

PLACE: Houston, TXDATE: 7-10-82DOCKETED
USNRC

I, Cecil G. Roach, hereby make the following voluntary statement to Mr. D. D. Driskill, who has identified himself to me as an Investigator with the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. I make this statement freely with no threats or promises of reward having been made to me.

I am currently employed as the Manager, Nuclear Licensing Department, Hamilton Lightning & Power Co (HLIP) and have been employed in this capacity since March 20, 1981.

I was apprised that the Quadrex review was underway and related to an assessment of the Brown & Root (B&R) Engineering and design efforts for the Sathu Texas Project (STP). My first direct association with the assessment was in about mid April 1981 when Quadrex presented an outline overview of their findings. During this session they were seeking direction concerning the format of their report. Their discussion of problem areas they had identified was not detailed.

Soon thereafter, during a discussion between Jerry Goldberg and I the topic of 50.55(e) reportability was discussed and it was decided that a timely review of the Quadrex Report would have to be performed upon its receipt to meet NRC requirements concerning such reportability.

8510290286 850807
PDR ADOCK 05000498
G PDR

REGULAR REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
STN 50-49801 (SMA) Ltr. W.
to the matter of
SMA
Applicant
Interview
Cont. Off
Cont. Off
Director
Recorder
DATE
DATE
RECEIVED
IDENTIFIED
8/2/65
✓
✓
TATE
WILSON

On about May 6, 1981 J. Goldberg sent a letter to B&R directing that they, upon receipt of the Quadrex Report, assess these findings with respect to reportability and provide us a results of their assessment, prior to noon May 8, 1981.

On May 7, 1981 Quadrex presented their report to H&P and B&R. I did not attend that meeting. I did attend an evening meeting with B&R where their various engineering disciplines presented their assessments and conclusions relative to reportability of the items identified as being most serious. They concluded that the HVAC design was the only area they would consider reportable. They transmitted their assessment to Mr Goldberg about noon, May 8, '81.

On May 8, '81 Jerry Goldberg, Jim Sumpter and I reviewed the most serious items in the report to make our own determination regarding their reportability. We identified two (?) additional areas that we considered not reportable criteria. On that afternoon the three items were reported ^{all} to R II.

In a timeframe which I believe was subsequent to the mid April briefing by Quadrex, I was present when Jerry Goldberg called Don Sells (WRP) and

~~CLP~~^{CLP} informed him we had had the review performed and that we expected a report soon. Sells was told that there was a good possibility that ~~7~~ some 50-55(2) reportable items would be reported as a result. I believe Sells asked if we intended to send him a copy of the report and Jerry responded saying we did not intend to distribute the report outside HLIP; however he (or NRC) would be welcome to review the report at HLIP.

Subsequent to HLIP's receipt of the report, Jerry Goldberg and I briefly discussed the advisability of dissemination of the report outside HLIP. It was concluded that the report language and characterizations could be easily misinterpreted. We knew, for example, that some of the problems identified in the present tense related to activities which were recognized and corrected previously. Also some of the Quadrex findings were based on opinions of Quadrex as to the best ways of performing engineering functions which we did not necessarily agree with. It was decided, due to these considerations, that our interests would not be served if the report were provided to NRC and it eventually became a public document, especially prior to a more complete assessment of the

findings. There was no discussion regarding providing the report to the ASLB. Mr Goldberg stated his intention to brief Don Sells regarding the Quadrex findings and there was no distinction made between notifying Sells in relation to NRC HQ or NRC RIV.

With regard to dissemination of the report, my next direct involvement came during August '81, when I received a telephone call from Dave Barker who advised that Shannon Phillips had requested a copy of the Quadrex Report from someone in our QA Dept. (either FRAZAR or GEIGER) and been told "no." I advised Mr Barker to make a copy of the report available to Mr Phillips at the site, with the understanding that the copy would be returned.

Based on my review of the Quadrex Report I have identified no other items, than those reported, which I believe meet the NRC criteria for reportability. With regard to those which were reported, I have seen a letter to B&R (dated in 1980) from Jeff Blau (H&P) which discussed the HVAC problem and which in my mind would have triggered 50.55(c) reportability considerations.

I have read over, understand and initialed
errors in the foregoing 4 page Statement.

I certify, under penalty of perjury, that the
foregoing statement is true and correct to the
best of my knowledge. Executed on 2-10-82.

Clair H. Ratterman

[Signature]

Executed before me on this 10th day of Feb., 1982
at Houston Tx.

Walter A. Kirkell