

1 MR. WILLIAMSON: -- because I had one on the 18th at
2 1740 with Mr. Stello that lasted five minutes and eight
3 seconds.

4 THE WITNESS: If we can go off the record for a
5 second, I would be happy to look and see if it's reflected in
6 my notes.

7 MR. CHARNOFF: There were no other -- when we looked
8 through Mr. White's notes, there were no other notes concerning
9 the March 20 letter or the Appendix B letter at any time.

10 THE WITNESS: I never -- you know, I don't --

11 MR. CHARNOFF: That doesn't mean that there weren't
12 other conversations with Mr. Stello.

13 THE WITNESS: If it would help you, I would happy
14 to --

15 BY MR. WILLIAMSON:

16 Q Do you recall a conversation --

17 A No.

18 Q -- with him on the 18th?

19 A No. But if it would help you, I'd be happy to go
20 review it and see if I reflected what the subject is. I have
21 nothing to ~~me~~^{hide} in this. 62

22 Q I mean do you have any notes that would reflect --

23 A I might. I don't know. I would have to look on that
24 specific conversation.

25 MR. CHARNOFF: Mr. Williamson, we have his spiral

1 notebooks for those couple of months which I personally went
2 through with him and alone to pick out everything that might be
3 pertinent to an Appendix B letter. That's what we gave you.

4 There were clearly other conversations with Jim
5 Asselstine, with Stello over the three month period; generally
6 related to QTC or other matters, but not related to Appendix B.

7 We could specifically look to see if there was
8 something —

9 THE WITNESS: I did not —

10 MR. CHARNOFF: I am confident that it did not relate
11 to this letter.

12 MR. WILLIAMSON: Okay, I asked that -- I want to know
13 where you started because he said on the 19th. I am just
14 letting you know that in our review I show a phone call on the
15 18th, and I don't know if you had any notes or if you had gone
16 back -- that's my questions.

17 MR. CHARNOFF: We can check that.

18 THE WITNESS: Oh, going back to January --

19 MR. CHARNOFF: But we started in January to look for
20 notes pertinent to this.

21 MR. WILLIAMSON: And I got these numbers from the
22 telephone log you provided to me.

23 MR. CHARNOFF: Right.

24 THE WITNESS: I'd be happy to look if you want.

25 BY MR. WILLIAMSON:

1 Q I just wondered if you recall having any notes or --

2 A No.

3 Q -- you recall a conversation?

4 A No. Neither one.

5 BY MR. MURPHY:

6 Q Do you recall having a conversation, and I'm going to
7 tell you that the date of this conversation is unclear but --

8 A Is what?

9 Q Is unclear.

10 MS. BAUSER: Is unclear.

11 MR. MURPHY: Is unclear. I don't even know the exact
12 date. I don't have it with me.

13 BY MR. MURPHY:

14 Q In which you contacted Mr. Stello on evening probably
15 about the time the Glenn Committee was moving into action, and
16 told him in a very short few words, hang in there.

17 A Yes.

18 Q Or words to that effect.

19 A Yes, I did.

20 Q What was that all about? What was your --

21 A Nothing. He was under, I felt at the time under a
22 lot of unfair criticism, because remember, I don't think that
23 Mr. Asselstine did anything wrong. I don't think Mr. Stello
24 did anything wrong. I don't think Mr. Denton did anything
25 wrong. I don't think Mr. Thompson or Mr. Taylor in their phone

1 conversations did anything wrong.

2 I felt it was unwarranted criticism, and having been
3 involved with unwarranted criticism last year, I guess the
4 humane part of me said call the guy and just tell him -- you
5 know, give him some moral support in that regard, and that was
6 the conversation. It was just that. Hang in there. That was
7 it.

8 Q And that was --

9 A And he retorted I think, thank you, or some thing
10 like that, and that was it.

11 MR. ROBINSON: Are you going to go on to another area
12 or --

13 MR. MURPHY: Yes, I will.

14 MR. ROBINSON: I don't have any questions regarding
15 the phone calls.

16 BY MR. MURPHY:

17 Q The only thing I would -- I would like either now or
18 at the end of this conversation if you would look at those
19 notes and see if you have anything --

20 A I will be happy to. I will be happy to.

21 Q You might even check that date and time with the
22 phone logs specifically on the 18th.

23 A Is it in the phone log, you say?

24 Q Yes.

25 A Okay. Well, if it's in there, it's in there, and

1 I'll be happy to look.

2 MR. CHARNOFF: At the next break, we'll look.

3 THE WITNESS: Okay.

4 MR. MURPHY: In a previous -- do you have any other
5 questions?

6 MR. WILLIAMSON: No.

7 BY MR. MURPHY:

8 Q In a previous interview with you, Mr. White, in our
9 previous interview you talked about a conversation you had with
10 Mr. Sauer about his participation in the presentation, you
11 know, of how he was kind of forced into the presentation and
12 things like that.

13 Would you describe that one more time for us as best
14 you can recall.

15 A Yes. It was --

16 MS. BAUSER: Excuse me just to clarify the record.
17 You are talking about the presentation to Mr.

18 Asselstine?

19 MR. MURPHY: Yes.

20 THE WITNESS: It would be helpful I think if I looked
21 at my notes on that if that's --

22 MR. MURPHY: Sure.

23 THE WITNESS: If we want to do that. Can I --
24 somewhere is the, and I don't remember when it was, it ^{may} ~~could~~ ^{Ed}
25 take us awhile to find it.

1 MS. BAUSER: Do you want to go to another subject, or
2 shall we break and --

3 THE WITNESS: And I'm not sure it's in -- I don't
4 know what time frame it's in.

5 Let me categorize it the best that I can recall, and
6 it is somewhere in my notes. I'm not sure whether it was later
7 in the year or it might have even been this year.

8 MR. CHARNOFF: It was beyond March.

9 You had testified that it was well beyond March.

10 THE WITNESS: I suspect it was this year.

11 MR. CHARNOFF: '86.

12 THE WITNESS: You may not even have them. I will
13 have to check.

14 MR. MURPHY: And the information we have that it was
15 this year.

16 MR. CHARNOFF: Okay.

17 THE WITNESS: Then I would have to check my notes for
18 that conversation. But by giving my recollection, and then I
19 will get back to you --

20 MR. MURPHY: Sure.

21 THE WITNESS: -- if there is anything in addition, or
22 if I have said anything that's not reflected there.

23 Mr. Sauer took me through from his vantage point the
24 beginning until the end of what I would call the Appendix B
25 episode and his part in it. To the best of my recollection, he

1 indicated that someone was supposed to give this presentation
2 to Mr. Asselstine, and he said ^{he} they got sick. I believe he ~~Ed~~
3 said a second person was supposed to do it, and ^{he} they also got ~~2~~
4 sick.

5 He was told by someone, and I don't remember who, but
6 someone, you are now going to be the guy to do it. He told me
7 he wasn't prepared. He hadn't done anything.

8 So he then — and this was like a day, I think the
9 day before Commissioner Asselstine arrived, very close to the
10 thing, and I gather — he didn't say this, but I gathered he
11 was a little bit panicked that here he had been thrown into the
12 gap, didn't know anything about the subject. That he then sat
13 down with three, I believe three of the NSRS people. One was I
14 think he said Mr. Smith — two or three. I remember Mr. Smith
15 was one. I think Mr. Guity or Mr. Washer was one. And there
16 was a third whose name he told me and I don't recall, but who
17 he said didn't have anything to say anyhow, just kind of sat
18 there.

19 That they sat down then ^{and} ~~so~~ gave him, Sauer, kind of ~~to~~
20 here are our perceptions, and I gathered they sketched out this
21 part of the presentation.

22 The other thing that he said was that he had, and
23 this was quite a surprise to me because he then went to a
24 contractor with that list, and asked the contractor what he
25 felt of this thing which was — remember, these are NSRS

1 perceptions — and that the contractor, he said, added two
2 issues to the list. And that struck me because those — they
3 weren't NSRS's perceptions. They should have been labeled QTC
4 perceptions, and I thought that was a little underhanded, but
5 that's why I remember it because it did make an impact.

6 That he, Sauer, added one himself, and I think the
7 thing he added was one of the ones at the bottom. Whether it
8 was the — whether it was the general overall perception of
9 Appendix B or whatever the last one is down there, and I think
10 it's design control, but that he — he then on his own put one
11 in. And that I recall that he put something else in because at
12 the time he talked I wondered, god, if he didn't know anything
13 about this, how could you be adding in the perception.

14 He then indicated that he tried, I believe he tried
15 to show that to his boss. He indicated that he tried to show
16 or talk to Mr. Whitt about it, and Mr. Whitt was too busy. And
17 so his management was not familiar, but he felt from his point
18 of view he had given them the opportunity, and they weren't
19 familiar with what he was going to say.

20 Then of course he went through the fact that he had
21 given the presentation, that he had not expected I think the
22 reaction that came from it.

23 He then went through, in general, subsequent events
24 with the NSRS then being asked what are the facts to
25 substantiate your perceptions, and according to him there

1 really weren't any. And I think literally ~~the test~~ ^{NONE} -- you ^{Edw}
2 know, give us the specifics. There weren't any. They were
3 clearly, and I remember he told me at the time it was very
4 unexpected because again he felt these were just perceptions.
5 They were giving somebody perceptions. Why does somebody want
6 to know what you are backing up the perception with.

7 That then they went through over a period of time a
8 progressive kind of thing where they were asked, the NSRS felt
9 very much on the defensive. They felt they had to now go find
10 things. So they went out and found things. Some of these
11 things then were refuted by line management. They questioned
12 him again. They felt their reputation was at stake.

13 And I think his words were, we just dug in our heels,
14 and then obviously started getting any other information as
15 time went on, other things to substantiate the perceptions it
16 announced two months before.

17 That's about all I can remember of the conversation.

18 BY MR. MURPHY:

19 Q First off, I think your recollection seems to be
20 very, very good about those circumstances. Could I just ask
21 one question?

22 Did he in fact conclude something to the effect that
23 after all this was done though these perceptions became his
24 conclusion; that he had believed they were facts?

25 A Yes. I think that would be a correct categorization.

1 I'm a little confused over time because I know that -- let's
2 see, I'm trying to figure out whether I knew then or as a
3 result of my lawyers. I think as a result of other papers that
4 initially the NSRS opinion was that we were in compliance
5 presently; presently versus past, we were in compliance.

6 My guess would be that Mr. Sauer probably felt the
7 same way -- I'm guessing -- in that as they progressed, but I
8 associate more this comment, which he certainly may have made,
9 with the digging of the heels comment.

10 You know, that by god, by the time we were through,
11 you know, but, you know, they dug in their heels. They felt an
12 assault on their reputation, and I don't remember his exact
13 words, but I'm sure he included himself in one of the people
14 digging in his heels.

15 So from that perspective, I would think, yeah, he
16 probably said that he didn't agree with the letter.

17 Q Okay.

18 A But I don't recall him saying that. He may have.

19 BY MR. ROBINSON:

20 Q But not also from just a digging in the heels due to
21 the fact that NSRS was being challenged, but did he indicate to
22 you that he had a change of perception with respect to whether
23 or not those perceptions were in fact based in fact or not?

24 A Oh, he clearly may have. I don't recall. But, you
25 know, when somebody says to you -- I'm just being logical.

1 When somebody says, look, you know, you have attacked me. You
2 the system ^{has} attacked me, and I have dug in my heels, then I
3 wouldn't expect the guy to say, but even though I've dug in my
4 heels and you have attacked me and my credibility,
5 nevertheless, I'm still in agreement with you. I wouldn't have
6 expected that from a common sense point of view.

7 So it wouldn't surprise me, I would be happy to
8 review my notes and see if it's in there, but it wouldn't
9 surprise me, because the previous comment about them digging in
10 their heels. And he was under a lot of assault as part of
11 that. He was the guy who was credited with giving this thing.

12 And when I say credited, I mean that fully. It was
13 his name being used that he had said these things, and Sauer is
14 not a bad engineer, or a bad manager, and I'm sure he took it
15 very personally because he hadn't said it. He was parroting
16 somebody else's words, a contractor and some other people.

17 And so I think that colored, you know, his
18 impressions.

19 MR. ROBINSON: I don't have anything more on Sauer.
20 I do have a couple more questions.

21 MR. WILLIAMSON: Nothing.

22 BY MR. ROBINSON:

23 Q Mr. White, I am going to take you back again to the
24 February, March 1986 time frame.

25 To your recollection, how many times was a final

1 version of the Appendix B letter brought to you for your
2 signature?

3 A Twice.

4 Q About what was the time span between those two times?

5 A Probably my guess is as much as a month.

6 Q How many times were — how many times, if any, were
7 draft letters of the Appendix B certification brought to you
8 for your comment?

9 A I don't recall any.

10 Q Okay. About what time of day was it when you
11 actually signed the final March 20, 1986 letter?

12 A I don't recall.

13 Q Morning? Afternoon?

14 A I think afternoon, but I really don't recall.

15 Q At that point in time when you read —

16 A I think we could find out based on other evidence
17 because I signed it before Kelley and Kirkebo caught an *Eda*
18 airplane. If we know what time — and the airplane — well,
19 wait a minute. No, that was — that was the next morning they
20 caught that flight, so that wouldn't help. Sorry.

21 Q At the time you read it and signed it did you think
22 it was clear and responsive?

23 A Yes.

24 And I want to add. I felt that based on not only the
25 fact that it made sense to me and I had reviewed it, but that

1 was one of the very purposes of my calling and discussing with
2 Mr. Stello, Mr. Denton and even Commissioner Asselstine, was I
3 this responsive, understandable, is there anything in here you
4 are sensitive to. You know, that was really the purpose.

5 And so based on that and the change I made, I clearly
6 felt it was not only responsive to the question but
7 understandable to the individuals it was being sent to.

8 Q With respect to the time that you signed the letter,
9 at what point in time, was the decision made to have Kelley and
10 Kirkebo handcarry the letter to Washington?

11 Was it the height, or before or after?

12 A I don't recall whether it was before or after.

13 MR. CHARNOFF: Excuse me, he cannot relate it,
14 apparently to when the letter was signed, but he can relate it
15 to the telephone call to Mr. Stello, according to his notes, we
16 don't know the exact time. Presumably the van call, where in
17 that conversation, I think that the notes suggest that he is
18 sending Kirkebo.

19 And so if you can relate it to that.

20 THE WITNESS: But I don't have that call so that I
21 don't know the time of that. I don't know.

22 MR. CHARNOFF: Well, if you have the time, then you
23 probably know.

24 BY MR. ROBINSON:

25 Q It was interesting that you commented that the reason

1 that you thought that it was clear and responsive was because
2 you had made the phone calls.

3 My question to you is, if you think that the letter
4 is clear and responsive, why is it necessary to make the
5 explanatory phone calls?

6 A Well, I would not characterize them as explanatory
7 phone calls. It is not uncommon, in my experience -- and
8 remember I had, at that point, had been a couple of months'
9 experience in this part of the business -- it is not uncommon
10 at all in the other career that I had in the Navy, that you are
11 writing a difficult letter, and you want to be responsive to
12 what has been asked, you want to make sure that there are not
13 sensitivities involved that you inadvertently ~~dropping on~~ ^{stepping} on. *edw* It
14 is not uncommon at all to call someone and say, look at this.

15 And nor is it uncommon for the person to say, well,
16 you know, from my perspective, the receiver's perspective, it
17 would be better if you said this. And you might change the
18 letter then, even though you felt the letter, as in this case,
19 stood on its ^{own}, ~~before to get involved~~. *edw* *ex*

20 And so, you know, it was not uncommon to me. And
21 frankly, even now, I think that it was a wise thing to do to
22 ensure that.

23 Q Well, if that is so, if you felt that you had
24 clarified and come to a meeting of the minds regarding the
25 responsiveness of the letter with the phone calls, why send

1 Kelley and Kirkebo to explain the letter further?

2 A Well, I think that if you look at who they were
3 explaining that to, that would be very clear and remember now,
4 part of the explanation was going over, in much more detail,
5 the enclosures to this thing.

6 You see, when I was talking to Mr. Denton, for
7 example, ^{ON the} ~~only~~ enclosures, as I recall, the only thing that I ^u
8 was doing was taking a couple of them and saying, we are not
9 talking about the past and we are basing it on what the NSRS is
10 telling us. And then saying, for example, in this enclosure, it
11 says, and then you know, based on these problems and some of
12 those enclosures were very specific, saying, based on these
13 problems, we looked at these things.

14 And so that he understood the context of the whole
15 thing. I thought that the letter was self-explanatory.

16 MR. ROBINSON: I don't have any more questions.

17 BY MR. MURPHY:

18 Q Let me ask you, you said that as a result of your
19 commission meeting on 11 March 1986, at the commission, that
20 you felt that you were under some pressure from Mr. Asselstine,
21 and also you made a two week commitment which I think that you
22 thought was true.

23 A It is true.

24 Q Yes, as I recollect, it is correct.

25 We have talked to Mr. Gridley last week who said that

1 you said earlier that you were exerting pressure on the folks
2 to get the letter out, earlier today, that you felt that you
3 were under pressure and you wanted to get on with it?

4 A Yes.

5 Q And Mr. Gridley expressed, just the other day, that
6 he was the one that exerted the pressure and that he did not
7 think that you were under any pressure at all.

8 Which is correct? I mean, and of course, we have
9 talked to Commissioner Asselstine, and I think that he reflects
10 that he thought that you could take all the time necessary, in
11 that evening conversation with Mr. Stello, I think, from your
12 testimony, he indicated to you to take the time, you know, you
13 should not be under any pressure to get this job done.

14 What is this pressure thing all about?

15 A Well, let me explain it.

16 I challenged -- I guess I cannot challenge what Mr.
17 Asselstine said -- but I think that the record which any
18 objective person reading that record, and the way that he was
19 boring in on me, would certainly have considered that pressure,
20 and I did, as I tried to explain. I did not want to commit to a
21 specific date.

22 If you read it, you clearly come across with, I am
23 trying not to and he finally kind of pins me to the wall and
24 says, when are you going to answer the letter?

25 And I say, within about two weeks.

1 Before that, I am trying to explain to him, I am
2 having trouble, I am having other issues. If Commissioner
3 Asselstine, ex-Commissioner Asselstine, does not consider that
4 pressure, I don't know what the hell it is. Okay?

5 So, let me tell you, I was under pressure. I felt
6 the pressure, not only from that, but from the January
7 conversations with Asselstine, and with Taylor, I mean with
8 Denton and with Stello.

9 I felt under pressure. There is not any question,
10 and I cannot explain Gridley's feeling, but he may not have
11 been here long enough to understand what real pressure was, I
12 don't know.

13 MR. MURPHY: We were given these notes today, Mr.
14 Charnoff, and would you want to go through these and explain
15 these telephone conversations, which I think that they are
16 telephone.

17 MR. CHARNOFF: These notes?

18 MR. MURPHY: Yes, if you would read these?

19 THE WITNESS: Yes, I can explain them.

20 I have not reviewed the telephone records and so I
21 cannot say who initiated the calls. I think that the first one
22 was initiated by Mr. Taylor, to me and it was a day that they
23 had signed out their May 16th letter.

24 My notes reflect that he indicated, that he was,
25 "Reserving our options —

1 BY MR. MURPHY:

2 Q Excuse me, that says 5-16th, is that the date of the
3 call?

4 A Yes, I am sorry, May 16th.

5 I don't know the time.

6 Q Okay, that is fine.

7 A But that the NRC was reserving their options, and
8 they could not say yes, or no. Yes, or no being agreement or
9 disagreement with my March 20th letter. And therefore, whether
10 they were going to take enforcement action.

11 The whole conversation was, I will explain why, was
12 an utter surprise to me and as it went through, it became more
13 of a surprise.

14 I don't know what the legalistically, I cannot
15 explain that note.

16 He then, got into a discussion of, like they were
17 trying, well the words say, seeking the middle ground. That
18 really was a reference to the pressure that they were under by
19 perhaps a Congressional Committee to go in one direction in the
20 letter and the other that they were trying to balance this
21 thing somehow.

22 The next part was an utter surprise to me because he
23 was saying that we need to look at broad things as a separate
24 issue from the 11 issues. He was telling me we have now
25 changed the question. We are now asking a different question.

1 That surprised me because they knew precisely the
2 question that they had asked, they knew what the answer was, I
3 had discussed it with them. And so I was puzzled, you know, why
4 are you guys changing the question?

5 Then he went on to say that — and this was a
6 puzzlement to me — because he went on to say that he wanted me
7 to write him a letter now, and put in writing why I had
8 withdrawn the license?

9 MR. CHARNOFF: Why you had withdrawn the --

10 THE WITNESS: The license for Watts Bar, which had
11 been submitted a year earlier.

12 MR. CHARNOFF: Not the license, the certification.

13 THE WITNESS: The certification, I am sorry, the
14 certification, the license request.

15 MR. CHARNOFF: Yes.

16 THE WITNESS: Now, it really became a puzzle as I got
17 the letter later than this and reflected on the letter versus
18 this, because the May 16th letter — do you have a copy of it
19 that I could look at?

20 (Witness is proffered document.)

21 THE WITNESS: This is what was very surprising to me
22 that the May 16th letter says, signed by Eisenhut, says, the
23 second to the last paragraph, says, hey, we don't understand
24 this inconsistency between your letter and this other thing.

25 That is what the letter says, that we, in the NRC,

1 don't understand. His phone conversation says to me, that we
2 do. And you should show that there is no tie between the two
3 issues.

4 So, he is really -- I did not recognize it at the
5 time, I put a question mark, because I said, what does he mean
6 a tie between the two issues?

7 I should write him a letter and show no tie and then
8 I get the letter and understand, the letter says something,
9 hey, there is a tie and so I was very perplexed.

10 The last reference is a CYA, cover your ass, kind of
11 thing, he says, but of course, I have told you this, but do
12 whatever you think is right, kind of thing.

13 Do it as you see it.

14 But again, when I got the letter I saw that they had,
15 in fact, changed the question, from what it was initially. And
16 then I go back and look and say, my God, you know, that was
17 what he was telling me that day, we are changing the issue on
18 you midstream. That is what he was telling me -- very
19 perplexing.

20 And so that was one of the reasons why I felt that I
21 had to write a letter, that subsequently ended up the 5 June
22 letter. And I believe and my records don't indicate it, I
23 think that I had an input from Mr. Stello also in this time
24 frame, that I should write a letter.

25 My notes don't reflect that, so that may be an error.

1 Mr. Hugh Thompson, on the 29th, of May, discussed with me then,
2 my notes reflect the appendix B letter and we discussed the
3 fact that it was never intended to be a final answer.

4 And then again, I gave myself the note is clear, that
5 he wanted also felt that I should write a letter. And this was
6 either the second or third such suggestion and that is the
7 reason that you see the little star there, which says, I had
8 better go do this, after two or three conversations, I had
9 better write him a letter.

10 And subsequently it is circled, indicating that I did
11 that. And the rest of the conversation deals with some other
12 things that Hugh Thompson is passing to me that Stello wants me
13 to do on another issue.

14 Then on the next page, we apparently went back to the
15 appendix B letter and in that comment, Mr. Thompson is saying
16 something very interesting to me, he says that the one area out
17 of the 11 areas, the 11 perceptions, the one area that is
18 making them nervous is the design control area.

19 He is telling me on the 16th of May that apparently
20 in the senior management team, -- the 29th of May -- the senior
21 management team which consists of Denton, Taylor, Thompson,
22 Hayes, and Bary Zech, they have apparently had discussions and
23 there is only one area that is making them nervous and that is
24 design control and then, he says, Taylor is the guy who is
25 really worried about it, but that, he, Hugh Thompson is

1 satisfied that it is not a problem.

2 So, at that point in time, I am saying to myself,
3 well, there is only one question, I don't know why they got the
4 question, but I am saying to myself, the only problem is that
5 someone, namely Taylor, is worried about one part of this thing
6 and that is design control and they are satisfied with the rest
7 of it.

8 So, as late as the 29th of May, there is still not
9 any indication despite their 16th May letter, ^{In the phone calls it} ~~and despite, so~~
10 ^{than in these letters.} ~~that I am getting different words in letters.~~ And that is all
11 that I can explain about that.

12 BY MR. MURPHY:

13 Q Except that you did respond?

14 A Oh, yes, I responded after two or three calls, I got
15 the message.

16 Q Okay.

17 BY MR. WILLIAMSON:

18 Q Mr. White, during the course of this investigation, I
19 have asked a number of your managers a question that I would
20 also like to pose to you.

21 And that is, in view of the fact that you had done
22 your Stone and Webster evaluation, in the fall of 1985, and
23 presented your findings to the Board, and you also had a
24 systematic analysis and identified concerns which was conducted
25 by Mr. Nace, and you reviewed approximately 800 documents and

1 in late January or early February, we had Craig Lundin's review
2 of the NSR's perceptions, on-site at Watts Bar, and we also had
3 the EG & G Welding evaluation program on-board at Watts Bar,
4 and was identifying problems in the welding level.

5 And prior to that time, you had had access to a
6 number of concerns that had been raised by a QTC on-site, a
7 portion of which were obviously safety related concerns, which
8 were being addressed, by people in the Office of Nuclear Power,
9 a portion of which were also substantiated.

10 My question is, was all of this information that you
11 had, at your disposal, prior to your arrival and subsequent to
12 your arrival, was any or all of this information considered in
13 the formulation of your March 20th response?

14 A Well, when you say any and all, of course, that is a
15 very broad thing. Let me try to -- it is a very long question.
16 Let me try to answer it by walking through things.

17 The Stone and Webster, 1985 evaluation, you recall my
18 testimony before on that, was that I was -- you know that was
19 my -- I would categorize it as although not the first exposure
20 to the nuclear industry, it really was. I ^{had} ~~have~~ been to a ~~ELI~~
21 couple of other utilities, but I was looking at the thing from
22 a management perspective. And in that regard, certainly I made
23 certain management judgments that I would have had to consider
24 consciously or not, in draft, but in terms of knowledge of
25 specific individual problems, I, it really was not.

1 And now, after I arrived in January and I started
2 getting the people here, that is when I really started getting
3 what I would call the reviews that told me what areas I needed
4 to go after.

5 Nace's work, I would like to correct one thing that
6 you said that I reviewed 800, I did not review any of the
7 documents. But you recall that Nace's work dealt with -- his
8 instructions were to go categorize, list these things, list
9 these things, there was not any attempt in that regard, to
10 determine whether the allegations that they listed were true or
11 false. And if it was true, whether anything had been done
12 about it. Whether corrective action had been taken, if it was
13 still an issue to evaluate in any way.

14 So that I would say, ^{that} had, in my opinion, had nothing ^{ex}
15 to do with the 20 March letter. And if you said to me, did I
16 consider Nace's report, absolutely not. It was a different
17 issue.

18 By 20 March, I had forgotten about what Nace had
19 done, frankly, on that issue. The purpose of that was entirely
20 different so that I would say that clearly I did not consider
21 that.

22 Mr. Lundin's review, yes, of course, I considered
23 that. That was one of the papers, that is the paper which
24 comes, discloses the results or the findings of their review,
25 that they found nothing that -- I forget the exact words -- but

1 they found nothing that was not in compliance that would show
2 that we were not in compliance with Appendix B. Clearly, I
3 indicated that I looked at that.

4 The EG & G review, first of all, let me say that at
5 that point in time, there were a lot of questions about whether
6 the program was in compliance. And I did not know at that
7 time, whether the program, aside now, from ^{implementation} ~~any limitation~~, the
8 program, itself, was or was not in compliance, in terms of
9 historically, because you will recall that was what they were
10 looking for.

11 They subsequently found that it had been in
12 compliance historically, and but again, that is the historical
13 part. And again, the only reason that I would consider that
14 was because how great a breakdown, if there was a breakdown in
15 the past, taking Asselstine's question, that would be something
16 that I would have to know before I could answer Asselstine's
17 question, if I ever could, about how about 10 or 15 years ago.
18 And so that was the EG & G.

19 And QTC, very similar to that, QTC, the concerns were
20 not current. They were old concerns, that were historically,
21 they were not concerns, about, hey, today on the site,
22 something is happening. You know, I was answering the question
23 in compliance today. And so those were only considered with
24 the fact that we did not have evidence at that point to show,
25 and that is the reason that pervasive came in, was there enough

1 evidence to show that there was a pervasive breakdown?

2 No, there was not. There was not enough evidence to
3 show it. So, again, it is an historical thing. We still
4 don't have answers for that, but that is the purpose of a lot
5 of words in that letter, ~~that~~ to say that. *Edu*

6 If you review the letter, it clearly says, I don't
7 have the answers. You know, I have got to go back and we have
8 to do a lot of investigating to know and I did not use this
9 word, but it is clear what I am saying, to know if this plant
10 is built in compliance with Appendix B, and let me tell you, I
11 have got a lot of looking to do.

12 And that, you know, that is what the words in the
13 letter convey. So the QTC only in the respect to the past. So
14 I think that goes over what I considered and what I did not.

15 Q Are you suggesting that, in your view, that letter,
16 you hoped at least, conveyed to NRC that you are not in a
17 position to say whether that plant was built in compliance with
18 Appendix B?

19 A Oh, yes. In fact, I believe that the third paragraph
20 in the letter goes through that extensively. No one can read
21 that letter and come to ~~the~~ ^{ANY} conclusion, I think, a reasonable ^{Edu}
22 person, other than, "White doesn't know how this plant is
23 built. He's got to go investigate a heluva lot of things in
24 order to determine what happened historically." You read that
25 paragraph and you can't come -- I don't think -- even today, I

1 don't see how anyone can come to a different conclusion?

2 Q You mention the word "pervasive," and I want -- we've
3 covered this ground one other time, I know. I worded the
4 question just a little bit differnt than I did the last time.
5 Did you ever have a conversation with Mr. Kelley in which the
6 word "pervasive" was discussed and in which you went to the
7 dictionary and got out this dictionary and the dictionary
8 definition was, I guess, "extending to all parts," or words
9 close to that? Did that even ever occur to you?

10 A Yes.

11 Q Prior to March 20?

12 A No, specifically, I can tell you within a week of
13 when it occurred. ~~By~~ other events not associated with it, and ^{Ed}
14 that is, about a month after the letter was written, I called
15 Henry ^{Myles} ~~Myles~~, who is on Dingell's staff -- the purpose of that ^{Ed}
16 call was to ask --

17 BY MR. CHARNOFF: He's on Dingell's staff?

18 Q He's on Udall's staff.

19 A Well he works for Dingell. He may be on Udall's
20 staff but he works for Dingell.

21 The purpose of the call was to find out if he had any
22 information which might -- of problems down here that might be
23 of any help to me? The purpose of the call was, "^{Honey} ~~Henry~~ if you
24 know something that's a problem at TVA, you got to tell me
25 something so we can fix it." From that point of view the call

1 was entirely unsuccessful. It was a long call in which,
2 frankly, he threatened me, that if I — he was going to, in
3 essence, that he was going to "get" me for a "material false
4 statement." I think those were his words, unless I acceded to
5 certain demands that he made. And he made three or four
6 demands on me, which I wouldn't accede to.

7 But in that conversation, he then got into the
8 Appendix B letter, saying — he was emotional on his part. He
9 felt that I had hurt some of his friends, that I hurt a
10 contractor that he liked — he then got into, asked me the
11 question, "would you be willing to substitute 'widespread' for
12 'pervasive?'" This was the first time I heard that brought up.
13 That was about a month after the letter. Five weeks maybe.
14 Some time after that conversation, I talked to Mr. Wegner. And
15 I said, "you know, in talking to Henry ^{Meyers} ~~Meyers~~, he asked me this
16 question, 'would I substitute "widespread" for "pervasive?'"
17 You know, what does that mean?" And Wegner's response was
18 something to the effect that, "he's playing semantic games with
19 you, and forget it." So I did.

20 Then in May, we were preparing for testimony in front
21 of Mr. Dingell, which at that point in time was scheduled for
22 the 20th and 21st. In the week prior to that, we were having
23 Murder Board sessions, if you're familiar with the term. In
24 one of those, I had been — I think I had been called by Mr.
25 Chafin, a member of Mr. Dingell's staff, and he had told me, I

1 believe about that time, that Henry ^{Myers} ~~Myers~~ was going to be Ex
 2 conducting the hearing. So when I was meeting with my people
 3 here at the Murder Board issues and so forth, I raised the
 4 issue, "you know, so long as Henry ^{Myers} ~~Myers~~ is apparently going to
 5 to be running this hearing, I know one issue he's going to
 6 bring up. He's going to ask, or get Mr. Dingell to ask, 'would
 7 you substitute "widespread" for "pervasive?"' Based on that,
 8 then, there was a discussion. I said, "how do I answer it?"
 9 That is the discussion at which Kelley and I think Huston was ²
 10 present. And they attempted to give a definition of the
 11 difference between "widespread" and "pervasive" to me. Now
 12 clearly I knew that "pervasive" had a legal meaning, and I
 13 could say that this case tells you that. — But I said finally ²
 14 almost in ^{desperation} ~~desperation~~, 'they're trying to, they were trying to.
 15 describe ^{to} me this fine difference between 'widespread' and ²
 16 'pervasive,' and I finally said something like, "what you're ¹
 17 saying doesn't make any sense to me. You know, 'pervasive' is
 18 in the legal case, but it could have been 'widespread.' Why
 19 don't we get a damn' dictionary and see what it says?" And ^I
 20 think that's when this — I know: no question in my mind; ²
 21 that's when this issue came up. Someone actually got the
 22 dictionary ^{but} and we looked up not only "pervasive" and we looked
 23 up "widespread." And I ended up still not, not — you know,
 24 there are fine nuances, but I still didn't you know, truly
 25 understand if Callaway had said "widespread," I would conclude

We would have used

1 ~~be used~~ "widespread." And no question in my mind — none
 2 whatsoever, that the conversation took place with Kelley some
 3 time before I went to Washington, which would have been that
 4 Monday, if the thing was on Tuesday, the 20th, it would have
 5 been the 19th; it would have been the week prior to that. Some
 6 time between the 12th and 19th of May. I can tell you when it
 7 happened. It happened and that's when it happened.

BY MR. MURPHY:

9 Q That, to the best of your recollection, Kelley's
 10 concurrence with that letter was not based on his idea that
 11 word "pervasive" meant "extending to all parts?"

12 A I still don't know if that's it. Let me answer it
 13 this way: I — he certainly never mentioned that to me. And I
 14 still don't know if he feels that way. He still hasn't said
 15 that to me.

BY MR. ROBINSON:

17 Q Mr. White, do you think that the March 20 letter
 18 clearly says that the overall Q/A program has been in
 19 compliance with Appendix B, and that you don't know whether
 20 Watts Bar was built in compliance with Appendix B?

21 A The letter says that — the letter says that there
 22 are — it was certainly understood by the NRC — even in their
 23 subsequent letters, that I have "instances of non-compliances
 24 up there." And they recognize that in the subsequent letter
 25 and in testimony by Mr. Taylor in front of the Dingell

1 Committee where he made the same statement. He may have
 2 recognized that there were certain non-compliances. So the *etc*
 3 letter says, "look, I've got some non-compliances. But I look
 4 at what I have today, there isn't, you know, any evidence that
 5 says 'we're not in compliance.' But I don't know anything
 6 about the past." Clearly I don't know — I can't tell you
 7 whether the plant was or wasn't built. It isn't only the
 8 letter that says that; it's my testimony. I think my testimony
 9 alone in March makes very clear what I'm saying: that I
 10 haven't gone back; didn't intend to go back and look at — and
 11 so yea, I'm not saying ^{it was built in compliance.} That's one of the things that very *etc*
 12 much angers me in this whole thing is that people allege that
 13 the letter says that. That the plant was built in compliance.
 14 And it doesn't say that. It says just the opposite. It says:
 15 "I don't know. I got a lotta lookin' to do."

16 BY MR. CHARNOFF:

17 Q Didn't you also testify, Mr. White, that insofar as
 18 your broad conclusions in that second paragraph of the letter,
 19 that that was based on the limited review of the parameters
 20 within the presumptions rather than in the broad --

21 A Oh, yes, yeah, the assumptions. Well, I didn't
 22 answer that part of it. Clearly when we discussed that last
 23 time, clearly it's based on only what the NSRS's willing to
 24 say. Tell us as their substantiating fact — an' I think the
 25 enclosures — many, if not all the enclosures, kind-of make

1 that clear, that they ^{here} ~~hear~~ -- here are examples of some of the ^o
 2 problems that the NSRS's given us. It's clearly based on that

3 BY MR. MURPHY:

4 Q As opposed to being a matter of semantics, tone-
 5 definition of "pervasive," and the definition of "widespread,"
 6 isn't that more of a defining of degree? As opposed to just
 7 being a question of semantics between those two words?

8 A I-I-don't know -- if you're referring to ^{what} Mr. ^{Ed} Wegner
 9 said, I didn't question the thing at the time. It didn't seem
 10 like any big thing. It really didn't. I had a case -- this was
 11 on a kind of a legal licensing -- and that term, "legal" there
 12 is based on a Licensing Board decision that used the word,
 13 "pervasive" ^{Somebody} _^ wanted to substitute "widespread;" I ^{Ed}
 14 would ask the question, "why'd they want to do that?" I
 15 accepted the answer of "semantics," and dropped it. Now, since
 16 then, of course, it keeps coming up from Mr. ^{Myers who} ~~Meyers~~ keeps
 17 raising that issue. He has it in documents that they've
 18 written. Keeps asking it. So he attaches some significance to
 19 that which I still don't understand. Unless there's some legal
 20 case that I don't know of that uses the word, "widespread."

21 Q Well, legal cases aside, why do you have a problem
 22 in using "widespread" as opposed to "pervasive?" Or are you
 23 saying you don't have one?

24 A I guess when you look at it, if there'd been a case
 25 that said, "widespread," I'd been happy to use "widespread." I

1 don't — if you're asking, "do I see a ^{great} ~~present~~ difference Edw
 2 between the two words, other than what I've said the legal
 3 thing," I don't. Now it may be. If you ^{look at} ~~look at~~ a dictionary, Ed
 4 there may be -- there may be some, some difference in degree or
 5 something, but understand it, it was used because it had
 6 significance in the context, in the licensing context, it was
 7 used in.

8 Q Mmm, hnn. Just one little clarification on that
 9 point: you said you weren't talking about history, but in
 10 fact, to investigate or evaluate what the data that was used,
 11 the basis that we use to enhance our perception, isn't that all
 12 historical stuff?

13 A That's why in essence — in essence, yes. That's why
 14 the letter says, "we got to go back and look at all that."
 15 Even those eleven issues, and that's, that's, of course, the
 16 letter said that even before I added the sentence that Mr.
 17 Denton wanted in there, but-but that sentence makes very clear,
 18 "hey, we're ^{going to} ~~gott~~ go back and look at those, because, remember, Edw
 19 our conclusions are based on what the NSRS's told us. We may
 20 find other things." That's what it said. We may find other
 21 things as we investigate those and so we're going to go back
 22 and keep looking. You know, the conclusion — first, the
 23 perceptions, are so broad in nature — you know, "perception"
 24 says — what ^{does} ~~the~~ ^{owe} records say? That "your records," Edw
 25 you're in essence —

1 BY MR. ROBINSON:

2 Q "The quality of records is poor."

3 A "The quality of records is poor." My god, you know,
4 how, you know, anyone in their right mind would look at my
5 response and how it's worded and say, "well, White certainly
6 didn't mean to tell us in a page-and-a-half, everything he
7 knows about records at TVA. He's only talking about what he
8 looked at then."

9 So I guess, you know, from that perspective, I'm
10 saying, "I am gonna go back and look historically at a lot of
11 things." And we've done that. The Record shows that.

12 BY MR. MURPHY:

13 Q I only have one more question. You identified in
14 your March 11 meeting your "philosophy" about -- as far as
15 "responsibility" and "accountability" was concerned. Would you
16 state that for us?

17 A What is that? What I said?

18 Q On March 11.

19 A Yeah?

20 Q You basically said you came to TVA, looked around;
21 had a a big problem with management because it seemed like
22 nobody was in charge, but you had a "philosophy" that you'll
23 either live with in the Navy or with Mr. Rickover's view of
24 that, and it said that it dealt with "responsibility" and
25 "accountability." Would you --

1 A Well, it's more than "responsibility" and
2 "accountability." It's "responsibility, accountability and
3 'authority:'" responsibility, and I'm not sure I'd have to go
4 back and review what I said -- you asked me "philosophy" now,
5 and we have --

6 MR. CHARNOFF: Do you have those transcript tapes?

7 MR. MURPHY: I do not.

8 MR. ROBINSON: I do.

9 MR. MURPHY: Do you?

10 THE WITNESS: I do in the office. Can't -- can --
11 can we take a minute? I'd take -- I'm going to the head.

12 MR. ROBINSON: We have a transcript of March 11 here
13 -- I'm sorry. We can take a break.

14 MR. MURPHY: We ought to take a minute and let -- I
15 don't have a transcript of the March 11 hearing at NRC -

16 THE WITNESS: I do, I do, I do -- it's in my locker
17 in there. I keep all this stuff in there.

18 MR. MURPHY: Page 98 in that area?

19 THE WITNESS: Can I go to the head?

20 MR. MURPHY: That's not on the record?

End6 21 MR. ROBINSON: Sure.

22 (Whereupon a recess was taken.)

T7 23 MR. WILLIAMSON: We're back on the record at 12:35.

24 BY MR. WILLIAMSON:

25 Q And, Mr. White, you reviewed your record in an effort

1 to both determine if you had a conversation with -- a phone
2 conversation with Mr. Stello on the 18th, and also with regard
3 to questions Mr. Murphy had about your testimony on March 11,
4 1986.

5 A Yes.

6 Q And what did you find?

7 A Well, first, with regard to the conversation, there
8 was such a conversation. It's reflected in my notes, and it
9 had to do with QTC. The ~~contractor~~ ^{contractor I had} had nothing to do with ~~the~~
10 Appendix B.

11 A That was March the 18th that --

12 Q Yes.

13 Q Okay. With Mr. Stello?

14 A Yes.

15 MR. CHARNOFF: I'm not sure Mr. White proposed a
16 question on the record with regard to a transcript.

17 MR. MURPHY: No.

18 MR. CHARNOFF: Pose your question.

19 MS. BAUSER: It's not a question on the record.

20 MR. MURPHY: No, I may not have --

21 MR. CHARNOFF: Question on the record, sorry.

22 MR. MURPHY: Whatever.

23 BY MR. MURPHY:

24 Q What I would like you to do, Mr. White, is -- you can
25 do one of two things. You can read from the record your basic

1 understanding of, you know, responsibility, accountability and
2 authority.

3 Could you read that short paragraph in the record, or
4 give us a brief summation of how you view that, that concept?

5 A Well, all right.

6 As I — there are three aspects, responsibility,
7 accountability and authority, and they are all really woven
8 together. You know, and the feeling, first of all, that a good
9 manager seeks out responsibility. He doesn't wait for
10 responsibility to light on his shoulder. He goes out and he
11 seeks it.

12 That you must have the authority commensurate with
13 responsibility. That one without the other is — won't work.
14 And that you have to be then ready -- if you have the authority
15 and you have the responsibility, either you sought it out or it
16 has been placed on you, that you must be ready to accept the
17 accountability for whatever actions you have taken.

18 And that the — my concept of responsibility is such
19 that you have responsibility, and you can delegate that
20 responsibility. But even though you delegate it, you never
21 really absolve yourself from the responsibility. That's
22 sometimes a hard concept for people to — managers to
23 understand.

24 Q In that March 11th meeting, I am sure you are
25 referring to your trips around T.V.A. and you made this

1 comment. You saw some problems, and you would ask people, I
2 would like to talk to the person accountable, the responsible
3 guy for that. You know what I got? Everybody was responsible.
4 and therefore no one was responsible.

5 Is that a pretty clear statement of the situation?

6 A Yes, yes, I found that in a number of cases of
7 discussions with managers.

8 Q What do you think is the cause of that?

9 A The cause?

10 Q For that type of an atmosphere.

11 A Well, I think I would have to say at T.V.A. it was
12 the culture. It's a cultural thing. I think certainly within
13 the Navy where the process is more formal and disciplined,
14 there still is that kind of problem. It's one of these things
15 you have to continue to teach and try to practice yourself and
16 get others to practice. I think it's part of the management
17 culture that is here.

18 Q Let me ask you just one final question.

19 A Yes.

20 Q Do you think the way that this issue was handled, the
21 response to the January 3rd letter, your March 20th response,
22 was handled in a manner where people accepted responsibility,
23 where assigned responsibility and went out and did the job?

24 A Yes.

25 Now if you ask me was it perfectly done, no. But I

1 think clearly in the thing, the answer ^{is} unequivocally yes. ES
220
2 If I look, for example, at the things that I instituted as part
3 of this, and I instituted it as part of this because it was the
4 first such issue to come up.

5 But the fact that I required individuals to certify
6 to what they were saying, that was their accepting
7 accountability for what they were saying.

8 Not only that, but the individual, not only the
9 individual, but I think the sheets will show that the
10 supervisors to those people, managers higher in the T.V.A.
11 organization then certified to that. That was an acceptance of
12 that responsibility and accountability.

13 The whole process that was set up, the formalization
14 of, you know, maintaining adequate records of what was looked
15 at and what was found, all of those things ^{are} the discipline ^{ex}
16 process set up part of it.

17 The concurrence system instituted really as part of
18 this thing, instituted at T.V.A. for the first time, is part of
19 the acceptance of the accountability for that signature.

20 Now I have previously said to you today that I still
21 have problems with that, and I — you know, that's human
22 beings. You have to continue to do that.

23 So I think all of those things say yes, there was
24 that. Accountability by the individuals. Responsibility, I
25 think they felt the responsibility.

1 Q If at any point along the process you would have
2 either wanted to find out what the conditions of the technical
3 response would be being prepared by the line organizations and
4 the various review groups, or at what stage the cover letter
5 was, had you identified somebody that you would go to and ask
6 that question?

7 A Oh, I think Kelley is the individual that had that, &
8 that had that responsibility.

9 Now in the engineering area, you know, you have to
10 say if it was engineering I might have gone to Kirkebo or
11 Drotleff, one or the other, or both of them.

12 But, yes, certainly I would know who to go to.

13 Q Would you be surprised if I told you that in our
14 many, many interviews I don't think we found anyone who said I
15 was responsible for them for preparing that particular way?

16 A Yeah, that would surprise me. That would surprise me
17 because I clearly know who -- I know who I was talking to, and
18 that would surprise me very much, because I know who I was
19 talking to. I know who answer^{ed} the questions. I know who I had^s
20 discussions with. There is no question in my mind that the
21 individuals felt responsible and accountable, and to me on this
22 issue.

23 So, yes, that would surprise me greatly.

24 MR. WILLIAMSON: Go ahead.

25 BY MR. ROBINSON:

1 Q I have got one other questions and this refers to the
2 June 5th letter.

3 A Yes.

4 Q How did you get any indication, Mr. White, that your
5 group of senior advisors did any review of Craig Lundin's
6 efforts?

7 A Oh, from the discussions, again, depending on who the
8 individual is in that, in that group. I had discussions with
9 Mr. Kelley, and with Huston, primarily those. *sd*

10 But the discussions with Mr. Kelley, he knew the
11 details of this thing very clearly, because I asked him a lot
12 of detailed questions, and we went through this thing. And he
13 could have presumably -- I guess he -- I don't know how he got
14 it, whether he read the documents, talked to people, I don't
15 know, but clearly yes.

16 Q So you include Mr. Kelley in your group of senior
17 advisors?

18 A Oh, of course I do. Yes, yes.

19 Q Do you have any indication that any other of your
20 senior advisors did any review of Lundin's work --

21 A Yes.

22 Q -- other than Kelley?

23 A Oh, yes. When I say those top four, principally
24 those four that I just mentioned. The others, as I say they
25 were -- remember, I had a group, but not a group as a committee

1 kind of group. That wasn't, well, let's all get together and
2 review this thing. It was a group of people, but I was
3 treating them as individuals, individuals for common purpose if
4 I can put it that way.

5 And so as I say, on the other end of that spectrum is
6 the person that I might have gone to. I might have gone to
7 Siskin and said, if you knew A and B, and C is the facts, would
8 you conclude D from that. And he might not even know I was --
9 what I was asking him something Kelley just told me. *Ed*

10 And then I might go to Bass and I might say if I came
11 to the conclusion of D, and I had A, B and C, is there anything
12 else I would need to support A, B, and C to come to D.

13 And in that respect those senior managers, but it
14 goes the full spectrum.

15 Q Did you do anything like that specifically with
16 respect to the Lundin effort? Go to Bass or Brodsky and say if
17 D is true, can you say A, B and C happened?

18 A No, no.

19 Remember, I wasn't at all involved with the Lundin
20 effort. The Lundin effort was entirely under Mr. Kelley's *Ed*
21 purview, so I wasn't at all involved in it.

22 Q So in that respect I'll ask my specific question
23 again.

24 Other than Mr. Kelley, are you aware of any review by
25 any other of your senior advisors of Mr. Lundin's effort?

1 A Well, I can only answer that by saying that the fou
2 people — you know, that's Mr. Kelly, — in their various ^{Ed}
3 areas, Mr. Kelly, Mr. Kirkebo, Mr. Huston, Mr. Drotleff, all
4 had enough detailed knowledge when I asked them questions that
5 they must have.

6 But if you ask me of my personal opinion do I know
7 the extent or exactly how they did it, the answer is no, I
8 don't. But I know from the detailed knowledge they had that
9 they must have reviewed the thing.

10 Q Reviewed the Lundin effort, and not just the NSRS
11 perception.

12 A I would say both, both. I don't separate the two,
13 frankly, the Lundin effort and the — and what I call the line
14 responses.

15 Q I see. All right.

16 MR. MURPHY: No more questions.

17 BY MR. WILLIAMSON:

18 Q Mr. White, in closing have I or any other NRC
19 representative here threatened you in any manner, or offered
20 you any reward in return for this testimony?

21 A No.

22 Q Have you given this testimony freely and voluntarily?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Is there any additional information you would like to
25 add to the record?

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

A No.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Once again we would like to thank you for your time and cooperation in this effort.

This interview is concluded at 12:45 on August, 27, 1987.

(Whereupon, at 12:49 p.m., the interview was concluded.)

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:

Name: Appendix B Certification by T.V.A.

Deposition of Steven A. White

Docket Number:

Place: Chattanooga, Tennessee

Date: August 27, 1987

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.

15/ Andrew M. Emerson

(Signature typed): Andrew M. Emerson

Official Reporter

Heritage Reporting Corporation

TRANSCRIPT CORRECTIONS TO OI
INVESTIGATIVE INTERVIEW OF
STEVEN A. WHITE
August 27, 1987

- ✓p. 5, 1. 15 Change "issues that work" to "issues work"
- ✓p. 6, 1. 6 Change "Kelley" to "Kelly"
- ✓p. 6, 1. 18³ Change "Kelley" to "Kelly"
- ✓p. 6, 1. 19³ Change "letter turned" to "letter that turned"
- ✓p. 6, 1. 20³ Change "letter latter. They" to "letter, they"
- ✓p. 7, 1. 5 Change "quit" to "quite"
- ✓p. 7, 1. 8 Change "to, and" to "to me, and"
- ✓p. 7, 1. 8 Change "out" to "out,"
- ✓p. 8, 1. 11 Change "wanted" to "was looking"
- ✓p. 12, 1. 14 Change "understanding" to "understand"
- ✓p. 15, 1. 2 Change "Kelley" to "Kelly"
- ✓p. 15, 1. 4 Change "issue, and" to "issue, although"
- ✓p. 21, 1. 17 Change "objected, certainly," to "objected.
Certainly,"
- ✓p. 21, 1. 18 Change "wouldn't have -- those were essential
determin -- I guess if" to "would have
objected if"
- ✓p. 21, 1. 19 Change "two more people in there, you know, I
wouldn't" to "two less."
- ✓p. 21, 1. 20 Delete entire line
- ✓p. 21, 1. 21 Change "were essential." to "Those present were
essential."
- ✓p. 22, 1. 7 Change "Huston?" to "Huston."
- ✓p. 22, 1. 15 Change "I'd never notice" to "I never noticed"
- ✓p. 23, 1. 13 Change "Kelley" to "Kelly"
- ✓p. 23, 1. 14 Change "Kelley" to "Kelly"

- p. 37, 1. 19 Change "what were" to "which were"
 p. 38, 1. 19 Change "the corporate number." to "NRC numbers."
 p. 39, 1. 16 Change "in terms" to "was said in terms"
 p. 39, 1. 23 Change "and looked. I" to "in history and
 looked. That I"
 p. 41, 1. 2 Change "Kelley" to "Kelly"
 p. 41, 1. 15 Change "understand that," to "understand; that,"
 p. 41, 1. 16 Change "There" to "But there"
 p. 42, 1. 20 Change "discusses I had with Mr. Stello" to
 "discusses, as I had with Mr. Stello,"
 p. 42, 1. 22 Change "in that" to "we were in compliance, and
 that"
 p. 43, 1. 11 Change "compliance. No information to the" to
 "compliance -- no information to show"
 p. 43, 1. 12 Change "contrary that we weren't in compliance."
 to "that we weren't in overall compliance."
 p. 43, 1. 24 Change "Stello, and I categorize" to "Stello --
 and I categorized"
 p. 43, 1. 25 Change "be --" to "be --"
 p. 44,
 1. 14-15 Change "enough for a QTC" to "enough from QTC"
 p. 44, 1. 19 Change "with Sequoyah in dealing" to "up Sequoyah
 and dealing"
 p. 44, 1. 20 Change "and that" to "and that I"
 p. 44, 1. 21 Change "what he gained" to "what would be gained"
 p. 45, 1. 11 Change "Wagner" to "Wegner"
 p. 45, 1. 21 Change "Wagner" to "Wegner"
 p. 45, 1. 23 Change "full-minute" to "second"
 p. 45, 1. 24 Change "Wagner" to "Wegner"

- p. 46, 1. 2 Change "Wagner" to "Wegner"
 p. 46, 1. 3 Change "it wouldn't work --" to "I wasn't going
 to"
 p. 46, 1. 4 Change "gonna close" to "close"
 p. 46, 1. 5 Change "said in" to "said. In"
 p. 46, 1. 9 Change "Denton's" to "Denton was"
 p. 46, 1. 24 Change "Kelley" to "Kelly"
 p. 47, 1. 1 Change "Kelley" to "Kelly"
 p. 47, 1. 13 Change "Kelley" to "Kelly"
 p. 47, 1. 16 Change "told him" to "told them"
 p. 49, 1. 18 Change "test" to "testimony"
 p. 51, 1. 21 Change "hid" to "hide"
 p. 55, 1. 24 Change "make" to "may"
 p. 57, 1. 2 Change "they" to "he"
 p. 57, 1. 3 Change "they" to "he"
 p. 57, 1. 19 Change "as" to "and"
 p. 59, 1. 1 Change "the last" to "none"
 p. 61, 1. 2 Change "as" to "has"
 p. 62, 1. 17 Change "Kelley" to "Kelly"
 p. 64, 1. 13 Change "inadvertantly dropping" to "inadvertently
 stepping"
 p. 64, 1. 19 Change "own before to get involved." to "own."
 p. 65, 1. 7 Change "only enclosures" to "on the enclosures"
 p. 66, 1. 23 Change "kinds of" to "kind of"
 p. 72, 1. 9 Change "indication despite their 16th May letter,
 and despite, so" to "indication, despite
 their 16th May letter. In the phone calls
 it is clear"

- ✓p. 72, l. 10 Change "in letters." to "than in their letter."
- ✓p. 73, l. 20 Change "I have" to "I had"
- ✓p. 74, l. 14 Change "say had" to "say that had"
- ✓p. 75, l. 7 Change "any limitation" to "implementation"
- ✓p. 76, l. 5 Change "that to say" to "to say"
- ✓p. 76, l. 21 Change "the conclusion" to "any conclusion"
- ✓p. 77, l. 13 Change "But" to "By"
- ✓p. 77, l. 15 Change "Meyers" to "Myers"
- ✓p. 77, l. 23 Change "Harry" to "Henry"
- ✓p. 78, l. 15 Change "Meyers" to "Myers"
- ✓p. 79, l. 1 Change "Meyers" to "Myers"
- ✓p. 79, l. 4 Change "Meyers" to "Myers"
- ✓p. 79, l. 9 Change "Kelley" to "Kelly"
- ✓p. 79, l. 13 Delete the quotation mark after the second that
- ✓p. 79, l. 14 Change "despiration" to "desperation"
- ✓p. 79, l. 14 Delete quotation mark before they're
- ✓p. 79, l. 15 Change "describe me" to "describe to me"
- ✓p. 79, l. 16 Delete double quotation mark after 'pervasive,'
- ✓p. 79, l. 19 Change "And it" to "And I"
- ✓p. 79, l. 22 Change "and we looked" to "but we looked"
- ✓p. 80, l. 1 Change "he used" to "we would have"
- ✓p. 80, l. 2 Change "Kelley" to "Kelly"
- ✓p. 81, l. 2 Change "ver" to "were"
- 2 p. 81, l. 11 Change "saying." to "saying it was built in ?
compliance."
- ✓p. 82, l. 1 Change "hear" to "here"

