

# EXHIBIT 12

Case No. 2-1998-023S

5/76

EXHIBIT 12

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

----- X  
In the Matter of:                   :  
INTERVIEW OF                       :  
VONDA SISSON                       : Case No. 2-1998-023  
(CLOSED)                           :

----- X  
TVA Central Lab and Field Testing  
Services  
Chickamauga Power Service Center  
Access Road at Highway 153  
Chattanooga, TN  
Wednesday, April 26, 2000

The above-entitled matter came on for interview,  
pursuant to notice, at 11:55 a.m.

BEFORE:  
GARY CLAXTON, Special Agent  
WILLIAM BEARDEN, Inspector

APPEARANCES:  
On Behalf of the Tennessee Valley Authority:  
EDWARD J. VIGLUICCI, Senior Attorney  
Office of the General Counsel  
400 West Summit Hill Drive, ET-11A-K  
Knoxville, Tennessee 37902-1499

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.  
Court Reporters  
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 842-0034

C O N T E N T S

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

WITNESS

EXAMINATION

VONDA SISSON

BY MR. CLAXTON AND MR. BEARDEN

4

E X H I B I T S

NUMBER

IDENTIFIED

[NONE.]

P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. CLAXTON: For the record, today's date is April 26, year 2000. This is an interview of Vonda Sisson. The interview is being conducted at the TVA Central Services Building in Chattanooga, Tennessee. Also present at this interview is Ed Vigluicci who is Senior Licensing Counsel for TVA as well as Bill Bearden, who is from the maintenance branch of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in Region Two. My name is Gary Claxton, I'm a Senior Investigator for the Office of the Investigations, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Region Two. At this time, Mr. Vigluicci, I'll allow you to identify yourself officially and give your purpose for being here.

MR. VIGLUICCI: Thank you, Gary, my name is Ed Vigluicci. I'm with the Tennessee Valley Authority Office of the General Counsel. I am Senior Licensing Counsel for TVA Nuclear. I'm here today at the request of Vonda Sisson and will represent her this morning and this afternoon as well as represent the interests of Tennessee Valley Authority.

MR. CLAXTON: Ms. Sisson, you have previously had Mr. Vigluicci sitting in on previous depositions with you? I think our previous interview --

MS. SISSON: Mr. Fine was in that particular interview.

1 MR. CLAXTON: That's correct. So in this instance  
2 does Mr. Vigluicci have your permission to be here and  
3 you're aware of his position with TVA?

4 MS. SISSON: Yes.

5 MR. CLAXTON: And are you aware that anything you  
6 say here can be shared with your employer through Mr.  
7 Vigluicci?

8 MS. SISSON: Yes.

9 MR. CLAXTON: Okay. And you have no objection to  
10 him being here?

11 MS. SISSON: No.

12 MR. CLAXTON: Do you have any objections to  
13 providing this information under oath?

14 MS. SISSON: No.

15 MR. CLAXTON: Would you raise your right hand,  
16 please. Whereupon,

VONDA SISSON, the Interviewee, was called for examination and, having been first  
18 duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

19 DIRECT EXAMINATION

20 BY MR. CLAXTON:

21 Q Just as a little bit of a recap, can you tell me  
22 what your position is here at TVA?

23 A I am currently the principle metallurgical engineer  
24 at Sequoyah Nuclear Plant. During the '95 time frame I was  
25 a site metallurgist at Watts Bar.

1 Q At that time I think, as we discussed earlier, you  
2 had dealings with regarding the ice basket screws that had  
3 been found in the melt tank at Watts Bar?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Just as a quick little overview, can you tell me  
6 what your involvement was there? How you --

7 A Okay. And that's where these bullets will help and  
8 the time frames. Early April, Curtiss Overall, the system  
9 engineer, came to me with an assortment of screw heads and  
10 one whole screw that he had removed from a temporary screen  
11 in the melt out tank at Watts Bar and he asked if I thought  
12 that testing needed to be performed. I told him yes. I  
13 went through the screw heads that had failed and selected  
14 ten to send to the lab and also selected the one whole screw  
15 out of the population that he brought me to take to the lab  
16 for testing.

17 Q Uh-huh.

18 A Do you want me to go through this whole -- this is  
19 a lead-up.

20 Q Just a brief summary of what you did and --

21 A Based on preliminary data that came back from the  
22 lab I made a conscious decision to go and pull a population  
23 from the warehouse for testing.

24 Q This is a sample of screws when you say  
25 population?

1 A Yes. Yes.

2 Q And so this was after you --

3 A There are twelve.

4 Q This was after you received --

5 A Some data.

6 Q -- some data?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Now, was this after you received -- no, this would  
9 not have been after you received the June 2nd report?

10 A No.

11 Q Okay.

12 A This is before that. We stayed in communication  
13 with the lab and checked on how things were progressing.

14 Q Uh-huh.

15 A I also decided that we needed to remove some screws  
16 from the ice condenser that were already installed where it  
17 was accessible, and that's typically the top and lower ring  
18 of the ice condenser, for testing. And the intent of that  
19 was to bound the conditions, both conditions, what was  
20 installed and what was in the warehouse and sent those to  
21 the lab for testing. I also asked for specific information  
22 from Westinghouse on the heat treatment that had been  
23 applied to the screws and that was supplied to the lab.

24 Q You received that from Westinghouse?

25 A Curtiss got it for me and I provided it to the lab,

1 yes.

2 Q All right.

3 A And it was attached to the second report. Okay.

4 And before the first report came out Curtiss also came to me  
5 with some hypothetical things that -- could this have  
6 happened, is this something that we need to look at, and I  
7 mentioned those things to the lab. Thermocycling was one of  
8 them, overtorque, things of that nature. So I did mention  
9 them to the lab and in case it would give them an area they  
10 might want to look at, it might flag something to them.

11 The report was issued on June 2nd, report one. I  
12 transmitted a copy of the report to Landy McCormick, who was  
13 the systems engineer manager, direct manager. I received a  
14 call from Delsa Frazier at the lab, asking me to retrieve  
15 the reports. I did that and sent them back to her.

16 Q And did she say why she wanted you to retrieve  
17 them?

18 A I believe some additional information had come up  
19 and they needed -- that needed to be clarified. So that was  
20 her intent of retrieving them. Sometime in here, and I'm  
21 not sure exactly the time frame, Terry Woods got involved  
22 and we had a meeting at the lab and we looked at Report One  
23 for areas where information had been put into the lab  
24 report, hypothetical cases that could not be verified with  
25 data.

1           So we went through the report and we looked at  
2 that and tried to identify some areas that could not be  
3 verified with the information we had. On June 14th, there  
4 was a meeting at Watts Bar. It was a fairly large meeting.  
5 I do not remember everyone that was at the meeting. I know  
6 that Gordon Yetter from Westinghouse was there. Larry  
7 Katchum from Civil Engineering.

8           Q     Larry Katchum, spell his name. K-A-T-C-H-E-M?

9           A     I think it's U-M, but I'm not sure.

10           MR. VIGLIUCCI: I think it's U-M as well.

11           BY MR. CLAXTON:

12           Q     Okay.

13           A     James Adair from Civil Engineering; Terry Woods,  
14 chief metallurgist from corporate; myself; the system  
15 engineer; and Theresa Casner, who was a new metallurgist  
16 doing a stint at the site was there.

17           Q     Does she spell her name C-A-S-N-E-R?

18           A     Yes, it was Chapman at the time. She's now Casner.

19           Q     Okay.

20           A     At the meeting all of the -- most of the  
21 metallurgical data had been performed, the testing had been  
22 performed and we had that information. At that point it was  
23 going into the civil world and Westinghouse for analysis.

24           Q     Was this prior to the endorsement being issued?

25           A     No. The endorsement came out on the 12th, I

1 believe.

2 Q Okay.

3 A I have it. The 12th, June 12th.

4 And we were pretty much told that site  
5 metallurgists were done and that we had other things that we  
6 could -- we needed to work on and we were released from the  
7 meeting. Okay.

8 According to Curtiss' notes on June 16th, I was at  
9 the lab. Now, that is not uncommon when we have an issue  
10 that we need to be addressed. We will often go to the lab  
11 and sit and coordinate between the site and the lab for, you  
12 know, if the lab needs more information or if the site needs  
13 more information and kind of, I don't want to say baby-sit,  
14 support them as needed.

15 June 19th, the report was issued, Report Two.  
16 Now, after the report was issued, Curtiss Overall had some  
17 questions about the difference in the two reports and I did  
18 sit down with Curtiss and I went through the reports and the  
19 endorsement and we pretty much went line by line, paragraph  
20 by paragraph and I answered his questions. And during that  
21 review we contacted the lab, as we needed to, to try and  
22 clear some things up.

23 Q Who did you talk with at the lab?

24 A It more than likely was Daryl. I do not remember  
25 specifically. We typically would call the engineer that was

1 responsible for the work. If we could not get ahold of  
2 them, we would have talked to probably Delsa.

3 Q Okay.

4 A During that review there were no unknown  
5 significant issues, material issues that were identified and  
6 that's pretty much where that was left. I did not see  
7 anything that I felt was a major issue reviewing that  
8 report.

9 Q Okay. Did you determine at any time that there  
10 may have been a discrepancy in some of the figures between  
11 the Report Number One and Report Number Two that one figure  
12 --

13 A Now, that is --

14 Q -- was --

15 A -- a specific point that Curtiss mentioned. And I  
16 believe that we addressed that in our meeting before Report  
17 Two was issued. The meeting at the lab, and that was  
18 something that we had identified as that area was confusing.  
19 Okay. And asked them to go back and reverify and check to  
20 see -- make sure that they were right and that this was  
21 labeled correctly and just reverify their information.

22 Q How did you determine that there may have been a  
23 problem? Do you recall at this point?

24 A I believe that the label on one called it Set B.  
25 Now Set A was the failed screws and the whole screw from the

1 melt-up tanks. Set B were the screws from the warehouse.  
2 Set C through H were the sets of screws that we removed from  
3 the ice condenser.

4 Okay. I believe that one of the figures in the  
5 original report referenced a screw B from Set B which was a  
6 warehouse screw. And in the second report it referenced  
7 screw A. And that clarification came during that process  
8 from June 2nd to June 19th and it was documented in the  
9 endorsement.

10 Q Okay. Now, did you suspect that those two  
11 photographs were of the same screw; is that why you  
12 questioned that issue?

13 A That's not why I would have questioned it at that  
14 time. For me to go back and ask them to take a population  
15 from the warehouse and from the installed screws, it would  
16 have had to be information that I felt like could impact  
17 both. And typically, I would think it came from the whole  
18 screw in Set A.

19 Q Okay. Now, I'm not sure I follow you. Maybe I  
20 didn't ask that question clearly enough. Something aroused  
21 a question in your mind at that time --

22 A Yes.

23 Q -- that you went back to the lab and said, are you  
24 sure that this photograph of the Set A screw is properly  
25 labeled and this photograph is Set B; is that kind of what

1 happened?

2 A Well, one thing you need to make sure where you  
3 have an issue, okay, if it's a crack in the warehouse screw  
4 that's one thing, if it's one that you found in the bottom  
5 of the melt-up tank, that should be something else. I mean,  
6 that's something you need clarified so you know what  
7 direction to go at the site.

8 Again for me to ask for warehouse screws to be  
9 looked at, there had to be preliminary information that  
10 drove me there. And I'm saying, and I don't remember this  
11 specifically, but if I had to look at it now it would have  
12 been information off the whole screw that drove me to look  
13 at it. Because when I looked at it there was some corrosion  
14 product on the screw, I do not remember where, where it had  
15 looked like it had been installed. It just looked like it  
16 had been dropped to me, as I recall, and that drove me to  
17 bound the condition.

18 Q Okay. I still want to make sure I understand what  
19 caused you to look at these two figure sevens. Did you see  
20 that there was a problem or some discrepancy between the two  
21 figure sevens and these two reports that --

22 A There was a difference in the label, but that had  
23 been clarified in the endorsement.

24 MR. VIGLUICCI: I think we're talking about two --  
25 the confusion is we're talking two different time frames, I

1 think. You're talking about before you ever got to the  
2 second report.

3 THE WITNESS: Right.

4 MR. VIGLUICCI: What led you to think this was  
5 possibly a -- was there anything that led you to think there  
6 could be possibly a labeling problem with the fact that the  
7 Report One identified a Set B crack, not even seeing a  
8 Report Number Two?

9 THE WITNESS: Are you talking in the first report?

10 MR. VIGLUICCI: Uh-huh.

11 BY MR. CLAXTON:

12 Q Yeah. It's my understanding that something caused  
13 you to come back and question the lab as to whether the  
14 figures were properly labeled?

15 A And you're talking in the first report?

16 Q Right.

17 A Okay.

18 Q Does that clarify my question --

19 A Yes.

20 Q -- as to what I'm trying to find out?

21 A Yes. And a lot of it goes back to what I just told  
22 you. Okay. For me to pick screws in the warehouse, there  
23 was information, preliminary information, that drove me to  
24 go to that population, to cover both populations.  
25 Typically, that would have been something off the whole

1 screw. Okay. And that's just common sense, you're being  
2 conservative, you're covering your whole population, you're  
3 trying to make sure that there are no problems out there.

4 MR. BEARDEN: You're wanting to expand your sample  
5 to include new screws?

6 THE WITNESS: Yes.

7 MR. VIGLUICCI: And obviously that happened before  
8 Report One was ever issued?

9 THE WITNESS: Right. That's right.

10 MR. VIGLUICCI: So, see, Gary's focusing on this  
11 report -- this picture as a result of Report One, you're  
12 talking about a period of time before Report One was ever  
13 issued?

14 THE WITNESS: Right.

15 MR. VIGLUICCI: Yeah. So --

16 MR. CLAXTON: Yeah.

17 BY MR. CLAXTON:

18 Q My question is we're looking at figure seven in  
19 the June 2nd report and in that figure seven it shows cracks  
20 supposedly from a whole screw Set A and from a screw from  
21 Set B. Was there something that caused you to question the  
22 --

23 A In the report?

24 Q -- identity of those two screws?

25 A Part of it is what I told you and they're also

1 referenced new screw, I believe, for Set A and B in the  
2 text.

3 Q Uh-huh.

4 A And again, the one from the melt-up tank in my eyes  
5 was not a new screw.

6 Q Okay.

7 A It was one that was found in the melt-up tank. New  
8 screws came from the warehouse.

9 Q Uh-huh. So was it more the labeling of the screw  
10 as being new that caused you concern?

11 A That definitely would have raised a question, yes.

12 Q And what did you do at that point to the best of  
13 your recollection?

14 A Well, again, we came to the lab, there was Terry  
15 Woods from corporate, myself from the site, Robert Phillips  
16 was there. We talked to Daryl and Leslie Blankenship and  
17 went through the report and questioned areas that couldn't  
18 be, you know, validated with data or things to try and  
19 clarify certain areas. So, some of those questions came out  
20 of that and they went back and looked at some more  
21 information because of that.

22 Q Okay. Primarily, Vonda, what I'm trying to  
23 determine is why one of the photographs was removed from  
24 figure seven, supposedly the Set B screw. Did that come up  
25 in your conversation or your discussion as to whether that

1 was properly labeled?

2 A And that was in Report Two. So are you talking  
3 Report Two now?

4 Q No, just Report One. Report Two --

5 A Report One had that picture in it.

6 Q Correct. Report One showed cracks which  
7 supposedly were present in a Set A screw and then a second  
8 photograph showed a crack which supposedly was present in  
9 Set B?

10 A Right.

11 Q Okay. And then in the second report a photograph  
12 of what was labeled the Set B screw in the first report was  
13 removed and was replaced with an etched -- a photograph of  
14 an etched screw from Set A. In your conversations at the  
15 lab or with Daryl or with anyone that was involved with  
16 these examinations was it ever explained or discussed as to  
17 why that switch was made?

18 A And I think that came out of the clarification  
19 process new screw to new screw. New screw from the  
20 warehouse in their eyes, new screw from the melt-up tank and  
21 clarification on what was a new screw and what wasn't, and I  
22 don't think I'm answering your question. I'm not sure  
23 exactly what you want from me.

24 Q Uh-huh. I'm trying to find out, I don't want to  
25 put words in your mouth or make suggestions, but I'm trying

1 to determine if you were ever part of a conversation where  
2 it was discussed whether or not these screws were actually  
3 mislabeled or whether they were labeled correctly in the  
4 first report?

5 A And that would have been part of the meeting that  
6 we had here at the lab. We discussed whether the crack was  
7 in the warehouse screws or in the screw from the melt-up  
8 tank.

9 Q And what do you recall -- do you recall the  
10 results of that conversation?

11 A I know I made notes on the copy that I gave and  
12 asked them was the crack in A, B or G because the paragraph  
13 in the first report was fairly confusing.

14 Q Uh-huh. So -- and let me ask again, about when  
15 was this meeting? Was this --

16 A I don't remember exactly when it was. It was after  
17 the report was issued.

18 Q After the first report?

19 A Yes. It was not long after the first report was  
20 issued.

21 Q And this was --

22 A It was before the endorsement.

23 Q This was the meeting that Terry Woods --

24 A Yes.

25 Q -- called so he could discuss the problems with

1 the first report?

2 A Yes.

3 Q Okay. So if I hear you correctly, I understand  
4 that you had some concerns about whether or not at least one  
5 of these figures -- I'm sorry, whether one of these  
6 photographs in figure seven in the first report was  
7 correctly identified; is that correct?

8 A And that question was raised.

9 Q So that's --

10 A Yes.

11 Q Do I understand you correctly?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Okay. Good. And were you a part of the  
14 conversation whether that was ever resolved or the decision  
15 making where it was resolved whether or not that was -- the  
16 screw was properly identified?

17 A No.

18 Q Now, when the second report was issued and the  
19 figure seven became a different photograph, was that ever  
20 explained to you as to why that figure seven was changed?

21 A Well, that was identified in the endorsement.

22 Q Okay.

23 A There is a note that talks about one screw that was  
24 received in the original batch of fractured screws, Set A,  
25 in which cracks were found at the thread roots. An

1 additional set of twelve new screws were received from Set  
2 B; and of the seven screws remaining in Set B which were not  
3 destroyed for other testing, no additional cracks were  
4 found.

5 Q So what does that --

6 A It tells me that there were no cracks in the  
7 warehouse screws.

8 Q And does that also indicate to you that the crack  
9 that was depicted in figure seven in the first report, which  
10 was initially identified as Set B, does that indicate to you  
11 that that was probably improperly labeled? That's a real  
12 long question, isn't it? Do you understand what I'm trying  
13 to ask?

14 A I believe this was Set A screw, if that's what  
15 you're asking.

16 Q Okay. Yes. And you're pointing to a photograph  
17 of a crack in a screw that was identified as a Set B screw  
18 in the first report?

19 A That's right.

20 Q Okay. So now let's see if I can make that a  
21 little bit more concise. Is it your understanding that  
22 figure seven in the first report improperly identified a Set  
23 A screw as being Set B?

24 A That's correct.

25 Q Okay. And you came to learn that through the

1 endorsement which was issued on June 12th?

2 A Right.

3 Q Okay. Did you verbally talk that out with anyone  
4 or did you just deduct that from the endorsement? Did  
5 someone sit down and say here is why the endorsement says  
6 this?

7 A No, I did not. I know that corporate was involved  
8 with communicating with the lab on this issue. I do not  
9 recall that that happened, let me put it that way.

10 Q When the second report came out, did you discuss  
11 that with Curtiss?

12 A Yes, I did.

13 Q Did you discuss the endorsement with Curtiss?

14 A Yes.

15 Q Okay. Now, your understanding, from what I just  
16 heard, was that the only cracked screw was Set A?

17 A That's correct.

18 Q Did you explain that to Curtiss?

19 A Yes.

20 Q And how did he respond or how did he react to  
21 that? Did he believe you?

22 A I don't think that Curtiss believed everything that  
23 was defined to him, no, I don't.

24 Q Did he question you further? Do you think he was  
25 ever satisfied with your explanation?

1 A No, I don't think he was ever satisfied. No.

2 MR. CLAXTON: Why don't we go off the record for a  
3 minute at 12:19 p.m.

4 [Recess.]

5 MR. CLAXTON: Back on the record at 12:22 p.m.,  
6 with the same parties present.

7 BY MR. CLAXTON:

8 Q Now, in our interview last year, Vonda, you told  
9 me that there had been no discussions at the lab meeting  
10 with Terry Woods regarding figure seven. Was there  
11 discussions with someone else or --

12 A We went through the lab at the meeting. Now, I  
13 don't know what led up to that statement. Okay.

14 Q Okay.

15 A So it's hard to give you an answer on that, but we  
16 did discuss the report at the lab that day.

17 Q Okay. And I specifically asked you here whether  
18 -- we were talking about do you have any idea or since that  
19 time have you found out why figure seven was taken out, and  
20 we were talking about in the first report, why figure seven  
21 had been changed.

22 A And you're asking since that time have you found  
23 out why figure seven was taken out, and at that time I had  
24 not talked to anyone about that. In my eyes that was since  
25 this whole issue was resolved in '95, have I talked to

1 anyone, and no, I have not.

2 Q Okay. All right. Maybe my question wasn't very  
3 clear at the time and I guess what I was trying to ask was  
4 since you had that meeting at the lab did you have any  
5 understanding of why that figure seven was taken out or  
6 changed. And I think what you're telling me now is that you  
7 understand from the endorsement --

8 A Yes.

9 Q -- that it was changed --

10 A Yes.

11 Q -- because it was mislabeled?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Okay. Did you have any discussions with Jim Adair  
14 regarding the Set B screws or the --

15 A I did not interface with Mr. Adair directly. Larry  
16 Katchum is the one that owned the issue in civil  
17 engineering, and he's the one I would have talked to in  
18 civil engineering. And the only interface I would have had  
19 at that time was to provide them a report if they needed  
20 one.

21 Q And is that true of the second report as well?

22 A Yes.

23 Q That you did not speak with Mr. Adair about any  
24 changes that you recall?

25 A No.

1 Q So was the endorsement the result, not just of  
2 your request, but was the endorsement -- well, let me ask  
3 you: was the endorsement to that first report a result of a  
4 request that you made?

5 A Yes.

6 Q Okay. And --

7 A The site needed that clarified, that information  
8 clarified.

9 Q As to which screw was actually --

10 A Yes.

11 Q -- cracked?

12 A Yes.

13 MR. CLAXTON: Okay. Bill, do you have anything  
14 while I'm thinking here?

15 BY MR. BEARDEN:

16 Q I'm a little confused about the samples. All of  
17 the samples that were sent down to the lab were taken -- the  
18 very last sample was taken prior to, which I guess is H, so  
19 that was all reflected in the first report? There weren't  
20 any subsequent samples taken after issuance of the first  
21 report?

22 A No. We had provided the samples to the lab all at  
23 the same time, the installed screws, but they had not  
24 completed all the testing prior to Report One being issued.

25 Q Okay. But any additional testing that occurred,

1 occurred on these original samples?

2 A Yes. A through H, yes.

3 MR. VIGLUICCI: But not all the tests results were  
4 reflected in Report One?

5 THE WITNESS: No, that's true. All the testing  
6 was not complete. BY MR. BEARDEN:

7 Q When Report One was issued there was some more  
8 testing that occurred afterwards?

9 A Yes.

10 Q But when Report Two was issued, that was the end  
11 of the testing?

12 A Yes.

13 Q In '95. There was no subsequent testing after  
14 that that you know about?

15 A No.

16 BY MR. CLAXTON:

17 Q To make sure that you understand what we're trying  
18 to get at, the information which initially appeared in the  
19 first report indicated that there was a Set B screw, which  
20 is a new unused warehouse screw that had a manufacturing  
21 defect. And then in the second report the figure of that  
22 screw which at first was identified as a Set B was removed.  
23 And I think Curtiss may have talked to you about that?

24 A Yes.

25 Q I believe you told me that he talked to you about

1 that was -- was he suspicious of that or he was just curious  
2 about why that happened?

3 A Well, he wondered why there was a difference.

4 Q Subsequently, the reason we became involved is the  
5 appearance of or the allegation that that Set B screw  
6 information had been removed because it was a new unused  
7 screw and that may have allowed TVA to use a screw without  
8 going through a quality check so to speak. Sometime after  
9 that initial testing in June of '95 there was a request to  
10 compare those two reports to see what the differences were  
11 and the explanation for that Set B information not being in  
12 the second report was that it was an inadvertent omission.  
13 Were you ever aware of that report or that explanation?

14 A What time frame was that?

15 Q Two years later?

16 A No.

17 Q '97, '98.

18 MR. VIGLUICCI: Delsa did a -- '97, '98. Terry  
19 Woods official reconciliation in '98, Delsa was asked to do  
20 a quick review in late '97?

21 THE WITNESS: I was not directly involved in that,  
22 no. BY MR. CLAXTON:

23 Q Did Delsa or Daryl, did anyone come to you that  
24 you recall back in the '98 time frame and say do you  
25 remember anything about this? Do you remember what we

1 talked about or anything along those lines?

2 A '98, I was at Sequoyah already. No, not that I  
3 recall.

4 Q As we sit here today if you had seen that report,  
5 or if you'd have seen that memo which said that it was just  
6 an inadvertent omission, do you think that caught your  
7 attention?

8 A Are those the exact words, inadvertent omission?

9 Q That was two of the words.

10 A Well, I guess it would depend on the context of the  
11 sentence and the way it was presented.

12 Q It was also presented that there was not time  
13 enough to have additional photos made, that they wanted it  
14 to be a better flow of pictures, that this one photograph  
15 actually was very similar to other photographs that had been  
16 seen, so they pulled that Set B photograph and put another  
17 set photograph in there to improve the flow?

18 A Now, there was a time at the lab where they had to  
19 send their photographs downtown to reproductions and there  
20 was a lag, and we're talking several days lag in time in  
21 getting the figure pages back, so I could see that  
22 happening. Okay. Of course, I wasn't intimately involved  
23 in doing that. And when you're doing information like that,  
24 you would take a typical photograph to demonstrate what you  
25 had seen, you wouldn't necessarily put every photograph that

1 you had in a report. It would become too cumbersome and  
2 costly to produce considering the numbers that you would  
3 send out, but --

4 Q I think for my purposes today and you've already  
5 answered this, but to kind of tell you what I'm trying to  
6 get at is, you told me no one contacted you to ask you about  
7 why we changed these figure sevens to get your memory?

8 A In '98.

9 Q Uh-huh.

10 A I do not recall that that happened.

11 MR. CLAXTON: I don't think I have anything else.  
12 Bill, do you have any anything else?

13 BY MR. BEARDEN:

14 Q The quench cracks -- now, I'm not a metallurgist,  
15 so forgive me if I don't use correct terminology. But the  
16 quench cracks or quench microstructure present in unused  
17 screws, whether they're new or whole screws, is that not a  
18 significant -- do you view that as not being a significant  
19 problem?

20 A It's not a desirable thing. It would depend on --  
21 now, you had a core that had a different hardener and --

22 Q Yeah?

23 A -- it's tougher and your quench cracks were pretty  
24 much confined to your case. Okay. And these screws were  
25 used in a static application, there were no rotating

1 elements and there would be no reason for those cracks to  
2 propagate into a tough core.

3 Like I say, it's not desirable, but I don't think  
4 it's a real detriment either. And that was something again  
5 that Westinghouse was going to look at in their analysis was  
6 -- they had the first report, they had information and that  
7 was something they were going to look at. In my eyes, it  
8 was not a real detriment in this particular application. If  
9 it would have been a different environment, it would have  
10 been less desirable.

11 BY MR. CLAXTON:

12 Q Did anyone ask you about that or did you discuss  
13 that significance of those cracks with anyone as a result of  
14 receiving that information from the lab?

15 A Curtiss and I discussed that.

16 Q Uh-huh.

17 A Beyond Curtiss, no.

18 BY MR. BEARDEN:

19 Q Are you aware of the basis that was used to close  
20 the problem evaluation report, which is what the PER is, for  
21 these screws, are you aware the basis did not involve the  
22 analysis or the resolution of the existence of the cracks?  
23 The basis was a statistical analysis.

24 A That's true, but they also had the information from  
25 the first report and it was provided to them and they had

1 that knowledge. I mean, we did not hide the information  
2 from them.

3 MR. VIGLUICCI: If you had seen something, Delsa,  
4 in either the first or the second report that caused you any  
5 sort of concern as a metallurgist knowing the application of  
6 those screws, would you have brought that up?

7 THE WITNESS: Yes, definitely. I would have  
8 pursued that.

9 MR. VIGLUICCI: With?

10 THE WITNESS: By going to management document,  
11 documented it in a PER, there was already a PER there that  
12 was addressing the issue. Another one did not need to  
13 necessarily be written. I would have pursued it.

14 BY MR. BEARDEN:

15 Q So the potential for evidence of cracks in new  
16 screws might not have been of issue at the time?

17 A Might not have been an issue at the time.

18 Q It wouldn't necessarily have been an issue?

19 A Are you asking would it have been looked at and  
20 addressed?

21 Q Yeah.

22 A And again, yes, it would have been. It would not  
23 have been ignored.

24 MR. VIGLUICCI: The fact you had a quenched  
25 microstructure, did that come to your attention?

1 THE WITNESS: We had tempered Martensite which is  
2 desirable in this type of application. If you had as  
3 quenched Martensite, it's very brittle, very hard, it's not  
4 forgiving. Tempered Martensite softens the material so what  
5 -- increases the toughness, if you do it too long it will  
6 soften the material. You had a case hardening to harden the  
7 edges. They were self-tapping, you'd need that to help  
8 drive them in. That's it.

9 BY MR. BEARDEN:

10 Q There is some comment, I believe it's in the first  
11 report, about the presence of zinc in the crack, I guess,  
12 which you now believe was an A set whole screw.

13 A Now, what, I'm sorry?

14 Q The crack.

15 A An A set whole screw.

16 Q A, yeah, A set whole screw as opposed to the new  
17 screw which was stated in the first report, that presence of  
18 zinc, I believe the report, indicated that that meant the  
19 screw was a new screw or an unused screw?

20 A And the zinc was also mentioned in the second  
21 report. And I think if you go to the first report it  
22 references you to Table 1, which it mentions zinc and Table  
23 1 was on a G screw, I believe, Set G so that was an  
24 installed screw.

25 Q So the zinc was not on an A Set screw it was on a

1 G screw?

2 A Well, it was identified in the report on the G  
3 screw.

4 MR. BEARDEN: Yeah, because I don't have the  
5 entire report here. I just have a part of it.

6 MR. VIGLUICCI: Whether it's in the G or A or a B,  
7 what is zinc.

8 MR. BEARDEN: Yeah, what does it mean?

9 MR. CLAXTON: Do you recall the question?

10 THE WITNESS: Yes. The screws had a zinc  
11 phosphate coating. It could have been one of three things  
12 by the Westinghouse specification, but I believe the testing  
13 showed it to be zinc phosphate. It could have been  
14 deposited during manufacture or it could have been deposited  
15 during the testing and the lapping when they were polishing  
16 the specimens. The levels of zinc were fairly low in the  
17 crack and it really couldn't be identified one way or  
18 another when it was deposited in the crack, but it was  
19 identified that zinc was found in the crack on Set G.

20 MR. BEARDEN: So there was no zinc found in the  
21 Set A screw?

22 THE WITNESS: Set G is the only one documented in  
23 the table.

24 MR. BEARDEN: That is it.

25 MR. CLAXTON: I don't think I have anything else.

1 Ed, do you have any other questions?

2 MR. VIGLUICCI: Let's take a two minute break.

3 MR. CLAXTON: All right. We'll go off the record  
4 at 12:41 p.m.

5 [Recess.]

6 MR. CLAXTON: Back on the record at 12:44 with the  
7 same parties present. Ms. Sisson, I don't think I have any  
8 other questions. Do you have anything that you would like  
9 to add?

10 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.

11 MR. CLAXTON: Okay.

12 THE WITNESS: Lately when we've been preparing for  
13 the enforcement conference, we've had the opportunity to get  
14 together and there were many pieces to this puzzle, we all  
15 owned a piece and it was really the first opportunity that  
16 we had to talk to each other and see the information that  
17 was available. Some of it was Curtiss' notes, his time  
18 line, and just be able to discuss what our thoughts were at  
19 the time, things of that nature. And it has made it easier  
20 for me to come in and give you more detailed information. I  
21 did have some difficulty remembering things when you'd ask  
22 me specific dates or time frames, and I just want to say  
23 that I was just able to give you better information based on  
24 what we accumulated --

25 MR. CLAXTON: Okay.

1 THE WITNESS: -- for the conference.

2 BY MR. CLAXTON:

3 Q And I think to wrap up what I was trying to ask  
4 you, what information I was trying to obtain from you was  
5 whether or not you had any questions regarding the removal  
6 of the Set B information from the first report, whether you  
7 had any involvement there and what I've heard you say was  
8 that you questioned whether that photograph was properly  
9 labeled and as a result the lab performed some additional  
10 examination or they did something and produced an  
11 endorsement or supplementary report which indicated that a  
12 Set B screw was not observed to have a crack but, in fact,  
13 it was a Set A screw?

14 A The site definitely needed to have it clarified  
15 where the crack was identified and we did ask the lab to go  
16 back and clarify that information.

17 Q And did the question arise in your mind initially  
18 because Set A or the Set A screw was identified as a new  
19 screw?

20 A That was part of it.

21 Q Uh-huh.

22 A And just knowing why I picked the population I did  
23 for more examinations, what my reasoning would have been  
24 made me want to go back and look and have them verify,  
25 confirm where the crack came from.

1 Q Are you satisfied that that crack was, in fact, in  
2 the Set A screw as opposed to the Set B screw?

3 A Yes, I am.

4 MR. CLAXTON: All right. I don't think I have any  
5 other questions. I would like to ask you whether the  
6 information that you've provided has been freely and  
7 voluntarily provided?

8 THE WITNESS: Yes.

9 MR. CLAXTON: And whether or not any employees or  
10 anyone from the NRC or TVA has threatened you or made any  
11 offers to you in exchange for your testimony?

12 THE WITNESS: Absolutely not.

13 MR. CLAXTON: If there are no other questions,  
14 we'll conclude the interview at 12:48 p.m.

15 [Whereupon, at 12:48 p.m., the interview was  
16 concluded.]

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATE

COUNTY OF HAMILTON  
STATE OF TENNESSEE

I, Pamela A. Fisher, Notary Public and Certified Court Reporter, do hereby certify that I reported in machine shorthand the recorded interview of Vonda Sisson; that the said witness was duly sworn by me; that the foregoing pages, numbered from 1 to 37, inclusive, were typed under my personal supervision and constitutes a true and correct record of the recorded interview of said witness.

I further certify that I am not an attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor financially interested in the action.

Witness my hand in the City of Chattanooga, County of Hamilton, State of Tennessee, this 1st day of May, 2000.

*Pamela A Fisher*

Pamela A. Fisher, Notary Public  
and Certified Court Reporter  
My Commission Expires: 08/26/00.  
Certificate No.0232.