

In Reply Refer
To: JYVZF035

DEC 07 1981

Dear

This refers to our letter to you dated August 12, 1981 which indicated that we had initiated an inquiry into your concerns regarding construction practices at Carolina Power and Light Company's Harris nuclear power plant site as documented in the enclosure to that letter.

Our special inspection regarding this matter has been completed and our findings are documented in the enclosed report. One item, pertaining to epoxy grout, outlined on Page 3 of the enclosed report is still open and will be addressed by our inspectors during a future upcoming inspection. As you will notice, this item has been assigned a specific number and it has been included in our computer tracking system which will ensure adequate resolution is obtained.

With regards to the violation identified during the inspection, Carolina Power and Light Company is required to inform us in writing of the corrective actions they have taken or plan to take and our inspectors will continue to follow such actions to ensure proper resolution.

I would like to explain that the finding "unsubstantiated" does not necessarily mean that we find the facts as you stated them to be untrue, rather it means only that we were unable to obtain objective evidence to corroborate your statements through interviews, document reviews, and/or direct observations.

This concludes the Enforcement and Investigation Staff's activities regarding this matter. We appreciate your informing us of your concerns and feel that our actions have been responsive to those concerns; however, should you have further questions regarding this matter, please contact me. Please be assured that we will continue to perform inspections to ensure that construction procedures are properly followed at nuclear power plants to protect the public health and safety.

Sincerely,

B406010040 B40403
PDR FOIA
VADENB3-413 PDR

James Y. Vorse
Regional Investigator

Enclosure: IE Report
No. 50-400/81-18

RII:EIS
JYVorse:cmc
12/7/81

RII:EIS
CEAlderson
12/7/81

MEMORANDUM TO CASE FILE

TYPE ACTION <input type="checkbox"/> RECORD OF CONVERSATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CASE REVIEW / STATUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER	PARTICIPANTS	FILE NO
	<i>Vorse to Case Alc</i>	DATE
	CONFIDENTIALITY REQUESTED YES NO	12-07-81 TIME

SUMMARY

Case completed - recommend closing

PAGE OF

PREPARED BY <i>Vorse</i>	DATE 12-07-81
-----------------------------	------------------

ACTION REQUIRED

I concur - case closed

REVIEWED BY <i>[Signature]</i>	DATE 12/7/81
-----------------------------------	-----------------

MEMORANDUM TO CASE FILE

TYPE ACTION <input type="checkbox"/> RECORD OF CONVERSATION <input type="checkbox"/> CASE REVIEW / STATUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER	PARTICIPANTS	FILE NO.
	VORSE AND ALLEGER "A"	2F017
		DATE
		8 APRIL 6, 1981
	CONFIDENTIALITY REQUESTED	TIME
	YES XX NO	1610

SUMMARY

ALLEGER "A" CALLED AND WE DISCUSSED DETAILS OF HIS ALLEGATIONS. CONCERNING NUMBERS 1a AND 1b OF THE MARCH 16, 1981 MEMO FROM ECONOMOS, ALLEGER "A" STATED THEY ARE RELATED. THE HANGER INSPECTORS REFERRED TO ARE ~~THEY~~ AND ~~THEY~~ THEY DO HANGER WELDING INSPECTIONS AND HAVE NO SUPERVISION IN THE ~~KIKKX~~ FIELD. THEY START D TRAINING BY ~~XXXXXX~~ "SHADOWING" HANGER WELD INSPECTORS FOR 3-4 WEEKS AND PERFORMED THE PAPERWORK WITHOUT ACTUALLY BEING INVOLVED IN THE INSPECTIONS. THEN, THEY TOOK EXAMINATIONS FOR LEVEL II WELDING WHICH THEY BOTH FLUNKED TWICE. THEY WERE THEN GIVEN A MODIFIED EXAMINATION FOR LEVEL II HANGER INSPECTION ONLY. ALLEGER "A" IS NOT CERTAIN IF IT WAS THE MODIFIED EXAMINATION OR ANOTHER EXAMINATION WHICH THEY TOOK ~~MMKX~~ ON A FRIDAY AFTERNOON, DID NOT FINISH, AND RETURNED MONDAY MORNING WITH THE EXAMINATIONS ~~WHICH~~ ^{AND} ALL THE ANSWERS. AFTER THE MODIFIED EXAMINATION WAS TAKEN, SOMETIME IN NOVEMBER OR DECEMBER (AS BEST ALLEGER "A" COULD RECALL) 1980, BOTH OF THEM WENT INTO THE FIELD, WORKED INDEPENDENTLY, WITHOUT SUPERVISION, AND DID (AND ARE STILL DOING) INSPECTIONS OF NEW HANGERS, OLD HANGERS THAT NEED REINSPECTION AND INSPECT "AS BUILT" DESIGN CHANGES TO HANGER WELD MODIFICATIONS. THE INSPECTIONS CONSIST ALMOST EXCLUSIVELY OF FILLET WELDS AND THESE REQUIRE INTERPRETATION ~~XXX~~ UTILIZING AMERICAN WELDING ~~SHEIKITXX~~ SOCIETY (AWS) D11 CODES WHICH REQUIRE LEVEL II CERTIFICATION.

REGARDING ALLEGATION 1c OF THE ECONOMOS MEMO, ALLEGER "A" STATED THAT THE THEN "QA SPECIALIST" AND NOW TITLED "QA DIRECTOR" WOULD TAKE THE ROUGH DRAFTS ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ OF DEFICIENCY DISPOSITION REPORTS ~~INXXXX~~ (DDR'S) AND SANITIZE THEM BY CORRECTING GRAMMAR, SPELLING, PUNCTUATION, ETC.

PREPARED BY	DATE
VORSE	APRIL 7, 1981
ACTION REQUIRED	
GET WITH ECONOMOS XXXXXXXXXX	
WRITE REPORT OF XXXXXXXXXX	
ATTEND TO XXXXXXXXXX WITH HIS XXXXXXXXXX	
- THE XXXXXXXXXX TO XXXXXXXXXX VIA XXXXXXXXXX DISCUSSION XXXXXXXXXX	
REVIEWED BY	DATE

242

MEMORANDUM TO CASE FILE CONTINUATION SHEET

AND ~~HE~~ DOES, IN ALLEGER "A'S" OPINION, CHANGE THE CONTENT SO THAT IT DOES NOT APPEAR TO BE A NON-CONFORMING ITEM BUT RATHER A "GREY AREA". HE BELIEVES ~~HE~~ DOES THIS SO AS NOT TO MAKE CONSTRUCTION LOOK BAD. ALLEGER "A" STATED HE COULD PROVIDE NO SPECIFIC EXAMPLES AND THAT ANY RECORDS WOULD BE DIFFICULT TO OBTAIN SINCE THERE HAS BEEN A CHANGE IN UPPER QA MANAGEMENT.

ALLEGER "A" STATED HE DID NOT EXPRESS CONCERN 1d OF THE ECONOMOS MEMO.

CONCERNING 1e OF THE MEMO, I EXPLAINED THIS IS A MANAGEMENT DEFICIENCY WHICH THE NRC DOES NOT LEVY REQUIREMENTS BUT CONSIDERS IT BAD PRACTICE NOT TO HAVE A MORE OPEN DOOR POLICY. I ALSO EXPLAINED THAT GEORGE MAXWELL HAS BROUGHT THIS TO THE ATTENTION OF SITE MANAGEMENT.

ALLEGER "A" EXPLAINED THAT HE HAS SEEN A GRADUAL IMPROVEMENT IN THE QA PROGRAM, PARTICULARLY THE BETTER COMMUNICATIONS REGARDING DDR'S. HE DOES BELIEVE, HOWEVER, THAT A FEW DDR'S ARE BEING POLISHED TO CHANGE THE CONTENT AS BEFORE STATED. HE ALSO DOES NOT THINK THE HANGER INSPECTORS ARE PROPERLY QUALIFIED FOR WHAT THEY ARE DOING (THE TWO MENTIONED EARLIER).

HE ALSO ADDED THAT I SHOULD ASK ECONOMOS ABOUT ~~IT~~ HE DID NOT SPECIFY WHAT THIS MEANT EXCEPT WHEN ASKED, EXPLAINED IT WAS CONCERNING WORK RELATED THINGS.

HE REITERATED HIS DESIRE FOR COMPLETE ANONYMITY AND DID NOT EXPRESS A DESIRE TO HAVE ANYTHING FROM ME IN WRITING.

FILE NO

DATE

TIME

PAGE OF

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION-RELATED CONVERSATION

CASE NO. 2FO17	DATE 04-06-81	TIME INITIATED	TIME COMPLETED
-------------------	------------------	----------------	----------------

TYPE <input type="checkbox"/> MEETING <input type="checkbox"/> INTERVIEW <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TELEPHONE CALL COLLECT <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER	PARTICIPANTS VORSE + ROBERT MAXWELL (RT)	
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>CALLED NO.</td> <td>CALLING NO.</td> </tr> </table>	CALLED NO.
CALLED NO.	CALLING NO.	

SUMMARY:

I CALLED GED MAXWELL AND ADVISED HIM OF MY DISCUSSION WITH ALLECK "B". I ASKED HIM TO CONTACT ALLECK "A" AND HAVE HIM CALL ME COLLECT AS I HAVE SEVERAL QUESTIONS TO ASK HIM. HE SAID HE WOULD TRY TO GET A HOLD OF ALLECK "A".

REVIEWED BY

DATE

PAGE OF

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

INFORMATION CONTAINED MAY BE EXEMPTED FROM DISCLOSURE BY FOIA (5 USC 552(b)(2)) AND/OR PRIVACY ACT (5 USC 552a(k)(2))

43

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION-RELATED CONVERSATION

CASE NO. 2FO17	DATE 04-02-81	TIME INITIATED	TIME COMPLETED
TYPE <input type="checkbox"/> MEETING <input type="checkbox"/> INTERVIEW <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TELEPHONE CALL COLLECT <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER	PARTICIPANTS <u>PERSE + ALLEGED "B"</u>		
	CALLED NO.	CALLING NO.	

SUMMARY:

ALLEGED "B" CALLED COLLECT AND DISCUSSED HIS CONCERNS. HIS CONCERNS ARE #S 1, 2, 7 + 8 IN THE STATEMENT OF CONCERNS. I ADVISED HIM THAT CONCERN # 8 IS A MANAGEMENT FUNCTION AND THAT THE RESIDENT INSPECTOR HAS DISCUSSED THIS WITH THE QA DIRECTOR IN AN EFFORT TO HAVE A MORE OPEN DOOR POLICY. I ALSO EXPLAINED THAT THE NRC DOES NOT HAVE REQUIREMENTS FOR ITEMS #1 AND #2 IN THE STATEMENT OF CONCERNS BUT THAT IT IS CONSIDERED GOOD POLICY FOR THIS TO BE HAPPENING. HE EXPLAINED THAT IN HIS OPINION, THE QA DIRECTOR IS MORE OR LESS INTIMIDATED BY THE [] AND THE IT APPEARS TO ALLEGED "B" THAT ALTHOUGH [] IS SUPPOSED TO BE EQUIVALENT IN THE ORGANIZATIONAL RANK STRUCTURE, HE DOES NOT WANT TELL HIM TO DO FOR EXAMPLE, [] WILL BE INTO OFFICE, [] GETS UP OUT OF HIS CHAIR, SITS DOWN IN ANOTHER CHAIR AND [] WILL SIT IN THE DESK CHAIR AND PUT HIS FEET UP ON THE DESK. ALSO, THAT [] HAVE PARKING SPACES AND [] DOES NOT. ALLEGED "B" BELIEVES THAT [] SHOULD BE ABLE TO OPERATE INDEPENDENTLY AND NOT HAVE PROCEDURES/POLICIES DIRECTED BY OTHERS. I EXPLAINED AGAIN, THAT THESE ARE ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS WHICH THE NRC HAS NO REQUIREMENTS FOR. HE COULD PROVIDE NO DETAILS REGARDING FURTHER EXAMPLES OF CONCERN # 2. HE SAID HE WOULD THINK ABOUT THEM AND GET BACK WITH ME LATER.

REVIEWED BY <u>[Signature]</u>	DATE	PAGE OF
-----------------------------------	------	---------

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

INFORMATION CONTAINED MAY BE EXEMPTED FROM DISCLOSURE BY FOIA (5 USC 552(b)(2)) AND/OR PRIVACY ACT (5 USC 552a(k)(2))

443

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION-RELATED CONVERSATION

CASE NO. 3 FOI7	DATE 04-01-81	TIME INITIATED	TIME COMPLETED
TYPE <input type="checkbox"/> MEETING <input type="checkbox"/> INTERVIEW <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TELEPHONE CALL COLLECT <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER	PARTICIPANTS VORSE + MAXWELL (RT SHEARSON HARRIS)		
	CALLED NO.		CALLING NO.

SUMMARY:

0930
 I CALLED EEO MAXWELL TO ATTEMPT TO OBTAIN TEL # 'S AND ADDRESSES OF ALLIERS. HE SAID ONE OF THEM DOES NOT WANT ANY REPLY BUT ONE OF THEM MAY HE STATED HE WOULD CHECK WITH HIM TO SEE IF HE WANTED ANYTHING IN WRITING FROM EIS. MAXWELL ADVISED HE HAS ALREADY DISCUSSED ^{WITH THE QA DIRECTOR} THE QA COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN THE QA PERSONNEL AND THE QA DIRECTOR AND THAT THE COMMUNICATIONS HAVE GREATLY IMPROVED. ALSO, THE PLANT HAS REVISED THEIR PROCEDURES TO ENSURE TRAINING AND ^{EXPERIENCE} QUALIFICATION OF THE CONSTRUCTION INSPECTORS.

1345 - EEO MAXWELL CALLED BACK AND PROVIDED ME WITH TEL # AND ADDRESS OF ONE ALLIERS. HE WAS ASKED TO HAVE ALLIERS CALL ME COLLECT.

REVIEWED BY VORSE	DATE	PAGE OF
----------------------	------	---------

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

INFORMATION CONTAINED MAY BE EXEMPTED FROM DISCLOSURE BY FOIA (5 USC 552(b)(2)) AND/OR PRIVACY ACT (5 USC 552a(k)(2))

45 44