

JAN 07 1982

MEMORANDUM FOR: A. Herdt, Chief, Materials and Processes Section, ETI  
THRU: J. Olshinski, Director, Engineering and Technical  
Inspection Division  
FROM: C. E. Alderson, Director, Enforcement and Investigation  
Staff  
SUBJECT: IMPROPER WELDING INSPECTION PRACTICES, SHEARON HARRIS  
(REFERENCE: CASE 2F051)

As you are aware, the EIS conducted an investigation regarding this matter recently. As I discussed with you, the investigation disclosed no firm evidence that safety-related welds were signed off without the required visual inspections. However, many interviewees stated that they had heard rumors that one QC inspector had done so and one interviewee stated that he had first hand knowledge that the identified QC inspector had done this on non-safety-related systems.

In view of the extent of the rumors and the allegations that the practice did occur on non-safety-related systems, it appears prudent to check, as part of the investigation, a sample of the welds accepted by the identified QC inspector. In order to complete our investigation in a timely manner, it is requested that one of your inspectors perform independent inspection of a sample of the welds in question no later than January 22, 1982. The inspector should provide a handwritten draft summary which identifies the sample size, the specific welds inspected, and the findings to the EIS for inclusion in the investigation report.

The assigned inspector should contact the resident inspector, G. Maxwell who is knowledgeable of the welds which should be inspected.

Carl E. Alderson

E406010074 840403  
PDR FOIA  
VADEN83-413 PDR

R11:EIS *CEA*  
CEAlderson:cmc  
1/7/82

12/11/61

To: R. C. Lewis  
A. R. Herdt  
C. E. Alderson

I had requested G. Maxwell to document in this memo the allegations/events concerning the welding problems he had encountered at the Harris site for our review, records and to assist with our subsequent actions.

C. W. Burger

Maxwell-

March 18, 1980

*Company location  
on site  
just in middle*

FILE MEMORANDUM

FROM: B. L. Montague

SUBJECT: News Media Contact

I received a call from Janet Hobbs of the Western Wake Herald about noon on Monday, March 17, 1980. She stated that she had interviewed four of the workers on site and that they had made a number of allegations. The conversation indicated that three of the workers interviewed were a Daniel's inspector, a welder, and an iron worker. She pointed out that she had talked with an OSHA consultant and the NRC and that now she wanted to talk with me. Listed below are the allegations along with the meat of my response:

- 1) Q. Three of the four workers interviewed had sustained some type of injury. The job is unsafe and when a worker is hurt, Daniel tries to blame the worker for the accident.
- A. Lacking specifics, we can only point out the safety record for the job. The injury rate on this job is about one-half the national average, there has been no death or disabling injury. Daniel has received several safety awards.

Each worker views a video tape orientation prior to going to work and safety is covered. They also receive a booklet on work rules which covers safety and a safety booklet. The site safety officer holds weekly meetings with foremen and they, in turn, hold meetings with the craftsmen.

I then related the incident where the rodbuster working on the exterior of the containment fell while climbing over the safety rail and down the side of the scaffolding rather than down the ladder provided for him. He was, in fact, responsible for his own injury and was, in fact, very fortunate not to have been impaled on the bar.

- 2) Q. She had shown pictures she had taken on the job to the OSHA consultant and he indicated there may be a safety violation. Specifically, there was a rope supported platform under a steel beam, the beams seemed to be too wide apart or another scaffold, and there was no safety rail on another.

- 2) A. The rope supported platform is used by an ironworker to bolt the end of a girder. This is an accepted method and when the platform is in use, the ironworker must be tied off with his lanyard. Reference: Scaffolding boards too wide apart and no guard rail. It is difficult to judge from a photograph all conditions that existed at the time. For instance, in either case, the scaffolding may have been under construction or being torn down. I questioned the propriety of an OSHA consultant making observations based upon photographs. If he has concerns, he should come to the job and make his own verifications.
- 3) Q. In reference to safety, the allegation was made that trash was not cleaned up and that materials were allowed to accumulate when not necessary.
- A. In our conversation we never got back to a response.
- 4) Q. Drugs are rampant on the job. Do you have any undercover narcotics agents on the site at this time?
- A. To my knowledge there are no undercover narcotics agents on the site at this time; however, anytime we receive an allegation we check it out thoroughly in cooperation with the local law enforcement. We have no evidence of hard drugs. Work rules prohibit possession or use of drugs and any employee found in violation is terminated immediately. There have been drug-related terminations. It is not realistic to say there are no drugs on site because there is drug use in every segment of our society.
- 5) Q. How many ironworkers have quit since January? You do not pay enough and they are going to continue to leave.
- A. For the month of February the turnover rate for ironworkers was 12.9%. This is about the average for all crafts on this job and is fairly typical of the industry. The 12.9% equates to 42 terminations; 24 voluntarily quit, and 18 were discontinued for cause. Cause generally covers violations of work rules, unacceptable performance, excessive absenteeism.

Reference: Wage rates - Talked on viewpoint of local contractors thinking they are too high and any employee generally feeling wages are too low. Both CH&L and Daniel management make annual wage surveys and from these surveys arrive at competitive wages.



- 6) Q. Job is cost plus and Daniel does not care how much money they waste.
- A. Job is cost plus fixed fee (fixed dollars). It is not cost plus a percentage. There is no incentive for Daniel to perform poorly. There are, in fact, several good reasons why Daniel wants to do a good job.
- 7) Q. How much money has been spent?
- A. From most recent report to the North Carolina and South Carolina Commissions, \$845,814,000.
- 8) Q. How much rework is there?
- A. We did not get back to this question in our conversation.
- 9) Q. What percentage of work is checked? (Implication was inspected)
- A. All work to one degree or another. Example, every weld in the loop piping is radiographed along with other types of inspections. A drain pipe from a toilet facility receives a visual inspection.
- 10) Q. Must all welders pass a test?
- A. Yes
- 11) Q. The welder I talked to said he had taken two tests and only passed one but was allowed to continue welding.
- A. There are 24 welding procedures on site to which welders may qualify. He may take the test for two procedures and flunk one, but he can still weld under that procedure for which he is qualified. Then discussed the issue of filler material and checks involved - must be qualified under procedure. Foreman must prepare requisition for filler material; on safety related welds procedure must be in possession of the welder.
- 12) Q. Do not pay enough and do not get qualified people; union jobs pay about \$2 more per hour and they get the qualified people.
- A. Do not believe that you want to imply that most of the construction work and products produced in North Carolina are inferior because they are produced by non-union workers. Union labor percentage is low in North Carolina.

As to qualifications of inspectors, their training and qualifications under site procedures is thoroughly documented. We do not take their word for their qualifications. The entire issue relating to quality receives inspection and audit by several groups: site inspectors, site QA people, corporate QA people, NRC, ASME, and ANI.

- 13) Q. How much of the welding is radiographed?
- A. All Code Class I (Example is loop piping), large part of Code Class II is 100% radiographed, some welds which do not relate to nuclear safety are 100% radiographed.
- 14) Q. How many CP&L inspectors on the job?
- A. Fifty-four (54) CP&L employees involved inspections and 53 Daniel employees who report directly to and are supervised by CP&L.
- 15) Q. There are bad welds on the condenser fabricated by Westinghouse and you are having to repair them.
- A. Our inspectors did detect welds which were not satisfactory to us. The condenser is not safety related. We were not concerned that the welds would fail but Westinghouse agreed that they were not satisfactory, we are doing the repair work and Westinghouse will pay for it.
- 16) Q. Welder who failed one of his tests was welding in the containment.
- A. As best we could determine, he was doing structural welding on small "I"-beams used to support rebar in the containment basement. The only purpose of this steel is to support the rebar until concrete is placed around it. No structural credit is taken for this steel in the design. It is perfectly appropriate that the welder be doing this type welding even though he had not passed the tests for some other type welding procedure.

*A. J. Montague*