

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of:)

INVESTIGATIVE INTERVIEW OF)
JOHN CRNICH)

(CLOSED))

LOCATION: Washington, D.C.

PAGES: 1 through 39

DATE: August 11, 1988

HERITAGE REPORTING CORPORATION

Official Reporters

1228 L Street, N.W., Suite 600

Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 628-4838

2-87-0026
B901050273 BB1011
PDR ADOCK 05000370
Q PDR

EXHIBIT 2 41
Page 1 of 41 Pages

1 UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
2 OFFICE OF INVESTIGATION

3 In the Matter of:)
4 INVESTIGATIVE INTERVIEW:)
5 JOHN CRNICH)
6 (CLOSED))

7 Thursday,
8 August 11, 1988

9 Shaw, Pittman, Potts,
10 Trowbridge
2300 N Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

11 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing,
12 pursuant to notice, at 2:33 p.m.

13 APPEARANCES:

14 On behalf of the Interviewee:

15 DEBRA CHARNOFF, ESQ.
16 Shaw, Pittman, Potts, Trowbridge
17 2300 N Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

18 On behalf of Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

19 E.L. WILLIAMSON, INVESTIGATOR
20 DANIEL D. MURPHY, INVESTIGATOR
21 Office of Investigations
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C.

22
23
24
25

J.C.

- 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

CONTENTS

WITNESS

John Crnich

EXAMINATION

Page 4

EXHIBITS

None

je

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. WILLIAMSON: For the record, this is an interview of Mr. John Crnich, Director of Engineering for EBASCO Corporation, employed at the Commanche Peak Steam Electric Station.

This interview is conducted by the Office of Investigations, Nuclear Regulatory Commission. It is August 11, 1988. The time is 2:30 p.m.

The interview is being conducted in the offices of Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge in Washington, D.C.

The nature of the interview pertains to the facts and circumstances surrounding the submittal of a letter from the Tennessee Valley Authority to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission dated March 20th, 1986 regarding TVA's compliance with 10CFR Appendix B at the Watts Bar Nuclear plant.

Currently present at this interview are Mrs. Debra Charnoff, attorney with the law firm of Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge; Daniel D. Murphy and E.L. Williamson, Investigators for the Office of Investigation of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

This interview is being transcribed by a Court Report.

Mr. Crnich, do you have any objections to being placed under oath prior to providing your testimony?

MR. CRNICH: I do not.

je

1 Whereupon,

2

JOHN CRNICH

3 having been duly sworn as a witness herein, was examined and
4 testified as follows:

5

EXAMINATION

6

BY MR. WILLIAMSON:

7

Q Mr. Crnich, prior to conduct of the substance for
8 a portion of this interview, would you please provide to us
9 a chronology of your background, your work experience, to
10 include your present position and previous positions you've
11 held in the nuclear engineering industry?

12

A You want to start with the nuclear industry?

13

Q Why don't we do that.

14

A Okay. I was first employed in the nuclear
15 industry with Knolls Atomic Power Lab after ^I~~he~~ left the
16 Navy in 1953.

17

I worked for them for a period of twelve or
18 thirteen years in which I participated in the start up of
19 four land-based Navy prototype plants for the nuclear navy.
20 Three of those were in the capacity of operations manager.
21 Well, actually, I was operations manager on all four of
22 them.

23

Following that, I went to work for General
24 Dynamics in one of their subsidiaries General Atomic, who
25 were in the business of developing high temperature gas

Je

1 reactor plants. I worked for them in various capacities,
2 from an engineer, cost engineering management, I managed
3 the purchasing department for several years. I was also
4 project manager on the largest HTGR they had designed to
5 date, which was the high gas reactor temperature plant out
6 in Denver.

7 In about 1976, General Atomic decided to go out of
8 the nuclear industry business, commercial business at least;
9 and I went to work for G.E. San Jose.

10 Incidentally, Knolls Atomic Power Lab was owned by
11 General Electric Company.

12 I went back to work for G.E. in the nuclear power
13 division in San Jose, California; and I worked for them for
14 two years as manager of nuclear valve design.

15 At that point I was offered a position by EBASCO,
16 this is now 1978, as a site manager / construction manager,
17 of the Waterford III Nuclear Power Plant being built in
18 Louisiana near New Orleans. I worked on that job for four
19 years, after which I was promoted to a position as an
20 assistant. Well, it's called construction manager; but what
21 it really was, I was assistant regional manager for the
22 Southern region.

23 After being in that job for about a year, I was
24 assigned as construction manager to the South Texas Project.
25 That's a project ^{IN} for which we took over construction

Jc

1 responsibility from another contractor. I worked in that
2 capacity for three years.

3 I went from there to the WPPS 3&5 Project in
4 Washington for a period of one year in which we developed a
5 maintenance concept which would preserve the plant for
6 licensing reasons for a period of about ~~sixty~~ ^{FIFTEEN} years.

7 I was then assigned to TVA. Do you want me to
8 continue there?

9 Q If you would, tell us when you were assigned to
10 TVA and how long you there and what you did while you were
11 there.

12 A Okay. Oh, incidentally, I was at the WPPS 3&5
13 plant, as I said for one year.

14 I was assigned to the TVA on June 1, 1986.

15 Q How long did you work with TVA?

16 A I worked at TVA for a period of one and a half
17 years. I left there in December 1987.

18 Q December 1987?

19 A Yes.

20 Q Thank you.

21 Let me clarify for the record, or state for the
22 record, that on February 10, 1988, Mr. Crnich was
23 interviewed by the Office of Investigation; and at that time
24 we clarified for the record the nature and the scope of the
25 representation by Mrs. Charnoff as it pertained to

1 Mr. Crnich.

2 I'll just ask you once again. Is Mrs. Charnoff
3 serving as your personal representative during this
4 interview?

5 A Yes, she is.

6 Q Okay, and was she your choice to serve as your
7 representative here today?

8 A She's entirely my choice.

9 Q Okay. Thank you. Mr. Crnich, can you tell us,
10 when reporting to TVA in June of 1986, what your
11 responsibilities were? What the assignment was first, and
12 then your responsibilities as part of that assignment.

13 A Well, my assignment was to a task force which had
14 been in existence for some period of time. I don't remember
15 how long. I was an addition to that task force.

16 The purpose of that task force was to -- the
17 primary purpose, I guess I should say, was to assure the
18 development and implementation of what we called Volume IV
19 performance plan. That was a continuation of a corporate
20 performance plan which had been previously issued.

21 The Volume IV performance plan applied
22 specifically to Watts Bar.

23 Q Specifically, what were you involved in, in the
24 development and implementation of this nuclear performance
25 plan?

fe

1 A Well, I was involved primarily in the area of
2 operations and maintenance.

3 Q Did you work for someone? Was there a task force
4 team leader?

5 A When I arrived there was a task force leader. His
6 name was Willy Brown.

7 Q If I may go back just a little bit. When were you
8 contracted to come to TVA? Was that done earlier in the
9 year of 1986?

10 A Do you mean when was the contract signed?

11 Q Yes, sir; or when you contacted about coming to
12 work at TVA?

13 A I don't ^{KNOW} when the contract was signed. It was
14 prior to that time, but I don't ^{KNOW} when. I was contacted, I
15 think it was in May.

16 Q In May?

17 A Yes. Of May '86.

18 Q '86, yes. As part of your responsibilities on
19 this task force, you said you were involved in the
20 operations and maintenance. Specifically, what were you
21 doing in the areas of operations and maintenance?

22 A First of all, let me clarify. That was my primary
23 responsibility.

24 Q Okay.

25 A Actually the task force -- our communications were

1 rather informal, and we jointly became involved in a number
2 of areas as a secondary responsibility; but, primarily, it
3 was operations and maintenance.

4 My responsibilities were to be sure that, like the
5 other areas, that the parts of the corporate performance
6 plan that dealt with operations and maintenance were being
7 developed and implemented in that area of operations and
8 maintenance.

9 Q Were you physically located on site at Watts Bar?

10 A Yes, I was.

11 Q Okay, and who were you reporting to? Was it
12 Mr. Brown?

13 A It was Mr. Brown at that time.

14 Q Did you have any contact with the people in what
15 used to TVA's engineering design group or operations group,
16 nuclear engineering group, in Knoxville or Chattanooga?

17 A Yes. I had some involvement in that. As I said,
18 the relationship among the task force members was somewhat
19 informal; and we supported each other in our areas. Other
20 task force members would support me in operations and
21 maintenance and vice versa.

22 So, I had some involvement with the Knoxville
23 engineering operation. I went to several meetings there on
24 several issues.

25 Q You mentioned you had some secondary

1 responsibilities. Could you elaborate on those
2 responsibilities?

3 A Well, those were sort of the back up to the other
4 task force members in their areas. We supported each other.

5 All the task force members had fairly broad
6 knowledge in the industry beyond their specific area of
7 coverage. So we tended to use that broad experience and
8 talked to each other about the various issues.

9 Q This information that you were developing during,
10 I guess, June, July, the subsequent months following June,
11 was it being incorporated into a single document that is now
12 known as the Watts Bar Nuclear Performance Plan Volume IV?
13 Or was that all draft material at that time?

14 Volume IV was never issued. It was being formed
15 into a single document. That document was never issued, to
16 my knowledge.

17 No. I shouldn't say it was never issued. It was
18 never issued, to my knowledge; it wasn't issued while I was
19 there.

20 BY MR. MURPHY:

21 Q During the period that you were there, you talk
22 about these back up functions, did you have any dealings
23 with the folks that were working on the corrective action
24 program?

25 A I don't understand that question.

1 Q Okay. Let me try it again. We spoke to several
2 people lately. One of the individuals told us this task
3 force, among other things, worked on the corrective action
4 program at TVA. Did you take any part in that?

5 A Oh, I guess, in my opinion everybody at Watts Bar
6 was working on a corrective action program.

7 MS. CHARNOFF: When you say corrective action
8 program, are you talking about a specific program?

9 MR. MURPHY: Yes.

10 MS. CHARNOFF: That's what is confusing about the
11 question.

12 BY MR. MURPHY:

13 Q Let's address corrective action maybe as a quality
14 assurance program. Is that the same thing you're talking
15 about when you talk about corrective action?

16 A I'm talking about corrective action in a very
17 broad sense.

18 Watts Bar had a number of problems that had to be
19 corrected, and the primary function of everybody on the job
20 site at that point was to participate in that broad program;
21 but if you're talking about a specific. Are you talking
22 about a specific?

23 A Corrective action program.

24 Q Corrective action program?

25 Q Yes.

JE

1 A Then you'd have to define which one that was.
2 There were a number of correction action programs defined by
3 the quality program with CAR identification, et cetera.

4 There were many of those. I don't know which one
5 you're referring to.

6 Q Did you work on any of them?

7 A On any specific ones?

8 Q Yes.

9 A Only in a broad sense.

10 Q Why don't you explain that broad sense to us?

11 A There were a number of CARs in existence. The
12 correction of those were and was, for example, we had looked
13 at what we called an independent design verification
14 program.

15 Q Okay.

16 A Okay. Which went back and looked at and would
17 have sampled various areas of the plants to assure that
18 things in specific corrective action programs had been truly
19 taken care of.

20 The development of that independent design
21 verification, I helped in the development of that
22 independent design verification program.

23 So, in that sense, in a broad sense, I was
24 involved in those CARs.

25 Q Are talking about CARs that were developed in

1 recent years, and I'm going to say from the time Mr. White
2 arrived on the scene; or are we talking about CARs or
3 non-conformance reports that were historically left open or
4 hadn't been closed?

5 A Both.

6 Q Both. Do you have any idea or any feel for the
7 amount of time you're talking about? How far back in
8 history you went on those things?

9 A I don't know how far back in time. I couldn't
10 make that judgment.

11 Q But three or four years? Is that outside the
12 limits, I mean?

13 A It was in that realm, yes; but I couldn't tell you
14 specifically.

15 Q Okay. Did you have any opportunity to talk with
16 Mr. White about problems or the program? Let's not even say
17 about -- but the program that you worked on while you were
18 at TVA?

19 A We initially had periodic meetings with Mr. White
20 in which we made a report of our activities.

21 Q When you say we, who are we talking about?

22 A We, the task force.

23 Q I mean, how many members were on the task force?
24 Do you know? Give or take a few.

25 A The membership varied over time, but on the order

JE

1 of five or six.

2 Q Okay. Then you would get together with Mr. White,
3 am I correct? How often did that happen?

4 A There was not a specific routine period of time.
5 Whenever he felt like he needed a report from us, he would
6 tell us.

7 Q Okay, and how often was this?

8 A Well, in several instances it would be within two
9 weeks. Another period, it might be a month. I don't recall
10 specifically; but the time span varied.

11 Q Did you partake in a number of these meetings, or
12 was it limited to just a few? How many of these meetings
13 were you involved in, would you say?

14 A Half a dozen, maybe. On that order.

15 Q That's for the entire period that you were at
16 Watts Bar, which looks like about eighteen months?

17 A Yes. Initially, those meetings took place for
18 about the first six months that I was there. Then they
19 became more sporadic and discontinued after awhile.

20 Q Did the task force ever issue any type of report?

21 A We issued reports that were given to Mr. White at
22 our meetings.

23 Q Written?

24 A Status. They were like one or two page status
25 reports.

1 Q Do you recall what any of the topics of these task
2 reports was?

3 A Just not off hand. Well, IDVP was one, for
4 example. I do recall that one. It happened to be the
5 subjects that we were addressing at the moment.

6 Q Was your group developing any areas that had to be
7 dealt with or had to be corrected?

8 A Certainly.

9 Q Did you bring this to Mr. White's attention? Can
10 I say they were problem areas, or would you describe them?

11 A They were areas that had been or were identified
12 as areas that needed some action.

13 Q What type of action are we talking about? Can you
14 give me some examples?

15 A It could have been corrective action in
16 implementing additional design requirements, assuring that
17 CARs were properly implemented and closed out. These types
18 of things.

19 Q Are you familiar with the March 20, 1986 letter
20 from Mr. White to the NRC regarding the quality assurance
21 program at Watts Bar?

22 A I read the letter. Yes.

23 Q Did you ever get a chance to look at the
24 enclosures to the letter?

25 A Which enclosure are you referring to?

je

1 Q Well, there was an attachment, actually, to the
2 letter where they addressed the specific items identified by
3 NSRC as problem areas.

4 A I believe I read that. Yes.

5 Q Did you agree with the letter?

6 A I don't understand what you mean by that.

7 Q Did you form any opinion as to whether the letter
8 was valid or not valid?

9 A I had no basis for forming an opinion on that.

10 Q Did your work at Watts Bar not give you the
11 opportunity to look at areas that might have been mentioned
12 in the letter that you could have formed an opinion on?

13 A No. We looked at areas, but not in the depth that
14 would have been required to form any judgments of that
15 letter.

16 Q In addition to the reports that you gave to
17 Mr. White on a periodic basis, did that group, the task
18 force we're talking about now, ever write any formal
19 reports; or at the end develop a series of reports
20 addressing what you looked at during the period of time you
21 worked there?

22 A No. The only reports we prepared were these
23 status reports of various things we were looking at.

24 Q In other words, there's no final report on what
25 your effort was?

1 A No. There was not. To my knowledge, there
2 wasn't.

3 BY MR. WILLIAMSON:

4 Q Would any of this information have been reported
5 in the unpublished Nuclear Performance Plan Volume IV?

6 A What information?

7 Q The information that you were working on as part
8 of the task force. I mean, as I understand it, the task
9 force was developing information that would be eventually
10 implemented into the Nuclear Performance Plan IV for Watts
11 Bar.

12 A That's correct.

13 Q Okay. There is a document that exists called the
14 Nuclear Performance Plan IV -- and I don't know, but it's
15 probably undated -- but would that information be contained
16 in that document? Even though it hasn't been published
17 officially, I don't think. But is that where this
18 information --

19 A I'm not sure what you mean by that information.
20 That document contained: primarily it was for the purpose of
21 developing a plan for licensing Watts Bar and assuring that
22 the corporate performance plan was being implemented. So,
23 that was the primary function of that plan.

24 Q But as part of this task force, from June '86
25 until December '87, some of the information that was

1 developed as a result of your efforts and other people's
2 efforts, would that be contained in the Nuclear Performance
3 Plan IV?

4 A As I understand your question, we looked at
5 problem areas that had been identified; and the action to
6 correct that, those kinds of things were in that performance
7 plan. Yes.

8 Q Let me change. You mentioned a few minutes ago in
9 addition to it being your primary responsibility, you had
10 secondary responsibilities. Did any of these secondary
11 responsibilities include working with Mrs. Charnoff and some
12 other members of the, I guess original, task force on a
13 project for her or with here?

14 A In the development of the performance plan?

15 Q No, sir. Just working on a separate project that
16 she had requested assistance working on.

17 A Yes. I worked on a separate project for her later
18 on in my assignment.

19 Q When did you begin? When did you start working on
20 that, do you recall?

21 A I believe that was about mid-'87. Somewhere in
22 the summer of '87, to the best that I can recollect.

23 Q Do you recall why you were asked to participate in
24 that review or project?

25 A I don't ~~recall~~ ^{know} why I was asked.

J.C.

1 Q Okay. Do you recall what it involved?

2 A Yes. I recall what it involved.

3 Q Okay. What was that? If you would relate that to
4 us, please.

5 A We were asked to review a number of items that
6 were contained in the Congressional staff report and to
7 assure ourselves that those items were being addressed in
8 some kind of a program that was trackable so that those
9 items could be tracked to completion at some point in time.

10 Q Do you recall other people that assisted you in
11 that effort?

12 A We talked to a lot of different people.

13 Q I guess, members of the team.

14 A Oh.

15 Q Members of the team that worked on it.

16 A Yes. I recall who those were.

17 Q Who were those people?

18 A They were Mike Matthews, Bill Gordon, Dave
19 Kulisek, and myself.

20 Q Okay. In reviewing the document from the
21 Congressional report, as I understand it, were you to single
22 out or surface specific concerns from this report and
23 identify them, as you said, in some way that you could
24 relate to either see that they had been addressed or
25 properly disposed of? I guess what I'm trying to ask you

J. C.

1 is exactly what did you do when you got this document?

2 A We went through that document line by line and
3 made sure that every item that was mentioned was listed and
4 was included in some form of corrective action that was
5 trackable.

6 We just went through it just line by line, every
7 item that you could conceive to be an item that required
8 attention. To ^{some} the extent, ~~that~~ there was some redundancy in ?
9 the final list that we came up with.

10 Q Do you recall how many items you identified as
11 areas of concern?

12 A I recall there being several hundred. Around 260,
13 as I recall. Something like that.

14 Q Once you identified them, what was the next step?

15 A The next step was to determine whether some
16 program on the site was covering that correction or
17 completion or as the case may be.

18 Q Some existing program?

19 A Some existing program or if a new one had to be
20 created. I don't recall any of that specifically; but some
21 existing program, what was covering that item, and was it
22 trackable.

23 Q Once you identified what it was and where it
24 should be, what did you do with the information?

25 A Not necessarily where it should be; where it was.

1 Q Where it was. Okay.

2 A We listed that information on the report.

3 Q Who was responsible for the disposition or
4 resolution of that matter?

5 A Did we list who was responsible?

6 Q Was it assigned to someone?

7 A There was a program identified, not a name.

8 Q Okay. Was there a status given? Was there a
9 place for status, such as completed or unresolved or NRC
10 initiated? Was there a place for status so you'd know what
11 the current disposition of the concern was?

12 A We did not status the report. I'm trying to
13 remember whether we showed the completed item; and I don't
14 remember, we may have; but we did have what were then known
15 to be the estimated completion dates for the item, where
16 they were available.

17 Q Were you getting feedback from the people
18 responsible for resolving the issues?

19 A No. We didn't get feedback from the standpoint of
20 establishing communications. We did talk to various people
21 who were involved in the programs to obtain completion dates
22 or to assure ourselves how that was being handled.

23 Q Was this full-time? Did this require your
24 complete attention on this issue, or was it something that
25 was done sporadically?

1 A It was done, I would say, three-quarter time for
2 some period of time.

3 Q Tracing this line by line review of this document,
4 did you personally reach any conclusions about the voracity
5 of any of these concerns?

6 A No.

7 Q Do you recall any of your other team members
8 reaching any conclusions or expressing any concerns about
9 the voracity of these issues?

10 A No. That was not our function.

11 Q Okay. Did you ever express any opinion to anyone
12 outside of that group about the voracity of these concerns?

13 A I can't recall ever doing that.

14 Q Okay. Did you ever discuss that with Mr. White
15 specifically?

16 A Never.

17 BY MR. MURPHY:

18 Q You said you identified some 260, that estimate.
19 What percentage of that had been resolved as opposed to
20 those that needed some action?

21 A I have no idea. I couldn't recall.

22 Q I mean, was it half? More than half?

23 A I don't know.

24 Q You don't have any idea?

25 A No.

1 Q You also said that there were some items that were
2 -- Mr. Williamson asked you if they're where they should be
3 or where they happened to be or where they were. What's the
4 distinction of that?

5 A I don't understand your question. I'm sorry.

6 MS. CHARNOFF: I don't either.

7 BY MR. MURPHY:

8 Q Mr. Williamson asked you did you find these items
9 in this thing where they should be, right? You said, no.
10 You're weren't looking as to where they should be but where
11 they were.

12 A Are you talking about what programs they should be
13 in?

14 Q Yes, probably. I mean, you know.

15 A I guess the reason I made that distinction was
16 because, as I recall, by that time they had been assigned to
17 some kind of program; and I don't recall there being any
18 that were hanging out in space and needed to be assigned to
19 something at that time. That's why I made that distinction.

20 Q Okay. One of the things that I'm not sure I fully
21 understand, and maybe you can give me a little better
22 explanation, is when Mr. Williamson asked you did you arrive
23 at any kind of a feeling as to whether there were concerns
24 in there that were valid or whatever, right, you said that
25 was not your function.

1 A That's right.

2 Q For me, I guess, I have a very difficult time
3 believing that a person who's been in this business since
4 1953, in the nuclear business of sorts, right, with the kind
5 of background, and it appears you have an excellent
6 background, wouldn't arrive, in his own mind -- you know,
7 whether your conclusions were right or wrong, but in your
8 own mind -- after doing this work, you wouldn't come and
9 say, you know, it's either good or it's bad or it's a no-
10 never-mind.

11 You're saying that you formed no opinion about the
12 contents of the Congressional documents after you worked on
13 this for some period of time?

14 A In order to have formed that judgment -- and,
15 again, that's another thing I learned in the nuclear
16 business: you don't draw conclusions without facts -- and I
17 would have to go back and dig up a lot of facts to draw
18 those conclusions.

19 We did not do that. We were not asked to do that.
20 We didn't do it. We didn't draw any conclusions based on
21 hearsay or reading a one-liner in a report. How can you do
22 that?

23 Q Wait. I'm not asking whether you drew any
24 conclusions or not. I'm asking you, after working on this
25 thing for some period of time, that you didn't form some

J.C.

1 personal opinion of whether --

2 A That's a conclusion.

3 Q A conclusion we view as something that has, you
4 know, some factual background. An opinion might be just a
5 feeling you got about things.

6 A I have no opinion on that subject.

7 Q Whatsoever?

8 A On the voracity of that report.

9 MR. MURPHY: Fine.

10 BY MR. WILLIAMSON:

11 Q How long did you work on this report, Mr. Crnich?

12 MS. CHARNOFF: This report being the effort for me
13 we've been talking about?

14 BY MR. WILLIAMSON:

15 Q Yes. The effort for Mrs. Charnoff.

16 A In the order of five or six months.

17 Q Okay. We've been told that it was concluded in
18 the November or December '87 time frame, by the time you
19 left. You left in December of '87.

20 MS. CHARNOFF: I think you were told it was
21 stopped.

22 MR. WILLIAMSON: Stopped.

23 MS. CHARNOFF: Not concluded.

24 MR. WILLIAMSON: Yes. Concluded meaning no
25 additional work being done in that time. Not final; but

1 concluded.

2 BY MR. WILLIAMSON:

3 Q Did you ever see the final product? The results
4 of your labors?

5 A Of course.

6 Q Do you know if that was used by anyone: Mrs.
7 Charnoff or Willy Brown or anyone else in TVA's management
8 structure?

9 A I have no knowledge of it being used by anyone.

10 Q Do you know what kind of distribution or
11 dissemination this document received? We understand it was
12 a draft or a preliminary document and not a final document.
13 Do you know what kind of distribution it might have
14 received.

15 A It would have no distribution if it
16 hadn't -- because, theoretically, it really didn't exist,
17 you know.

18 Q It didn't exist?

19 MS. CHARNOFF: When you say that, you mean it was
20 a draft and not completed?

21 THE WITNESS: Yes. I mean, you know, a document
22 isn't distributed with a distribution until it's something
23 that exists and is complete.

24 MS. CHARNOFF: Okay.

25 THE WITNESS: It wasn't distributed, to my

1 knowledge.

2 BY MR. WILLIAMSON:

3 Q Okay. At this period of time, who were you
4 working for?

5 A For TVA.

6 Q Okay. I mean, did you report to someone? You
7 know, I'm low enough on the chain and have been for a number
8 of years; and I always someone over me. Did you have
9 someone you had to report to?

10 A I guess the closest thing would be Dave Kulisek
11 who was the TVA spokesman for the task force. So, I had to
12 say in that context I was working for Kulisek.

13 Q Do you know if Mr. Kulisek reported your status or
14 your progress in reviewing the Congressional document to
15 anyone?

16 MS. CHARNOFF: To anyone?

17 BY MR. WILLIAMSON:

18 Q To anyone.

19 A I guess in general I would have to say that
20 he -- I don't know for sure that he did, but he probably
21 reported it to the site manager.

22 MS. CHARNOFF: Do you know if he reported it to
23 me?

24 THE WITNESS: To you? In what context? I don't
25 understand. He gave it to you.

1 MS. CHARNOFF: Okay. Thank you.

2 BY MR. WILLIAMSON:

3 Q Did Ms. Bowser understand this document?

4 A Did she understand it? I don't know.

5 MR. WILLIAMSON: I mean Mrs. Charnoff. Excuse me.

6 BY MR. WILLIAMSON:

7 Q We've been told that this document, at least in
8 some part, was provided to line managers for review or for
9 comment or whatever, because they are the people who were
10 working on these issues.

11 Do you recall having specific discussions about
12 specific problems? I'll use the example welding concerns,
13 primarily, with people either in the construction or
14 division of QA at Watts Bar?

15 A I remember talking to, not distributing the
16 report, but sitting down and looking at the items in the
17 report with people so that I could do my job.

18 Q Did you have any discussions with anybody from the
19 EG&G group?

20 A Well, I'm not really sure who the EG&G group
21 really is or who all those folks were because they weren't
22 really identified as such.

23 I think the answer is yes, because I did talk to
24 some welding people; and I'm fairly certain I talked to some
25 EG&G people.

1 Q I recall only one. Kent Therpe.

2 A I beg your pardon?

3 Q Kent Therpe, I think. T-H-E-R-P-E.

4 A I don't know him.

5 Q He was the head of that project at one time. I
6 was wondering if you had any discussions with him.

7 A Okay. I've never talked to him. I don't know
8 him.

9 Q Do you know the status of the document that you
10 worked on, you know, until November-December '87?

11 A I don't understand what you mean by that.

12 Q Well, I mean as to what was done with it. Was it
13 ever finalized and given to anyone to use?

14 A I think I said earlier that I don't. I don't know
15 what happened to the document.

16 Q Your contract expired in December of '87, and you
17 left TVA?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And haven't been back.

20 A That's correct.

21 MR. WILLIAMSON: All right.

22 MS. CHARNOFF: Can I ask a question? When you're
23 talking about the document, are you talking the work in
24 connection with me?

25 THE WITNESS: Yes.

J.C.

1 MS. CHARNOFF: Okay. Thank you. Can I ask a
2 question?

3 MR. WILLIAMSON: Yes. Go ahead.

4 MS. CHARNOFF: There have been a number of
5 questions to Mr. Crnich about ensuring that every item that
6 was listed in the Congressional staff report was trackable,
7 I think it was the phrased you used.

8 Is it correct to say that the item was an
9 allegation? When you say every item, is that what you're
10 talking about?

11 THE WITNESS: I would term it as an allegation.
12 Yes.

13 MS. CHARNOFF: Okay. Was there any determination
14 made by you or your group whether that allegation^w as
15 correct?

16 THE WITNESS: Never.

17 MS. CHARNOFF: Thank you.

18 BY MR. WILLIAMSON:

19 Q I've asked other people this; and I'll ask you,
20 also. We had four professional engineers working on this
21 document for a period of, I guess, four to six months. To
22 my knowledge it hasn't been used by TVA.

23 In your opinion, was this a worthwhile effort by
24 your group? Did it result in any changes being made with
25 regards to the --

1 A I can't comment on that.

2 Q I mean, whether it was a worthwhile effort. Can
3 you give an opinion.

4 A I think that we did what we were asked to do. I
5 do know how pressing a need that was for any reason.
6 Someone else would have to discuss that.

7 BY MR. MURPHY:

8 Q Let me switch tracks a little bit and go back to
9 what that task force job was ^{AT} Watts Bar. I only have a
10 couple of questions.

11 A Which job?

12 Q The overall task force.

13 A June of '86?

14 Q Yes. The June '86. It looks like you worked
15 there, I'll repeat, for about eighteen months, right? Give
16 or take a little bit.

17 You prepared these reports. I guess, what would
18 you call the little reports you gave to Mr. White? Were
19 they final reports? Were they kind of information
20 documents? Were they briefing papers? What were they?

21 A They were, I guess I would call them a status
22 report.

23 Q Status report.

24 A Of different things that we were looking at.

25 Q And all of this data was never compiled into any

1 type a final report or a draft report at the end of the job?

2 A Not to my knowledge.

3 Q Is that commonplace? I mean, is that common
4 practice that a group of folks work a long period of time on
5 a task in the nuclear industry; and then at the end of this
6 period we don't have any type of final documentation to
7 state what their work concluded or what it found?

8 A There was no composite status report prepared. I
9 guess you could say that Volume IV encompassed pretty much
10 all the issues that we were reviewing.

11 You know, anything that we looked at would be
12 covered somehow in Volume IV.

13 MS. CHARNOFF: I don't understand, Mr. Murphy,
14 how, if it's a status report, you could have a final report
15 that included the earlier status. It wouldn't even be
16 accurate any more. I don't understand your question.

17 BY MR. MURPHY:

18 Q As I understand the task force, correct me if I'm
19 wrong, you were looking at some areas at Watts Bar that you
20 were directed to, by Willy Brown or whoever was in charge;
21 and as you went along you prepared status reports regarding
22 those particular areas. Right?

23 A Yes. That's correct.

24 Q Okay. What I'm saying is at the end of -- I mean,
25 you're actually reviewing some areas, some problem areas, or

1 some areas that needed review out there.

2 I'm asking why, at the end of all this review, a
3 report wasn't written saying this is the results of our
4 overall review. As I understand it, from what you're
5 telling me, this, in essence, was done in Volume IV.

6 A Yes. Those issues were all covered in Volume IV.

7 Q Okay.

8 MS. CHARNOFF: I just want to make a
9 clarification. It's true though, is it not, that Volume IV
10 was a different kind of document than the status reports.
11 Am I correct?

12 THE WITNESS: Oh, certainly.

13 MS. CHARNOFF: The Volume IV was a beginning of a
14 plan, as I understand it, that wasn't complete, of how to
15 get the plant licensed what programs would be underway and
16 things of that sort.

17 THE WITNESS: Oh, yes.

18 MS. CHARNOFF: I mean it's apples and oranges is
19 my problem with the discussion.

20 THE WITNESS: The status report was a status of
21 our --

22 MS. CHARNOFF: Assignment?

23 THE WITNESS: Well, of how we were doing on issues
24 that we were addressing. You know, how are we progressing
25 on those issues. Volume IV would have described the issues

1 and the program for conducting them or handling them.

2 MR. WILLIAMSON: I've got some more questions.

3 BY MR. WILLIAMSON:

4 Q You stated earlier that at some point in time, and
5 I won't ask you to recall, that you did review the March
6 20th, 1986 letter from TVA to the NRC regarding meeting the
7 requirements of Appendix B at Watts Bar and the enclosures
8 which I think we've kind of deemed as the eleven perceptions
9 that had been identified earlier. That was the enclosure to
10 the document.

11 Did you have any occasion, did you on any
12 occasion, ever discuss that document with Mr. White
13 personally?

14 A The March 20th letter? Never.

15 Q Did you ever tell anyone that statements made by
16 Mr. White in his March 20th letter to the NRC could not be
17 supported or defended as a result of what you had found at
18 Watts Bar?

19 A I can't recall ever making such a statement.

20 Q Do you know if that was ever told by anyone to
21 Mr. White?

22 A I don't know if it was, but I have no knowledge of
23 it being told.

24 Q Let me ask you something else. A final question.
25 Did having read the March 20th letter and the enclosures,

1 having been on a Watts Bar task force and also having been
2 on the Charnoff review, did you find anything in conflict
3 between the March 20th letter and what found either as a
4 task force member or part of this review group? Was there
5 anything that was in conflict ?

6 A I'm not sure I understand what you're asking.

7 Q Okay. You read the letter at some point in time.
8 You were also doing a lot of background work --

9 A Yes, sir.

10 Q -- in operations and maintenance. Was there
11 anything there that caught your attention, as a professional
12 engineer with a lot of experience, to be in conflict with
13 what you were finding, to be in conflict with what was
14 stated in the letter?

15 A I'm still not sure I understand your question.
16 Can you rephrase it?

17 MR. MURPHY: Let me try it one time.

18 BY MR. MURPHY:

19 Q Having read the letter and the supporting
20 document, the enclosures, the attachments, at one point in
21 time -- not the supporting document: that's another
22 thing -- but having read that and having spent all that time
23 at Watts Bar, did you agree with the letter?

24 A Whose letter?

25 Q Mr. White's letter. The March 20th letter that I

1 think we've talked about for a little bit.

2 A I have no basis. I'd have to do a lot more than
3 we did to form a judgment on Mr. White's letter.

4 Q Okay.

5 A The work that we did would not support a judgment
6 of that letter.

7 MS. CHARNOFF: Let me ask a question. The work
8 you did, would you say a lot of it was organizational in
9 terms of getting things -- well, they're not listening. I'm
10 going to withdraw the question.

11 MR. WILLIAMSON: I'm sorry.

12 MR. MURPHY: Yes.

13 MS. CHARNOFF: My question to him was, because I'm
14 trying to clarify this point that you keep on pushing with
15 him, did you look at a lot of things, Mr. Crnich, that were
16 not substantive in terms of whether or not the plant was in
17 conformance with the regulation or not, or whether or not
18 something was the way it should be?

19 In other words, is that true, for example, that in
20 your work with me it was what I called earlier
21 organizational rather than substantive? Can you answer that
22 question?

23 THE WITNESS: I guess I don't understand your
24 question either.

25 MS. CHARNOFF: That's fair.

1 THE WITNESS: The work we did with you was data
2 gathering effort --

3 MS. CHARNOFF: Okay.

4 THE WITNESS: -- which required somebody with a
5 technical background to perform. The kind of a judgment
6 that I was asked about earlier --

7 MS. CHARNOFF: Right.

8 THE WITNESS: -- for example, the first thing, in
9 order to form that judgment, we would have to interview the
10 people who were involved in preparing that letter. We never
11 talked to any of those individuals. I mean, that's just a
12 start, right? I mean, there's no way we could have formed
13 conclusions, drawn conclusions from that letter, without at
14 least doing that.

15 So, you just couldn't do it. You would have to do
16 a lot ^{of} digging and go back and look at dates documents were
17 implemented, what regulations were in effect then.

18 You know, it would take a tremendous effort to
19 substantiate that. We did not do that; and we had no
20 knowledge, at least I don't, of how that letter was
21 prepared, in any way. No knowledge of it.

22 BY MR. MURPHY:

23 Q Just one more question, and it's much along the
24 lines of Mr. Williamson's question.

25 Just prior to leaving Watts Bar and the Watts Bar

Je

1 general area of TVA, did you ever have a discussion with
2 anyone during which you said that you didn't think the
3 letter could be supported and that if you were Mr. White
4 you'd dump it all on his subordinates?

5 A Did I ever say that?

6 Q Yes.

7 A I can't imagine my saying that.

8 Q You never made such a statement?

9 A I never made such a statement.

10 MR. WILLIAMSON: Let's take just a short break.

11 (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

12 MR. WILLIAMSON: Mr. Murphy, do you have any
13 additional questions you'd like to ask?

14 MR. MURPHY: No. I sure don't.

15 MR. WILLIAMSON: Mrs. Charnoff, do you?

16 MS. CHARNOFF: No.

17 BY MR. WILLIAMSON:

18 Q Mr. Crnich, in closing, I'd like to ask you if I
19 or any other NRC representative here as threatened you in
20 any manner or offered you any reward in return for your
21 testimony?

22 A The answer to that is no.

23 Q Have you given this testimony freely and
24 voluntarily?

25 A I have.

1 Q Is there any additional information you'd like to
2 add to the record?

3 A No. There isn't.

4 MR. WILLIAMSON: In conclusion I'd like to thank
5 you for your time and for your cooperation. I know that you
6 have come here to us and that you have a busy schedule. We
7 appreciate your time for doing that.

8 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

9 MR. WILLIAMSON: Mrs. Charnoff.

10 MS. CHARNOFF: I just wanted to confirm that we
11 were operating under our standard operating procedures as
12 far as the transcript.

13 MR. WILLIAMSON: Certainly. You will be provided
14 that. Yes, ma'am.

15 MS. CHARNOFF: Thank you.

16 MR. WILLIAMSON: Any other questions from anyone?
17 If not, this interview is concluded at 3:33 on August 11th,
18 1988.

19 (Whereupon, the matter was concluded at 3:33 p.m.,
20 on Thursday, August 11, 1988.)

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE

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

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission in the matter of: Investigative Interview

Name: John Crnich

Docket Number:

Place: Washington, D.C.

Date: August 11, 1988

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the file of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission taken stenographically by me and, thereafter reduced to typewriting by me or under the direction of the court reporting company, and that the transcript is a true and accurate record of the foregoing proceedings.

181 K.C. Sekander

(Signature typed):

K.C. Sekander

Official Reporter

Heritage Reporting Corporation

J. Crnich
8/28/88

Heritage Reporting Corporation
(202) 628-4288

je