

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INSPECTION AND ENFORCEMENT

REGION IV

Report No. 50-445/79-10; 50-446/79-10

Docket No. 50-445; 50-446

Category A2

Licensee: Texas Utilities Generating Company
2001 Bryan Tower
Dallas, Texas 75201

Facility Name: Comanche Peak, Units 1 & 2

Investigation at: Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Glen Rose, Texas

Investigation conducted: April 6 through June 1, 1979

Inspectors: W. A. Crossman
for R. G. Taylor, Resident Reactor Inspector, Projects Section

7/5/79
Date

W. A. Crossman
W. A. Crossman, Chief, Projects Section

7/5/79
Date

Approved: W. A. Crossman
W. A. Crossman, Chief, Projects Section

7/5/79
Date

Investigation Summary:

Investigation April 6 through June 1, 1979 (Report No. 50-445/79-10; 50-446/79-10)

Areas Investigated: Investigation of an allegation of the generation of false Quality Assurance records by a person employed at the construction site in a responsible Quality Assurance position. The investigation involved thirty-four inspector-hours by the Resident Reactor Inspector (RRI) and the Chief, Projects Section.

Results: The allegation could not be substantiated. No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

774230

7908230666

INTRODUCTION

Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station (CPSES), Units 1 and 2, are under construction in Somervell County, Texas, near the town of Glen Rose, Texas. Texas Utilities Generating Company is the Construction Permit holder with Brown and Root, Inc., as the constructor and Gibbs & Hill, Inc., as the Architect/Engineer.

REASON FOR INVESTIGATION

The Region IV Reactor Construction and Engineering Support Branch office received a telephone call from a newspaper reporter stating that he had information indicating that a present CPSES employee involved in certain Quality Assurance activities was known to have been unavailable for work at the site on specific dates and any records of tests or inspections generated on those dates by the employee would have had to have been falsifications.

SUMMARY OF FACTS

On April 6, 1969, the Region IV Reactor Construction and Engineering Support Branch office received a telephone call from a party who identified himself, and was known to be, a newspaper reporter. During the conversation, the caller stated that he had received information indicating that a CPSES employee involved in certain Quality Assurance activities of a responsible nature was not at the site on specific dates when the employee allegedly generated important Quality Assurance records. The caller concluded that the records had to be considered falsifications.

CONCLUSION

Based upon an extensive review of time-keeping records and pertinent Quality Assurance records in conjunction with data concerning the employee's alleged whereabouts, the allegation could not be substantiated.

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Nonlicensee or Contractor Persons

The Alleger - a newspaper reporter
Various law enforcement agencies were also contacted to obtain information related to this investigation.

Principal Licensee Employees

TUGCO/G&H Product Assurance Supervisor
TUGCO Site Quality Assurance Supervisor

2. Investigation

During the telephone conversation, the allegor indicated that an employee who held a responsible position in the on-site Quality Assurance organization had falsified certain Quality Assurance records to apparently coverup the fact that he had been detained by law enforcement authorities. The allegor identified the employee and provided five specific dates of detention. The allegor also indicated that he was reasonably sure that the employee had been detained in other jurisdictions but could not provide specific information as to where or when.

The Resident Reactor Inspector (RRI) at Comanche Peak Station (CPSES) was assigned the responsibility for conducting the investigation.

The RRI visited the sheriffs' offices in both Somervell and Hood Counties on the premise that arrests of this nature often occur near home or work. The named employee had no arrest records in either county.

Records were also reviewed and other contacts utilized to verify the five dates originally offered by the allegor and to develop information on what may have occurred in other jurisdictions.

This investigation and records review verified that four of the five dates provided by the allegor were accurate but also indicated that the party had been released before noon of the day following each arrest. Two additional arrest dates were found in other jurisdictions, one of which involved several days of detention. The records of detention in the jurisdictions involved do not routinely indicate time of release from detention, but the law enforcement agency representative indicated that it is normal practice to make such releases early on the day of release so as not to interfere with the persons' job more than necessary.

The RRI obtained and carefully analyzed certain payroll records maintained by the site. These records covered the entire period germane to the allegation; i.e., late 1975 through 1976. Neither the allegation nor the subsequent law enforcement agency search indicated any arrests since the end of 1976. The payroll records, available to the RRI, indicated the number of hours a given employee was paid for on a given day but did not indicate the specific time span in which he worked. The payroll records show that in each instance of arrest and/or detention that either the employee did not work at all, or that he could have worked during hours of a given day after early release from detention.

The RRI reviewed applicable Quality Assurance records during the progress of the investigation to see if there was any possible evidence that the person might have performed a test or made an observation that could only have been made during the discrete period of absence. In no instance was the RRI able to develop evidence that this had happened.

Based on the above findings, it was concluded that the allegation could not be substantiated.

774233