

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS

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

-----X
In the Matter of :
INVESTIGATIVE INTERVIEW OF :
R. J. Rehkugler :
(CLOSED) :
-----X

Nuclear Support Center
South Texas Project
Bay City, Texas
Wednesday, July 15, 1992

The above-entitled matter commenced at 2:05 p.m.,
before Tom Whiteside, a court reporter, when were present:

Information in this record was deleted
in accordance with the Freedom of Information
Act, 5 U.S.C. 552
FOIA- 95-80 7C

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, Ltd.
Court Reporters
1612 K. Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D. C. 20006
(202) 293-3950

- 4 - 92 - 003
9509110019 950810
PDR FOIA
SAPORITO95-80 PDR

EXHIBIT 119
PAGE 1 OF 27 TABS (5)
RP

1 On behalf of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

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

VIRGINIA VAN CLEAVE
Office of Investigations
Region IV
611 Ryan Plaza Drive
Arlington, Texas

DARYL M. SHAPIRO, ESQ.
Office of General Counsel
One White Flint North
Rockville, Maryland

On behalf of the Witness:
WILLIAM E. BAER, JR.
Newman & Holtzinger
1615 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2 (2:05 P.M.)

3 MS. VAN CLEAVE: For the record, this is an
4 interview of Roy J. Rehkugler, and that is
5 R-e-h-k-u-g-l-e-r. His address is [REDACTED]
6 [REDACTED] date of birth, [REDACTED] He *7C*
7 is employed by Houston Lighting and Power, South Texas
8 Project. The date is July 15, 1992, and the time is 2:05
9 p.m.

10 Present at this interview are myself, Virginia Van
11 Cleave, an investigator for the NRC Office of
12 Investigations; Daryl Shapiro, attorney for the NRC Office
13 of General Counsel; and William Baer, an attorney with
14 Newman & Holtzinger.

15 This interview is being tape recorded by Court
16 Reporter Tom Whiteside. And, Mr. Rehkugler, if I could ask
17 you to stand and raise your right hand.
18 Whereupon,

19 ROY REHKUGLER

20 a witness, was called for examination, and was examined and
21 testified as follows:

22 EXAMINATION

23 BY MS. VAN CLEAVE:

24 Q I have a few questions to ask you about the
25 attorney present, Mr. Baer. Does your employer require you

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, Ltd.

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

7C
interview
RJR

1 to have an attorney present when you talk to the NRC?

2 A No.

3 Q Is Mr. Baer acting as your personal
4 representative?

5 A Yes. Yes.

6 Q Did you select him personally or did your company
7 select him for you?

8 A I chose to have him represent me.

9 Q You selected him personally?

10 A Yes.

11 MS. VAN CLEAVE: Mr. Baer, who is your employer?

12 MR. BAER: Newman & Holtzinger.

13 MS. VAN CLEAVE: Are you acting as Mr. Rehkugler's
14 personal representative?

15 MR. BAER: Yes, I am.

16 MS. VAN CLEAVE: Does your firm represent any
17 other party associated with the South Texas Project?

18 MR. BAER: We represent the licensee for the
19 project, Houston Lighting and Power Company; yes. And, as
20 well, I'm representing a number of other individuals that
21 are subject to this investigation.

22 MS. VAN CLEAVE: Do you personally represent at
23 other parties at this site?

24 MR. BAER: Yes. I also represent the other people
25 that have been subpoenaed here today for this series of

1 interviews.

2 MS. VAN CLEAVE: And you also personally represent
3 Houston Lighting and Power with respect to this interview?

4 MR. BAER: Yes, I do.

5 MS. VAN CLEAVE: Do you believe a potential
6 conflict of interest could arise during the course of this
7 interview?

8 MR. BAER: It is always possible that a conflict
9 of interest could arise. At this time, I foresee no such
10 conflict.

11 MS. VAN CLEAVE: If a potential conflict of
12 interest arises, what would you do?

13 MR. BAER: If a potential conflict of interest
14 arises, I will inform Mr. Rehkugler of that potential
15 conflict, then we will discuss how best to proceed at that
16 point.

17 BY MS. VAN CLEAVE:

18 Q Mr. Rehkugler, do you understand that Mr. Baer
19 represents other parties associated with the South Texas
20 Project?

21 A Yes, I do.

22 Q What is your understanding of who will pay the
23 attorney's fee?

24 A HL&P will assume the responsibility of that.

25 Q And if the licensee, meaning HL&P, decides not to

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, Ltd.

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

RR

1 continue to have Mr. Baer represent you, what is your
2 understanding of the fee?

3 A That hasn't been discussed. I would imagine we
4 would have to discuss it at that time.

5 Q With that understanding, do you still want Mr.
6 Baer as your representative?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Okay. Mr. Rehkugler, what is your current
9 position here at the South Texas Project?

10 A I am the Director of Quality Assurance.

11 Q And how long have you held that position?

12 A I think that became effective February 1st, 1992.

13 Q That's fairly recent.

14 A Yes.

15 Q Did you work for the South Texas Project prior to
16 that time?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And what was your position then?

19 A The position that I held previous -- immediately
20 previous to the one I have now was officially a senior
21 consultant in the Quality Assurance organization. What I
22 actually did is that I was the supervisor for both the Audit
23 Section and the Procurement Quality Assurance Section.

24 Q How long did you hold that position?

25 A Approximately three years.

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, Ltd.

Court Reporters

1612 K. Street, N.W., Suite 300

Washington, D. C. 20006

(202) 293-3950

1 Q How long have you worked for Houston Lighting &
2 Power?

3 A It will be eleven years this September.

4 Q And were you always here at South Texas Project?

5 A No. I was affiliated with South Texas the entire
6 time, but I think the first three-and-a-half years or so I
7 was up in the Design Office in Houston.

8 Q Okay. As you're certainly aware, I'm sure, we're
9 here to look into some issues surrounding Mr. Thomas J.
10 Saporito. The first question I have is when did you first
11 become aware of Mr. Saporito?

12 A Let me -- I guess I need to really understand
13 exactly, because -- because two different times, but one for
14 real. When did I personally know about the situation, or
15 when was the first time I ever laid eyes on him?

16 Q When was the first time you had any dealings with
17 Mr. Saporito?

18 A The first time I ever had any dealings with him
19 was the day that he came into my office to meet with me, and
20 the specific date is on that paper. I don't remember
21 specifically. I'd have to look.

22 Q So that's February 27th, is that the meeting
23 you're referring to?

24 A Yes.

25 Q Were you aware of Mr. Saporito's existence prior

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, Ltd.

Court Reporters

1612 K. Street, N.W., Suite 300

Washington, D. C. 20006

(202) 293-3950

AR

1 to that time?

2 A After I found out what his name was, yes. I would
3 -- I would say maybe two days, and I'm guessing. But maybe
4 two days prior to the time that he came into my office, I
5 saw him in the office area upstairs. He was in Don Bohner's
6 office. And so I saw -- I had seen the face before, but I
7 didn't know who the person was or, you know, I didn't know
8 anything.

9 So, yes, I saw his face, I knew he existed, but I
10 didn't know who he was until the day he walked into my
11 office.

12 Q Did you have anything to do with responding to the
13 2.206? Had you been notified of the existence of a 2.206?

14 A I was aware that there was one, yes. I don't -- I
15 don't recall specifically, but I don't think that I really
16 had anything to do with the response to the 206. I may
17 have. Well, to answer your question, to the best of my
18 knowledge, no; I did not participate in the response
19 process.

20 Q Then were you aware that Mr. Saporito was a 2.206
21 petitioner?

22 A At the time that he walked into my office to talk
23 to me, my answer is no. I didn't even know who he was until
24 he walked into my office. And to be -- to be perfectly
25 honest with you, I'm a little fuzzy as to the timing as to

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, Ltd.

Court Reporters

1612 K. Street, N.W., Suite 300

Washington, D. C. 20006

(202) 293-3950

1 exactly when I became aware of the 206 as opposed to when he
2 came into my office.

3 But I wasn't aware that he was an allegator, if
4 you will, or whatever you want to call him when he came in.
5 I knew there were some problems, but I didn't know what they
6 were.

7 Q So when you met with him on February 27th, which
8 was after Mr. Saporito had already left the site, you were
9 not aware that he was a 2.206 petitioner although you might
10 have know that there was a 2.206 petition?

11 A That's correct.

12 Q Is that correct?

13 A That's correct.

14 Q All right. Is this standard procedure for you to
15 meet with individuals like this?

16 A No.

17 Q Okay. Who arranged this meeting? Who directed
18 you to meet with Mr. Saporito?

19 A I don't know who arranged the meeting, for your
20 first question. For the second question, no one directed me
21 to talk to him.

22 Q How did you end up meeting with him on the 27th of
23 February?

24 A I was aware, or I was made aware that an
25 individual wanted to talk to me. And to the best of my

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, Ltd.

Court Reporters

1612 K. Street, N.W., Suite 300

Washington, D. C. 20006

(202) 233-3950

1 knowledge, I think Don Bohner is the one who advised me that
2 this individual wanted to talk to me. At that point I said
3 bring him in, set it up, bring him in. I didn't know what
4 he wanted to talk to me about, but I knew that he wanted to
5 talk to me.

6 Q So when did you actually meet with him in
7 connection with when Mr. Bohner told you he wanted to meet
8 you, was it the same day, was it two hours later, or five
9 minutes?

10 A To the best of my knowledge, I -- I think that he
11 told me in the morning that he had set up a time for me to
12 talk to this guy. And I'm pretty sure it occurred that
13 afternoon.

14 Q Who else was present during this meeting besides
15 yourself and Mr. Saporito?

16 A ^{RR} Rick Cink, who is a Senior ~~Speak-Out~~ ^{SPEAKOUT} Investigator,
17 and Rich DeLong, who at the time was a Division Manager in
18 ^{RR} ~~INC~~ Maintenance.

19 Q Anyone else?

20 A I don't think so. I'd have to -- I would have to
21 -- can I get one of them and -- I'm pretty sure that was
22 all. But to state positively, Mr. Saporito, that was it,
23 and myself.

24 Q Prior to meeting with Mr. Saporito, did you
25 receive any debriefing or instructions from anyone regarding

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, Ltd.

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

RR

1 your meeting with him?

2 A No.

3 MS. VAN CLEAVE: Let's go off the record.

4 (Off the record)

5 MS. VAN CLEAVE: It's about 2:20. We've been off
6 the record for approximately two minutes in order to try to
7 determine if the fire alarm had any implications for us.
8 And we've determined that it probably doesn't, at least as
9 of now.

10 BY MS. VAN CLEAVE:

11 Q I think my last question was, prior to your
12 meeting with Mr. Saporito, you stated that you had not
13 received any instructions from anyone or any debriefing from
14 Mr. Baer or any attorneys before you met with him, is that
15 --

16 A That's correct.

17 Q -- correct? Okay. What was discussed during your
18 meeting with Mr. Saporito, in general terms? Let's start
19 with the general terms.

20 Well, he had several --

21 A Have you read this?

22 Q Yes. He had several concerns.

23 A That's a big question you're asking me.

24 Q Did he tell you why he wanted to meet with you?

25 A To the best of my recollection, he said that he

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, Ltd.

Court Reporters

1612 K. Street, N.W., Suite 300

Washington, D. C. 20006

(202) 293-3950

RJR

1 wanted to make me aware of some problems ^{at RFR} in the station.
2 Without going through this paper ad ^{mauseum} ~~nauseum~~, can I
3 characterize what I think he wanted to talk about?

4 Q Uh-huh.

5 A I would say that the crux of the issues that he
6 brought to me were things that he perceived to be -- things
7 that he perceived to be problems that we were having in the
8 plant with regard to compliance with procedures, with regard
9 to what he thought were some training inadequacies, and he
10 mentioned that we were performing activities in violation of
11 ^{Technical} Specifications.

12 ^{HR} Now, that's putting it in a nutshell, but I would
13 say that's the crux of what he wanted to talk about.

14 Q And you referred to this paper earlier. Is this
15 the document entitled "Meeting Notes," dated February 27,
16 1992, is that what you're referring to as "this paper"?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Is that in your handwriting?

19 A Yes, ma'am.

20 Q And these notes are your recollection of the
21 meeting on February 27, 1992, is that correct?

22 A Yes, ma'am.

23 Q During this meeting did Mr. Saporito bring up the
24 circumstances surrounding his termination from the South
25 Texas Project or his unescorted access revocation?

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, Ltd.

Court Reporters

1612 K. Street, N.W., Suite 300

Washington, D. C. 20006

(202) 293-3950

RFR

1 A Details? I -- I lost you. Could you re-ask that
2 again?

3 Q Did Mr. Saporito bring up his termination? He had
4 already been terminated and was no longer on site. His
5 unescorted access had been revoked.

6 A Okay.

7 Q Did he bring --

8 A Yes.

9 Q -- that subject up --

10 A Yes.

11 Q -- during this meeting?

12 A Yes. Not to me. When he first walked into the
13 room ^{he} ~~and~~ pretty much acted like I wasn't even there for the
14 first couple of minutes, he talked to Rick Cink and told him
15 that his main concern was in -- with regard to his access.
16 And nothing else was discussed, the circumstances behind his
17 access.

18 And to be honest with you, at the time that he
19 talked about that, I didn't know that he was a terminated
20 employee. I didn't know that he was someone who had their
21 access revoked or denied, whichever the case may be. And I
22 still don't know that. I don't know if he ever did get
23 access, I don't know.

24 But, anyway, he did mention it to Rick Cink that
25 he was concerned about the issue regarding access. And Rick

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, Ltd.

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

RJR

1 acknowledged that, and that was the extent of the
2 conversation with regard to that. So did he mention it,
3 yes; did he talk to me about it, no.

4 Q But it was discussed at the meeting, at least by
5 Mr. Saporito, he did mention it?

6 A He mentioned -- he mentioned an access issue, but
7 he didn't get into any specifics at all.

8 Q What was he concerned about, just --

9 A I don't know.

10 Q Did he mention the fact that he believed he didn't
11 understand why his -- why he'd been terminated from the site
12 or why his access had been revoked, did he mention that?

13 A Not that I recall.

14 Q Did he ask for an explanation of his revocation?

15 A No.

16 Q Or an explanation as to why he had been terminated
17 from the site?

18 A No.

19 MR. SHAPIRO: I think you may have two meetings
20 confused.

21 THE WITNESS: He didn't -- no, he didn't ask for
22 an explanation. The only thing that I recall that he did is
23 he just mentioned an issue regarding access to Rick Cink,
24 and that was the extent of it. That was not -- if you
25 wanted, you know, a little while ago I described the crux of

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, Ltd.

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

1 the issue of what he came in to talk to me about. And if I
2 had to characterize it, that ^{was} ~~is~~ not one of the issues that
3 he came to talk to me about. He didn't even look at me when
4 he discussed this. And I would say the entire thing took
5 maybe 20 seconds. I mean, it was quick, brief, over with,
6 and then we got on to the other issues.

7 BY MS. VAN CLEAVE:

8 Q Have you had any other meetings or conversations,
9 telephone conversations with Mr. Saporito other than this
10 one meeting?

11 A No.

12 Q You had only one time that you talked with Mr.
13 Saporito, is that correct; he didn't call you later, or you
14 call him, or try to clarify his issues, or anything like
15 that?

16 A No. As a matter of fact, I gave him my card and
17 said if you have anything that you need to talk about, call
18 me. And I never got a call.

19 Q Okay. Did you have any meeting with the February
20 27, 1992 meeting attendees after your discussions with Mr.
21 Saporito at this time, any debriefings perhaps by attorneys,
22 or meetings regarding the subject matter that was discussed?

23 A We -- we had a meeting, yes. We stayed in the
24 room; and did we debrief, yes.

25 Q In addition to the three individuals you've

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, Ltd.

Court Reporters

1612 K. Street, N.W., Suite 300

Washington, D. C. 20006

(202) 293-3950

RJR

1 already noted besides Mr. Saporito, who else was present?

2 A To the best of my recollection, that meeting was
3 Will Jump, Rick Cink, Rich DeLong, Bob Purcell who was an
4 HL&P lawyer, and Jack Newman and myself. I may have missed
5 one, but I'm pretty sure that was it. I'm pretty sure that
6 was who was in that meeting.

7 Q Do you have any notes regarding that meeting?

8 A No.

9 Q What was discussed at that meeting?

10 A Well, the basic thing that was discussed was the
11 interview -- the meeting that I had with Mr. Saporito. I
12 don't want to say that -- I don't want to say that I did
13 this, but to the best of my recollection I think I pretty
14 much didn't call the meeting, but I wanted to have the
15 meeting.

16 What was -- what was -- did you ask me what was
17 discussed?

18 Q Uh-huh.

19 A Pretty much what he came to talk to me about,
20 where the problems were, and any resolutions or issues that
21 he brought up that -- that took place in the meeting. And
22 that was it.

23 Q Why did you want to have the meeting?

24 A I'm trying to -- I'm trying to figure out a good
25 word for it, and I can't. So I would say that after the

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, Ltd.

Court Reporters

1612 K. Street, N.W., Suite 300

Washington, D. C. 20006

(202) 293-3950

1 meeting that I had with Mr. Saporito, I was pretty amazed
2 and wanted to know what was going on about these issues that
3 were being brought up because, to be perfectly honest with
4 you, I had no knowledge of anything before he walked into my
5 office.

6 And a guy came into my office and sat there for, I
7 don't know, maybe an hour-and-a-half, two hours, however
8 long. I think it was almost two hours that the meeting
9 lasted, with all these problems and all these issues. And
10 this was the first that I had heard about them and I wanted
11 to find out what was going on.

12 Now, I didn't call all those people to my office.
13 Somehow or other everybody ended up there. But that's what
14 happened.

15 Q During that subsequent meeting with the other
16 individuals, was there any discussion regarding Mr.
17 Saporito's termination --

18 A No.

19 Q -- from South Texas?

20 Was there any discussion regarding the revocation
21 of his unescorted access to South Texas Project?

22 A To the best of my recollection, no.

23 Q Have you since received any instructions or orders
24 regarding Mr. Saporito's termination or how you would
25 respond to questions regarding that?

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, Ltd.

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

1 you don't hear about stuff like that. That's not something
2 that gets publicized. If someone loses their access, unless
3 you have a need to know you don't hear about it. So I can't
4 even really answer that question.

5 If someone fails fitness for duty, naturally
6 that's a done deal, they're gone. But, see, you don't hear
7 about that either. But if someone, particularly someone who
8 works in the plant that I would have no dealings with
9 anyway, I would never hear about it. So I can't answer you.

10 Q Rumors don't circulate at the site about access
11 being revoked or anything like that?

12 A Not -- not really. You know, if I have someone --
13 if I have one of my counterparts that all of a sudden isn't
14 here anymore, I'm sure I would have questions about it. But
15 as to whether or not an individual who works at STP lost
16 their access, does that word go around the job site, I would
17 almost say no. But that's my opinion, but I don't hear
18 about that stuff.

19 Q You've presented me with some copies of some
20 records or notes here. There's an office memo from you to
21 Mr. Bohner, "Interpretation of Procedural Intent and
22 Requirements as Relating to ~~Speak Out~~ ^{SPEAKOUT} Concern 12266." What
23 is this?

24 A ~~That was a plant notice to me.~~ ^{gr} The people in
25 Quality Assurance go back and at least partially

1 A The only instructions that I've received were from
2 Bill, and that was to tell the truth and that's it. I
3 wasn't involved in any way, shape, or form with any
4 decisions regarding his access. So I really don't have
5 anything to even talk about. You know, I wasn't involved.

6 Q Have you received any information after your
7 meetings here from any source regarding Mr. Saporito's
8 termination or revocation of access?

9 A Do you mean the circumstances surrounding --

10 Q The circumstances surrounding it, yes.

11 A For what it's worth, I have heard that his access
12 was -- now, I don't know if his access was denied or if he
13 had access and it got revoked, I don't know. But whichever
14 the case may be, I had heard that the reason that happened
15 is because he had failed to disclose some type of
16 information when he filled out his papers. But what that
17 was, I have no -- you know.

18 But that's -- I heard that -- I heard that it
19 happened due to failure to disclose.

20 Q You've been with HL&P about 11 years?

21 A Yes.

22 Q How often does access revocation occur? Is this a
23 common thing that you hear about?

24 A Is that what happened, it got revoked? Okay. How
25 often. I don't -- I don't think I can answer that because

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, Ltd.

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

1 Quality Assurance Program, do I need to issue a deficiency
2 report.

3 Now, there may be a different type of problem
4 that's outside of my purview, but when I say no deficiency
5 exists that means that I'm not going to take any ^{quality} ~~quality~~
6 ^{assurance} ~~quality~~ actions relating to this. That's what that means.

7 Q All right. You've also presented me a copy of
8 your meeting notes dated February 27, 1992, and you've
9 already stated this is in your handwriting and these notes
10 were made following your meeting with Mr. Saporito and they
11 represent your recollection of that meeting?

12 A Yes.

13 MR. SHAPIRO: Are those notes from both meetings,
14 with Saporito and then the follow-up meeting right
15 afterwards, of just the first meeting?

16 THE WITNESS: The first meeting.

17 BY MS. VAN CLEAVE:

18 Q And this is the 2.206 petition here. When did you
19 receive that?

20 A I don't recall. I think my boss gave that to me
21 maybe a week or so after it was filed. Because, see, I knew
22 something was going on, but I didn't know what. And he
23 said, "Here, it's official. Read it." The specific time as
24 to when I got that, what date, I don't know. I would say it
25 was -- I would have to guess and say early March is when I

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, Ltd.

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

RAR

SPEAKOUT ~~AM~~ *AM*

1 reinvestigate the issue, confirm the facts that ~~Speak-out~~
2 presented, and then we do an evaluation to decide whether or
3 not there was, in fact, a violation of the Quality Assurance
4 Program that would warrant issuance of a deficiency report.

5 This memo that you have is one that came out of
6 the -- a result of the investigation that ~~Speak-out~~ *AM* did,
7 where they sent me two or three issues saying take a look at
8 this. Take a look at this and decide whether or not the
9 Quality Assurance Program has been violated. From that
10 point on, it's my decision whether or not I need to issue a
11 deficiency report or take some other kind of action.

12 So what that memo is, is my memo back to Don
13 Bohner, who is the ~~Speak-out~~ *AM* Manager, telling him we've
14 looked at it, this is what I say, this is my decision; yes
15 or no, it is a ~~Quality Assurance~~ *AM* issue.

16 Q And you have circled this independent verification
17 signature, and it says "no deficiency exists." So that was
18 your -- that's the one that related to Mr. Saporito?

19 A No. I didn't circle. I don't know who did, but I
20 didn't. All three of those issues --

21 Q All of them?

22 A -- were brought up by him, I'm pretty sure.

23 Q They all say "no deficiency exists"?

24 A Yes. Well, you need to understand that when I say
25 no deficiency exists, that's within my interpretation of the

RJR

1 got that thing.

2 Q Like I say, you believe you got this after your
3 meeting with Mr. Saporito?

4 A I know I got it after that meeting. Absolutely.
5 I didn't have that before this meeting. But when I got it
6 specifically, I don't remember.

7 MR. SHAPIRO: Are there notes from the second
8 meeting?

9 MS. VAN CLEAVE: No, he said he had no notes.

10 MR. SHAPIRO: Okay.

11 MS. VAN CLEAVE: Did you have any other questions,
12 Daryl?

13 MR. SHAPIRO: Give me a second.

14 BY MR. SHAPIRO:

15 Q There were two meetings, one with Saporito and
16 then the subsequent meeting right afterwards. You knew
17 about the 206 petition, but you didn't actually have a copy
18 of it? Or you knew -- is that a correct statement?

19 A I -- I can't say that that is correct because when
20 I became aware of a 206, I don't really know. The only
21 thing that I know when he came in to talk to me is that
22 something was going on, but what it was, I don't know.

23 If I had to bet -- if I had to really guess and
24 bet when did I know that the 206 existed before, you know,
25 but it wasn't him or whatever, no. I have no idea. I

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, Ltd.

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

RJR

1 didn't know what this guy wanted. All I know is somebody
2 wanted to come talk to me.

3 MR. SHAPIRO: Let's put on the record how we're
4 going to deal with transcripts of this and the subsequent
5 interviews in this investigation.

6 The Director of Office of Investigations, Ben
7 Hays, and Jack Newman of your firm have worked out an
8 acceptable arrangement for inspection of the transcript.
9 There's a memo -- I wish I could read the date on it -- July
10 7th, I think it is, a memo from Jack Newman to Ben Hays, or
11 a letter. I'll describe in detail in a minute.

12 There has been no and cannot be any request for a
13 transcript yet because it does not exist. The witnesses
14 already have a right to request a transcript copy after the
15 interview.

16 This letter purporting an agreement between Mr.
17 Hays and Mr. Newman talks about inspection of the transcript
18 and an acceptable method agreeable by both parties. On the
19 record, we have to again say we have denied a transcript
20 copy to anyone nor would we until the interview takes place.

21 However, this agreement concerning inspection is
22 acceptable and no way reflects a denial of the actual
23 transcript coming. That being said, the substance of this
24 letter recognizes a witness' right to inspect a transcript
25 copy, it recognizes the reasons why as stated in the APA and

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, Ltd.

Court Reporters

1612 K. Street, N.W., Suite 300

Washington, D. C. 20006

(202) 293-3950

within a ~~with any~~ RJC

1 some of the legislative history, and OI does agree
2 reasonable time to make the inspection available.

3 OI will bring the transcript to site here, and at
4 a reasonable time and a reasonable place afford inspection.
5 That procedure will apply to this interview and the other
6 nine or ten interviews in this case. I put it on the record
7 now, but it will apply to everyone.

8 MR. BAER: I agree that that's acceptable and that
9 the agreement is the one set forth in Mr. Newman's July 8,
10 1992 letter to Mr. Hays, which I believe is a verbatim
11 re-typing of the July 7th telecopy.

12 MR. SHAPIRO: Okay.

13 MS. VAN CLEAVE: Mr. Rehkugler, have I or Mr.
14 Shapiro threatened you in any manner or offered you any
15 rewards in return for this statement?

16 THE WITNESS: No.

17 MR. SHAPIRO: Have you given this statement freely
18 and voluntarily?

19 THE WITNESS: Yes.

20 MS. VAN CLEAVE: Is there anything --

21 MR. BAER: Wait, wait. I'd like to clarify that.
22 Have you given this statement voluntarily? Or are you
23 appearing here under subpoena?

24 THE WITNESS: I'm -- I'm under subpoena, there's
25 no question about that. But am I willing to give the

RJR

1 statement, yes. I have no problem with that.

2 MS. VAN CLEAVE: Is there anything further that
3 you wish to add for the record?

4 THE WITNESS: No.

5 MS. VAN CLEAVE: This interview is concluded.

6 (Whereupon, at 2:42 p.m., the interview was
7 concluded.)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

RJR

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission

in the matter of:

NAME OF PROCEEDING: R. J. Rehkugler

DOCKET NUMBER:

PLACE OF PROCEEDING: Bay City, Texas

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the file of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission taken by me and thereafter reduced to typewriting by me or under the direction of the court reporting company, and that the transcript is a true and accurate record of the foregoing proceedings.

Tom Whiteide

Official Reporter
Ann Riley & Associates, Ltd.

Supplemental Statement of R. J. Rehkugler

On page 19, line 24, there is a statement "That was a plant notice to me." This statement makes no sense in the context of my testimony and I do not believe I said those words. However, I do not recall what words I did use. With this change, and the other changes noted on the transcript, I believe that the transcript of testimony I gave on ~~June~~^{July} 15, 1992 is accurate.

R. J. Rehkugler
R. J. Rehkugler

09-17-92
Date 19
EXHIBIT

Supplemental Statement of William J. Jump

During review of the transcript of testimony given by me on July 16, 1992, I noted certain discrepancies based on my current knowledge and recollection:

1. On pages 36, 41, and 46, I testified that I reviewed Mr. Saporito's nuclear file in the hallway outside Mr. Hall's office. In fact, I believe I obtained Mr. Saporito's nuclear file, reviewed it, and returned it to Mr. Odom while we were standing outside of the Nuclear Support Center building. The remainder of my testimony regarding my review of this file is correct.
2. On page 88, I testified that the eight criteria for evaluation of individuals for access authorization are specified in an NRC regulation. In fact, those criteria are specified in NRC Regulatory Guide 5.66, which is a guidance document issued by the NRC which describes means for complying with NRC regulations. HL&P's access authorization procedure is designed to comport with this guidance.
3. On pages 131 and 136 I testified that Mr. Balcom made the decision to deny Mr. Saporito's appeal of Mr. Balcom's decision to revoke Mr. Saporito's access. In fact, that decision was made by Mr. Wisenburg.

Aside from these three items, I believe that the testimony I provided was accurate.

9/17/92
Date

William J. Jump
William J. Jump