United States Nuclear regulatory commission

OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS

In the Matter

INVESTIGATIVE INTERVIEW:

DAVID A. KULISER

(CLOSED)

RB AUG B A9: 2:

DATE: July 29 1988

LOCATION: Mashington, D.C.

PAGES: 1 through 35

8901050287 881011 PLR ADDCK 05000390 PDR

HERITAGE REPORTING CORPORATION

Official Reporters
1228 L Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 628-4888

| 1 | UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATIONS | TORY COMMISSION |
|-----|--|---|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | In the Matter of | } |
| 4 | INVESTIGATIVE INTERVIEW: | |
| 5 | DAVID A. KULISER | i |
| 6 | | Friday, July 29, 1988 |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | | Tennessee Valley Authority Tennessee |
| 9 | The above-entitled | matter came on for hearing, |
| 10 | pursuant to notice, at 11:45 | a.m. |
| 1.1 | APPEARANCES: | |
| 12 | On behalf of the Nu | clear Regulatory Commission: |
| 13 | E.L. WILLIAMSON Office of Investiga | itions |
| 14 | Region II Atlanta, Georgia | |
| 15 | DANIEL D. MURPHY | |
| 16 | Operations Officer White Flint, Maryla | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | On behalf of the Re | |
| 19 | DEBORAH B. CHARNOFF Shaw, Pittman, Pott | s & Trowbridge |
| 20 | 2300 N Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. | |
| 21 | | 4 . |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |

25

ich

CONTENTS

<u>WITNESS</u> <u>EXAMINATION</u>

David A. Kulisek Page 4

10 EXHIBITS

None

21 22

23 24

1

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROCEEDINGS

2 MR. WILLIAMSON: For the record, this is the interview of David A. Rulisek, regulatory licensing manager, 3 employed by the Tennessee Valley Authority. This interview is being conducted by the Office of Investigations for the 5 Muclear Regulatory Commission. It is July the 29th, 1988. 6 The time is 11:45. The interview is being conducted in the 7 offices of the law firm of Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and 8 9 Trowbridge in Washington, D C. 10

The nature of the interview pertains to the facts and circumstances surrounding the submittal of a letter from TVA to NRC dated March 20th, 1986, regarding TVA's compliance with 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, at Watts Bar nuclear plant.

Currently present at this interview are Mr. Kulisek.

Mrs. Deborah Charnoff, attorney for the law firm of Shaw,

Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, Daniel D. Murphy, and E.L.

Williamson, investigators with the Office of Investigations

for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

This interview is being transcribed with a court reporter.

Mr. Kulisek, do you have any objections to being put under oath prior to your testimony?

THE WITNESS: No.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Would you mind standing, please, and raise your right hand?

all

2

1

DAVID A. KULISEK

3

having been duly sworn, was called as a witness herein, and testified as follows:

4

EXAMINATION

5

6

BY MR. WILLIAMSON:

7

8

9

TVA?

11

10

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Kulisek, for the record, would you provide to us some background information with regard to your education and your work experiences to include your present position with

I received my BS degree in nuclear engineering from the University of Illinois in December of 1980, came to work for TVA in January of '81, in the licensing staff, spent a couple of years there and transferred over to the Division of Nuclear Power in their Reactor Engineering Branch, transferred up to Watts Bar about four years ago in the regulatory engineering section, was promoted to supervisor shortly thereafter.

I have gone through, I am a certified shift technical advisor on Watts Bar nuclear plant. I was promoted to the regulatory licensing manager position I believe back in '86. Since then. I have served on the Watts Bar Task Force from about March of '87 until December of '87. From then until about a month ago, I was the acting site licensing manager, and about a month ago I entered into about an

| 2 | through to receive senior reactor operator licenses on |
|----|---|
| 3 | Sequoyah. |
| 4 | Q. So up until this training period, you were |
| 5 | physically located at the Watts Bar site? |
| 6 | A. Yes, for about the past four years. |
| 7 | Q. Prior to the time that, of the substantive portion |
| 8 | of this interview, I would like to clarify for the record the |
| 9 | nature and scope of the representation by Mrs. Charnoff as it |
| LO | pertains to Mr. Kulisek personally and any other parties of |
| 11 | interest in the matter under investigation. |
| 2 | Mr. Kulisek, I have a few questions I would like for |
| .3 | you to answer. |
| 4 | Is Mrs. Charnoff your personal representative at |
| .5 | this interview? |
| .6 | A. Yes, she is. |
| 7 | Q. Did you select her on your own, or was she selected |
| 8 | for you? |
| 9 | A. I selected her. |
| 0 | Q. Can you briefly describe how this selection process |
| 1 | took place? |
| 2 | A. Basically I have been working with Debbie on this |
| 3 | project all along. When I found out that, through her, that |
| 4 | you had asked to interview me, I asked her to represent me. |
| 5 | Q. Is Mrs. Charnoff being paid for her services as you |

18-month program that several middle level managers are going

| | A. We have not discussed that. I do not know who is |
|----|---|
| 4 | paying. |
| 5 | Q. Would you assume that your employer is paying for |
| 6 | Mrs. Charnoff's services since you are not paying for them an |
| 7 | I don't think they are probably free? |
| 8 | A. I would assume TVA is paying for them, yes. If not |
| 9 | I certainly will. |
| 10 | Q. Were you directed by anyone in your organization or |
| 11 | were you told by anyone in your organization that you could |
| 12 | have anyone to represent you and you voluntarily selected Mrs |
| 13 | Charnoff? |
| 14 | A. I voluntarily selected Debbie. |
| 15 | Q. To your knowledge, did Mrs. Charnoff represent any |
| 16 | other party of interest in this interview? |
| 17 | A. She certainly represents other parties such as TVA. |
| 18 | I'm aware of that. |
| 19 | Q. Let me ask you, do you envision any conflict of |
| 20 | interest regarding your testimony here today between Mrs. |
| 21 | Charnoff's representation of both you and TVA? |
| 22 | A. No. I don't. |
| 23 | Q. If your testimony should contain information that |
| 24 | either you know or think would be derogatory to TVA, or would |
| 25 | indicate any criminal activity by TVA but was in no way |
| | |
| | |

personal representative by anyone other than yourself, or are

1

you paying?

| 2 | to testify knowing that Mrs. Charnoff represents TVA? |
|-----|---|
| 3 | A. Yes, I would. |
| 4 | C. If Mrs. Charnoff were to advise you not to testify |
| 5 | regarding such information, would you feel compelled to follo |
| 6 | that advice? |
| 7 | A. I would probably seek advice from another counsel a |
| 8 | that point. |
| 9 | Q. Is it your understanding that Mrs. Charnoff will be |
| 10 | your legal representative during this entire, the course of |
| 11 | this investigation to include any subsequent enforcement or |
| 12 | criminal action against TVA if such actions s were taken, or |
| .13 | do you understand that she will represent you only at this |
| 14 | interview? |
| 15 | A. I can't say. I haven't any understanding either |
| 16 | way. I have not thought about that. |
| 17 | Q. That would be something you would have to discuss i |
| 18 | the situation arose? |
| 19 | A. Yes, sir. |
| 20 | MR. WILLIAMSON: Mrs. Charnoff, are you acting as |
| 21 | Mr. Kulisek's personal representative here today? |
| 22 | MS. CHARNOFF: Yes, sir. |
| 23 | MR. WILLIAMSON: Is he paying you from his own fund |
| 24 | for your personal representation? |
| 25 | MS. CHARNOFF: As he indicated, we haven't discussed |
| | |

derogatory or incriminating to yourself, would you feel free

| 1 | it, but my expectation is that TVA would pay me as they have |
|----|---|
| 2 | done with respect to other individuals who are, who have been |
| 3 | subject to this investigation because of their work at, |
| 4 | because they work for TVA. |
| 5 | MR. WILLIAMSON: You have indicated that you have |
| 6 | represented other parties of interest to this interview. |
| 7 | MS. CHARNOFF: Yes. |
| 8 | MR. WILLIAMSON: In view |
| 9 | MS. CHARNOFF: You have you continually asked that |
| 10 | question in terms of other parties of interest to this |
| 11 | interview, and I think that's the wrong question. I think |
| 12 | that there are other parties of interest in this |
| 13 | investigation. I don't know whether they are of interest in |
| 14 | this interview, and I think that's where people have stumbled |
| 15 | in answering that question. |
| 16 | MR. WILLIAMSON: Okay. In view of this additional |
| 17 | representation by you, do you believe it possible conflict of |
| 18 | interest could arise during this interview? |
| 19 | MS. CHARNOFF: I have no expectation whatsoever that |
| 20 | there would be a possible conflict of interest. |
| 21 | MR. WILLIAMSON: If such a conflict did arise, what |
| 22 | would you do? |
| 23 | MRS. CHARNOFF: I think this is the fourth time I |
| 24 | have made this explanation, but in essence, as in any other |
| 25 | situation, other cases in which I am working on, if I had a |

conflict of interest among several clients, it would be my responsibility, and this is spelled out in some detail in the lawyer's ethical standards, it would be my responsibility to discuss the matter with all parties concerned, at least both clients, and to determine with them what the best course of action would be.

There is not an automatic rule under our Code of Responsibility for how to treat every case. It involves judgment in terms of whether to continue the representation or not continue the representation, and obviously it involves the preferences of the client. If the clients want you to continue to represent them, even though there may he a potential conflict, I believe that that's what a lawyer is supposed to do, but I don't think we are anywhere near that situation in this case, so that is hypothetical.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Any questions?

MR. MURPHY: Yes, just one or two minor points.

BY MR. MURPHY:

- Q. You said that you had worked with Deborah Bauser all along. When this interview, when we asked for this interview that you, you selected her as you attorney, what does all along mean? As we understand it, one of the projects you worked on, Watts Bar ended in December of 1987?
 - A. We--

Q. Have you continued to work on this project since

latt

| den. s, of rrect? |
|-------------------|
| s, of rrect? |
| s, of rrect? |
| rrect? |
| |
| d abou |
| d abou |
| d abou |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| this |
| |
| be |
| |
| d to |
| |
| n? If |
| one |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

A. Certainly Bill has to make that decision for

1 | himself.

2

3

BY MR. WILLIAMSON:

4

Q. Mr. Kulisek, you mentioned that you were assigned to the Watts Bar project, Watts Bar Task Force from April '87 through December '87.

6

7

5

What were you doing immediately prior to April of '87? What was your position again, please?

8

A. The regulatory licensing manager at Watts Bar.

9

Q. Okay. What, as a member of this Task Force, what were your responsibilities as you understood them at that

11

12

time?

10

A. Is that concerning Task Force activities or concerning--

14

13

Q. Task Force.

1.5

A. This effort with them?

16

17

Q. Task Force.

Task Force or --

18

to both the site director and Mr. White, the manager of nuclear power, and in a nutshell, we were there to do certain

20

19

tasks to evaluate corrective action programs, making sure that

A. Okay. The Task Force basically had dual reporting

21

they were effective in correcting the problems, identifying

22

any potential problems that needed to be taken care of.

23

Q. Did you have any special responsibilities with regard to the Task Force? I mean were you the head of the

25

Jale

| 1 | A. I was the TVA representative. All the other |
|----|---|
| 2 | gentlemen on the Task Force were contract personnel. I was |
| 3 | TVA representative and spokesman for the Task Force. |
| 4 | Q. You were a working member of the Task Force? |
| 5 | A. Yes. |
| 6 | Q. I know there are a number of people that were, that |
| 7 | were, that were assigned to the Task Force that were from. |
| 8 | were TVA employees I think? |
| 9 | A. Not during the time that I was on the Task Force. |
| 10 | Q. Okay. What were your responsibilities after April |
| 11 | of '87 when you began work with Mrs. Charnoff? |
| 12 | A. The first time we had any, I had any contact with |
| 13 | this effort with Debbie was in June of 1987, and the effort |
| 14 | there was to take the technical issues that were, that were |
| 15 | identified in the Congressional staff report and identify |
| 16 | where in TVA this issue was either being handled or would |
| 17 | eventually be looked at under some program. |
| 18 | Q. And the report you refer to I will mention here is |
| 19 | dated December 17, 1986, to John D. Dingell, Chairman of the |
| 20 | Committee on Energy and Commerce, subject, staff review of NR |
| 21 | response to quality assurance breakdown within TVA's nuclear |
| 22 | program. |
| 23 | I would like for you to look at that and tell me if |
| 24 | that is in fact the document that, that you reviewed? |

Yes, it is.

| 1 | Q. You began working on these specific concerns with. |
|----|--|
| 2 | say the Congressional paper concerns, raised concerns raised |
| 3 | by the Congressional subcommittee in June of '87? |
| 4 | A. Yes. |
| 5 | Q. Was this a full-time effort on your part? |
| 6 | A. No. |
| 7 | Q. Estimate what percentage of your time was spent on |
| 8 | this effort as opposed to other concerns as a member of the |
| 9 | Task Force? |
| 10 | A. In June, it was probably, June, July timeframe, it |
| 11 | was probably 50 percent. From then through December, it |
| 12 | waried widely. I'm not sure I can even make an educated |
| 13 | guess. |
| 4 | Q. Did you, as you understood, did anyone else |
| 15 | specifically work on this document with you, the review of |
| 16 | this document? |
| 17 | A. The Task Force members that worked on this document |
| .8 | with me were of course Mike Matthews, Bill Gordon, John |
| 9 | Crnich, and Fred Pope had a very, very limited effort on this |
| 0 | Q. During June and July, early stages of your review |
| 1 | process, what did you understand Mrs. Charnoff wanted your |
| 2 | group to do with these concerns as specifically as possible in |
| 3 | you can relate that to us? Did you have a meeting, your group |
| 4 | have a meeting with Mrs. Charnoff and she directed that |
| | |

25

certain things be done?

| | 14 |
|----|--|
| 1 | A. Yes. We had a meeting, and I can't, I don't recall |
| 2 | the date. |
| 3 | Q. Okay. |
| | A. My understanding was pretty much as I stated before. |
| 5 | to take the technical issues that were identified in the |
| • | report, and find the program that was either in progress or |
| | was being put together now that these issues would fall under. |
| l. | Q. Was this effort, did this effort involve the support |
| | or participation of people other than the specific members of |
| | the Task Force? |
| | A. Yes, yes, it did. |
| | Q. A number of people, or just I am looking for a |
| | number. Is it something that, people you can relate by name. |
| | or is it a number of people that were required to support this |
| | effort? |
| | A. Well, there were a number of people that were |

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- ere required to support the effort based on a large number of technical issues, and the number of references that we had to come up with.
- You must of had a lot of interaction with other people, other departments or divisions there at Watts Bar to establish these references?
 - In regard to the individual issues, yes.
- Did you have any people working for you--I say lower level people, that were doing some of the legwork for the Task

Force itself?

A.

2

1

- No. A.
- 3 You all were doing this work personally?
- 5 0. Divided it up?

Yes.

- Yes.
- 8
- Okay. Certain allegations or certain concerns were assigned to certain individuals and they were pursuing those to a logical conclusion?
- 10

9

- A. Yes.
- 11

12

- Were there any conclusions ever reached with regard to this, to your review?
- 13
- I don't understand what you mean by.
- 14
- point that there were conclusions or findings or a status or

A. Well, the intent was not to per se draw any

TVA that would eventually evaluate this type of technical

Did you ever formalize your, your review to the

16

15

- disposition of these concerns?
- 17
- 18 conclusions. It was simply again to identify the program in
- 19
- issue. It was not a matter of drawing conclusions. It was a 20
- 21
- matter of gathering data that was already out there, and

direction of drawing conclusions.

- 22 putting it together under each of the technical issues, so I
- 23
- guess what I am saying is the effort didn't lead into that
- 24

25

Q. Did you know at any point that during your effort

| 1 | that this document wasn't one to be completed? |
|----|--|
| 2 | A. No. |
| 3 | Q. Do you know the status of it today? |
| 4 | A. My understanding of the status is that it is still |
| 5 | draft report, and to the best of my knowledge, hasn't been |
| 6 | worked on since essentially late December or early part of |
| 7 | January of this year. |
| 8 | Q. Do you know why it hasn't been worked on? |
| 9 | A. No. The Task Force was disbanded in late November, |
| .0 | early December. |
| 1 | Q. On its own volition or was it directed or was itI |
| 2 | mean what was, how did that come about? |
| .3 | A. There was a memo from Admiral White disbanding the |
| 4 | Task Force. |
| .5 | Q. Because he didn'tdo you recall, was there a reaso |
| 6 | given? |
| 7 | A. Yes. Thebasically the program teamI believe |
| 8 | that's the name of itprogram team or project team, was bein |
| 9 | put together by Mr. White and staffed by TVA employees, and |
| 0 | they took over the major responsibilities of what the Task |
| 1 | Force was doing, and our Task Force really became redundant. |
| 2 | There was no reason for it anymore. |
| 3 | Q. You mentioned |
| 4 | A. That did not include, of course, this effort with, |

25

with Debbie.

| 1 | Q. You mentioned that you went, first went to Watts Ba |
|----|--|
| 2 | in 1984? |
| 3 | A. Yes. |
| 4 | Q. You said four years ago? |
| 5 | A. Yes. |
| 6 | Q. And |
| 7 | |
| | A. I believe it was July of 1984. |
| 8 | Q. Okay. So you were there during a period of time |
| 9 | when there was a lot of activity going on regarding the |
| 10 | quality issues and the safety issues, specifically I guess the |
| 11 | initiation of QTC, employees concern program? |
| 12 | A. Yes. |
| 13 | Q. And some other activities that went on regarding |
| 14 | Watts Bar; you had perhaps, based on you being the only TVA |
| 15 | employee and also being a TVA employee that had been at Watts |
| 16 | Bar for approximately three years prior to beginning work on |
| 17 | this project, were there any concerns in here or issues raised |
| 18 | that were of a particular importance to you is one question? |
| 19 | And were there any concerns in there that, that I guess were |
| 20 | surprise to you? |
| 21 | A. I would have to ask you to rephrase that. I don't |
| 22 | understand what you are saying. |
| 23 | Q. Which part do you want me to rephrase? |
| 24 | A. Both; question No. 1 first. |

Jak

I am saying because you are the only individual

25

Q.

18 1 regarding this effort that we have talked to that had been at 2 Watts Bar for three years, you had seen a lot of things 3 regarding quality and safety issues that had surfaced there. You had seen the employee concern program, the QTC group. 5 TVA's own QTC program, so you had been subjected to--you had 6 been in Licensing, is that correct? 7 A. Yes. 8 Licensing, you had been subjected to a lot of concerns and/or allegations, at least the knowledge of some of 9 the concerns? Is that not true? 10 11

- I wouldn't necessarily say that was true, no.
- Okay. What did you do in Licensing?
- I was again in the regulatory licensing group. We handled basically the FSAR, the technical specifications. experience review program, items such as that. The other side of the Licensing house which was the compliance licensing group, typically handled the 50.55E items and the inspection reports and the deficiency type areas.
 - 0. Okay. Thank you. BY MR. MURPHY:

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You mentioned earlier that in, as you were dealing with this Congressional report there, that your job on that, you dealt with a lot of other people in the various areas? I guess you would have to, to get the information you need, is that correct?

| 2 | Q. Were these people aware of what you were doing? |
|-----|--|
| 3 | A. They were aware of the fact that we were gathering |
| 4 | information to identify where in TVA these specific technical |
| 5 | issues were being dealt with. |
| 6 | Q. I mean did they know why you were doing this? |
| . 7 | A. I don't know. |
| 8 | Q. Do you know if any directions were given to the |
| 9 | various line organizations that you dealt with that instructe |
| 10 | them to help you as much as you can? |
| 11 | A. Instructions by, by me personally or certainly yes, |
| 12 | that was done. |
| 13 | Q. And what were your instructions to these people? |
| 14 | A. To provide information as requested by any of the |
| 15 | Task Force members to gather this information. |
| 16 | Q. You never told them why they were |
| 17 | A. Yes. I just mentioned that I believe they were mad |
| 18 | aware of the fact that we were trying to find and put down in |
| 19 | a report the programs that were either ongoing or would |
| 20 | eventually be ongoing that covered the technical issues being |
| 21 | raised in the report, in the Congressional staff's report. |
| 22 | |
| 23 | The state of the s |
| 24 | was going to be turned over to the legal staff? Was that ever |
| | part of your instructions? |
| 25 | A. I believe they were aware that I was working with |

Yes.

Debbie on this, the Shaw Pittman lawyers. I can't say for, 1 for certain, you know, that they were. 2 3 BY MR. WILLIAMSON: 4 Did you have any contact with TVA's Office of 5 General Counsel during this? 6 Yes. Yes. I dealt with--7 When Mrs. Charnoff was not available, you were 0. 8 dealing with Rick Levi? 9 A. Yes. In fact, most of the time I dealt with them 10 jointly. 11 MR. WILLIAMSON: Mrs. Charnoff, I understand you are 1.2 not the interviewee, but the question just popped in my mind, 13 can you divulge how much time you spent with these gentlemen 14 in this effort? 15 MS. CHARNOFF: I have no problems doing it. I have 16 trouble estimating what it was. We had a number of, we had, 17 we met--I can't remember how many times we met when I was down 18 at TVA, and we had, I had many phone conversations with one or 19 more of the group. I didn't always know how many people were 20 at the other end of the phone--most frequently with Dave and 21 other members who had questions. 22 MR. WILLIAMSON: Was the purpose of that since you 23 weren't physically located there, was the purpose of that 24 maybe a status report?

MS. CHARNOFF: Sometimes it was a status. Sometimes

it was as we began to do this, to make sure we all agreed on 1 what we were trying to do. 3 MR. WILLIAMSON: I'm, I didn't know that the that the group was disbanded by the direction of Mr. white. 5 Were you aware of Mr. White's desire to disband that 6 and did you object to that at all, or is that not an accurate 7 characterization of how the group was disbanded? 8 MS. CHARNOFF: I hate to be testifying, but in the 9 interest of full disclosure, I don't believe I was aware until 10 it had already happened. I knew that there was a lot of 11 effort by Mr. white which was a general TVA decision to try to 12 transition to line TVA people from contract employees, and 13 this was part of that effort, I assumed, but I don't think I ever specifically talked to him about that decision. 14 15 BY MR. WILLIAMSON: 16 Mr. Gordon, were you briefing Mr. White--excuse me. 17 Mr. Kulisek, were you briefing Mr. White as to the status or, 18 of your effort? 19 The effort with Debbie? 20 Q. Yes. 21 No. 22 Were you briefing Mr. White with regard to--23 MS. CHARNOFF: I don't believe that I ever discussed 24 with Mr. White any facts beyond the fact that I had asked, I 25 did ask him for permission to get some help from TVA people.

| 2 | BY MR. MURPHY: |
|-----|--|
| 3 | Q. This small group working on the, on Mrs. Charnoff's |
| 4 | request, were you in charge of that group or did you have, I |
| - 5 | mean were you in charge? Was anyone? |
| 6 | A. I was the coordinator, being the TVA representative |
| .7 | on the Task Force, I was the coordinator of the group for this |
| 8 | effort. |
| 9 | Q. Would you assign various tasks to the people on the |
| 10 | on the Task Force? |
| 11 | A. Yes. |
| 12 | Q. And they would, would they report back statuses of |
| 13 | how they were doing on their, on their individual items that |
| 14 | they were assigned? |
| 15 | A. Yes. |
| 16 | Q. Were these in writing? |
| 17 | A. No. |
| 18 | Q. Oral? |
| 19 | A. No. We all sat in the same small trailer and |
| 20 | essentially that was all. |
| 21 | Q. Then there was no written product produced in this, |
| 22 | at the various stages that you went through? |
| 23 | A. As far as the status report from the other members |
| 24 | of the Task Force, no. |
| 25 | Q. How did itI know, we know that this is a document |

and he knew I was doing that.

| 2 | Did youwho prepared this document? |
|----|---|
| 3 | A. That latest document was actually, was actually |
| 4 | compiled and put together by John Crnich and Bill Gordon, |
| 5 | actually putting the final product together and the stamping |
| 6 | of preliminary on there and the date. I happened to be on |
| 7 | vacation at that time when it was put together. |
| 8 | Q. What is the time frame on that? |
| 9 | A. It was late, late December, over the holidays |
| 10 | basically, Christmas holidays. Mike Matthews had left TVA an |
| 11 | gone down to Comanche Peak and I believe in late November |
| 12 | basically. I have not even looked at that, that particular |
| 13 | final compilation. I say final. It is obviously still |
| 14 | preliminary. |
| 15 | Q. Preliminary in the sense it is a draft of whatever, |
| 16 | whatever your group developed, right? |
| 17 | A. Yes, it is a draft. |
| .8 | Q. I mean, and I mean how did they compiledid they |
| .9 | not have small, short writeups about each of these things tha |
| 0 | went along, or at the end did they justI mean how did they |
| 1 | keep track of what they were doing? |
| 2 | A. I'm not sure what you are asking. |
| 3 | Q. You do have a final written product, right? I don' |
| 4 | understand |
| 5 | A. Draft. |

that includes the work, the effort that you have performed.

| 1 | Q. Draft, Fight. Well, draft? |
|--|--|
| 2 | A. Final meaning it was typed. |
| 3 | Q. Yes. That's what I am talking about. How did that |
| 4 | how was that developed? From notes or from |
| 5 | A. Yes. That came from handwritten versions and was |
| 6 | provided to the word processing group on the site that typed |
| 7 | it. |
| 8 | Q. I mean was this not prepared, I mean were these |
| 9 | notes not prepared as you went along? I do not envision |
| 10 | waiting until the last moment to prepare all these notes. |
| 11 | A. Yes, they were prepared as we went along and |
| 12 | modified and updated as any, you know, as any product would |
| 13 | be. |
| 14 | Q. And who performed that task? |
| 15 | A. The members of the Watts Bar Task Force, members |
| 16 | that I already mentioned. |
| 17 | Q. Was that information shared with any line managers? |
| 18 | A. The information was at various times in bits and |
| 19 | pieces, and I believe as a whole late in the year was shared |
| 20 | with the line managers. |
| 21 | Q. And |
| 22 | A. To ask them if they had any further information or |
| 23 | any comments on the product. |
| 24 | Q. And who were these line managers? Can you remember |
| 25 | A. Oh, well, it would be the project engineer at Watts |
| The second secon | |

| 1 | Bar, the site licensing manager. |
|----|---|
| 2 | Q. Would you give us some names if you could? |
| 3 | A. If I can remember the names |
| 4 | Q. Sure. |
| 5 | A. Benny Bounds would be the project engineer. Hoyt |
| 6 | Johnson would be the QA manager. John McDonald would be the |
| 7 | site licensing manager. Eddie Ennis would be the plant |
| 8 | manager. Jim Thompson would have been the construction |
| 9 | manager. I believe that's, that's the principal line manager |
| 10 | that were sent to them. There may be one or two others that |
| 11 | don't come to mind right now. |
| 12 | BY MR. WILLIAMSON: |
| 13 | Q. Let me go back just a minute, Mr. Kulisek. Did you |
| 14 | have, being at Watts Bar, did you have an opportunity to |
| 15 | review the March 20th letter from Mr. White to the NRC and th |
| 16 | supporting documentation, the enclosures? |
| 17 | MS. CHARNOFF: March 20, 1986. |
| 18 | BY MR. WILLIAMSON: |
| 19 | Q. March 20, 1986? |
| 20 | A. Prior to it being sent out? |
| 21 | Q. No; after it was sent out? |
| 22 | A. Yes, as part of this effort, I had reviewed the |
| 23 | March 20th. |
| 24 | Q. Would you have, I mean in your licensing role. |
| 25 | regulatory licensing, would you have had any, any reason to |
| | |

| 2 | A. No. |
|----|---|
| 3 | Q. Okay. After reviewing it, did you have occasion to |
| 4 | discuss that letter with Mr. White? |
| 5 | A. No. |
| 6 | BY MR. MURPHY: |
| 7 | Q. I think you told us you have not discussed the grou |
| 8 | effort with Mr. White, is that correct? |
| 9 | A. Yes, that is correct. I have not discussed this |
| 10 | effort with Mr. white. |
| 11 | Q. Did you discuss it with Mr. Willis, the general |
| 12 | manager at TVA? |
| 13 | A. No, sir. |
| 14 | Q. I think he has some other designation now, but I |
| 15 | think he was the general manager at the time. |
| 16 | A. The reason I hesitate there is another Mr. Willis |
| 17 | works at Watts Bar. |
| 18 | Q. Did you, did you discuss this with any of the Board |
| 19 | members? |
| 20 | A. No, sir. |
| 21 | BY MR. WILLIAMSON: |
| 22 | Q. Let me ask a question. Mike Matthews, you indicated |
| 23 | that I think that he was an advisor, in an advisor capacity |
| 24 | while working at TVA? |
| 25 | A. That's the way they classified all the contractors |

1

review that?

| 2 | managerscontractors could be one of two things, the line |
|-----|--|
| 3 | manager or an advisor. |
| 4 | Q. Okay. Would you or anyone else on your Task Force. |
| 5 | would you or anyone else on that Task Force have an occasion |
| 6 | or responsibility to brief Mr. White on any of these findings |
| 7 | that your review disclosed? |
| 8 | A. To the best of my knowledge, no. |
| 9 | Q. I mean you are the head of it, right? |
| 10 | A. I was the TVA representative and the coordinator. |
| 11 | Q. Would you know if someone else was briefing Mr. |
| 12 | White or Mrs. Charnoff or anyone else? |
| 1.3 | A. Well, certainly, no, I would have no idea when Mrs. |
| 4 | Charnoff was having discussions with Mr. White, and I can't |
| .5 | for a hundred percent say that I would certainly know if any |
| .6 | of the other Task Force members had a discussion with Mr. |
| 7 | White. |
| .8 | MS. CHARNOFF: Can I ask a question while you are |
| 9 | pausing? |
| 0 | MR. WILLIAMSON: Sure. |
| 1 | BY MS. CHARNOFF: |
| 2 | Q. As I understand your testimony, Mr. Kulisek, the |
| 3 | purpose, am I correct that the purpose of your discussing your |
| 4 | effort or showing your effort to the line management was to |
| 5 | ensure that you were, the information that you had gathered |

that were on the Task Force. They were either line

was accurate and complete? Is that right?

A. Yes, basically, because you know, to expand on that, basically what we were doing was referencing documents or programs that described documents that already existed in the system. There wasn't any, any making up of original information I guess I would say. It was really a data gathering effort. And of course most of those documentation belonged to the various line managers who would certainly have the best knowledge of, collectively the best knowledge of what their programs entailed.

BY MR. WILLIAMSON:

Q. This calls for an opinion, Mr. Kulisek, but you and three other people spent considerable amount of time reviewing this document and making the appropriate references.

And like I said, this calls for an opinion, but was it a worthwhile effort? Nothing has been done with it. You were working on it for several months. Apparently there was a lot of manhours expended on it. Still it is a preliminary or draft document. Nothing has been done since December '87. Is that a worthwhile document?

- A. Well, I believe the--
- Q. Could you take it and use it today?
- A. Could I take it and use it? I guess I never intended to take it and use it.

MS. CHARNOFF: Let me distinguish. You have asked

him whether the effort was worthwhile and also whether it is a 1 useful document now, which I think are different points, and I have no problem with him answering either or both, but--3 BY MR. WILLIAMSON: 5 I asked for opinion. Was it a worthwhile effort? 6 I'm not sure I have an opinion on that. 7 0. Once again, I guess I use the frame of reference having been at Watts Bar for a number of years, you didn't 8 9 operate in a vacuum. There was a lot going on from '74, 10 '75--'84, '85, '86. You spent a considerable amount of time. 11 There was a lot going on, and I guess I'm wondering--I haven't 12 seen the results, the fruits of your labors, so I don't know. 13 but I am wondering if in your opinion, as a professional 14 engineer, if that was a worthwhile effort? And I think it is 15 a reasonably simple question. 16 I think to achieve the purpose that it was intended to, and that was to identify the programs that were ongoing or 17 would be initiated, that these various technical issues raised 18 19 in the Congressional staff report to ensure that they were 20 being covered some place in the system, 21 Q. But it wasn't complete? 22 A. It wasn't finalized. 23 Q. Would it ever be completed?

j.

24

25

A.

The nature--

Q. A living document?

1 The nature of the document -- of course, programs A. 2 change continuously, scopes of programs. New programs are identified, so, so the document, the document that hasn't been 3 4 worked on for, you know, since December of 1987 would 5 certainly be out of date now. 6 BY MR. MURPHY: 7 You said you have read this Congressional document? 8 A. Yes, back in the fall. 9 In its entirely as opposed to just subsections of 10 it, is that correct? A. I have read the entire document. However, that 11 12 really was done in, in bits and pieces. I can't say I have picked it up and sat down and read it at one time from cover 13 14 to cover. 15 Q. Have you formed any opinion as of the validity of 16 the, of the concerns raised in this document? 17 A. No. 18 You never gave that any thought as you have gone through whether this was valid, true not true? 19 20 A. It really had, you know, the validity of the concerns really had no part in this effort. We took the 21 concerns as, the technical issue and the concern at face 22 23 value. Q. But you never formed any independent opinion as 24

opposed to what you were doing?

| 1 | A. I really wasn't in a position to, to form an opinion |
|----|--|
| 2 | on that. |
| 3 | Q. Okay. This gentleman, Fred Pope, how long did he |
| 4 | work with your group, give or take a little, you know? |
| 5 | A. He came in I believe in May. I would have to guess |
| 6 | May, and he worked on through December, but he, I didn't use |
| 7 | him, but very limited on this effort. |
| 8 | Q. Is there any reason for that? |
| 9 | A. Well, yes. Hethere was a lot of engineering |
| 10 | activity going on at the time, and I left him out of this |
| 11 | effort to keep abreast of those activities. |
| 12 | BY MR. WILLIAMSON: |
| 13 | Q. A couple more questionsdid you ever tell anyone |
| 14 | that statements made by Mr. White in his March 20th, 1986 |
| 15 | letter to the NRC could not be supported or defended? |
| 16 | A. No, sir. |
| 17 | Q. Okay. Do you know of anyone that ever told Mr. |
| 18 | White that those statements could not be supported or |
| 19 | defended? |
| 20 | A. No, sir. |
| 21 | MR. WILLIAMSON: Can we take a short break? |
| 22 | (A brief recess was taken.) |
| 23 | MR. WILLIAMSON: We are back on the record. Mr. |
| 24 | Murphy, do you have my additional questions? |
| 25 | MR. MURPHY: No. |

| 1 | mr. Williamson: Mrs. Charnott, do you have any |
|----|--|
| 2 | questions or statements you would like to make? |
| 3 | MS. CHARNOFF: No. I presume you are operating |
| 4 | under the same principles about the transcript? |
| 5 | MR. WILLIAMSON: Yes, ma'am. |
| 6 | BY MR. WILLIAMSON: |
| 7 | Q. I would just in closing, Mr. Kulisek, have I or an |
| 8 | other NRC representative here threatened you in any way or |
| 9 | offered you any reward in return for this testimony? |
| 10 | A. No, sir. |
| 11 | Q. Have you given this testimony freely and |
| 12 | voluntarily? |
| 13 | A. Yes. |
| 14 | Q. Is there any additional information you would like |
| 15 | to add to the record at this time? |
| 16 | A. No, sir. |
| 17 | Q. We appreciate your time, and your cooperation in |
| 18 | this effort. |
| 19 | Thank you very much? |
| 20 | A. Thank you. |
| 21 | MS. CHARNOFF: Off the record for a second. |
| 22 | (A discussion was held off the record, and the |
| 23 | witness left the room.) |
| 24 | MR. WILLIAMSON: We are back on the record. Mrs. |
| 25 | Charnoff, I would like to take this opportunity to discuss |
| | |

with you some concerns we have regarding the attorney work product privilege.

It is my understanding that you have exercised this privilege with regard to providing OI a copy of this product. I also state for the record that you have indicated that you would make it, the document available for OI's review, to visually inspect the document, but that would be done with some conditions or stipulations regarding the disclosure of that information, and after talking with our management, and what I believe to be our Office of General Counsel's feelings is that, that this information that you call the attorney work product privilege or attorney work product might not in fact be privileged information, but however, I cannot make that determination. It is something that will have to be discussed between you and our Office of General Counsel.

Do you have any statements that you would like to make regarding this document?

MS. CHARNOFF: Yes. I am not going to repeat here a statement that I made previously during a February 10, 1988 interview of John Crnich where I explained in some detail our views about the document question.

We have, on several occasions I have offered to you the opportunity to review the document in order to substantiate that the document is what at this point a number of witnesses have described it to be and what I have also

described it to be to you, and you were going to or there was some consideration as I understand it by you whether to do that again today, and you have opted not to do that.

TVA and the other people who have been interviewed by you on this matter are anxious to cooperate, and to facilitate NRC's processes, including the one that you are involved in, and have no desire to in any way hinder those processes, and I think I went into that in some detail during the Crnich interview.

At the same time, we are anxious to minimize the need to waive any privileges or rights that we have by law, and it was our hope that we could all accomplish our purposes or we could satisfy both of these purposes at the same time, that is, that OI could establish that there is, the document is work product, is, was worked on by and with counsel, and for counsel, and has absolutely no relevance whatsoever to the March 20, 1986 letter, which is what you have stated, and I have always understood to be the subject of this investigation.

To that end, we have sought to show you the document, but maintain its, certainly its work product status and possibly its status as a privileged document or at least ensure that the disclosure was only for a very limited purpose to certain individuals only, namely, the OI investigators, and if we, if a need arose subsequently to show it to someone

1 3 and we are anxious to cooperate. I hope that you will agree that we have tried hard 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 MR. WILLIAMSON: Mrs. Charnoff, thank you for your 12 time. This interview and the subsequent discussion regarding 13 the attorney work product paper and privilege is concluded at 14 12:55 on July 29th, 1988. 15 16 concluded.)

else, my view has always been that if there is a valid reason for someone else to look at it, that we would certainly entertain that. We consider you to have a legitimate purpose

here to cooperate with you all, the investigators, and we have brought forward a number of witnesses, some repeatedly, in an effort to be done with this whole thing, so I would just refer the record in the John Crnich interview where I had a more complete statement of our position on the issue.

(Whereupon, at 12:55 p.m., the interview was

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24