEST for FAIRRIS.

LEE stated that he talked to other people at CP&L in other divisions and, to his knowledge no one else was doing this "shape up or ship out program."

B11/20

EXHIBIT (20)
Page 1 of 2 Pages

LEE stated that he felt that FULLER was sincerely trying to be a good manager but that he was inexperienced and blindly following the company line. He stated that FULLER was not very receptive to suggestions.

LEE cited one instance where CP&L needed some overtime hours but were only going to pay people for a 40 hour week, and FULLER made sure that everyone in the section understood that they were still going to work their 50 to 58 hours a week, but that CP&L was only going to pay for 40 hours during that period.

LEE stated that he held his own nuclear safety meetings with his people, and FULLER was not even aware that LEE was holding these meetings, or that the meetings were even required. He stated that experienced workers handle nuclear safety "in spite of" FULLER.

LEE stated that he felt that if CP&L and FULLER find out that he (LEE) had provided this information to the NRC, that they would probably take retribution against him. He stated, however, that he gave this information freely and with no malice intended.

In closing, LEE stated that he felt that FULLER was sincerely trying his best to do his job for CP&L at Shearon Harris.

This Results of Interview was prepared on February 25, 1985.

Larry L. Robinson

Larry L. Robinson, Investigator

EXHIBIT (2)
PAGE 2 of 2 PAGES

RESULTS OF INTERVIEW WITH ALEXANDER GRAHAM FULLER
ON FEBRUARY 21, 1985, AS PREPARED BY INVESTIGATOR
LARRY L. ROBINSON

On February 21, 1985, Alexander Graham FULLER, Principal Engineer, Carolina Power and Light Company (CP&L), was interviewed by NRC Investigator Larry L. Robinson on site at the Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant.

The nature of the interview was explained to FULLER as pertaining to his knowledge of any facts and circumstances regarding allegations of harassment and intimidation of Chan Van VO by him (FULLER), or any of Van VO's former supervisors at CP&L.

FULLER stated that he was employed by CP&L on May 29, 1973, and that he has been at the Harris site since that date. He stated that he had no prior nuclear experience, and that he came directly to CP&L from graduation at North Carolina State University with a Civil Engineering Degree.

FULLER stated that about February 1981, he was in charge of the construction engineering group, specifically the pipe hanger section, under the supervision of Ed WILLETT. FULLER stated that he came to the construction engineering group having worked at the Shearon Harris Reservoir.

FULLER stated that in about April 1982, Chan Van VO transferred into the hanger section from the piping section. FULLER stated that at that time WILLETT told him that Van VO had had some problems in piping. He advised that WILLETT did not specify these problems to him.

FULLER stated that initially he assigned a man that he did not further identify, to work with Van VO in handling Van VO's transition from piping to hangers. FULLER stated that Van VO told him that he was ready to accept the responsibility in the hanger section right away without any transition, but FULLER kept this other individual with him for a while, and then let Van VO go on his own.

FULLER stated that initially Van VO was a "go getter," but as the months went by certain things did not "ring true" about Van VO's performance. FULLER stated that he initially passed these things off as normal problems that would come up when an individual was transferred to a new section and also due to Van VO's language difficulty.

FULLER stated that in October 1982, he prepared a rating on Van VO and rated him competent. He stated that he did not recall that Van VO had any problem with that rating. He stated that he discussed it with Van VO, and he did not recall Van VO having any objections to the competent rating. FULLER stated that during these first six months from April to October 1982, as he said before, certain things did not "ring true," but that there were no specific items that he could pinpoint to give Van VO a less than competent rating at that time.

B11/21

EXHIBIT (21)
Page 1 of 3 Pages

FULLER stated that when formal counselling was initiated on Van VO on March 11, 1983, the five areas in which Van VO's performance were indicated to be less than acceptable had all exhibited themselves within a two week period just prior to this formal counselling. He stated that he was initially willing to give Van VO the benefit of the doubt with respect to areas in engineering judgment, but that in the March 1983 time frame he realized that it was time to formally counsel Van VO on his performance.

FULLER stated that in August 1983, approximately five months after he had initiated formal counselling with Van VO, FULLER put Van VO on a pipe hanger surveillance project. He stated that as a result of this project, Van VO brought him some problems, which included the use of an apparently voided purchase order number to purchase steel. FULLER stated that he remembered that Wayne HARRIS, who had been his (FULLER's) predecessor as the leadman in the hanger section, was a very meticulous man and if he would have used Purchase Order No. 21022 to order steel, he would have logged it in a separate logbook maintained there in the office. FULLER stated that he told Van VO to check that book. He advised that Van VO checked with accounting and purchasing and found that Purchase Order No. 21022 had been voided, but that he never really resolved the discrepancy in the purchase order. FULLER stated that he wanted to double check the use of this purchase order number before he actually wrote a non-conformance report (NCR) on it, so he had Rick FICHERA, who was also a very meticulous individual, check on the reportability on the misuse of the purchase order number. He stated that FICHERA actually found the fact that Purchase Order No. 21022 was used as a substitution for the actual purchase order used by purchasing to buy the steel.

FULLER stated that on August 15, 1984, he had a meeting with Van VO to advise him that he was not going to be able to put him on the second shift. During the course of this meeting he (FULLER) mentioned that he had had FICHERA research the three problems that Van VO had brought to him as a result of the hanger surveillance, and that FICHERA had found different resolutions on these problems, and that they were not reportable items. He stated that Van VO became very upset at this.

FULLER stated that he never told Van VO that he had to clear any subject with FULLER before going to the NRC. FULLER stated that Van VO probably misinterpretated the memoranda that stated that CP&L wanted to be advised of the nature of any contact between their employees and the NRC.

FULLER stated that in 1981, it was not site procedure for anyone except CI or QC inspectors to write-up NCR's. He stated that obviously at present, anyone on site could write NCR's.

FULLER stated that at no time has he ever harassed or intimidated Van VO and that at not time has he ever disregarded or ignored any type of concern that Van VO has brought to him. He stated that he does not recall Van VO ever bringing a true nuclear safety related concern to him during Van VO's employment under FULLER's supervision. FULLER stated that regarding VO's construction concerns Van VO may have interpreted any apparent inaction on FULLER's part improperly, because he (FULLER) may have been aware of corrective actions already in process, which Van VO may not have been aware of.

FULLER advised around June 1984, Ed WILLETT supervisor, Al RAGER, told him (FULLER) and some other section heads, namely Paul HOWARD and Bob SISSON, to select some of their weaker performers because there was about to be a lay-off of employees.

FULLER stated that he gave a list to RAGER that included the names of Ferrell GASS, Duc NUYGEN, Buddy WEST, Bruce DEESE and Jim FAIRRIS. FULLER stated that HOWARD and SISSON also gave RAGER their list

FULLER stated that as he recalled GASS was the only individual on that list of five names that was actually laid off. He stated that GASS worked for Tompkins and Beckwith. He stated that NUYGEN was moved to the second shift, and WEST and DEESE were both counseled.

FULLER stated that he would have counseled DEESE about his performance items at review time anyway, but he would not put the 30 day deadline on improvement.

FULLER advised that he did not really think that anything would happen in 30 days to the men that he was counseling, but he could not really tell the people that he was counseling that fact.

FULLER stated that he thinks he remember that a fellow by the name of KIRBY was the man that actually got laid off that was on SISSON's list. He stated that he did not know if either SISSON or HOWARD did their counselling as they were instructed to do.

FULLER stated that he has no knowledge of any routine, or intentional, discarding of past inspection documents that had been superceded with an inspection under a revised inspection procedure.

FULLER stated that he wanted to make sure that the NRC understood that CP&L was very concerned about nuclear safety and quality.

This Results of Interview was prepared on February 25, 1985.

Larry L. Robinson

Larry L. Robinson, Investigator

RESULTS OF INTERVIEW WITH EDWIN EUGENE WILLETT ON
FEBRUARY 22, 1985, AS PREPARED BY INVESTIGATOR
LARRY L. ROBINSON

On February 22, 1985, Edwin E. WILLETT, Manager of Piping and Instrumentation, Carolina Power and Light Company (CP&L), was interviewed by NRC Investigator Larry L. Robinson on site at the Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant.

The nature of the interview was explained to WILLETT as pertaining to his knowledge of any facts and circumstances regarding allegations of harassment and intimidation of Chan Van VO by WILLETT, Alex FULLER, or any of Van VO's former CP&L supervisors.

WILLETT stated that he was employed by CP&L in September 1973. He stated that he has 14 years prior nuclear experience at Newport News Ship Building as a piping draftsman and in the nuclear Navy Ship Building program. WILLETT stated that in May 1980, he came into the piping section at CP&L as a second level supervisor over FULLER and Steve FRESHWATER.

WILLETT stated that he was initially very positive about Van VO, who was working under him in piping. He stated that because of Van VO's age, experience, and maturity, he thought about grooming him for a "lead" job.

WILLETT stated that he observed a confrontation between Van VO and FRESHWATER in which Van VO became very emotional and the confrontation boiled down to some physical contact in the form of pushing. He stated that he knew that Van VO had a lot on his mind from a personal standpoint about relatives in Vietnam, because he had seen two or three letters from Van VO's homeland that were very emotional. He stated that he did not recall specifically what the confrontation was about.

WILLETT stated that because of this conflict between Van VO and FRESHWATER he decided that he would put Van VO in the hanger section under FULLER, whom WILLETT thought was a better supervisor. He stated that he took a walk with Van VO and explained why he was transferring him, and that Van VO accepted this reason fairly well.

WILLETT stated that the only professional performance factor that entered into his decision about transferring Van VO to the hanger section was that when Van VO was working in the waste processing area, there was a terrific backlog of problems that needed to be solved and Van VO would not admit that he had this large backlog. WILLETT stated that Van VO kept denying that there was a backlog of problems in waste processing. WILLETT advised that other than this, there was no "quality of work" factor that played a part in this transfer decision.

WILLETT advised that in April 1982, immediately after the transfer of Van VO from piping to hangers, he (WILLETT) got some feedback from FULLER that Van VO was having difficulty scoping his work. WILLETT advised that FULLER told him that Van VO was also having difficulty and managing his job.

B11/22

EXHIBIT (24)
Page 1 of 3 Pages

WILLETT advised, however, that in October 1982 he and FULLER went ahead and promoted Van VO to engineer. He stated that at that time he was not personally aware of any specific quality problems in Van VO's performance in hangers. He stated that engineering aides that have achieved a competent performance evaluation can be promoted to engineers.

WILLETT stated that as time went by FULLER became more and more doubtful about Van VO's performance, and WILLETT told FULLER that they needed to "rescue" Van VO. He stated that he told FULLER to go ahead and do a performance appraisal on Van VO at that time, which was six months prior to the scheduled October 1983 potential salary action date. He stated that he and FULLER had a discussion with Van VO and pointed out five areas in which they thought he could improve his performance. WILLETT advised that Van VO did not accept their evaluation of his performance.

WILLETT stated that at this point in time, around March or April 1983, he was trying to tell Van VO that he had a chance to improve himself before the official salary action time in October 1983, and that was why they were having this early performance discussion. WILLETT stated that Van VO refused to accept this evaluation and they reached a "impasse." WILLETT stated that Van VO was not accepting that he had a performance problem, and WILLETT decided that he had to escalate the improvement plan into formal probation.

WILLETT stated that he has no knowledge of Van VO ever bringing any safety problem to FULLER that was not fully explored. WILLETT stated that he does not recall Van VO ever coming to him with a true nuclear safety related problem.

WILLETT stated that he wanted to emphasize that CP&L is very concerned about quality and safety at Shearon Harris, giving the example of the "hanger of the week" program.

WILLETT stated that he has never seen FULLER harass or intimidate anyone, much less Chan Van VO.

WILLETT stated, with regard to Van VO's accusations of his denying Van VO's transfer request, that Van VO and Ed McLEAN were friends, and Van VO came to WILLETT several times saying that all the problems would be over if WILLETT would simply transfer Van VO to McLEAN in the Equipment/HVAC section. WILLETT stated that they needed Van VO in hangers, and WILLETT also did not think that Van VO's "friend" McLEAN would objectively supervise Van VO. He stated that he received no request from any other areas for Van VO to be transferred.

With respect to Van VO's educational discrimination allegations, WILLETT stated that Van VO wanted to attend California Coast University. WILLETT stated that he found out that it was not an accredited university. WILLETT suggested that Van VO attend Duke University. He stated that Van VO told him that it was too expensive. He stated that he advised Van VO that CP&L would sponsor him at Duke University, and yet Van VO decided not to attend Duke.

EXHIBIT (22)
PAGE 2 OF 3 PAGES

WILLETT reiterated that CP&L management is very concerned about safety. He stated that the organization of the hanger surveillance team in which Van VO participated was a quality action in itself. And finally, that Van VO's allegations of CP&L not being concerned for safety were totally unfounded.

WILLETT advised that in June 1984, his supervisor, Peter FOSCOLO, told he and Al RAGGER that he (FOSCOLO) needed list of names for lay-offs. WILLETT advised that FOSCOLO said he needed five names. He advised that he had about 100 people in the Equipment, Piping and Instrumentation Division at the time. He stated that he thought he only laid off one of the five names on the list that he gave to FOSCOLO. He stated that the decision on who was going to be laid off was made based on who would hurt the organization the least by being laid off. He stated it was not a seniority type layoff, but was based strictly upon performance.

WILLETT stated that to get the list he went to his leads in Instrumentation, Piping and Equipment and asked for names. He advised that FOSCOLO said to counsel the people that were selected and tell them that they had 30 days in which to improve.

This Results of Interview was prepared on February 25, 1985.

Larry L. Robinson, Investigator

EXHIBIT (2-3)
Page 2 of 2 Pages