

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Quality Assurance Supervisor
Waterford III Nuclear Plant
P. O. BOX 782
Killona, LA 70066

RE: Harassment of Quality Control Inspector

On the above date, I was called for a heat number transfer on [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] On arrival, the craft wasn't ready for Quality Control
at [REDACTED] I was called for a fit-up inspection at same
location. Notified [REDACTED] that there was a problem with this
package and had to check out the drawings. Told foreman that I was going
to QC office to check our drawings out. Got a call from [REDACTED] on
radio to come to QC base. When I got there he stated that, "What the Heck
was I holding his job up for the last hour". I was at QC base [REDACTED]
The man started yelling at me concerning this job. I showed him the package
and told him it was very vague and not enough information. I'd back away from
him and Ralph Powers was trying to make end meet. The site [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] heard [REDACTED] verbally
say, "He was going to hang the son of a bitch" (myself). This has been going
on for the last couple of weeks. He would call us down, myself and [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] for inspection and the workers would never be ready. The workers
would say to us, "We told him [REDACTED] we weren't ready". He's rushing
the workers which in return brings out bad work. This is not the first time
I've had a problem with [REDACTED] The man has raised heck concerning
Procedural Problems and when you show him the problem, he still says we are
wrong. [REDACTED] apparently doesn't know the Procedures that the men in
the field are working to, yet he continues to tell his men, Don't worry about
QC, He'll take care of them when the time arises. Every day the man, I feel
continues to harass me while I'm doing my job. I feel there should be
something done know about this problem. The man has made comments to his
foreman concerning Procedure Reading List, not to worry about them, read 15
minutes, sleep 15 minutes. Foreman made this statement to both [REDACTED]
and myself.

8507130245 850502
PDR FOIA
BERNABE84-717 PDR

CC: [REDACTED]

E. MORRIS HOWARD, DIRECTOR REGION IV
OFFICE OF INSPECTION AND ENFORCEMENT
U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
611 RYAN PLAZA DRIVE, SUIT 1000
ARLINGTON, TEXAS 76012

TO: [REDACTED]

FROM: [REDACTED]

RE: Alleged Harassment of a Quality Control Inspector

REF: 1 [REDACTED]
2 USNRC IE Information Notice 81-22, Dated July 31, 1981

In response to your memo on the subject matter, I too am deeply concerned with this alleged incident of harassment.

This alleged incident was the subject of an impromptu meeting called by [REDACTED]

Allegations, denials and agreement between both persons ensued. To reduce any further expansion of the problem I requested that I be allowed time to verify the documentation deficiency allegation. At this point both [REDACTED] decided to immediately go to the field and check out the situation.

Today, [REDACTED] after my visiting the Control Station in the field, to verify the documentation problem, I received a type written copy of the alleged complaint of harassment signed by [REDACTED]

Soon thereafter I informed [REDACTED] that a meeting will be convened later in the day to discuss this alleged incident. The meeting convened at approximately [REDACTED] in my office with [REDACTED] and myself in attendance. Prior to the beginning of the meeting both [REDACTED] were cognizant of the contents of the type written signed allegation.

[REDACTED] was informed of the alleged harassment and handed said document to read and comment on. After reading the alleged complaint [REDACTED] denied all allegations without exception. [REDACTED] was informed by myself that I would be taking action in this matter today, but that I needed to listen to all other parties involved and/or cited in the alleged harassment. The meeting was adjourned until [REDACTED]

As you know I attended your meeting on the subject allegation and listened to all parties present, ie [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] All parties involved confirmed and affirmed the statements made in the allegation.

ATCH

(3)

B-3
-6-

At approximately [redacted] the persons in attendance at the [redacted] meeting together with [redacted] met in my office. Weighing the allegation and confirming oral statements coupled with the oral affirmations from the other parties involved, I took the action of relieving [redacted] from his present position, duties and involvement with [redacted] until further notice.

To resolve this allegation through to a satisfactory conclusion I wish to meet with yourself sometime on [redacted] to review a schedule for the dictation of depositions by all parties involved.

Attachment

cc: [redacted] (with attachment)
[redacted] (with attachment)
[redacted] (with attachment)
[redacted] (without attachment)
[redacted] (without attachment)

E. Morris Howard, Director Region IV Office of Inspection and Enforcement
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 1000
Arlington, TX 76012
(with attachment)

DATE:

TO:

FROM:

SUBJECT: USNRC IE INFORMATION NOTICE 81-22

The attached letter from [REDACTED] relates a situation that cannot be tolerated. The letter reports on an incident that causes me great concern.

Attitudes play a very important role in the functioning of inspection personnel on a Nuclear Power Plant Site, and if these people feel harassed or in any way threatened with job security or physical harm, it is their duty to report this to their supervisor. [REDACTED] letter reflects such an attitude.

I had a discussion with [REDACTED] today on this letter, during which he re-affirmed his written statements, as well as stating that he still feels harassed.

Interviews with the people [REDACTED] refers to in his letter resulted in confirmation from them as to what [REDACTED] reported. They all stated they would be willing to sign statements to this effect.

This situation cannot go unaddressed or unresolved. Any escalation of the type of attitude that [REDACTED] now has, or the attitude on the part of field supervision toward the Field QC Technicians will reflect in the ability for [REDACTED] to continue to implement an effective Quality Assurance Program at this jobsite.

Your attention to this matter is necessary without delay. Resolution must be reached and appropriate actions taken based on your investigation of the incident.

CC:

AUG 16 1981

E. Morris Howard, Director Region IV
Office of Inspection and Enforcement
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 1000
Arlington, Texas 76012

B-4
-7-

172

Attention:

Dear Sir:

The recent incident involving [redacted] is regretful by any standard of measure.

I, as the [redacted] have spoken to [redacted] prior to the incident and was impressed by his positive and aggressive attitude. With this in mind I expressed my concern to [redacted] regarding [redacted] qualifications, also prior to the incident. My concerns were based on the following:

- A - [redacted] has not worked at a Nuclear Site prior to Waterford III.
- B - [redacted] resume does not indicate he has experience in the field of instrumentation.
- C - [redacted] has not been exposed to the requirements of safety related installations.

It is not [redacted] intention to act as a judge or jury regarding the validity of the allegations toward [redacted].

It is [redacted] intention to meet our responsibility by responding to any and all occurrences that threaten the integrity of the Quality Program.

[redacted] response to the incident of subject was concluded to be in the best interests of the project, the client, [redacted].

We are confident that there are areas within the [redacted] organization where [redacted] valuable experience can be utilized while expanding his expertise in the Nuclear field.

[redacted] has reviewed the situation and is certain that the re-installation of [redacted] will have a disrupting effect within the organization and propagate the already

ATCH -8-

dangerous perception that [redacted] is not controlling their
Quality Program or field forces. For this reason we find [redacted]
unacceptable to the [redacted]

Sincerely,

[redacted]

10 Mar 83

was not employee

1. I responded in writing to [] in a memo.
2. []
3. agreed to send Memo to me plus all info about []

Ret

5

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Quality Assurance Supervisor
Waterford III Nuclear Plant
P. O. BOX 782
Killona, LA 70066

RE: Harassment of Quality Control Inspector

On the above date, I was called for a heat number transfer on [REDACTED]. On arrival, the craft wasn't ready for Quality Control at [REDACTED]. I was called for a fit-up inspection at same location. Notified [REDACTED] that there was a problem with this package and had to check out the drawings. Told foreman that I was going to QC office to check our drawings out. Got a call from [REDACTED] on radio to come to QC base. When I got there he stated that, "What the Heck was I holding his job up for the last hour". I was at QC base [REDACTED]. The man started yelling at me concerning this job. I showed him the package and told him it was very vague and not enough information. I'd back away from him and Ralph Powers was trying to make end meet. The site [REDACTED] heard [REDACTED] verbally say, "He was going to hang the son of a bitch" (myself). This has been going on for the last couple of weeks. He would call us down, myself and [REDACTED] for inspection and the workers would never be ready. The workers would say to us, "We told him [REDACTED] we weren't ready". He's rushing the workers which in return brings out bad work. This is not the first time I've had a problem with [REDACTED]. The man has raised heck concerning Procedural Problems and when you show him the problem, he still says we are wrong. [REDACTED] apparently doesn't know the Procedures that the men in the field are working to, yet he continues to tell his men, Don't worry about QC, He'll take care of them when the time arises. Every day the man, I feel continues to harass me while I'm doing my job. I feel there should be something done know about this problem. The man has made comments to his foreman concerning Procedure Reading List, not to worry about them, read 15 minutes, sleep 15 minutes. Foreman made this statement to both [REDACTED] and myself.

CC: [REDACTED]

E. MORRIS HOWARD, DIRECTOR REGION IV
OFFICE OF INSPECTION AND ENFORCEMENT
U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
611 RYAN PLAZA DRIVE, SUIT 1000
ARLINGTON, TEXAS 76012

-5-
B-2

TO: [REDACTED]

FROM: [REDACTED]

RE: Alleged Harassment of a Quality Control Inspector

REF: 1 [REDACTED]

2 USNRC IE Information Notice 81-22, Dated July 31, 1981

In response to your memo on the subject matter, I too am deeply concerned with this alleged incident of harassment.

This alleged incident was the subject of an impromptu meeting called by [REDACTED]

Allegations, denials and agreement between both persons ensued. To reduce any further expansion of the problem I requested that I be allowed time to verify the documentation deficiency allegation. At this point both [REDACTED] decided to immediately go to the field and check out the situation.

Today, [REDACTED] after my visiting the Control Station in the field, to verify the documentation problem, I received a type written copy of the alleged complaint of harassment signed by [REDACTED]

Soon thereafter I informed [REDACTED] that a meeting will be convened later in the day to discuss this alleged incident. The meeting convened at approximately [REDACTED] in my office with [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] and myself in attendance. Prior to the beginning of the meeting both [REDACTED] were cognizant of the contents of the type written signed allegation.

[REDACTED] was informed of the alleged harassment and handed said document to read and comment on. After reading the alleged complaint [REDACTED] denied all allegations without exception. [REDACTED] was informed by myself that I would be taking action in this matter today, but that I needed to listen to all other parties involved and/or cited in the alleged harassment. The meeting was adjourned until [REDACTED]

As you know I attended your meeting on the subject allegation and listened to all parties present, ie [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] All parties involved confirmed and affirmed the statements made in the allegation.

ATCH

(3)

B-3
-6-

At approximately [redacted] the persons in attendance at the [redacted] meeting together with [redacted] met in my office. Weighing the allegation and confirming oral statements coupled with the oral affirmations from the other parties involved, I took the action of relieving [redacted] from his present position, duties and involvement with [redacted] until further notice.

To resolve this allegation through to a satisfactory conclusion I wish to meet with yourself sometime on [redacted] to review a schedule for the dictation of depositions by all parties involved.

Attachment

cc: [redacted] (with attachment)
 [redacted] (with attachment)
 [redacted] (with attachment)
 [redacted] (without attachment)
 [redacted] (without attachment)

E. Morris Howard, Director Region IV Office of Inspection and Enforcement
 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 1000
 Arlington, TX 76012
 (with attachment)

DATE:

TO:

FROM:

SUBJECT: USNRC IE INFORMATION NOTICE 81-22

The attached letter from [REDACTED] relates a situation that cannot be tolerated. The letter reports on an incident that causes me great concern.

Attitudes play a very important role in the functioning of inspection personnel on a Nuclear Power Plant Site, and if these people feel harassed or in any way threatened with job security or physical harm, it is their duty to report this to their supervisor. [REDACTED] letter reflects such an attitude.

I had a discussion with [REDACTED] today on this letter, during which he re-affirmed his written statements, as well as stating that he still feels harassed.

Interviews with the people [REDACTED] refers to in his letter resulted in confirmation from them as to what [REDACTED] reported. They all stated they would be willing to sign statements to this effect.

This situation cannot go unaddressed or unresolved. Any escalation of the type of attitude that [REDACTED] now has, or the attitude on the part of field supervision toward the Field QC Technicians will reflect in the ability for [REDACTED] to continue to implement an effective Quality Assurance Program at this jobsite.

Your attention to this matter is necessary without delay. Resolution must be reached and appropriate actions taken based on your investigation of the incident.

CC:

AUG 16 1981

E. Morris Howard, Director Region IV
Office of Inspection and Enforcement
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 1000
Arlington, Texas 76012

B-4

-7-

172

Attention: [redacted]

Dear Sir:

The recent incident involving [redacted] is regretful by any standard of measure.

I, as the [redacted] have spoken to [redacted] prior to the incident and was impressed by his positive and aggressive attitude. With this in mind I expressed my concern to [redacted] regarding [redacted] qualifications, also prior to the incident. My concerns were based on the following:

- A - [redacted] has not worked at a Nuclear Site prior to Waterford III.
- B - [redacted] resume does not indicate he has experience in the field of instrumentation.
- C - [redacted] has not been exposed to the requirements of safety related installations.

It is not [redacted] intention to act as a judge or jury regarding the validity of the allegations toward [redacted].

It is [redacted] intention to meet our responsibility by responding to any and all occurrences that threaten the integrity of the Quality Program.

[redacted] response to the incident of subject was concluded to be in the best interests of the project, the client, [redacted]

We are confident that there are areas within the [redacted] organization where [redacted] valuable experience can be utilized while expanding his expertise in the Nuclear field.

[redacted] has reviewed the situation and is certain that the re-installation of [redacted] will have a disrupting effect within the organization and propagate the already [redacted]

ATCH -8-

dangerous perception that [REDACTED] is not controlling their
Quality Program or field forces. For this reason we find [REDACTED]
unacceptable to the [REDACTED]

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

SUBJECT: ALLEGED. HARASSMENT. OF. A QC. INSPECTOR

[
In keeping with your request (see Reference 3),
to the

] will not be reassigned

ATCH
(5) -9-
B-6

Rev.

27 June 83
1050

Rec. call from Clyde Mines -
said he received a telephone call this AM
from

[REDACTED] (CONF. REQUESTED)

HOME:
[REDACTED]

1. [REDACTED]

2. Had a number of Mercury employees
and

FISHBANE^{CH} & Moore employees
who worked at most 3 return.

3 These employees said they were
given an option by their employers
to

- A. EITHER SIGN OFF QA RECORDS or QUIT
- B. These men QUIT
- C.

4. [REDACTED]

B-7

-7-

Don,

Letter Dec. 201

No intimidation
or harassment

Said same
thing to NRC
resident

MEMORANDUM
OF CALL

Previous editions usable

TO:

Dick

☐ YOU WERE CALLED BY-

☐ YOU WERE VISITED BY-

OF

J

☐ PLEASE PHONE ▶

☐ FTS

☐ AUTOVON

☐ WILL CALL AGAIN

☐ IS WAITING TO SEE YOU

☐ RETURNED YOUR CALL

☐ WISHES AN APPOINTMENT

MESSAGE

did not work
for
May be moving

RECEIVED BY

DATE

TIME

MEMORANDUM
OF CALL

Previous editions usable

TO:

Dick or Don

☐ YOU WERE CALLED BY-

☐ YOU WERE VISITED BY-

OF (OR)

☐ PLEASE PHONE ▶

☐ FTS

☒ AUTOVON

☐ WILL CALL AGAIN

☐ IS WAITING TO SEE YOU

☐ RETURNED YOUR CALL

☐ WISHES AN APPOINTMENT

MESSAGE

RECEIVED BY

DATE

TIME

63-110 NSN 7540-00-634-4018
U.S. G.F.C. 1982-361-529/219

STANDARD FORM 63 (Rev. 8-81)
Prescribed by GSA
FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.6

Wat 3

>

>

kind me off

> hard to say one way/another

> hard to say whether harassment/intimidation

felt @ x was intimidated

looking bk now do question that

> couple things bothered me

> mgs (GA) left frag by hand 4

> Co didn't want to admit there were
major probs

⊕ heat #s in basiplates/angles

have diff # by it that time or dec

they wanted us to revise dec
to match new #

> no insp of new weld

aws
orig Dil. l.
were wanted
ASME
NF

was intimidated same Xs
never intimidated to extent I wrote
if something incorrectly

don't know whether it was pressure
to work

7 days x 12 hrs

12/7/82 memo

for Mr. C.A.

- we were told not to write MR's
- 1/2 inch ST tubing
- hard prob during hydro test
- none of it was documented
- we found 300' of it during walk-down
- they didn't want us to write MR's
on it

7 Mr. prob
gave contract to (MERC)

they never did it
an auditor found this
- re-work got screwed up
- drawings chg'd - things got into mess



OFFICE OF
INVESTIGATIONS

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555

2/6/93

no intimidation by
either employer



OFFICE OF
INVESTIGATIONS

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555

6-27-83

F & M Tech Svc
Mara

Fishbach & Moore (Mather Co)

⚡ () upset about the
way the people are treated
⚡

wed/thur next wk.

Waller:



- both -
sign NCR as leave

Envia Technical Svcs

7/22/83

(KIA Eng / formerly at Zimmer) - think went to N.C.
- CIA Der Review
had to sign papers at lit Gate

GA Eng - can tell you a lot more than I
(disconnected - info - nothing)
~~can~~ can tell you all about the probs
there

NOT WHAT?

said ab 30% of concrete in containment
bad...
was

schedule & assure performance of the
review audit results
told me he could tell me things would
make my hair stand up
was @
contact #

in de reviews @ wat 3 were

I've been in part of this business
since [redacted] started this Co in [redacted]
business poor

72223

job market poor is only reason Merc gets
along - they pay poorly

Merc

[redacted] nothing listed
Granbury/Caburne
- might now be at [redacted]
Field Workdown Insp Mech AC
quit because of the probs there
left this yr. [redacted]

Merc

[redacted] disconnected
Documentation Reviews
told me things aren't kasher down there
think [redacted] still working there

Merc

[redacted] - Phoenix Ariz
[redacted] R/B
AC Insp left because was dis

Merc

was there
last yr.

they demoted him

don't know what
there was

7-22-83

~~_____~~
~~_____~~ 7
now @ ~~_____~~
was a ~~_____~~ @ Merc

~~Nick BROEMMER 7809 Spruce St New Orleans LA~~
~~GC TUSA for Merc @ wal 3~~
~~was unhappy ab the way things~~
~~were being handled~~

~~_____~~
~~GC TUSA for Merc~~
GC Remover / GC ~~_____~~ ✓
no answer 10/10



if these guys will talk to you they
can tell you things you won't believe
there wasn't under gun to get built
" doesn't care / don't know

~~_____~~ (H) ~~_____~~
wrong #
no answer 10/10
wounded

①

7-22-XJ

i put [redacted] to work - [redacted] knows ab doc
being all messed up
can tell you a lot
worked many 20 hr days some 24

[redacted]

Ebasco oversee Merc
knows lot about - what is bad there
think [redacted] still there - don't know where

7-22-83

([redacted])
LPL
[redacted]
might talk

(disconnected)
(H)
(W)

([redacted]) called while I was there...
said he had probs w/ night

EDS
Tiff Dillman
was nearly all pers contracts @ [redacted]
think [redacted] gets kickbacks
for exclusive use of that Co.

C
7-22-83

I got 6-26-83 what prompted your getting in touch w/ me

[redacted] Doc Reviewer

[redacted] sent me resume
knew this false
when I saw

[redacted] got fired from Ebasco

[redacted] is
until
worked @

[redacted] draftsman

[redacted] doing ^{REB} NCRs

[redacted] Turned over to Ebasco QA Supv

[redacted] a part of Ebasco

[redacted] 2 card Trade Ctr
TS Floor

[redacted] NY
diff resume

[redacted] has
used to work for [redacted]

[redacted] heard
write it up
for salesman

heard for couple guys
doing out [redacted] bringing people in w/o
since Ebasco owns [redacted] qualifications

most plants req quals / sight test / even ck
before they go on site or within 2 wks

what 3 (Mere) requires
don't know what Ebasco does --
we send Ebasco / LPL
they end up getting hired

shows nothing about [redacted] false

- nothing ab aircraft industry
- nothing ab Ebasco 2 to 4 wks
- believe he was @ Ebasco
after I told about [redacted]

7-25-23

I really got mad - this guy working at
me plants - nobody doing out

at [redacted] in 83
[redacted] should have checked him out
I don't think this is same resume

[redacted] Ebasco have
obvious they didn't check it out

business bad - deals w/ co's

[redacted]
more still activating people to
everything [redacted]
has had taste in months

where

was field Eng

- think he told me ab work down
finding pipe that went nowhere

- was signed off

- 40' / 50' of pipe missing

- just being signed off - not walking down

I put ab [] people to wk there
they were quitting after shift X
because of pressure

can give you
- title #
he left w/ bad taste
in mouth

Allegation No. _____

ALLEGATION REVIEW

SUBJECT: ALLEGATION IN REGARD TO HARASSMENT OF QUALITY CONTROL INSPECTOR

DOCKET NO. Waterford 3 (DN: 50-382)

ALLEGER NAME:

ADDRESS:

TELE. NO: NO PHONE*

POSITION/TITLE:

DETAILS:

* AT ANYTIME WE DESIRE TO CONTINUE [] WHEN
HE IS NOT WORKING HE NOT FREED TO
USE FROM A PAY PHONE.

Action Assigned To:

Disposition: