Docket Nos. 50-443 50-444

Public Service Company of New Hampshire
ATTN: Mr. Robert J. Harrison
President and Chief Executive Officer
P.O. Box 330
Manchester, New Hampshire 03105

Gentlemen:

Subject: Investigation Nos. 50-443 and 50-444/1-83-001 and 1-83-007

This refers to the investigations conducted by Messrs. R. Shepherd and R. Matakas of the Office of Investigations at Seabrook Station, Seabrook, New Hampshire, concerning allegations of intimidation and harrassment of Quality Control Inspectors and alleged employee discrimination by a licensee contractor.

The results of the investigations are described in the enclosed investigation summaries. Based on our review of the results of the investigations, no violations were identified.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.790(a), a copy of this letter and the enclosure will be placed in the NRC Public Document Room unless you notify this office, by telephone, within ten days of the date of this letter and submit written application to withhold information contained therein within thirty days of the date of this letter. Such application must be consistent with the requirements of 2.790(b)(1). The telephone notification of your intent to request withholding, or any request for an extension of the 10 day period which you believe necessary, should be made to the Supervisor, Files, Mail and Records, USNRC Region I, at (215) 337-5223.

No reply to this letter is required. Your cooperation with us in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Original Signed By:

Richard W. Starostecki, Director Division of Project and Resident Programs

Enclosures: Investigation Report Numbers 50-443 and 50-444/1-83-001 and 1-83-007 Summaries

8310270445 831013 PDR ADOCK 05000443 PDR

TEO!

cc w/encls:
John DeVincentis, Project Manager
S. Floyd, Operational Services Supervisor
D. E. Moody, Station Manager
Public Document Room (PDR)
Local Public Document Room (LPDR)
Nuclear Safety Information Center (NSIC)
NRC Resident Inspector
State of New Hampshire

bcc w/encls:
Region I Docket Room (with concurrences)
Senior Operations Officer (w/o encls)
DPRP Section Chief
J. Grant, DPRP
D. Holody, RI

RI:DPRP Gajlaga

Brap Kister 19483

Enf. Spec. Holody

OIFO FIL Christopher

DPRIS Starostecki

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Klingla ckayer (not for Jame) 10/11

Allan ex ofther 10/11



NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS FIELD OFFICE. REGION I

631 PARK AVENUE

KING OF PRUSSIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19406

REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

TITLE:

Seabrook Station Units 1 and 2/Allegations Concerning Intimidation and Harrassment of Quality Control Inspector and Hanger Welding

Deficiencies

SUPPLEMENTAL: Docket Numbers 50-443 and 50-444

DATE: August 2, 1983

CASE NUMBER:

1-83-001

STATUS: CLOSED

REPORTING OFFICE: Office of Investigations

Field Office, Region I (OI:RI)

PERIOD OF INVESTIGATION:

December 28, 1982 and January 10-14, 18-21, 1983

REPORTING INVESTIGATOR:

R. E. Shepherd, Investigator Office of Investigations Field Office, Region I

PARTICIPATING PERSONNEL:

R. A. Matakas, Investigator Office of Investigations Field Office, Region I

REVIEWED BY:

K. nousel R. K. Christopher, Director Office of Investigations Field Office, Region I

REVIEWED BY:

William Ward, Division of Field Operations Office of Investigations

REVIEWED BY:

rtuna, Acting Deputy Director

Office of Investigations

APPROVED BY:

Office of Investigat

8310270462 831013 PDR ADDCK 05000443 This investigation was initiated to investigate allegations made by a Pullman-Higgins (P-H) Quality Control (QC) Inspector who alleged that he was verbally threatened by a welder on December 14, 1982; that a paper cup full of water was dropped on him by person(s) unknown while performing an inspection on December 17; and that he was transferred from an inspection assignment as a result of four false accusations made by a welder concerning his inspection performance on December 21. The welder who allegedly made the verbal threat denied making the threat. The welder's fitter, who was reportedly present when the threat was made, denied hearing any threat made. The investigation did not identify the person(s) responsible for dropping a cup of water that splashed on the QC Inspector.

The welder, who allegedly made the aforementioned false accusations concerning the QC Inspector's inspection performance, denied making the accusations, one of which was made by a welding supervisor who alleged that the QC Inspector did not use a fillet weld gauge during an inspection on December 21. The above welder verified that the QC Inspector did use a fillet weld gauge and he reportedly informed a P-H QC supervisor, who investigated that accusation, of that fact.

The above QC Inspector informed the investigator that the aforementioned QC supervisor told him "we are taking you out of the PAB (Primary Auxiliary Building) for your own safety." During the interview with the QC supervisor, he denied saying that to the inspector.

The above QC Inspector also informed the NRC investigator that a second P-H QC Inspector was sprayed with a hose on January 6, 1983. The investigation established that the incident occurred on January 7 and that based on interviews with that QC Inspector and two construction personnel, they believed it to be an accident.

The QC Inspector who made the initial allogations in this case said that a third QC Inspector told him that he had an argument with a general foreman who later "came back to him with a bunch of pipefitters." During the interview with the third QC Inspector he denied that such incident occurred but he mentioned three incidents when a general foreman criticized his work and thereby caused him to feel intimidated. He also informed the investigator that the second QC Inspector, mentioned above, told him that a fitter or a welder told him "I guess you heard what happened to the last inspector in this building." The second QC Inspector was reinterviewed and he said that the individual who made that statement to him smiled after he said it and that he did not consider the comment as a threat but more as a joke.

The third QC inspector, mentioned above, informed the investigator that a P-H craft foreman told him that the QC Inspector, who made the initial allegations in this case, was not a very well liked person and that he had better watch it or watch out. During the interview with the craft foreman, he denied making that statement about the QC Inspector but said that the QC Inspector had signed a day sheet, which is not a controlled document, indicating that he inspected hanger welds on two occasions, when in fact, he had not done so.

A fourth P-H QC Inspector informed the investigator that a P-H craft foreman threatened to physically assault him on January 11. During the interview with the craft foreman, he admitted that he told the aforementioned QC Inspector to leave him alone or he "would punch his lights out."

Two additional P-H Inspectors informed the investigator of incidents where debris or other small objects had fallen on them while conducting inspections but they did not know if the incidents were intentional.

00

UNITED STATES

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS FIELD OFFICE, REGION I

631 PARK AVENUE KING OF PRUSSIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19406

REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

TITLE: Seabrook Station Units 1 and 2/Alleged employee discrimination by

licensee contractor (Perini Power Constructors, Inc.)

SUPPLEMENTAL: Docket Numbers 50-443 and 50-444

DATE: August 19, 1983

CASE NUMBER: 1-83-007

STATUS: CLOSED

REPORTING OFFICE: Office of Investigations

Field Office, Region I

PERIOD OF INVESTIGATION:

April 11, 1983 through June 3, 1983

REPORTING INVESTIGATOR:

E. Shepherd, Investigator Office of Investigations Field Office, Region I

REVIEWED BY:

Christopher, Director Office of Investigations

Field Office & Region I

REVIEWED BY:

William Ward, Director Division of Field Operations

Office of Investigations

REVIEWED BY:

fortuna, Deputy Director Roger

of Investigations

APPROVED BY:

Office of Investigations

SUMMARY

This investigation was initiated to investigate an allegation made by a former employee of Perini Power Constructors, Inc. (Perini) who alleged in a letter forwarded to the NRC, dated February 8, 1983, that he was terminated from his job at Seabrook Station on May 26, 1982 which, he said, was the same day that he reported an allegation of noncompliance concerning construction procedure to Perini quality assurance personnel and to the NRC. The alleger had previously reported the above alleged noncompliance matter to NRC Region I on May 27, 1982, after he received his Notice of Termination of employment. He said at that time that he had reported the alleged noncompliance to a Perini quality assurance (QA) inspector on May 26, 1982 and was terminated for doing so.

The investigation included interviews of the alleger, two Perini management personnel who claimed responsibility for the decision to terminate the alleger. and four other Perini management and supervisory personnel who had direct or indirect knowledge of the alleger's work record at Seabrook Station. All of the aforementioned Perini personnel said that they did not know if the alleger ever reported any matter to the NRC or if he had reported an allegation concerning construction procedure to a Perini QA inspector on May 26, 1982. The aforementioned QA inspector, who is no longer employed by Perini and the NRC Senior Resident Inspector at Seabrook Station were also interviewed. By letter to the NRC, dated April 26, 1983, the alleger provided a copy of his Notice of Termination, dated May 26, 1982, which states that he was discharged for excessive absenteeism, leaving assigned work area/company premises without authorization, and various written warnings for other Project Rule misconduct that were previously issued to him. During the interview with the alleger, he said that he had been previously terminated from his job at Seabrook Station because of excessive absenteeism (two months duration) in 1980 or 1981 and was subsequently rehired. He said that he was also absent from work for approximately 13 months, sometime after January or February 1982, and that he was subsequently rehired. He said that he received two warnings for absenteeism and a written

warning for passing out adverse literature on site at Seabrook Station. With regard to one of the reported reasons for the alleger's termination i.e. leaving assigned work area/company premises without authorization, he said that the Perini Labor Relations/Personnel Manager had given him permission to leave company premises early on May 26, 1982 in order to cash his (the alleger's) paycheck. He said that the Labor Relations/Personnel Manager gave him his Notice of Termination on May 27, 1982 and told him on that occasion that he was being terminated for his absenteeism of 1½ months duration during 1982 and for leaving the site early on May 26 to cash his check. The alleger said that he feels that his coming to the NRC "was a very strong part of it" (the reason for his termination) and that he thinks that the aforementioned incident regarding adverse literature was also a reason for his termination.

The Perini Labor Relations/Personnel Manager informed the investigator that he decided on the alleger's termination after the Perini Mason Superintendent told him that the alleger walked off the job on May 26, 1982 without telling anyone where he was going. He said that, in response to a request from the alleger, he gave the timekeeper permission to give the alleger his paycheck on May 26, 1982, which was a day earlier than usual, but he denied that he gave the alleger permission to leave work early on May 26 to cash his check. He said that the alleger was terminated for the aforementioned reasons stated in his Notice of Termination, dated May 26, 1982. He said that he did not give the alleger his Notice of Termination on May 27, 1982 and that he did not recall discussing the alleger's termination with him on that date. The Labor Relations/Personnel Manager provided the investigator with copies of six written Warning Notices issued to the alleger for violations of Project Rules related to uncooperative conduct, safety, carelessness, and passing out adverse literature on company property during working hours without authorization. He also provided the investigator with a copy of a Notice of Termination that was previously issued to the alleger on March 8, 1982 as a result of his being absent from work from February 6, 1982 until the date of his termination on March 8. He said that the alleger was subsequently rehired on March 22, 1982

and that he was also eligible for rehire after his termination on May 26, 1982 but that such eligibility was contingent on job openings being available to the alleger.

The Perini Mason Superintendent said that he and the Labor Relations/Personnel Manager jointly decided to terminate the alleger's employment for the aforementioned reasons stated in his Notice of Termination, dated May 26, 1982.

The aforementioned Perini QA inspector said that he had nothing to do with the alleger's termination and that he could never believe that Perini would "let a person go" for reporting a problem.