

ORIGINAL
OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Agency: Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Title: Investigative Interview of
Ronald J. Adkisson (CLOSED)

Docket No.

LOCATION: Gore, Oklahoma

DATE: Friday, March 1, 1991 PAGES: 1 - 28

Information in this record was deleted
in accordance with the Freedom of Information
Act, 5 U.S.C. 552, b(7)C
FOIA # 93-105

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

1612 K St. N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 293-3950

4-90-012

EXHIBIT 116
PAGE 1 OF 30 PAGE(S)

30pp, 1, 7c contents

D/12

1 BEFORE THE
 2 U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
 3 In the Matter of:)
 4 INVESTIGATIVE INTERVIEW OF:)
 5 RONALD J. ADKISSON)
 6 (CLOSED))

7

8 Conference Room
 9 Sequoyah Fuels
 10 Gore, Oklahoma

11

12 Friday, March 1, 1991

13

14 The above-entitled matter convened for
 15 INVESTIGATIVE INTERVIEW pursuant to notice at 12:06 p.m.

16

17 APPEARANCES:

18

19 On behalf of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

20

21 LARRY CHAPMAN, Senior Investigator
 22 Office of Investigations
 23 U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 24 Suite 1000, 611 Ryan Plaza
 25 Arlington, Texas 76011

6,70 Porters

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

On behalf of Sequoyah Fuels:

IRA S. SHAPIRO, Attorney
Winthrop, Stimson, Putnam & Roberts
1133 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

P R O C E E D I N G S

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

MR. CHAPMAN: For the record, this is an interview of Ronald D. Adkisson --

THE WITNESS: J.

MR. CHAPMAN: K?

THE WITNESS: J.

MR. CHAPMAN: Ronald J. Adkisson, who is employed by Sequoyah Fuels Corporation, Gore, Oklahoma. The location of this interview is the Sequoyah Fuels Facility, Gore, Oklahoma. The date is March 1 and the current time is 2:08 p.m.

Present at this interview in addition to Mr. Adkisson is Ira Shapiro, who is an attorney from the law firm of Winthrop, Stimson, Putnam & Roberts, Washington, D.C. and is representing Sequoyah Fuels Corporation. Also present at this meeting representing the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Office of Investigations, is Larry Chapman.

Mr. Adkisson, will you please stand and raise your right hand?

Whereupon,

RONALD J. ADKISSON

appeared as a witness herein, and having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

MR. CHAPMAN: Please be seated.

EXAMINATION

1 BY MR. CHAPMAN:

2 Q Mr. Adkisson, I'd like to get on the record some of
3 your formal educational background as well as your work
4 experience background. Would you please start by giving us a
5 little bit of your formal training?

6 A I began working for Kerr McGee in the Nuclear
7 Products Division in 1963. I worked as an operator for a
8 year, then was promoted to a supervisor on the shift -- shift
9 supervisor in lithonium production area. From there I went
10 to Manager of Accountability for several years and we moved
11 over to the new site the Cimarron Plant north of Oklahoma
12 City. We had a new low-enriched fuels plant and we built a
13 plutonium facility. I went from there to a contract
14 administration job at that facility. Then I left the company
15 for nine months ([REDACTED]
16 [REDACTED]) so I went back to work for the
17 company and stayed at the Cimarron facility until 1975 with
18 responsibilities in security and safeguards, accountability
19 and those kinds of areas.

20 In 1975, I moved to Oklahoma City where I became a
21 Contract Administrator for the Nuclear Division. By that
22 time it was Kerr McGee Nuclear Corporation. After two years
23 in that job, I became the Director of Sales for five years
24 and then somewhere, 1985 or something like that, I went back
25 to the Cimarron facility as the director, to decommission

6,7C portions

1 that facility.

2 My formal education is [REDACTED]

3 [REDACTED]

4 [REDACTED]

5 Q All right, sir. And your current position out here
6 is?

7 A Vice President of Business Development.

8 Q And your primary duties include -- currently
9 include?

10 A Special projects. I am responsible for some of the
11 waste projects and for looking at some new business
12 opportunities that we look at.

13 Q In the course of your work experience here, you've
14 been through a variety of fields, have you had any formal
15 training from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission or formal
16 training from contractors on specific NRC regulations
17 relating to uranium contamination levels?

18 A Just various seminars.

19 Q Would it be a correct assessment to say that you
20 are familiar with the fact that there are limits by which
21 uranium has contamination values? By that I mean, do you
22 understand that uranium can't be left unguarded or cannot be
23 released on the site?

24 A I understand Part 20 and those things pretty
25 clearly, yes.

6,7C portions

1 Q Part 20 being 10 CFR Part 20?

2 A Yeah, that being radiological protection.

3 Q Are you familiar with the release limits regarding
4 environmental releases?

5 A Some.

6 Q How above versus restricted release limits?

7 A I'm familiar with them, but you know, I'm not too
8 conversant about that.

9 (Brief pause.)

10 Q Mr. Adkisson, we were discussing your somewhat
11 familiarity with NRC requirements and you say you're somewhat
12 familiar or that you have a general understanding that
13 uranium must be contained and that it is not allowed to be an
14 unrestricted release off the site, is that fair?

15 A I understand that, yes.

16 Q With that in mind, you mentioned you were somewhat
17 conversant or knowledgeable or familiar with Part 20. Are
18 you familiar with all the tables that are associated with
19 Part 20, such as Appendix B?

20 A Not all of them. Yes, I am familiar with Appendix
21 B, but not all the tables.

22 Q With Appendix B familiarity, are you familiar that
23 action level for an off-site environmental release is 225
24 micrograms per liter?

25 A It's not, I don't think. I think the off-site

1 release is 45 milligrams per liter.

2 Q All right, sir, I'll stand corrected -- you're
3 right, for NRC purposes, you're right.

4 Are you familiar with the fact that Sequoyah Fuels
5 has a license condition which sets a lower value of 225
6 micrograms per liter?

7 A I think we ought to correct that. I don't think
8 that's a license condition. I think that is a statement -- a
9 self-imposed statement we put in the condition -- into the
10 license for ourselves. A license condition is generally
11 thought of as something that the NRC imposes upon the
12 licensee.

13 Q All right. My understanding from staff of the NRC
14 is that once a facility makes itself in position into a
15 license such as this, it has the effect and force of a
16 license condition, and therefore is binding on the facility.

17 A I wouldn't doubt that.

18 Q Were you not familiar with that?

19 A I wouldn't doubt that, but I don't know.

20 Q Therefore, what I'm trying to ascertain is if you
21 felt like this 225 micrograms per liter was not, in your
22 mind, a valid release limit or was it 45,000 grams per liter?

23 A I guess I'm not sure.

24 Q What I'm trying to understanding is your general
25 knowledge of the NRC requirements, Sequoyah Fuels

1 requirements, because somewhere down the road, we're going to
2 get into a discussion of Mr. Lacey coming and discussing with
3 you Part 20.

4 A Sure.

5 Q And I want to know what your understanding of the
6 NRC regulations prior to you being in a position to speak on
7 it.

8 A Okay. Let me answer it this way, maybe it'll do
9 it. The 225 micrograms per liter is a number -- as I
10 understand it, is a number that is -- it's an action level
11 number, it requires us to do some investigation.

12 (A short recess was taken.)

13 MR. CHAPMAN: For the record here, we had an
14 announcement on the intercom system that there was some sort
15 of a problem out in the plant, unidentified, and gave
16 somewhat of an ambiguous notice that we should vacate the
17 premises, which we took to include this facility, so we went
18 out of the room for a few minutes.

19 It's now 2:20 and we're back on the record and Mr.
20 Adkisson is attempting to pick up where he left off with his
21 understanding of action levels and readings of action levels
22 relevant to off-site contamination.

23 THE WITNESS: The 225 micrograms per liter action
24 level, as I understand it, is a level that if you measure
25 that level and you're obligated to do some additional

1 investigation --

2 (Brief pause.)

3 MR. CHAPMAN: Back on the record. We're having
4 intermittent interruptions here with announcements. We'll
5 try to stay back on the record as much as possible.

6 Okay, Mr. Adkisson.

7 THE WITNESS: Okay. As I understand it, the 225
8 microgram-- per liter action level is a level that if
9 measured, requires that the source be investigated and
10 appropriate corrective action taken, whatever that
11 appropriate corrective action may be.

12 BY MR. CHAPMAN:

13 Q Now we understand that is relevant to off-site
14 release of material in unrestricted areas, is that your
15 understanding of the 225 micrograms?

16 A I don't know, but I would assume it's a limit for
17 either off-site -- restricted area or unrestricted area.

18 Q Okay. Just for a matter of record, for your
19 information, there is a different on-site restricted area
20 release limit, but at the time of this event occurring, your
21 understanding of NRC requirements was the lower limit -- or
22 the plant's lower limit of 225?

23 A It was my understanding that the 225 required us to
24 investigate.

25 Q Okay, sir. Mr. Adkisson, I understand that

1 sometime around the 1st of August and up to around
2 approximately the 20th of August or 21st of August, Mr.
3 Graves, President of Sequoyah Fuels, was absent from the
4 facility, is that correct?

5 A That's correct. He went on vacation, I couldn't
6 tell you the dates.

7 Q During that period of time that he was absent, were
8 you placed in charge of the facility or given?
9 responsibilities for any of his duties?

10 A I don't think so, but he does that when he does
11 leave and occasionally I am. So I don't know if I was at
12 that particular time or not.

13 Q All right, sir. Of particular interest to me is a
14 senior staff meeting which took place on August 7th which is
15 in the period of time Mr. Graves was gone. Do you recall if
16 during that particular day or that particular week, that you
17 were assigned any responsibilities with reference to
18 management --

19 A I don't recall any, no.

20 Q Okay. Were you present during a senior staff level
21 meeting that occurred on the 7th of August?

22 A That's the regular Tuesday staff meeting?

23 Q Yes, sir.

24 A Yes.

25 Q Do you recall who was in charge or who was chairing

1 that meeting?

2 A I could only guess. No, I don't recall.

3 Q Do you recall if any discussions were held during
4 this meeting over possible contamination of uranium products
5 in an excavation being conducted adjacent to the solvent
6 extraction building?

7 A No, I do not.

8 Q You do not recall any discussions of the fact there
9 may be contamination even if specific limits or specific
10 values were not discussed?

11 A No, I don't.

12 Q I understand that the meeting lasts usually
13 approximately an hour in duration, give or take some time.

14 A Normally, yes.

15 Q Do you normally exit the meetings immediately upon
16 completion?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Do you have any recollection of perhaps on that
19 particular meeting staying back and Mr. Don Knoke of the
20 laboratory coming in and making mention to you or a
21 pronouncement to the group that there was three grams per
22 liter of uranium contamination located in water that had been
23 sampled from the excavation?

24 A I don't recall that, no.

25 Q Do you recall after the meeting running into Mr.

1 Knoke and he expressing to you that there's approximately
2 three grams per liter of uranium in that water, within that
3 day or the next day after the meeting?

4 A No, I don't.

5 Q Mr. Knoke has indicated that he expressed this
6 value to you. Are you simply unable to remember if he did or
7 didn't, or are you pretty certain he didn't?

8 A I'm pretty certain he didn't, but I -- I certainly
9 don't remember it if he did.

10 Q In your position as Vice President of Business
11 Development, would you routinely or normally come into
12 contact with operations of this facility?

13 A Not normally, no. Most of my activity is out away
14 from the facility itself and it's -- I don't know how to
15 explain it, we just do different things.

16 Q But you normally do not become involved in
17 production activity of this facility?

18 A Not at all, no.

19 Q Were you involved in any type preplanning meetings,
20 project meetings for lack of a better term, regarding the
21 excavation of this area?

22 A No.

23 Q Were you required, in your position, to be involved
24 in any securing of contractors or of any types of --

25 A When I get contractors, yes, I do use contractor.

1 Q Would you have been involved in securing the
2 contractors for this project here?

3 A No.

4 Q Did you have any indications from any of the staff
5 members, operational staff members or health and safety staff
6 members -- and I include the environmental department in
7 that, that there was a concern that there could be
8 contamination in the soil in the area to be excavated?

9 A The only thing I can recall is one day I was in
10 Lee's office and Carol came in and said that there was some
11 yellow rocks out there and we went out and looked at those
12 yellow rocks and had them removed.

13 Q We being?

14 A Carol and I and as I recall, Lee went out there
15 too.

16 Q Do you remember about when that occurred or do you
17 remember -- if you can't remember the date, do you remember
18 the completion stage of excavation?

19 A I think it was fairly early, but that's just -- I
20 really don't have anything to base that on because I think
21 that was the only time I even went out there.

22 Q Out to the excavated area?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Was there any discussion when you went out there to
25 look at these -- what was your interest in going out there?

1 A Well Carol came in and said -- I don't recall if
2 she saw them or if somebody had told her and she was just
3 stopping by on the way, but she said there was some yellow
4 rocks out there and she wanted to know what to do with them.
5 Sometimes people ask me, what do you think we ought to do
6 with this or what do you think we ought to do with that, how
7 do we go about doing it. And I said well, you know, how
8 many, how much, how big, what are you really talking about.
9 And she didn't really know, so that's when we went out to
10 look at it.

11 Q Well I guess that's one of the questions I asked
12 you during some previous conversations, is why people rely on
13 you so much -- or rely on you to some degree for health and
14 safety issues, this is really not your area of
15 responsibility.

16 A No, I think it's just because --

17 MR. SHAPIRO: 27 years in the nuclear industry.

18 A -- because I do understand most of the regulations.
19 Most of them, I've had something to do with at one time or
20 another, Part 73s and 70s and transportation and all these
21 things, I used to be the expert for the company.

22 BY MR. CHAPMAN:

23 Q Well in light of your fairly extensive knowledge,
24 when you went out there and saw these yellow rocks, I assume
25 the yellow rocks were later determined to be yellow cake or

1 some form of solidified uranium -- did it concern you that
2 there could be some contamination in that area?

3 A No, I was pretty confident there was contamination
4 in that area before then.

5 Q Before the excavation began?

6 A (Nodding head affirmatively.)

7 Q What made you believe that?

8 A Oh, I don't know, probably just rumors. As I
9 recall, there was a little bit of a survey done out there at
10 one time and I remember when I came over here going through
11 the inspection reports or something and just to kind of
12 figure out -- moving from one facility to the next, just to
13 kind of figure out what the tempo was --

14 (Brief pause for alarm.)

15 THE WITNESS: But I'd gone through some inspection
16 reports and as I recall, there was a couple of samples of
17 that taken by a couple of NRC inspectors out north of that
18 building, and I remembered seeing that. So, you know, I had
19 a fairly good idea that there was contamination on the ground
20 out there.

21 BY MR. CHAPMAN:

22 Q Of course, at that point you had no expectations of
23 when they dug, of encountering any water?

24 A No, water, I would not have had any expectation of
25 at all under the ground.

1 Q I believe you indicated before we got on the record
2 here -- discussed this latest information we've learned
3 regarding sandwells and some samples being taken at the fire
4 stations, you had no information or knowledge of those items?

5 A Not at all.

6 Q Now I understand that between the period of time of
7 the senior meeting up until about August 17, you were pretty
8 well removed from that project out there, but on August 17,
9 Mr. Lee Lacey came into your office and indicated he had
10 heard some information which led Lacey to believe there were
11 some elevated levels of uranium in some water concentrations
12 out there. Would I be correct in that assessment?

13 A Yes -- I'm using your date, I don't know what the
14 date was.

15 Q It was August 17, that's pretty well established.

16 A That's fine.

17 Q But the fact that I really want to understand is
18 that Lee did come into your office and expressed to you --

19 (Brief pause for alarm.)

20 MR. CHAPMAN: Again for the record, we keep
21 repeatedly being interrupted by an announcement so we're on
22 and off the record on occasions.

23 BY MR. CHAPMAN:

24 Q As I was discussing prior to this last announcement
25 on the intercom and shrill whistle, you agree that Mr. Lacey

1 did come into your office and express to you his knowledge,
2 first-time knowledge he thought, of some high levels of
3 uranium.

4 A Yes.

5 Q Was he specifically, as you recall, discussing
6 water samples versus soil samples at that time?

7 A Yes, water samples.

8 Q Did he indicate to you where he had obtained his
9 information from?

10 A Mike Chilton, as I recall.

11 Q Why was Mr. Lacey in your office? What was his
12 concern in coming to see you?

13 A Whether or not he should report it to the NRC.

14 Q And again, why would he seek your counsel if he's
15 the regulatory contact for this facility?

16 A Well I can only conjecture why he was in there, but
17 I suspect he just wanted to bounce it and see what happened,
18 see what I thought about it.

19 Q And I think you indicated earlier to me in some
20 conversations, you felt he was in there because of your
21 experience and somewhat knowledge of NRC requirements.

22 A Yes.

23 Q Do you recall if in his discussion with you he
24 mentioned that he had already spoken to General Atomics or he
25 had mentioned this to anyone else prior to visiting with you?

1 A I don't recall.

2 Q Do you know, at the time he came to you, if he had
3 been over to try to locate some laboratory results or was he
4 speaking of information he had just heard? And I'll go on
5 and say I understand when he heard these levels, he's
6 indicated he went to Mike Nichols' facility to look for some.
7 When he came to you, do you know if he'd already made that
8 attempt?

9 A I don't recall him saying that he had, no.

10 Q At the time he came to your office, did he bring
11 any laboratory results in or any hard documentation to show
12 you why he suspected high levels of uranium?

13 A Not that I remember, no.

14 Q If you can, kind of in the best of your own words,
15 you mentioned that Mr. Lacey came in to bounce this issue off
16 of you.

17 A Uh-huh.

18 Q Can you kind of expand on that, tell me what his
19 concern was and why he wanted to talk to you? You mentioned
20 something to do with reportability. Did y'all get into
21 specifics on that?

22 A Well as I recall, what he told me was that they had
23 discovered some liquid in the excavation pit and that it was
24 fairly high and I think he said eight grams per liter, but
25 it's been awhile ago. And he said that first of all, he

1 didn't think it was reportable and he wanted to pass it by me
2 to see what I thought about it. So we sat down and looked at
3 it.

4 Do you want me to go on from there?

5 Q Please sir.

6 A Okay, well I think we concluded pretty quickly -- I
7 think there's four parts to that --

8 Q Parts to?

9 A Parts to 20.403 reportability requirements. It's
10 not an immediate notification we were concerned about, it was
11 the 24-hour notification. And we were pretty confident that
12 the exposure parts of that requirement had not been exceeded,
13 it has to be -- I don't remember now, ten times or 500 times
14 the Appendix A or Appendix B or five times Appendix B.
15 Another part was it exceed \$2000 or involve more than one-day
16 shutdown. From the way it was explained to me, and we didn't
17 really talk about where the project was or whether it had
18 been stopped or anything like that, we concluded that this
19 was really one of those matters that we ought to -- I guess
20 they had been barreling the drums, I don't recall -- it's
21 been awhile. I think they had been barreling the drums.

22 Q Barreling the water into drums?

23 A Something like that. I'm a little bit confused on
24 the dates and the timing when all this happened but we had
25 concluded that this was one of those things that the new

1 decommissioning rules was designed to handle. I don't
2 remember the decommissioning rule, 40.9 or 49 or something
3 like that, that says when these types of events occur, that
4 you'll document that in your decommissioning file. Now we
5 had kind of looked at that from a perspective of well if we
6 go in there and start digging it up, what the hell do we do
7 with it.

8 Q Digging --

9 A Digging the dirt up. If the water was
10 contaminated, then you have to assume you have contaminated
11 soil. And concluded that probably until we could get some
12 type of a limit, that it would be very difficult to do that.
13 So we said well we'd better do two things. One is we'd
14 better get a little better handle on the monitoring wells,
15 better get a truck out there and see how far this thing has
16 moved, and see what else was it -- I forgot where I was going
17 -- we were going to get a truck out and see how far this
18 thing had moved. We needed to tell the NRC about it, but we
19 didn't believe that it fell within those requirements of
20 20.403 for a 24-hour reporting.

21 As a matter of fact, I made the comment that we'd
22 better get something moving on this because if we don't, the
23 NRC is going to move it for us and we won't like the way they
24 drive. So that's why we had decided to go ahead and get the
25 truck out and get some monitoring done to see if it was

1 moving laterally under the ground or what really happened.

2 Q And I take it from what you're saying here that Mr.
3 Lacey agreed with your assessment of what you should do and -
4 -

5 A I think he agreed with me, yeah, that the two
6 things, one is that we didn't think it was reportable and
7 two, that we'd better get something moving to start
8 monitoring this thing and see how big it is. I think in fact
9 we had even talked about well nothing had shown up in the
10 wells today.

11 Q The monitoring wells?

12 A In our monitoring wells that we had. So we were
13 pretty confident that it hadn't gone that far, however that
14 far is.

15 MR. SHAPIRO: He mentioned that to you?

16 THE WITNESS: Yes.

17 BY MR. CHAPMAN:

18 Q Do we know how -- you say Mr. Lacey mentioned that
19 to you, it hadn't gone -- the monitoring wells hadn't shown
20 anything?

21 A Yes.

22 Q Do you know if he had already reviewed that or he
23 had assumed that or did he make any comments about it?

24 A No, I just assumed that he knew that from his
25 reports and those kinds of things, we were pretty confident

1 it wasn't something that just happened overnight.

2 Q Just for your information, at one of our previous
3 discussions, you indicated that your portion of the decision
4 that it wasn't reportable was based on about four things, and
5 I'll go over them with you and see if you still agree with me
6 -- one, that, as you've already mentioned, no monitor well
7 showed -- reflected an outside flow. Two, that there were no
8 indications that anyone had received an over-exposure. Do
9 you still agree with me?

10 A Well from the perspective of those two requirements
11 in the 20.403, they had not exceeded those requirements. To
12 say over-exposure is probably a bad choice of words.

13 Q And thirdly, that you believed that the water was
14 contained in the pit and it wasn't going to be going
15 anywhere, you'd indicated because of a shale layer, it wasn't
16 going to be running off in the immediate future.

17 A I don't recall saying that, but you've got the
18 notes so I guess I did.

19 Q Do you still think that came into part of your
20 decision-making process, or you just don't recall it?

21 A Well I don't think I would say something to the
22 effect that the shale layer would stop anything from going
23 off-site because --

24 Q You're right. I don't particular say shale layer,
25 you just made the comment you believed the water was

1 contained and not going anywhere.

2 MR. SHAPIRO: That'll make reference to the
3 monitoring wells.

4 BY MR. CHAPMAN:

5 Q You said well it's contained in the layer of the
6 ground, but I won't argue that point with you, I agree. You
7 felt it was contained.

8 A Yeah, I felt it was contained and, you know, just
9 thinking about the slope out there, the slope is out to the
10 ditch that goes out to the lagoon, so I wasn't --

11 Q And also as you indicated earlier you believed that
12 this was a matter that should be noted in the decommissioning
13 file for later reference.

14 A Right.

15 Q And finally, that it's not something that's
16 airborne so it didn't have a severe chance for ingestion.

17 A Right.

18 Q Also I think, Mr. Adkisson, that you indicated to
19 me that you and Mr. Lacey held a discussion -- or in your
20 discussion, you got into the area of reporting requirements
21 and you centered it on what constitutes an event.

22 A That's correct, I recall that.

23 Q And y'all had some discussion about an event.

24 A That's right.

25 Q I'm not trying to put words in your mouth, so

1 please correct me if I'm wrong, but you --

2 A You're right, I do remember that.

3 Q -- you felt that it was not an event within the
4 requirements.

5 A That's correct. Now that you mentioned it, I do
6 remember that very clearly. It's ironic if you go to the
7 dictionary and look up the definition of "event", what you
8 will find.

9 Q The dictionary definition --

10 A I remember doing that, a dictionary definition of
11 an event has got something to do with a continuum in time,
12 real long and hairy.

13 Q After you and Mr. Lacey held this discussion, and I
14 assume that he left your office, did you share your
15 discussion with Mr. Lacey with anyone else at the facility
16 prior to notifying the NRC?

17 A I don't recall.

18 Q Mr. Mestepey returned on the 20th of August and
19 your discussion with Mr. Lacey was on the 17th. Do you
20 recall, upon Mr. Mestepey's return being present in any
21 meetings on the evening of the 20th?

22 A What's the 20th? I don't --

23 Q It's a Monday.

24 A On the evening, you mean work time or after work?

25 Q I'm sorry, where I come from evening is anything

1 after lunch, so --

2 A Okay.

3 Q He showed up, Mr. Mestepey showed up sometime
4 around 2:00 in the afternoon of the 20th and I understood he
5 called a meeting together. Were you present at that meeting
6 on Monday, the 20th at around 2:00-3:00 in the afternoon?

7 A I don't recall it.

8 Q Were you -- when Mr. Mestepey returned on the 20th
9 and prior to Mr. Graves' returning on the 21st -- I believe
10 I'm correct on that date -- were you called in by either Mr.
11 Mestepey or Mr. Graves, so to speak, and asked to recount
12 your discussion with Mr. Lacey or provide any information?

13 A No.

14 Q So as far as you're aware and to the best of your
15 knowledge, the discussion with Mr. Graves and his decision to
16 report it to the NRC as a courtesy call or however it was
17 finally brought into, was without your direct input, after
18 the 17th of August?

19 A No, I think Lee and I had, you know, part of our
20 discussion was that -- well I guess really not, because our
21 discussion really was that it's one of those things we need
22 to call them, we need to get things moving and let Reau
23 handle it when he gets back, I guess -- I guess you're right.

24 Q All right, sir. Have you been in attendance at any
25 enforcement conferences within the last year of this August

1 event?

2 A No.

3 Q You were not present at any type of enforcement
4 conference in Arlington during April or May?

5 A No.

6 Q Were you in any meetings since that -- let me back
7 up and reference this before I ask this question -- sometime
8 in April or May, Sequoyah Fuels personnel were in an
9 enforcement conference with the NRC, and I understand it
10 occurred, like I say, in April or May. And at that meeting,
11 Sequoyah Fuels pretty well said that they wanted to take a
12 conservative approach to letting the NRC know about any
13 events that occurred out here -- and I'm not using the term
14 "events" with reportability, but just occurrences out here.

15 Do you think that you took -- when you had your
16 discussion with Mr. Lacey, that you were cognizant of the
17 conservative approach or you just pretty well looked at the
18 fact of the regulations and made your decision there?

19 A Well I didn't make the decision of course.

20 Q Well I mean your decision to advise Mr. Lacey that
21 you didn't feel it was reportable.

22 A I think we're very much aware of those, but then
23 again, we still at that particular time did not think that
24 that was something that needed to be reported under 20.403.

25 MR. CHAPMAN: Okay. Mr. Shapiro is needed for a

1 moment, so we'll stop the discussion.

2 (Brief pause.)

3 MR. CHAPMAN: For the record, we've had to go off
4 the record again a little bit, Mr. Shapiro is needed out of
5 the room. So we're back on the record here at 2:55.

6 BY MR. CHAPMAN:

7 Q Mr. Adkisson, let me characterize this, that you
8 understood that as a result of that April-May enforcement
9 conference, Sequoyah Fuels had somewhat taken a posture that
10 they wanted to be on the conservative side in dealing with
11 the NRC, is that correct?

12 A That's correct.

13 Q Okay, sir.

14 MR. CHAPMAN: What were we talking about?

15 MR. SHAPIRO: Talking about that.

16 I was going to say though, it's not necessarily
17 inconsistent with a conservative approach, because here they
18 reached the conclusion that they didn't have to report under
19 403, but they did notify the NRC anyway.

20 MR. CHAPMAN: Yes, sir, duly noted, I understand.

21 All right, sir. Mr. Adkisson, I basically don't
22 have any additional information I need from you, we pretty
23 well have covered our previous discussion we had on September
24 7. Is there anything you wish to add or any information you
25 feel is relevant to this discussion we're having?

1 THE WITNESS: I can't think of anything, no.

2 MR. CHAPMAN: Has myself or any NRC representative
3 threatened you or promised you in any manner for this
4 testimony?

5 THE WITNESS: No.

6 MR. CHAPMAN: Have you given this information
7 freely and voluntarily?

8 THE WITNESS: Yes.

9 MR. CHAPMAN: Is t here anything further you'd like
10 to add for the record?

11 THE WITNESS: No.

12 MR. CHAPMAN: Okay, sir, this interview is closed
13 at 2:55 p.m. Thank you very much.

14 (Whereupon, the interview was concluded at
15 2:55 p.m.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission in the matter of:

Name: Investigative interview of Ronald J. Adkisson

Docket Number:

Place: Gore, Oklanoma

Date: Friday, March 1, 1991

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 my
direction, and that the transcript is a true and accurate
record of the foregoing proceedings.

William L. Warren

William L. Warren
Official Reporter

Ann Riley & Associates