

ORIGINAL

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

In the matter of:

TEXAS UTILITIES ELECTRIC
COMPANY, et al

Docket No. 50-445
50-446

(Comanche Peak Steam Electric
Station, Units 1 & 2)

Deposition of: Thomas Ruel Locke, Jr.

Location: **Glen Rose, Texas**

Pages: 41,503-41,606

Date: Tuesday, July 10, 1984

*Original to E. Pleasant
H-1149 TR 01 0/1
1 copy E. Johnson, Region 4*

TAYLOE ASSOCIATES

Court Reporters
1625 I Street, N.W. Suite 1004
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 293-3950

8407170283 840710
PDR ADOCK 05000445
T PDF

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY & LICENSING BOARD

-----x
 In the matter of: :
 :
 TEXAS UTILITIES ELECTRIC :
 COMPANY, et al. : Docket Nos. 50-445
 : 50-446
 (Comanche Peak Steam Electric :
 Station, Units 1 and 2) :
 -----x

Glen Rose Motor Inn
Glen Rose, Texas

July 10, 1984

Deposition of: THOMAS RUEL LOCKE, JR
called by examination by counsel for the Intervenor,
taken before Mary C. Simons, Court Reporter,
beginning at 10:05 a.m., pursuant to agreement.

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

APPEARANCES:

Sim 1-3

- 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 the Applicants:

DONALD O. CLARK, ESQ.
 Bishop, Liberman, Cook, Purcell & Reynolds
 1200 Seventeenth Street, N. W.
 Washington, D. C. 20036

On Behalf of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

GREGORY A. BERRY, ESQ.
 U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Office of the Executive Legal Director
 Bethesda, Maryland

On Behalf of the Intervenor:

JOEL R. REYNOLDS, ESQ.
 c/o Trial Lawyers for Public Justice
 2000 P Street, N. W.
 Suite 611
 Washington, D. C. 20036

Sim 1

I N D E X1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25WITNESSEXAMINATION BYPAGE

THOMAS R. LOCKE, JR.

By Mr. Reynolds

41,507

By Mr. Berry

41,568

By Mr. Clark

41,585

By Mr. Reynolds

41,595

By Mr. Berry

41,601

E X H I B I T SExhibit No.For IdentificationReceived

Intervenor's 1-4

41,509

Applicants' 1, 2 and 3

41,588

...lock. I'm a
...lock, Purcell &
...Company,
...today in that
...sa, Jr., an

...point out
...he is not
...requested

...proceeding,
...Edward W. Belter,
...ported for
...transcript

...objections to
...the Board,
...Locke

...please,
...ring.

...of
...not
...of

QA or

APPEARANCES:

Sim 1-3

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

DONALD O. CLARK, ESQ.
Bishop, Liberman, Cook, Purcell & Reynolds
1200 Seventeenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

On Behalf of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

GREGORY A. BERRY, ESQ.
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of the Executive Legal Director
Bethesda, Maryland

On Behalf of the Intervenor:

JOEL R. REYNOLDS, ESQ.
c/o Trial Lawyers for Public Justice
2000 P Street, N. W.
Suite 611
Washington, D. C. 20036

Sim 1

I N D E X

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

| <u>WITNESS</u> | <u>EXAMINATION BY</u> | <u>PAGE</u> |
|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| THOMAS R. LOCKE, JR. | | |
| | By Mr. Reynolds | 41,507 |
| | By Mr. Berry | 41,568 |
| | By Mr. Clark | 41,585 |
| | By Mr. Reynolds | 41,595 |
| | By Mr. Berry | 41,601 |

E X H I B I T S

| <u>Exhibit No.</u> | <u>For Identification</u> | <u>Received</u> |
|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Intervenor's 1-4 | 41,509 | |
| Applicants' 1, 2 and 3 | 41,588 | |

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 MR. CLARK: My name is Donald O. Clark. I'm a
3 member of the law firm of Bishop, Liberman, Cook, Purcell &
4 Reynolds, Counsel for Texas Utilities Electric Company,
5 Applicant in this proceeding. I appear here today in that
6 capacity and as an attorney for Mr. T. R. Locke, Jr., an
7 employee of Texas Utility Services, Inc.

8 Before proceeding further, I wish to point out
9 that Mr. Locke is appearing voluntarily and that he is not
10 under subpoena. Mr. Locke's testimony has been requested
11 from the Applicant by CASE, Intervenor in this proceeding,
12 on the topic specified in CASE's letter to Leonard W. Belter,
13 dated June 27, 1984, a copy of which has been marked for
14 identification by the reporter, appended to the transcript
15 of Mr. Vega's deposition as Exhibit A.

16 The Applicant has already noted his objections to
17 the deposition procedures and schedule ordered by the Board,
18 and it intends no waiver of these objections by Mr. Locke
19 appearing today.

20 In addition to that, I would like to note, please,
21 the guidelines under which we understand we are operating.

22 We have objected previously to the appearance of
23 anyone from public relations on the grounds that it is not
24 providing someone who has any direct personal knowledge of
25 any alleged intimidation, harassment, or threatening of QA or

1 QC personnel at Comanche Peak.

2 Also, it is our understanding that in two matters,
3 Mr. Reynolds, that we are to be guided by your -- at least by
4 your good faith, your professional competence, that being in
5 the area of hearsay, that we're not to get into questions
6 which elicit hearsay testimony except upon some showing of
7 good faith by you as to where that may lead to some sort of
8 evidentiary facts being elicited; and secondly, that if
9 we are to stray in any way over into discovery, as opposed
10 from evidentiary questioning, that you will so indicate, that
11 the question you're asking is for discovery purposes and not
12 for evidentiary purposes.

13 Then, I think, finally, that we would object to
14 this entire line of questioning, because as we understand it,
15 there's been an objection raised by CASE with NRC that the
16 publications of TUGCO and its related organizations -- namely
17 the Circuit Breaker News -- the Circuit News Breaker --
18 constitutes itself an act of intimidation.

19 And we believe that any -- any such argument on
20 behalf of CASE abridges the First Amendment rights of TUGCO.

21 MR. REYNOLDS: We will respond to the extent that
22 we deem appropriate at some later point. By not doing so
23 now, I do not intend any waiver of any right to respond to
24 those points that you've just raised. It's more appropriate
25 to have Mr. Roisman raise them at such time as anything from

1 this transcript is entered into evidence in this case.

2 MR. BERRY: The Staff of the NRC also want to
3 reserve the right to respond to Mr. Clar, the Applicant's
4 objections. Also, by not responding at this time, it
5 intends no waiver of its right to respond at a later date.

6 MR. REYNOLDS: Mr. Locke, my name is Joel Reynolds.
7 I'm appearing here on behalf of CASE, which is the
8 Intervenor in this proceeding.

9 Could you state your name and spell it for the
10 record, please.

11 THE WITNESS: Yes. My name is T. R. Locke, Jr.
12 That's L-o-c-k-e.

13 MR. REYNOLDS: Mr. Locke, have you ever had your
14 deposition taken before?

15 THE WITNESS: Yes.

16 MR. REYNOLDS: Before coming here, have you had
17 an opportunity to discuss what a deposition is with your
18 lawyer?

19 THE WITNESS: Yes, I have.

20 MR. REYNOLDS: All right.

21 So, you're reasonably familiar with what this
22
23
24
25

1 involves, but let me go over a couple of points.

2 This deposition is being taken as part of an
3 NRC licensing proceeding with respect to the Comanche Peak
4 facility.

5 You're testifying under oath, the same as if you
6 were in a court of law. You are obligated, under penalty
7 of perjury, to tell the truth.

8 Every word that you or I say or anyone here says
9 is being transcribed by the court reporter.

10 After the deposition is completed, it will be
11 prepared for your review for accuracy and ultimately for your
12 signature.

13 You will have an opportunity to make any changes
14 that you deem necessary at that time. However, any party
15 to this proceeding would then have a right to comment on
16 any changes that you make.

17 Now, the booklet may then be used in this
18 proceeding. In fact, it becomes part of the record in this
19 case.

20 Now, a couple of sort of mechanical points is that
21 obviously the reporter can only take down the words of one
22 person at a time. So, if you will try wait until I finish
23 a question before beginning your answer, I will try and
24 wait until you finish your answer before beginning another
25 question.

1 You'll have to answer audibly. The reporter
2 can't take down a shake of the head.

3 If at any time you would like to take a break,
4 just say so and then we can do so.

5 If any of my questions are unclear, don't hesitate
6 to say they're unclear. Or if you don't remember -- I'm not
7 asking you to speculate, I just want to get at facts to the
8 extent possible.

9 Any questions?

10 THE WITNESS: No.

11 MR. REYNOLDS: All right. What is your -- oh, I
12 think we need to swear the witness.

13 Whereupon,

14 THOMAS R. LOCKE, JR.

15 was called as a witness and, having been first duly sworn,
16 was examined and testified as follows:

17 EXAMINATION

18 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

19 Q Could you state your current occupation?

20 A Yes, I'm vice president, Texas Utility Services,
21 Inc.

22 Q And how many years have you been in that position?

23 A About three.

24 Q What is -- could you describe briefly what the
25 duties are?

XXXXXXXX

1 A Yes. My responsibilities include internal and
2 external communications, public and governmental relations.

3 Q Okay. And then that is the sole focus of your
4 employment?

5 A Yes.

6 Q Could you describe your educational and
7 professional background in the area of public relations?

8 A Well, my educational background is actually in
9 the engineering area. However, I, fairly early in my
10 career with the system companies, moved into jobs throughout
11 Texas Electric Service Company that prepared me for this
12 particular assignment.

13 Q And can you describe what those were?

14 A Basically jobs in middle and upper management in
15 the division operations, where the public and communications
16 responsibilities were a large component of that responsibility
17 area.

18 Q Okay. Now, during the three years in which you
19 have held this position, have your duties changed at all or
20 have they remained fairly static.

21 A Fairly static, yes.

22 Q Okay. So, aside from what you have just
23 mentioned, there is no other professional or educational
24 background which you would say is particularly relevant to
25 your current duties?

1 A Not particularly, no, sir.

2 Q By chance, do you have a resume with you today?

3 A Yes.

4 Q I wonder if we could have that entered as
5 Exhibit 1?

6 Let's have this marked for identification.

7 (Intervenor's Exhibits 1 through
8 4, inclusive, were marked
9 for identification.)

XXXXXXXXX

10
11 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

12 Q Mr. Locke, is the document marked Exhibit 1 for
13 identification an accurate reflection of your professional
14 and educational background?

15 A Yes, sir, it is.

16 Q At the appropriate time, we will seek to move
17 that into evidence.

18 Are your current duties limited to the Comanche
19 Peak facility?

20 A No.

21 Q Could you briefly describe what percentage of
22 your time you estimate to be focused on the Comanche Peak
23 proceeding -- or the Comanche Peak facility?

24 A That's very difficult to say.

25 Could you -- could you give me any more idea of

1 what you're specifically --

2 Q I'm just trying to get a sense for whether you
3 spend 50 percent of your time on matters relating to the
4 Comanche Peak facility, 70 percent, 90 percent?

5 A Well, that would be difficult to say. I have not
6 done a study of --

7 MR. CLARK: Let me object to that on the grounds
8 that it does call for some speculation.

9 Why don't you -- if you want to ask whether or
10 not he keeps records and what those records show, I have no
11 problem.

12 MR. REYNOLDS: Fine.

13 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

14 Q Would you say that you -- I think you said, in
15 fact, that you didn't work full-time in Comanche Peak?

16 A That is correct.

17 Q Okay.

18 Would you say that it's more than half-time on
19 Comanche Peak?

20 MR. CLARK: Again, that calls for speculation.
21 I object.

22 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

23 Q Okay. I don't want you to speculate. I just want
24 to -- I just would -- just for the record, I would like to
25 show whether you -- whether the time that you spend in your

1 job is substantially related to Comanche Peak, whether it's
2 a de minimis amount of time which you spent on this facility.
3 It's not intended in any way to trick you or to pull some
4 kind of guess out of you.

5 A Oh, I understand. I just really have not kept
6 any records of it. If -- you know, I could speculate.

7 MR. CLARK: Don't speculate.

8 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

9 Q Well, let's say within the past -- let's say
10 1984.

11 Does that help to limit it in time?

12 A No, not really.

13 Q How about this week?

14 (Laughter.)

15 A Well, I don't know. That's difficult.

16 Q Let's try something else. What -- aside from
17 your responsibilities on Comanche Peak, could you briefly
18 describe what your other responsibilities are?

19 A Yes, it's -- again, it's the communications,
20 internal and external communications, public relations, and
21 governmental relations for -- for really the system companies.

22 Therefore, we're developing information for
23 dissemination to employees, we're developing information for
24 dissemination to the media. We're working up presentations
25 of various kinds, developing speeches for executives,

1 et cetera, et cetera.

2 Q Okay.

3 A So, the reason it's difficult at Comanche Peak
4 is a subject, obviously, that's of great importance to our
5 system, but also rates and regulatory -- we have rate cases
6 that are filed, other events that are occurring.

7 So, you know, unless I did a time and -- a time
8 study to say how much of this is strictly for this project,
9 how much of it is for something else, I really can't give
10 you an accurate answer.

11 Q Fine.

12 In other words, Comanche Peak is simply one of
13 many --

14 A Absolutely.

15 Q -- many things that you have responsibility for?

16 All right. Do you have -- do you have a staff
17 that works for you?

18 Q And how many persons are on that staff?

19 A Let's see.

20 Are you speaking of strictly in the -- in the
21 communications area?

22 Q Well, let's take communications area.

23 A Approximately 15.

24 Q 15?

25 A Approximately 15, yes.

1 Q Okay.

2 And aside from the communications area, how many
3 do you have?

4 A I believe that our total -- our total group right
5 now, under my vice presidency, is about 25, roughly.

6 Q Do you have an immediate supervisor yourself?

7 A I report to the president.

8 Q Do you report on a periodic basis or --

9 A Yes, as needed and as appropriate.

10 (Pause.)

11 Q Is it accurate to say that your duties include,
12 on behalf of the company, dissemination of information to
13 the public generally? That is an area for which you are
14 responsible?

15 A Yes, it's fair to say that.

16 Q Okay.

17 And is it also accurate to say that you're -- you
18 are responsible for dealing with the press and essentially
19 responding to press inquiries -- on behalf of the plant?

20 A I'll answer it this way. It is in -- it is in my
21 area of responsibility, yes.

22 Q Okay. Are you familiar with a periodical called
23 The Circuit Newsbreaker?

24 A Yes, I am.

25 Q Could you describe what that is?

1 A Yes, it's a -- it's a device -- it's a
2 communications piece designed to respond -- well, to all
3 employees about events of significance.

4 Q Events of significance within the company?

5 A Basically, yes. In fact, it would have an impact
6 on the company or have an impact on employees.

7 Q Okay.

8 And what's the basis for your familiarity with
9 it?

10 A It is produced in the operation that I supervise
11 -- that I'm responsible for.

12 Q All right. So, it's essentially produced by the
13 company?

14 A That is correct; yes.

15 Q Okay.

16 Was that something that you began? Or was it
17 something that was ongoing when you joined -- when you
18 assumed your position?

19 A No, it was ongoing. That communications program
20 was ongoing.

21 Q And when you -- when you took on your responsi-
22 bilities as vice president, you simply assumed that as one
23 of the -- one of the tasks?

24 A That is correct.

25 MR. CLARK: Joel, I have a copy of a front page

1 of the first Circuit that was produced by the company --
2 back in 1975 I think.

3 And on the face of that, it discusses the reason
4 for this program and then specifically discusses the
5 Circuit Breaker.

6 And if you want to take a look at that or if you
7 want to question Mr. Locke and enter that in evidence -- I
8 think we ought to enter it in evidence; it might be of some
9 use to you.

10 The left-hand column there and then the lower
11 right.

12 MR. REYNOLDS: Let me take a minute or so to look
13 at it.

14 (Pause.)
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

end 1

mgc 2-1

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. REYNOLDS: Let's go back on the record.

BY MR. REYNOLDS:

Q We were discussing a periodical called the "Circuit News Breaker." Can you tell me when the "Circuit News Breaker" was first published?

A October '75, I believe. I don't have a copy of the first "Circuit News Breaker," but the "Circuit" that I am reading from is dated October '75 and announces the beginning of that program. So any event in October of '75 or thereafter might have been subject to having a "Circuit News Breaker" published.

Q Okay. What is the "Circuit"?

A The "Circuit" is the monthly publication that goes to all the employees in the TUGCO division.

Q And that was back in 1975?

A Yes, sir.

Q And it has been published once a month?

A That is correct. Well, excuse me. Not necessarily once a month. Perhaps sometimes we'd skip and have one every two months. In other words, we might have had seven a year; we might have had twelve a year.

Q Okay. Now how does that differ from

mgc 2-2

1 the "Circuit News Breaker"?

2 A The "Circuit" is the monthly publication
3 that has general information about employees, employee
4 groups, the company, et cetera.

5 The "Circuit News Breaker" is for an
6 individual event and for the purpose of informing
7 employees about that particular event. It's a quick-
8 breaking, quick response vehicle for communicating.

9 Q Okay. So there is no set period or
10 set interval at which that periodical --

11 A That is correct.

12 Q Try and wait just until I finish the
13 question. It may be my fault, too.

14 A Okay.

15 Q How many times since it was first begun
16 has the "Circuit News Breaker" been issued, if you
17 know?

18 A I don't know.

19 Q Would you say on the average that it
20 is published five times a year, ten times a year,
21 or could you estimate?

22 A I don't know.

23 MR. CLARK: I'm going to object, because
24 of speculation again. Mr. Locke said he didn't
25 know.

pgc 2-3

1 MR. REYNOLDS: Actually he didn't say
2 that until you had jumped in.

3 THE WITNESS: Well, I don't know.

4 MR. REYNOLDS: All right.

5 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

6 Q Okay, so the distinction really between the two
7 isthat the "Circuit" is published to provide information
8 regarding the company and families and things of
9 that kind as a regular matter, whereas the "Circuit
10 News Breaker" comes out and focuses on individual
11 events on a non-regular basis.

12 A That's correct.

13 Q Now where is the "Circuit News Breaker"
14 printed?

15 A Where is it printed?

16 Q Yes.

17 A I don't know.

18 Q Okay. Presumably that's obviously also --

19 A You mean actually goes into the printing
20 press and is produced?

21 Q Right.

22 A I really don't know.

23 Q That also, just for the record, that
24 is produced by the company, correct?

25 A Yes, it is. Yes, it is.

mgc 2-4

1 Q How many copies of that are produced?

2 A I don't have that number.

3 Q Do you know where the "Circuit News
4 Breaker" is distributed?

5 A I know -- no. I don't know how it is
6 physically distributed.

7 Q Do you know where it is distributed?

8 A Yes. It goes to the groups in TUGCO,
9 the management groups in TUGCO.

10 Q Okay. By that, what do you mean exactly?

11 A It is sent to the management groups
12 in TUGCO at a designated location that they have
13 given our people, and it is sent to those locations.

14 Q Okay. So it would go, among other places,
15 to each of the facilities that are operated --

16 A Yes, it would go to -- we have lignite
17 plants in East Texas. The lignite plants would
18 get a copy. Comanche Peak would get a copy. The
19 offices in the Dallas area would get copies.

20 Q So as a regular matter, the "Circuit
21 News Breaker" is distributed at Comanche Peak.

22 A Yes.

23 Q Is the document solely funded by the
24 company?

25 A Yes.

mgc 2-5

1 Q Who is responsible for determining the
2 content of the stories that are included in the
3 "Circuit News Breaker"?

4 A That would be in my area of responsibility.

5 Q So ultimately you are responsible for
6 that?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Who writes the individual stories?

9 A It varies, but I would characterize
10 the people as professional journalists, many of
11 them with are those with backgrounds in journalism
12 who are employees of either our TUSI organization --
13 T U S I (spelling acronym) -- Texas Utilities Services,
14 or one of the other operating divisions.

15 Q So the people who write for it are all
16 employed by the company?

17 A That's correct.

18 Q Are they all within your division?

19 A Well, let's not use "division." They
20 are in the function, in the public information function.

21 Q So do they all report to you? In other
22 words, are they under your --

23 A Functionally, yes.

24 Q Functionally. Does that differ from
25 organizationally?

mgc 2-6

1 A Yes, it might, in some occasions --
2 on some occasions.

3 Q So they may actually be part of another
4 division?

5 A Another division. They might be in
6 one division and write for this, and it would come
7 into our operation for the publishing.

8 Q Do the people who write the stories
9 actually do the research themselves, as well?

10 A Yes.

11 Q So that if there isa story on a particular
12 subject, the reporter woluld be the same person
13 as the person who wrote it?

14 A Yes.

15 Q Are there any exceptions to that?

16 A I can't think of any.

17 Q Is there anyone responsible for editing
18 the "Circuit News Breaker"?

19 A Well, editing in what sense? Could
20 you describe what you....

21 Q Certainly. Generally how I mean that
22 term is to say that when a reporter writes a story,
23 it may then go to another person for review and
24 perhaps writing changes or perhaps to look at it
25 and send it back to the reporter for rewrite. There

mgc 2-7

1 can be different levels of editing, but essentially
2 what it means is, it's a level of review with possible
3 impact on either the content or the writing of the
4 story.

5 A Say that last part again, and then I'll
6 respond to it.

7 Q Sure. It is a level of review which
8 may result in changes to the content or the writing
9 of a particular story.

10 (Pause.)

11 A There could be some. There could be
12 some editing in that sense.

13 Q As a general matter, is there a process
14 that is involved -- and, in fact, it might be a
15 very good way to describe the whole process, if
16 you could, from the point at which an idea for a
17 story emerges through the writing of the story,
18 ultimately through the actual publication.

19 Are you familiar enough with it to provide
20 a description of --

21 A Well, just in very general terms.

22 Q Okay, could you give us that?

23 A Yes. This professional would prepare
24 from either, as you've described it, the research
25 or the observations of the event, assemble the facts,

mgc 2-8

1 that would be prepared in draft form and go to the
2 Director of Information for his review, and then
3 that would come, then, to myself for final sign-
4 off. Then it would go back into that operation
5 for the processing, whatever would be necessary
6 to put in on the letterhead and have it printed
7 at some location. And whether we use Quick-Copy
8 or whether we use Riverside Press, I can't tell
9 you exactly where that's printed.

10 Q Does it come back to you after it's
11 been printed and before final release?

12 A Not every time, no.

13 Q On occasion it does?

14 A Yes.

15 Q Is there a particular reason why it
16 would come back to you?

17 A There would be a reason why it would
18 not. If this was a quick-breaking event and there
19 was a need to get the material out very quickly,
20 and it might go on and be distributed, and obviously
21 I would be one of the first persons to get a copy,
22 but it would not necessarily come to me in whole
23 before I saw it.

24 Q By quick-breaking, would you mean something
25 like articles regarding licensing hearings?

mgc 2-9

1 A That's too broad. Could you give me
2 another example?

3 Q That's okay. We can come back to that.

4 A All right.

5 Q How are the ideas for the stories originated?

6 A Well, they're an issue, they're an event
7 that would trigger one of these professionals to
8 either realize that that's something employees would
9 be interested in, or it would be something that
10 would be perceived to be an event that would be
11 worthy of communicating to all employees.

12 Q Okay. For example, on a regular newspaper
13 there's something called an Assignment Editor who
14 sort of keeps track of things and then assigns different
15 reporters out to cover an event.

16 Is there a similar kind of assignment
17 person within the company for the "Circuit News
18 Breaker"?

19 A It's not that formal, no. And the events
20 are usually significant enough that it becomes apparent,
21 either to the professional or to some of us to say,
22 if they haven't already discovered it, then we might
23 say, well, is someone working on that one?

24 Q Are there meetings held to decide what
25 stories will be included?

mgc 2-10 1

A No.

2

Q Suppose I'm a reporter and there is an

3

event, and I think it would be interesting for the

4

"Circuit News Breaker," do I just go out and cover

5

it, or do I have to tell somebody that I'm --

6

A You'd pick up the phone and say, "Is

7

this something we should do?"

8

Q Okay. Whom would I call?

9

A Probably the Director of Information

10

or myself.

11

Q Who is the Director of Information?

12

A Dick Ramsey.

13

Q Okay. So --

14

A But these, again, these are significant

15

events. There are not that many of them. It's

16

not like you were trying to decide whether you were

17

covering ten a day.

18

Q So once I get approval from Dick Ramsey,

19

assuming I'm the reporter, if I get approval from

20

Dick Ramsey to cover a story, I then go out and

21

cover it, I write it up, I then submit a draft to

22

Dick Ramsey; is that correct?

23

A Yes, sir.

24

Q Okay. Now he has authority to edit

25

my draft?

mgc 2-11

1 A Yes, yes.

2 Q Once he has edited it, does he send
3 it back to me?

4 A I don't know.

5 Q All right.

6 A I'm not sure of the process.

7 Q But then at some point following that,
8 it goes to you in final.

9 A Yes.

10 Q For your review. You then have the
11 authority to make edits in its yourself, correct?

12 A Yes.

13 Q And then once you have done that, it
14 goes to final and printing and then ultimately for
15 distribution.

16 A That's correct.

17 Q All right. Has there ever been an instance,
18 to your knowledge, when a reporter has suggested
19 that he or she would like to do a story and it's
20 been rejected by the company?

21 A I don't know.

22 Q Has there ever been a circumstance where
23 someone from outside your division has requested
24 that a particular event be covered?

25

(Pause.)

mgc 2-12

1 A You mean before one of our people would
2 have suggested it? Is that the rest of your question?

3 Q That's correct.

4 A Not to my knowledge.

5 Q Do you recall whether or not once a
6 story has been written by the reporter and it goes
7 up for editing, editing changes are made, but that
8 a story is rejected by your division as inappropriate
9 for the "Circuit News Breaker"?

10 A I cannot remember.

11 (Pause.)

12 Q Do you recall if there have ever been
13 any stories in the "Circuit News Breaker" which
14 you would characterize as critical of the company?

15 A You'd have to be more specific on "critical
16 of the company."

17 Q That's difficult.

18 A That's the reason I couldn't answer
19 it.

20 Q Well, your personal responsibility is
21 public relations, so presumably it would be within
22 your area of expertise to know whether or not a
23 particular statement or a particular event reflects,
24 in your opinion, favorably on a company; is that
25 right?

mgc 2-13

1 A The philosophy of the communications
2 are to present factual material, and that's what
3 we're striving for, is to present factual materials
4 in an objective way.

5 Q So the purpose --

6 A And therefore if the facts were looked
7 at by someone to be, I think using your words, critical,
8 the facts would still be used.

9 Q So there is no intention really to use
10 the "Circuit News Breaker" as a promotion for the
11 company?

12 A I think that's fair to say, yes.. It
13 is not designed for that purpose. That's correct.

14 Q So it's designed to be an objective,
15 impartial --

16 A It's a communication piece to all employees
17 for significant events.

18 Q And, in your opinion, has it been so
19 implemented?

20 A Yes.

21 Q And if it were not being so implemented,
22 then that would be a matter of concern to you?

23 A Yes, it would.

24 Q How much time would you say that you
25 personally spend on a "Circuit News Breaker"?

mgc 2-14

1 A Again, I haven't done any time studies.

2 Q Not very much? I mean, is that a fair
3 statement?

4 MR. CLARK: I object. He said he hasn't
5 done any time studies.

6 MR. REYNOLDS: Okay.

7 MR. CLARK: I think it's speculation.

8 MR. REYNOLDS: No. I don't like to
9 speculate.

10 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

11 Q Do you know?

12 MR. CLARK: But you asked him to be
13 speculative.

14 THE WITNESS: No, I don't know. I really
15 don't.

16 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

17 Q Presumably, you don't spend all your time.

18 A Exactly. I have no problem with that
19 question.

20 (Laughter.)

21 Q Did you ever discuss or do you know
22 if the people who work on the "Circuit News Breaker"
23 discuss with other company personnel --

24 MR. CLARK: Excuse me. I object to
25 that now. Does Mr. Locke know whether anyone else

mgc 2-15

1 has discussed?

2 MR. REYNOLDS: In his division.

3 MR. CLARK: In his division. Okay.

4 I'm sorry.

5 THE WITNESS: Would you start again?

6 I've lost your question.

7 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

8 Q Do you or anyone in your division, to your
9 knowledge -- or have you or has anyone in your division,
10 to your knowledge, discussed articles in the "Circuit
11 News Breaker" with other company employees?

12 A "Discussed" is a relative term. What --

13 Q It's a fairly easy question. Presumably
14 that does occur, correct?

15 A You mean, do they converse about the
16 subjects and do they talk back and forth about them
17 and so forth?

18 Q Yes. Right.

19 A Yes. Sure.

20 Q To your knowledge, has there ever been
21 any attempt by anyone outside your division to influence
22 the content or the subject matter of the "Circuit
23 News Breaker"?

24 (Pause.)

25 A I'm having difficulty dealing with that

mgc 2-16

1 question. Could you restate it again?

2 Q Sure. Has anyone, to your knowledge,
3 has anyone outside your division ever attempted
4 to influence the subject matter or the content of
5 the "Circuit News Breaker"?

6 A Let me say this, and then you can ask
7 me again if I'm not answering your question.

8 Our job as information and communications
9 people is to try to determine the facts and to present
10 them accurately and objectively. We have to have
11 others to help us with the factual material -- technical
12 people, if it's dealing with a technical issue,
13 others who may be observers of this incident, et
14 cetera, to make sure that those facts are accurate.
15 So we do involve others in looking at the material
16 to check the factual data.

17 So your question was, do others influence
18 it, I'd have to just make that statement and then
19 see if that's close to what you're after.

20 Q I guess what I'm trying to get at is
21 whether or not someone outside your division in
22 the company would attempt to or has ever suggested
23 to you or people within your division that an article
24 that may have appeared is inappropriate, or perhaps
25 that you are failing to cover certain things that

mgc 2-17

1 should be covered?

2 A Oh, in the sense of the overall publication,
3 rather than specific items within the "Circuit News
4 Breaker," is that what you're driving at?

5 Q It could be specific items within the
6 "Circuit News Breaker," and it could, you know --
7 suppose an article comes out, and someone from another
8 division calls you and say --

9 A Oh, after the fact, you mean?

10 Q Yes, after the fact.

11 A I can't recall that occurring.

12 Q Okay. And the other side of the question
13 was whether or not someone outside your division
14 has ever, just as a general matter, suggested that
15 the "Circuit News Breaker" should cover something
16 which it is not covering, or should cover something
17 that it is covering in a different way.

18 MR. CLARK: Again, you are asking to
19 Mr. Locke's personal knowledge?

20 MR. REYNOLDS: To his personal knowledge
21 or if he's aware of those inquiries ever having
22 been made to other people in this division.

23 THE WITNESS: To my personal knowledge,
24 no. If you are meaning, is there a subject that
25 should have been covered, et cetera, no, in my knowledge,

mgc 2-18

1 no. We have not had that much input, no.

2 Q Is it a fair statement to say that the
3 purpose of the "Circuit News Breaker" is not to
4 intimidate or harass workers?

5 A That is correct. It is not. That is
6 not the purpose.

7 Q And if that were the effect, that would
8 be of concern to you?

9 A Yes, it would.

10 Q It is true, isn't it, that the "Circuit
11 News Breaker" has reported -- has filed stories
12 on the Comanche Peak licensing proceeding hearings;
13 is that right?

14 A There have been "Circuit News Breakers"
15 on those proceedings.

16 Q Is there any individual in particular
17 who is responsible for preparing those articles?

18 A Any one individual?

19 Q Yes.

20 A We have done that by assignment. As
21 a hearing was established, we have assigned one
22 of these reporters or persons with a reporting background
23 to the proceedings.

24 Q Okay. Whose idea was it to cover the
25 licensing proceeding hearings?

mgc 2-19

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

A I don't know.

Q Would it have been the Director of Information?

A Excuse me. Ask that question again.

Q Sure. Do you know whose idea, who would have been responsible initially for having the licensing hearings covered?

A Well, let me respond this way. Back to what we said originally, this is designed to coversignificant events to the company or information that should be communicated to employees, and I submit that the licensing hearings fit both those criteri. So it was really no one's idea. Gosh, that's something we ought to do. That's one of theevents. It's a significant event that should be covered.

Q So that would have been just assigned as a matter of course by whoever does the assignments.

A Yes.

End 2

1 Q Who makes the assignments?

2 A They would fall under the responsibility
3 of the Director of Information.

4 Q Dick Ramsey?

5 A YES, Dick Ramsey.

6 Q And so it is safe to assume that in the
7 instance of a licensing hearings you would have had
8 something to do with the decision to have them covered?

9 A Yes, he would have. And also who would be
10 assigned on a particular day.

11 Q Do you know who has covered the licensing
12 hearings for the Circuit News Breaker?

13 A Day to day I could not answer that, no.
14 Not specifically.

15 Q How about as a general matter?

16 A I could give -- yes, generally one or two
17 individuals.

18 Q Okay. Who are they?

19 A Kathy Miller, I believe, and Ed Hanley.

20 Q Any others?

21 A Not to my recollection.

22 Q Okay. Can you give me the description, if
23 you know, of Cathy Miller's position?

24 A Her position. Yes. She works in our
25 Texas Utilities Services Information Department and she is

1 a senior information coordinator.

2 Q What is a senior information coordinator?

3 A She is responsible for writing, for
4 developing materials, working in the areas such as the
5 Public Utility Commission hearings, ASLB hearings, and
6 so forth.

7 Q Is that her particular beat, so to speak?
8 Hearings that affect the company?

9 A Not really. But that's natural for her
10 because of her background and she is a professional in it
11 and really has that expertise. In other words she is
12 chief logical person.

13 Q What is in her background that you
14 classify her as a professional?

15 A Well, she spent a number of years, and I
16 can't tell you exactly how many, but a number of years
17 with the Fort Worth Star Telegram working her way up from just
18 a beat reporter up through their organization before she
19 came to our company.

20 Q How long has she been with the company?

21 A I don't know exactly.

22 Q Five years, ten years?

23 A Well, I would guess closer to 10.

24 Q She is a long time employee?

25 A Yes.

1 Q How about Ed Hanley. Can you give me the
2 same information?

3 A I really can't. I don't know much about
4 him.

5 Q Do you know what his position is?

6 A I believe he is a senior information
7 coordinator. And I am sure he has an educational and
8 proffessional background in the media but I can't tell
9 you which, what specifically what it is.

10 Q What makes you sure he has that background?

11 A Just hearsay.

12 Q Does he cover essentially the same beat as
13 Kathy Miller, or is it diffrent?

14 A Again, as I said earlier, by assignment.
15 If Kathy was available or not available Ed might cover.

16 Q And approximately how long do you think he
17 has been with the company; five, ten years?

18 A I would say roughly five. Five or less.
19 (Discussion off the record.)

20 Q Mr. Locke, wouldyou look at these, please,
21 and identify if you can each of those three exhibits?

22 MR. CLARK: I think your question was to
23 identify those to the extent that he can?

24 MR. REYNOLDS: Yes.

25 MR. CLARK: Before he answers that

1 question I want to go off the record.

2 (Discussion off the record.)

3 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

4 Q Can you identify those documents?

5 A Well, they appear to be a Xerox copy of
6 a Circuit News Breaker; Exhibit 2 being one dated
7 September 14; Exhibit 3 -- excuse me, '82, September 14,
8 '82; Exhibit 3 September 15, '82; and Exhibit 4,
9 February 14, '84. And they appear to be Xerox copies of
10 Circuit Breakers. The information is generally familiar
11 to me but I can't go any further than that.

12 Q All right. Is there anything about those
13 exhibits, any of them, that suggests that they are anything
14 but a copy of the Circuit News Breaker that you have
15 identified?

16 A Would you ask that again?

17 Q Sure. Is there anything about those
18 exhibits to suggest that it is anything other than copies
19 of the Circuit News Breaker for the dates you have
20 identified?

21 MR. CLARK: I am going to object to that.
22 We are not trying to give you difficulty on this,
23 Mr. Reynolds, except to say that what you are asking him is
24 if he remembers everything, and we are not trying dance you
25

1 on this. These are a year or so old and we are not
2 objecting, saying it is not a true copy. We don't know.
3 What we are saying is that it appears to be. You have
4 entered it as that and we are not going to quarrel with
5 you with regard to that. But we can't say for a fact that
6 it is an exact copy.

7 MR. REYNOLDS: Okay. I am not trying to
8 confuse you or anything. I am just trying to get these
9 things identified.

10 MR. CLARK: Yes.

11 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

12 Q My question is simply is there anything about
13 them on the reading that you have just made of them that
14 would suggest to you that they are --

15 THE WITNESS: Let me say it the same way that
16 I said it before. They appear to be Circuit News Breakers
17 with those dates on them. But, again, I cannot tell you
18 that they are exact copies.

19 MR. REYNOLDS: Right. You obviously
20 haven't committed the Circuit News Breaker to memory.

21 THE WITNESS: Exactly. That is right.

22 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

23 Q They don't appear to be forgeries to you.

24 A Well, again I would have to answer the same
25 way I did before.

1 Q Now, you have just read these over; is that
2 right?

3 A Yes.

4 Q Based on your reading and your opinion
5 as someone whose job it is to deal with the public
6 dissemination of information, is it your opinion that these
7 present a balanced picture of the hearings which they are
8 reporting?

9 A They attempted to present information
10 that occurred in the hearings in an objective way.

11 Q In your opinion they accomplished that
12 objective?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Do you think a reasonable person reading
15 these --

16 MR. CLARK: You haven't qualified
17 Mr. Locke as any sort of expert. Objection. Do you want
18 to qualify him as an expert?

19 MR. REYNOLDS: All I am asking is to have
20 him give his opinion of someone whose job it is to deal
21 with public relations.

22 MR. CLARK: Yes. And he gave you his opinion.
23 His opinion was that as such a person he believed it was --

24 MR. REYHOLDS: You didn't let me finish
25 the question.

1 MR. CLARK: I'm sorry. Go ahead.

2 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

3 Q Do you think that a reasonable person
4 reviewing these Circuit News Breakers would reach the
5 conclusion -- strike that.

6 Do you think a person having read these
7 should reasonably conclude that they are documents which
8 promote the company's point of view in the hearings?

9 MR. CLARK: I object on the ground that
10 it calls for a conclusion of the witness. You have laid
11 no basis that he is able to give.

12 MR. REYNOLDS: Okay. Go ahead.

13 MR. CLARK: I instruct you not to answer.
14 Do you have another question?

15 MR. REYNOLDS: No. As a matter of fact the
16 ruling in this case is that there shall not be instructions
17 to witnesses not to answer, that any disputes involving
18 admissibility such as this, whether or not he is qualified
19 or not to give that testimony, would be resolved later by
20 the Board.

21 Obviously we have got a dispute here about
22 whether he is qualified to make -- to answer that question.
23 You say he is not. It would be our opinion that he would.
24 And ultimately the Board would have to decide that question.

25 MR. BERRY: NRC staff also understands that

mgc 3-1
fl Jon7

1 the witness should not be instructed not to answer the
2 question, and the objection should be noted, and the
3 witness should answer the question.

4 MR. CLARK: When did this particular
5 guideline, do you think, come into effect?

6 MR. REYNOLDS: It was yesterday.

7 MR. CLARK: As a result of yesterday's
8 conference?

9 MR. REYNOLDS: The conference call with
10 the Board. That was one of the three points that was
11 raised.

12 MR. CLARK: Right. Okay. Go ahead.

13 THE WITNESS: You will have to restate the
14 question.

15 MR. REYNOLDS: Sure.

16 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

17 Q Do you think a person reading these three
18 exhibits could reasonably conclude that they promote
19 the company's position in the licensing hearings?

20 A The purpose, again, was to communicate
21 the facts and the events that occur. And I believe that
22 they do that.

23 Q Okay. But again, try and focus on my
24 specific question. That indeed was the previous question.
25 But this one is whether or not, in your opinion, a

mgc 3-2

1 person could reasonably conclude upon reading these
2 that they promote the company's position in the licensing
3 hearings.

4 MR. CLARK: Let me object to this, so you
5 understand clearly in that it calls for the rankest kind
6 of speculation.

7 THE WITNESS: It does.

8 MR. CLARK: He is not required to speculate.
9 You can answer, but in answering, you can answer that
10 it's speculation, and you're not required to speculate, and
11 you won't speculate.

12 THE WITNESS: Yes, it would only be an
13 opinion.

14 MR. REYNOLDS: That's all I'm asking for.

15 THE WITNESS: And again, that would be a
16 speculation on my part.

17 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

18 Q Okay. Given your opinion and your job,
19 your employment in public relations, you don't feel you
20 can make a judgment whether a reasonable person would
21 consider that is promotion of the company's position?

22 A Well, again, I have stated over and over
23 that I believe it demonstrates the facts that occurred
24 there and that people who read that would reach their own
25 opinion, depending on how they perceive the facts.

mgc 3-3

1 Q All right. Let me just read you a
2 paragraph, and I will ask you more specifically whether
3 or not you believe it could be construed as unnecessarily
4 critical of CASE's position in the licensing hearings.

5 MR. BERRY: What exhibit are you reading?

6 MR. REYNOLDS: I'm looking at Exhibit
7 No. 3, and the paragraph reads, quote: "Testimony by
8 a panel called to give evidence rebutting Atchison and
9 other witnesses for the Citizen's Association for Sound
10 Energy, CASE, took most of the day, primarily because of
11 tedious and repetitive cross-examination by CASE President,
12 Juanita Ellis."

13 MR. CLARK: What is your question?

14 MR. REYNOLDS: The question is whether
15 or not that reasonably could be construed as critical
16 of CASE's position.

17 THE WITNESS: It sound to me as if it's
18 the fact that the questioning took all day, and it adds
19 some adjectives that describe the reason for the fact
20 that the panel was up all day. And I can't speculate as
21 to what a reasonable person would -- how they would react
22 to that. Again, it would probably depend on their
23 position, what position they're coming from.

24 If you want my opinion, that's my opinion.

25 MR. REYNOLDS That is, in fact, what I'm

mgc 3-4

1 asking for.

2 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

3 Q If you could look at Exhibit 3 here, and
4 let me just ask you a question. Is there anyone in there
5 specifically quoted, other than company personnel?

6 (The witness examines the document.)

7 MR. BERRY: Off the record.

8 (Discussion off the record.)

9 (Brief recess.)

10 MR. REYNOLDS: Copies have now been provided
11 to all parties.

12 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

13 Q Let me ask you this. Looking at the three
14 exhibits, is there anywhere reflected on these three
15 copies of the Circuit News Breaker that it's a publication
16 by the company?

17 A The company's name does not appear on any
18 of these.

19 Q Okay. And having read these things over --
20 and again, I'm asking for your opinion on this -- would
21 it be reasonable conclude, would it be fair to conclude,
22 that these documents present a favorable impression of
23 the company's position and unfavorable picture of CASE's
24 position in the licensing hearings?

25 MR. CLARK: Would it be fair for whom to

mgc 3-5

1 conclude?

2 MR. REYNOLDS: For a reasonable person to
3 conclude.

4 MR. CLARK: I object to that on the grounds
5 that it is just speculative.

6 THE WITNESS: And again, in that sense,
7 just to speculate, if I was a reasonable person -- and
8 again, I think I tried to say it, maybe very poorly
9 before, but I think it depends on where you're coming from
10 as to what you read into these words. And again, I think
11 it presents materials, factual material, and, you know,
12 a reasonable person, I think, would perhaps, if they were
13 coming from our side, we might see it with more middle-
14 of-the-road or perhaps in certain statements more to the
15 side of the Intervenor in certain areas. On the other
16 hand, if it was the Intervenor, they'd probably see it
17 very negatively.

18 MR. REYNOLDS: Okay.

19 THE WITNESS: So a reasonable person coming
20 from one or the other persuasions, I think would cause
21 what you call speculation or a reasonable person's opinion
22 of how this material is presented.

23 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

24 Q Okay. So your answer, in essence, is that
25 you don't want to speculate on it?

mgc 3-6

- 1 A Exactly.
- 2 Q All right. But the purpose that you
- 3 testified to repeatedly, the purpose of the Circuit News
- 4 Breaker, is to report news events as accurately as you
- 5 can.
- 6 A That's correct.
- 7 Q Could you look at Exhibit 4.
- 8 A Yes.
- 9 Q Which is a Circuit News Breaker, February 14,
- 10 1984, entitled "Dunham Hearing Begins Monday."
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q Could you read -- well, let me just read
- 13 two paragraphs, the last two paragraphs, and I will ask
- 14 you about them.
- 15 Quote: "The company is committed to building
- 16 and operating a safe plant. This necessarily includes
- 17 finding and correcting any construction problems. Comanche
- 18 Peak has always had a good quality assurance program, and,
- 19 in fact, in recent months an extensive program has been
- 20 underway to reemphasize the commitment to the goals of the
- 21 program.
- 22 Paragraph: "This has included making
- 23 certain all employees know they are free to report any
- 24 problems they see or believe exist and making sure they
- 25 know how to report those possible problems. No effort

mgc 3-7

1 has ever been made to intimidate any inspectors at
2 Comarcho Peak in order to prevent them from reporting
3 unacceptable conditions. To the contrary, identifying and
4 reporting such conditions are what they are hired to do,"
5 unquote.

6 In your opinion, is that a report of a news
7 event, or is that a flat statement of opinion, indeed
8 the company's opinion?

9 (Pause.)

10 MR. CLARK: You are asking, Joe, whether or
11 not that paragraph, out of context, is news or non-news?

12 MR. REYNOLDS: Well, I'm just asking whether
13 the portion I just read is fact or company opinion. And
14 if you believe that it is somehow taken out of context,
15 as to the second part of this question, you can certainly
16 so indicate and explain to me why you believe it is.

17 THE WITNESS: Well, again, I think any --
18 those two paragraphs taken out of context are definitely
19 a statement of company policy and a statement of fact,
20 though. I think those are facts and a statement of
21 company policy.

22 I think to put back in context, in the fact
23 that this is a hearing about those kinds of issues, then
24 they are material facts about circumstances regarding the
25 Dunham hearing, which is the title of the Circuit News

mgc 3-8

1 Breaker.

2 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

3 Q Is there any attribution to a company
4 official there?

5 A No, there is not.

6 Q And does it not appear that that is simply
7 a statement by the Circuit News Breaker -- a statement of
8 fact of each of these points included in those two
9 paragraphs -- a statement as fact, even though those
10 indeed are the issues which will come up at the hearing.11 MR. CLARK: Joel, Mr. Locke just answered
12 that. He just said that those are, in fact, those are
13 facts, that they are statements of company policy and are
14 facts.15 MR. REYNOLDS: He also just indicated that
16 they are not attributed to the company. And my next
17 question, then, was, do they not appear to be statements
18 as fact of those disputed issues?19 THE WITNESS: Excuse me. I did not say
20 they were not attributed to the company. You asked me,
21 was they -- are they attributed to any company official?
22 In other words, are they in quotes, and is there a
23 company official's name? And the answer I gave you was,
24 no, they are not.

25 They are only -- when put in context with

mgc 3-9

1 the Circuit News Breaker, again a reasonable person who
2 knows that the Circuit News Breaker comes out of the
3 company offices, I think would attribute those to the
4 company.

5 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

6 Q So just to cut it all short, I mean,
7 basically upon reading this, you feel that it is a
8 statement of fact --

9 A Yes.

10 Q -- of the company's position, and that it
11 is clear that it's the company's position?

12 A Again, it is all on the Circuit News
13 Breaker letterhead, and you asked me to identify it as a
14 Circuit News Breaker earlier, which I did, and therefore
15 if it appears that way, I would assume that a reasonable
16 person who would look at this in that context would see
17 it to be the company's material, the company's facts.

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
End 3

Sim 4-1

1 Q All right. I think ultimately we will probably
2 have to let the documents speak for themselves here.

3 These documents will each be offered into
4 evidence at the appropriate time and I am certain that point,
5 to the extent there are any objections, we will raise them.

6 Has anybody ever suggested to you that the effect
7 of any of these Circuit News Breakers was to intimate or
8 harass workers? And I am not talking about the purpose, but
9 I am talking about the effect was to intimidate or harass
10 workers?

11 A Now how did you start your question?

12 Q Has anybody ever indicated to you or suggested
13 to you?

14 A Anybody or anyone?

15 Q Anyone.

16 A Not to my recollection.

17 MR. CLARK: Excuse me. Let's go off the
18 record for just a minute.

19 (Discussion off the record.)

20 MR. REYNOLDS: Back on the record.

21 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

22 Q Has anyone inside the company at any time
23 indicated to you that the effect of the Circuit News Breaker
24 may have been to intimidate or harass a worker at Comanche
25 Peak?

Sim 4-2

1 A Not to my recollection.

2 Q Has anyone outside the company ever suggested
3 that to you?

4 A Well, CASE made a filing back in -- well, I
5 don't know exactly, a couple of years ago, to that extent,
6 or to that idea. You know, I don't have that with me or
7 I don't remember the details.

8 Q Other than that formal submission by CASE, have
9 there been any other instances where that has been suggested
10 to you?

11 A Not to my recollection.

12 Q Do you know whether or not such a suggestion
13 either by someone in the company or outside the company has
14 been made to anyone else?

15 A Not, I do not know.

16 Q If that were the effect, would that be a matter
17 of concern to you?

18 A Yes.

19 Q Now these Exhibits 2, 3 and 4, which you
20 previously identified, would those have been distributed
21 on site at Comanche Peak?

22 A They would have been made available to the site.

23 Q For distribution?

24 A For distribution, that is correct.

25 Q All right. Do you know where on site these are

Sim 4-3

1 distributed?

2 A No, I do not.

3 Q So as far as you know, it simply goes to the
4 site and then it is up to the people on site as to where
5 the distribution points are?

6 A Yes, that is correct.

7 Q Are you aware that Darlene Steiner complained
8 in 1982 that the mention of her as a witness in the Circuit
9 News Breaker resulted in intimidation and harassment of her
10 by other workers at the site?

11 A As I recall, that was covered in this filing
12 by CASE, but again that has been a couple of years ago and
13 I don't have that with me.

14 Q Are you aware that she personally, that Darlene
15 Steiner personally went to company officials and indicated
16 that that was the effect of mentioning her in these?

17 A I don't have personal knowledge of that.

18 Q Okay. You have no knowledge of that whatsoever?

19 A No personal knowledge, that is correct.

20 Q Okay. Have you heard that she did so?

21 A I remember the discussions that surrounded this
22 filing.

23 Q Okay. Can you describe those discussions,
24 please?

25 A Well, that this filing was made and it was of

Sim 4-4

1 the nature that you described, that Ms. Steiner felt that
2 mentioning her name in this Circuit News Breaker about her
3 testimony was damaging to her.

4 Q And what was the response?

5 A By who?

6 Q By anyone at the meeting?

7 A At what meeting?

8 A I am sorry. I inserted meeting. In the
9 discussions was there any response?

10 A Response to what?

11 Q To the statement of fact that she had made that.

12 A My personal knowledge was that this filing had
13 occurred and that there were conversations with Ms. Steiner
14 concerning this matter.

15 Q Do you know who had conversations with her?

16 A No, I do not.

17 Q Did you personally do anything in response in
18 terms of investigation to determine whether or not that was
19 indeed the effect?

20 A No, I did not personally do anything.

21 Q Did you direct anyone else to investigate it?

22 A I don't remember.

23 Q Do you know if Dick Ramsey did anything to
24 investigate it?

25 A I don't know.

Sim 4-5

1 Q Do you know if anyone else in your division did
2 anything to investigate it?

3 A No, I don't know.

4 Q In your opinion, do you believe it would be
5 appropriate to investigate such a claim to determine whether
6 or not it was accurate?

7 A Well, again you are asking for speculation on
8 my part.

9 MR. CLARK: Are you asking whether or not
10 Mr. Locke feels it would be appropriate for Mr. Locke to
11 investigate it or whether or not he feels it would be
12 appropriate for anybody within the company to investigate
13 it?

14 MR. REYNOLDS: I am asking whether in light
15 of your position you believed that something should have
16 been done to investigate it initiated by you?

17 (Pause.)

18 MR. CLARK: Do you understand the question he
19 is asking you?

20 THE WITNESS: No, I really don't. I really
21 don't understand the question.

22 MR. CLARK: He is asking you whether or not
23 you think you should have investigated it, you or your
24 division.

25

Sim 4-5

1 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

2 Q You are in charge of the division which is
3 responsible for issuance of the Circuit News Breaker, correct?

4 A Yes.

5 Q You have testified that you became aware that
6 one of the workers on site believed that Circuit News Breakers
7 were causing her to be intimidated and harassed on site,
8 correct?

9 A Yes.

10 Q My question is do you feel that ---

11 MR. CLARK: Would you restate that, what you
12 just said?

13 MR. REYNOLDS: My question is ---

14 MR. CLARK: No, no, but you just said -- would
15 you read that back?

16 (The pending question was read by the reporter
17 as requested.)

18 MR. CLARK: I missed what you said to him
19 myself. I thought you said you were aware of the fact
20 that an employee had been intimidated, and you said are
21 you aware of the fact that an employee had said that she
22 had been intimidated and you in fact did so testify.

23 THE WITNESS: I was aware of the fact that the
24 filing was made by CASE. I had no personal knowledge of
25 the employee on the site or how she felt or what her problems

Sim 4-6

1 were.

2 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

3 Q Do you believe you had no responsibility yourself
4 to initiate any kind of inquiry to determine whether or not
5 her claim was accurate?

6 A Again, in the context of the questioning that
7 you are pursuing, you know, I do not see that it is my
8 responsibility to look further into this because that was
9 being handled by others.

10 Q Who else was handling it?

11 A Well, the people at the site working with
12 Ms. Steiner.

13 Q So you felt no need independently to do anything
14 about it?

15 A I guess that is what I am testifying.

16 Q All right. So you didn't make any inquiries
17 even of the people who were investigating it to determine
18 what they had found out?

19 A Well, again, all I know was the CASE filing
20 in that material and that is all I have personal knowledge
21 about.

22 Q Right. Now go ahead and answer my question.

23 A Say it again.

24 Q Okay. So you felt no need even to phone the
25 people who were investigating it to determine what the

Sim 4-7

1 results of their inquiry were?

2 A In what sense? I don't understand where you
3 are coming from.

4 Q Did you make any call to the people who you
5 believed to be investigating it to determine what the outcome
6 of their investigation was?

7 A I don't even remember the date of when this
8 occurred. I do remember the filing and that was, as someone
9 said two years ago, you are asking me to try to rethink two
10 years ago of all of the things that have happened and I
11 really cannot remember what took place and in our operation
12 two years ago concerning this particular matter. I have
13 some remembrance of the circumstances and I remember the
14 filing. I do not remember what we did and I don't remember
15 the calls we made and I don't remember exactly what responses,
16 if any, were made.

17 Q You don't remember making any phone call to ask
18 the people ---

19 A Fron two years back, no, I don't.

20 MR. REYNOLDS: Off the record.

21 (Discussion off the record.)

22 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

23 Q You don't remember making such a phone call?

24 A No.

25 Q Do you believe the company has a responsibility

Sim 4-8

1 to protect the safety of its workers?

2 A Yes.

3 Q And do you also believe the company has a
4 responsibility to ensure that there is no intimidation and
5 harassment of QC employees?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And you have testified already that it would
8 be a concern to you if the Circuit News Breaker were having
9 the effect of causing intimidation and harassment, correct?

10 A Yes.

11 Q And presumably it would also be of concern to
12 you if the Circuit News Breaker were endangering the safety
13 of one of the employees, correct?

14 A Yes.

15 Q All right. In light of that, do you still
16 feel that you have no responsibility in this matter at all?

17 A Well, let me say that as I remember there were
18 a number of media that were covering circumstances in that
19 particular point in time. There was a lot of general
20 media coverage, television and radio. As I recall,
21 Mr. Steiner and Mrs. Steiner both were in the newspaper and
22 quoted a great deal of time, in addition to any mention we
23 might have made of them in the circuit breaker.

24 Yes, I feel very strongly that we should be
25 very concerned about the effects of the Circuit Breaker

Sim 4-9

1 on employees, but again the Circuit Breaker is to help to
2 communicate to employees the facts, and sometimes those
3 facts may go further and may help support the information
4 that those employees are getting from the media that may be
5 in error. So it may help the safety of the employees and
6 it may help the attitude of the employees to hear information
7 through the Circuit Breaker rather than just simply relying
8 on the general media and the general media audience presen-
9 tations that they are getting.

10 I can't remember whether Ms. Steiner was quoted
11 or her story appeared in the newspapers at the same time
12 that it did in the Circuit Breaker or not, but I would
13 be very, very surprised if it didn't because it was a
14 significant event and, as we have described before, we
15 probably wouldn't have put it in the Circuit Breaker if
16 it hadn't been a significant event.

17 Q Do you have any idea of what the level of
18 readership of the Circuit News Breaker on site is?

19 A We have never done a survey.

20 Q So you have no basis to know?

21 A No.

22 (Pause.)

23 (Discussion off the record.)

24 (Short recess.)

25 MR. REYNOLDS: Back on the record.

Sim 4-10

1 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

2 Q Do you believe that a handout on site which can
3 be construed as indicating that a worker is testifying against
4 the interests of the company could have the result of
5 subjecting that witness to harassment on site?

6 MR. CLARK: I am going to object to that. That
7 calls for just the rankest kind of speculation. First of all,
8 there has been nothing to prove that these things in fact
9 do those kinds of things that were in your conclusionary
10 question and it calls for just a guess on Mr. Locke's part.

11 MR. REYNOLDS: I am stating that as a given in
12 this case.

13 Assuming that to be the case, whether or not you
14 agree with it, and assuming that this document does indicate
15 that a person is testifying adverse to the company's
16 interests.

17 THE WITNESS: No more than that same person
18 appearing on television or appearing the Fort Worth Star
19 Telegram that is widely read around the plant site.

20 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

21 Q If this handout had the effect of notifying more
22 people than notified by the media, do you think it could
23 have that effect?

24 A I would have no way to know.

25 Q No, but assume it as fact.

Sim 4-11

1 A If I assumed ---

2 MR. CLARK: I still object. It still calls for
3 just a guess on your part and speculation. You don't have
4 to speculate.

5 THE WITNESS: And I won't speculate.

6 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

7 Q So you have no opinion on that all?

8 A No, and I think I stated my opinion in an
9 earlier answer.

10 Q Do you recall any instance in which the Circuit
11 News Breaker has been reviewed prior to publication by someone
12 outside of your division?

13 A I think we dealt with that earlier in that I said
14 that in the development process of the Circuit Breaker people
15 from outside information services look at fact material from
16 time to time and given input to those.

17 Is that the sense in which you are asking the
18 question?

19 Q Yes, it is.

20 How does that occur and why does it occur?

21 A If the material that was being presented to
22 employees was -- well, let's just say one was a change in
23 employee benefits of some kind, and maybe there was a change
24 in the insurance program, someone out of the Insurance
25 Department would write it up and someone out of the Insurance

Sim 4-12

1 Department would look it over and say that fact is wrong.
2 It is not 29 years. It is 21 years. So change that and
3 so forth. Then they hand it back and then it goes ahead
4 through the process. So it is in that sense, and let me
5 make it very clear that it is in that sense that I answered
6 yes, there is input from the outside.

7 Q Okay. Do you know whether Exhibits 2, 3 and 4
8 would have been subject to that kind of input?

9 A I don't know. I don't know that Exhibits 2, 3
10 and 4 were subject to that kind of input.

11 Q Could you make an estimate, based on your reading
12 of it and the material that is contained in it, of whether or
13 not that is of sufficient complexity that it would be likely
14 to be subjected to that kind of review?

15 A Ask that again.

16 Q Sure. Having read Exhibits 2, 3 and 4, do you
17 think as a matter of course, given the substance that
18 is discussed in those exhibits that they would have been
19 subjected to outside review?

20 A Outside review in the sense that I described
21 as the Insurance Department would look at the facts and
22 so forth?

23 Q In the sense of anyone outside the Information
24 Division.

25 A I can't answer specifically for 2, 3 and 4, but

Sim 4-13

1 I would say again that in Circuit Breakers where there is
2 fact material where outside experts would be appropriate,
3 then I would answer that yes, they would be used.

4 Q Okay. If you took another look at those, would
5 it help you to make a judgment just about whether as a matter
6 of course that kind of outside review would have been applied
7 here?

8 A In these three?

9 Q Yes.

10 (Pause while the witness reviews the documents.)

11 MR. CLARK: Maybe we can go off the record
12 just one second.

13 (Discussion off the record.)

14 MR. CLARK: Back on the record.

15 Let's start again. Ask the question again.

16 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

17 Q Having looked this material over, Exhibits 2, 3
18 and 4, do you think it would have been subject to outside
19 review?

20 A It would be only speculation on my part
21 particularly because 2 and 3 go back to September of '32,
22 and I can't make any factual statement about that.

23 Q All right. Would you ever, during your review
24 of the Circuit News Breaker, suggest to a reporter that
25 it needs to go through that kind of a review?

Sim 4-14

1 A I might ask that question. Has it been looked
2 at by the experts. Just like in the insurance example I
3 gave you, I might ask that question if it is brought to me
4 by the insurance people, have they checked off on these
5 facts, and the reporter says yes or no, or whoever brings
6 it to me says yes or no. If they say no, then I say well,
7 that is a good idea to do that, and let's don't put out
8 bad data. So it is in that sense that I would question it.

9 Q Having looked at these then, would you make
10 that recommendation?

11 A Well, again, you are pinning me down tighter and
12 tighter and I would have to take time to really go through
13 item by item in here and, again, these are two years old.

14 Q Right, but you said that when you get these
15 drafts on occasion you make that recommendation and presumably
16 that is based on some judgments you have to make.

17 What I am asking you to do is to take the time
18 here and let's see you make a judgment here.

19 MR. CLARK: I just have to object to that, Joel,
20 on the very clear grounds that what you are saying is
21 that -- and under certain circumstances he might make that
22 recommendation.

23 Literally what you are asking is for him to
24 remember the circumstances that existed two years ago and
25 in the light of those circumstances make a recommendation.

Sim 4-15

1 As he has said repeatedly, he can't remember
2 the situation in its entirety as it existed then. He can
3 only speculate in looking at this now as to whether or not
4 he would recommend because he in essence is having to
5 recommend without any surrounding circumstances to help with
6 this. So it just calls for speculation on his part.

7 MR. REYNOLDS: I don't agree. I don't think
8 it calls for speculation at all. We have got five pages
9 here of the Circuit News Breaker which described the hearings,
10 and my question is very simply. Having read those five
11 pages, is it the kind of material that should be reviewed
12 by someone outside the Information Division?

13 A You are asking for me to make a general statement
14 about is this the kind of material and whether these are
15 the specific facts were or whether the facts about the
16 licensing hearings would have been looked at by an outsider.

17 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

18 Q You said you didn't know whether these were.
19 So I am accepting that.

20 A These Exhibits 2 and 3 dated September of '82.

21

22

23

24

25

mgc 5-1

1 Q So what I am asking you is whether you believe
2 that outside review is appropriate?

3 MR. CLARK: As a general policy?

4 MR. REYNOLDS: As a person who does that --
5 makes that kind of a judgment in your employment, in
6 the course of your employment. It's the same kind of
7 a judgment.

8 THE WITNESS: Well, again, are you
9 specifically asking about Exhibit 2, Exhibit 3, or are
10 you just asking me a general question about these kinds
11 of facts: If they were brought to me, what would I do?
12 I mean, there's two different questions there.

13 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

14 Q Okay. Answer that one. If those facts
15 were brought to you, what you do?

16 A I would ask. I would say, "Who has looked
17 at this? Have the facts been checked? Are they correct?"

18 Q When you say "have the facts been checked,"
19 you mean by people outside the Information Division?

20 A That's correct.

21 Q All right.

22 A In the same sense, as I've said earlier,
23 that we'd ask about the details of the insurance program.

24 Q And if the answer were no?

25 A Then I'd say, "Well, we need to get them,

mgc 5-2

1 make sure we are accurate and make sure that the facts
2 are there."

3 Q Thank you. Would you ask that those
4 documents be reviewed by CASE?

5 A No.

6 Q Why not?

7 A This is an internal communication.

8 Q All right. From an accuracy standpoint,
9 you do not believe that CASE should have any input?

10 A No.

11 MR. REYNOLDS: I have no further questions.
12 Thank you.

13 MR. BERRY: I have a few questions. Can
14 we take about a five-minute break, so I can get my notes
15 together. I do not anticipate that I will take too long.

16 (Brief recess.)

17 EXAMINATION

18 BY MR. BERRY:

19 Q Mr. Locke, my name is Gregory Berry. I am
20 here on behalf of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
21 and I have a few questions to ask you about your testimony
22 here this morning.

23 First, did you consult with anyone about
24 your testimony here this morning, outside of your lawyer?

25 A No.

mgc 5-3

1 Q You did not discuss, I guess, the subject
2 matter of the things that you testified about this
3 morning with anyone else other than your attorney?

4 MR. REYNOLDS: Clarification. During what
5 time period? Just this morning?

6 MR. BERRY: Within the last week.

7 THE WITNESS: Oh, within the last week?

8 I have talked with members of my Staff to
9 look into some information.

10 BY MR. BERRY:

11 Q When did you find out that you were going to
12 be deposed?

13 A Wednesday or Thursday of last week.

14 Q That would be the -- whatever.

15 A Whatever? I've got my calendar out in the
16 car.

17 Q The 2nd or 3rd.

18 A Wednesday or Thursday of last week.

19 MR. CLARK: Wednesday was the 4th, so
20 Thursday would be the 5th.

21 THE WITNESS: Oh, that's right. We were
22 off. It could have been Tuesday.

23 (Brief telephonic interruption.)

24 MR. BERRY: On the record.
25

mgc 5-4

1 BY MR. BERRY:

2 Q Mr. Locke, did you review any documents
3 in preparation for your testimony this morning?

4 MR. CLARK: Excuse me. Did we ever answer
5 that question before we went off the record?

6 (The reporter read the record as requested.)

7 BY MR. BERRY:

8 Q Mr. Locke, have you discussed the testimony
9 you gave this morning, the subject matter of the testimony,
10 your testimony this morning, with anyone than your lawyer
11 in the last week, from last Wednesday to today?

12 A Yes. Members of my staff.

13 Q Would you identify those persons?

14 A Dick Ramsey.

15 Q Dick Ramsey. Could you relate the substance
16 of that conversation?

17 A Oh, I don't remember word for word. Basically,
18 "I'm going to be deposed as one of the witnesses in the
19 hearing." Questioning back and forth, you know, "What in
20 the world -- you know, what are they after? What are they
21 going to be asking me about?" General things of that
22 nature.

23 I was informed that the Circuit News
24 Breakers would be one of the items that we'd be questioned
25 about, and we talked about those.

mgc 5-5

1 Q Were you aware or did you have any idea
2 that we'd be questioning you in particular on
3 Intervenor's Exhibits 2, 3 and 4?

4 A Specifically, no. I had no indication.

5 Q Did you and Mr. Ramsey discuss the
6 Circuit Breaker allegations of intimidation that have
7 been raised in connection with the Circuit Breaker?

8 A Only as a speculation that that might have
9 been -- that might be the subject of some of the questions
10 that might be asked.

11 Q Did you consult or review any documents or
12 reports or memoranda or any written materials in
13 preparation of your testimony this morning?

14 A Yes. We went back and researched and
15 picked up the front page of the Circuit, and then I
16 thumbed through the Circuit Breakers that had been
17 prepared this year.

18 Q The Circuit Breakers from January 1?

19 A Oh, just random. Just thumbed through the
20 file and read some of those.

21 Q Mr. Locke, earlier you testified that you
22 didn't know exactly how much time you spent in your job
23 in connection with Comanche Peak or so.

24 Do you keep personal calendars or appointment
25 calendars?

mgc 5-6

- 1 A Yes, I keep an appointment calendar.
- 2 Q Would those appointment calendars, they
- 3 would indicate who you would meet and --
- 4 A Well, not in great detail. I usually put
- 5 meetings on there. I will put if the meeting included
- 6 a person, I might write their name down in that particular
- 7 timeslot.
- 8 Q Would you also write any message to indicate
- 9 what the meeting would be about, the subject matter?
- 10 A If you want to know the truth, if I know
- 11 the individual, I probably would have the name of the
- 12 individual and the time, or if I don't know the individual,
- 13 I might have either the name of their organization or the
- 14 subject of the meeting and then the person's name.
- 15 Q Do you still have those records?
- 16 A Only this year, the '84 calendar. I keep
- 17 a pocket calendar.
- 18 Q As far as your activities and the activities
- 19 of your division, do you compile reports on those?
- 20 A We do an annual review, performance review
- 21 of sorts.
- 22 Q Are there weekly or monthly reports to your
- 23 supervisor or your immediate superior?
- 24 A No.
- 25 Q Is it your testimony that you have no idea,

mgc 5-7

1 no way to determine how much time you spend in
2 relation to Comanche Peak?

3 A No. It's my testimony that I don't know,
4 and I have not made a study. I didn't say I couldn't
5 make a study. I just have not made a study.

6 Q You could make a study?

7 A It could be done.

8 Q I want to learn a little bit more about,
9 I guess about your position as Vice President of
10 Communications, is it?

11 A Vice President of Public Affairs.

12 Q Vice President of Public Affairs. And you
13 have been in that position three years?

14 A About three years this year.

15 Q What generally is the goal of the Public
16 Affairs Department?

17 A Well, it's to gather information and
18 communicate it adequately to the publics that we serve.
19 They may be internal, external, governmental, the media.

20 Q Would you say it is part of your
21 responsibility to portray the company in the most favorable
22 light possible?

23 A Yes, I think that would be part of the
24 responsibility.

25 (Pause.)

mgc 5-8

1 Q Mr. Locke, do you know the difference
2 between editorializing and reporting?

3 A I have definitions of my own, yes.

4 Q What is your definition of editorializing?

5 A Editorializing would be to take only facts
6 that would support one particular position and package
7 those so that they could -- that it would be impossible
8 to see the other position. Editorialize would be to
9 move all the way to one position.

10 Q And reporting?

11 A Reporting would be to gather the facts.

12 (Pause.)

13 Q Mr. Locke, you stated and you testified
14 earlier this morning that Circuit News Breaker is
15 published on an infrequent basis to alert the employees
16 as to new items of particular interest, I guess
17 late-breaking stories and things like that.

18 A Yes, that's correct.

19 Q What is it about the Dunham hearing, which
20 is Intervenor's Exhibit 14, the Circuit Breaker story
21 dealing with the Dunham hearing, that is a story of
22 significant general interest to the employees of the
23 company?

24 A The Dunham hearing had a great deal of
25 media interest. There was a lot of general media about it.

mgc 5-9

1 This was in response to potentially stories that would
2 occur over that weekend or on that day to give employees
3 information concerning that particular circumstance.

4 Q So it was in response to stories in the
5 general media?

6 A Yes.

7 Q Do you recall the type and substance of
8 these stories?

9 A No.

10 Q You don't know if they were unfavorable to
11 the company or --

12 A No.

13 Q -- you don't remember?

14 If the stories had been unfavorable, would
15 the Public Affairs Department try to issue a News Breaker
16 that would try to put forth the company's position?

17 A Let's deal with "unfavorable." If the
18 stories failed to be objective, failed to -- the general
19 media stories failed to be objective, failed to present
20 the facts -- and many times they don't present enough
21 facts; they'll get one idea and won't go any further,
22 and therefore there is a need to know on our employees'
23 point of view -- the employees are shareholders in our
24 corporation, and they have a very definite interest in
25 what's happening to our corporation. And if the general

mgc 5-10

1 media stories leave the wrong impression or perhaps don't
2 go far enough in their explanations, then there is a need
3 to communicate with all employees, and that's the
4 purpose of the Circuit Breaker, is to help fill in
5 additional information.

6 Q I turn your attention to Plaintiff's --
7 strike that -- Intervenor's Exhibit 3. This is the
8 Circuit Breaker edition issued September 15, 1982. The
9 headline of this story says, "Company Witnesses Refute
10 Intervenors."

11 Q Could you explain to me the significance
12 of this story?

13 A This looks like a series, because Exhibit 4,
14 or is it 14 and 15 -- no, excuse me -- 14 and 15 --
15 this looks like Exhibit 2 began a public hearing and tries
16 to describe some of the activities that went on during
17 the first day. Exhibit 3 describes additional activities
18 from either the second day or the third day; I can't really
19 tell from this. And it seemed to be a running -- just a
20 running account of the hearing process, and obviously the
21 headline writer lifted out, as headline writers will do,
22 what they thought, on the first one, September 14,
23 Exhibit 2, "Comanche Peak Resumed: Atchison Claims Plot,"
24 that seemed to be their headline that day.

25 The next day, or the September 15th version,

mgc 5-11

1 they -- evidently they didn't have that feel for that
2 particular headline. They lifted out one that talks about
3 our company witnesses. So --

4 Q Who are your headline writers?

5 A The reporter writes their own headlines.

6 Q The reporters write their own headline.

7 A Did that answer your question. I'm sorry.
8 That was a long answer to a short question.

9 Q That did answer my question.

10 You had the authority, if you chose to
11 exercise it, to make any changes to any of these headlines
12 or stories or anything like that, did you?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Did you review each of these stories,
15 Exhibit 2 and Exhibit 3, before they went to press?

16 A Again, you're asking me to rethink and to
17 remember what happened in September of '82. I don't --
18 I cannot testify that I remember and personally did that.

19 Q You don't remember --

20 A No.

21 Q -- whether you read these?

22 A No.

23 Q But generally, you do read the stories.

24 A That would be our general process.

25 Q I want to clear up another matter that arose

mgc 5-12 1

in your earlier testimony.

2

3

4

Is there anything in Intervenor Exhibits 2, 3 or 4 that would suggest unauthenticity, that these are not authentic?

5

6

7

8

A I thought I answered that.

9

MR. CLARK: You did.

10

11

12

13

14

15

THE WITNESS: You want me to answer it

again?

16

17

18

19

MR. BERRY: Yes.

THE WITNESS: Again, these are Xerox copies.

They certainly appear to be on our letterhead, and they appear, and I think I testified earlier, that they are certainly if not the actual, very similar to the actual documents that would have been produced in those timeframes.

20

21

22

23

BY MR. BERRY:

Q And the company would keep record or keep the original editions?

24

25

A We would have copies of the original printing; that's correct.

Q Okay. Mr. Locke, you stated that you report to -- you're the Vice President of Public Affairs, and you report to the President of the company. Which company is that?

26

27

A I report to the President of TUSI, Texas Utility Services, Inc.

mgc 5-13

1 Q Okay. If the President of Texas Utility
2 Services, Inc. wanted a particular story in the Circuit
3 Breaker, and he asked you to see that that story was
4 printed in the Circuit Breaker, would you do it?

5 A Mr. Berry, I'd be less than candid if I
6 didn't tell you I'd tell my President we'd look into it
7 (laughing).

8 Q If the President of the company, after
9 reviewing, I guess a particular edition of the Circuit
10 Breaker, if he thought it didn't have enough punch or
11 didn't portray the company favorably enough, and that in
12 the future he would like to see the company's interests
13 presented more favorably and with more eloquence and
14 passion, you would heed that suggestion, wouldn't you?

15 MR. CLARK: Let me ask you, are you asking
16 whether or not, all still within the realm of legality?

17 MR. BERRY: Yes.

18 MR. CLARK: Okay.

19 MR. BERRY: I'm not asking him, would he
20 commit an illegal act.

21 THE WITNESS: You are asking me to speculate,
22 because that's never happened.

23 BY MR. BERRY:

24 Q You generally wouldn't -- you 'ust testified
25 that you wouldn't refuse a direct order from the President

mgc 5-14

1 of your company, did you?

2 MR. CLARK: I object to that. What specifically
3 Mr. Locke said was that he would be lying to you that he
4 would consider it.

5 THE WITNESS: I said look into it. That is
6 not to say that I would absolutely run out and do it
7 unequivocally. I would look into it.

8 BY MR. BERRY:

9 Q How much autonomy do you have or does the
10 Public Affairs Department have in determining the
11 editorial content, in terms of the factual content and in
12 general the stories that go into the Circuit Breaker?

13 A That's a difficult question to answer.
14 Restate that. I mean you are asking me to speculate.

15 Q I'll rephrase the question. Do you have
16 complete freedom over the subject matter of the stories
17 to be printed -- that are printed in the Circuit Breaker?

18 A The Circuit Breaker stories, I believe I've
19 testified, are issue-oriented. If an issue comes up, then
20 we cover them. We don't go out and - you know, we're
21 not looking for stories. We cover events, major events.
22 So if an event occurs, then we have the Circuit Breaker
23 capability to cover that event, and if they're significant
24 events, we do.

25 Q Has anyone ever told you that certain matters

mgc 5-15 1

or certain areas are hands-off?

2

A No.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

End 5

Sim 6-1

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

BY MR. BERRY:

Q Mr. Locke, you testified earlier that you were aware that Darlene Steiner had complained after being identified in one edition of the Circuit Breaker that she had been harassed and intimidated on the job, right?

A What is the question?

Q You did testify earlier that you were aware of allegations by Darlene Steiner that after being identified in the Circuit Breaker that she had been subjected to harassment and intimidation?

A I believe I testified that I was aware that CASE made a filing to that effect.

Q If an employee asked the Circuit Breaker not to identify them or list them in the Circuit Breaker because of fear of reprisal or retaliation or intimidation or harassment, would that request be honored?

A Well, it has never happened.

Q If it were to happen.

A Well, yes, we try to accommodate that person.

Q If it appeared to you that by listing or identifying a person in the Circuit Breaker that that could lead to harassment, would you not identify that person by name even though a formal request hadn't been made?

A That is a long question.

MR. CLARK: I am going to object to that question.

Sim 6-2

1 Are you asking whether or not it could, in Mr. Locke's
2 opinion, lead to harassment; if a story could, in Mr. Locke's
3 opinion, lead to harassment, would Mr. Locke in spite of
4 that opinion still publish the person's name?

5 MR. BERRY: Yes, that is my question.

6 THE WITNESS: State it one more time.

7 BY MR. BERRY:

8 Q If in your opinion by identifying a person in
9 an issue of the Circuit Breaker could cause that person to
10 be subjected to harassment or intimidation, would you
11 nevertheless identify that person by name?

12 A No.

13 Q Mr. Locke, now you have looked at Intervenor's
14 Exhibits 2 and 3, each of which I believe identify Darlene
15 Steiner, Darlene and/or Henry Steiner.

16 After reading those editions of the Circuit
17 Breaker, Exhibits 2 and 3, is it your opinion that those
18 stories could not have caused either Darlene or Henry
19 Steiner to be subjected to harassment or intimidation?

20 MR. CLARK: Again I object. Greg, are you
21 asking whether or not in Mr. Locke's opinion they would
22 likely cause it or are you asking whether or not in
23 Mr. Locke's opinion there is no circumstance imaginable
24 under which it could cause it?

25 MR. BERRY: I am asking it in the sense that

Sim 6-3

1 the Circuit Breaker has reported allegations made by
2 Darlene and Henry Steiner regarding quality control. The
3 Circuit Breaker reported that, and I am asking that if in
4 Mr. Locke's opinion by reporting that, that these employees
5 had made these allegations, could that result in their
6 being subjected to harassment and intimidation?

7 MR. CLARK: Could it under any circumstances,
8 is that what you said, or is it likely to?

9 MR. BERRY: Was it likely by the fact that it
10 was reported in the Circuit Breaker.

11 THE WITNESS: Okay. What is the question?

12 MR. CLARK: Would it be likely to cause
13 harassment and intimidation?

14 THE WITNESS: The way it is mentioned in these
15 would it be likely to?

16 MR. BERRY: Yes.

17 THE WITNESS: You just want my opinion, just
18 after I read what is said in here?

19 MR. BERRY: Yes.

20 THE WITNESS: Specifically Darlene Steiner you
21 are asking me about?

22 MR. BERRY: We will take Darlene Steiner first.

23 THE WITNESS: There is certainly very limited,
24 if any, mention of her.

25 MR. BERRY: So the answer is no?

Sim 6-4

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

THE WITNESS: The answer is no.

BY MR. BERRY:

Q What about Henry Steiner?

A No.

Q Mr. Locke, do you recall getting any feedback from company officials regarding Exhibits 2, 3 or 4?

A Feedback, Mr. Berry?

Q Did anyone criticize you for these stories in the Circuit Breaker? Were they criticized?

MR. CLARK: Anyone within the company?

MR. BERRY: Company officials.

THE WITNESS: Well, the most recent February 14, 1984. I have no recollection of this one, you know, any comments at all on this one. And the other two, as I have testified before, go back to 1982, and I just don't remember, to tell you the truth.

BY MR. BERRY:

Q Do you have any recollection of any criticism, favorable or unfavorable, regarding the Circuit Breaker's coverage of the licensing proceeding, the Comanche Peak licensing proceeding?

A Criticism? Could you define that for me?

Q I will give you an example.

A Yes, please.

Q Did anyone come to you and say well, the

Sim 6-5

1 Circuit Breaker, its coverage of the Comanche Peak licensing
2 of the Comanche Peak licensing proceeding is biased?

3 A Inside the company? Someone inside the company
4 came up and said it is biased? No.

5 Q Do you know of anyone in the Public Affairs
6 Department who had been told by the company employees that
7 the coverage had been biased?

8 A I have no knowledge of anyone.

9 Q Has the Public Affairs Department been
10 congratulated by company officials on its coverage of the
11 Comanche Peak Licensing Proceeding?

12 A No.

13 Q No, or you have no recollection?

14 A No, I have not been congratulated for the
15 coverage of Comanche Peak.

16 Q Do you know of anyone on your staff?

17 A No.

18 (Pause.)

19 MR. BERRY: I have no further questions.

20 MR. CLARK: I have just a few quick questions
21 to clear up in my own mind a couple of things.

22 EXAMINATION

23 BY MR. CLARK:

24 Q Mr. Reynolds asked you whether or not the
25 Circuit News Breaker was distributed regularly at Comanche

INDEX

Sim 6-6

1 Peak, and my recollection of your response was yes. My
2 question is whether or not the Circuit News Breaker was
3 distributed also at the same time throughout the family
4 of companies that it was being distributed at Comanche Peak?

5 A Yes, sir, that is correct. It is a system-wide
6 publication.

7 Q Mr. Reynolds, I ask you whether or not Exhibits
8 2, 3 and 4 were distributed at Comanche Peak and your response
9 was yes, and I would ask you again whether or not at the same
10 time that Exhibits 2, 3 and 4 were distributed at Comanche
11 Peak that they were also distributed throughout the system?

12 A Yes, they would have been.

13 Q Mr. Reynolds asked you whether or not you
14 personally investigated further allegations, responses,
15 et cetera, with regard to Exhibits 2 and 3 particularly and
16 whether or not you felt there was a need for you to do that.

17 Let me very quickly, if I may, and your response
18 was no, that you did not know there was no need, but let
19 me very quickly again ask you, please, to state what you
20 perceived to be your responsibilities and duties in your
21 position as Vice President?

22 A Well, again, the internal and external communica-
23 tions, and then focusing on communications it is dealing with
24 the issues and communicating with employees and communicating
25 with the general public.

Sim 6-7

1 Q State, please, whether or not you felt it was
2 your job to do these additional investigations?

3 A No, I do not feel it was my job to do additional
4 investigations.

5 Q Please tell us whether or not these investigations
6 were done by someone else within the company?

7 A Yes, they were.

8 Q Mr. Berry asked you whether or not it was a part
9 of your duties and responsibilities to portray the company
10 in the most favorable light possible and your response was
11 yes.

12 My question is whether or not in so portraying
13 the company in the most favor light possible you would
14 stretch the facts or misstate the facts and willingly do
15 these things, stretch the facts, misstate the facts or
16 fabricate facts or introduce any sort of inaccuracy or
17 falsity into these reports?

18 A No, sir we would not.

19 Q Please tell me whether or not the employees
20 of the various companies in the families of companies served
21 by you are also shareholders.

22 A Yes, they are. They are members of ESOP which
23 is a program where shares are distributed and have the
24 opportunity then to be members of the Thrift Plan where they
25 may place deposits with the company and have additional

Sim 6-8

1 shares matched.

2 Q Tell us whether or not, please, these employees
3 as shareholders received the same reports from the companies
4 that other shareholders do?

5 A Yes, they did.

6 Q Tell us whether or not, please, if there was
7 any interest expressed by employees within the family of
8 companies served by you in the licensing hearings with
9 regard to Comanche Peak prior to September the 14th and 15th,
10 the date of Exhibits 2 and 3?

11 A Yes, sir, there has been a continuing interest
12 in the employee group of actions and activities surrounding
13 Comanche Peak.

14 MR. CLARK: Would you please mark these as
15 Applicant's Exhibits 1, 2 and 3.

16 (The documents were marked for
17 identification as Applicants'
18 Exhibits 1, 2 and 3 inclusive.)

19 (Pause while the parties examine the documents.)

20 BY MR. CLARK:

21 Q Mr. Locke, I hand you here a paper marked
22 Applicants' Exhibit No. 1, and could you please tell us
23 whether or not that is a true copy of an article from the
24 Dallas Times Herald of Thursday, September the 9th, 1982,
25 with a title "Comanche Peak Probe Criticized"?

INDEX

Sim 6-9 1

2 MR. REYNOLDS: I am going to object to any
3 testimony about this. I am going to object to the admission
4 of this document into evidence.

5 There is absolutely no way to authenticate this
6 document. It is complete hearsay. You know, you don't
7 attach newspaper articles at random to a deposition, and I
8 don't believe this witness is qualified to authenticate it
9 in any way.

10 MR. CLARK: We are in the process of attaching
11 some Xerox copies of something which you sought to introduce
12 and the witness is certainly capable of testifying whether
13 or not in fact this clipping is something clipped by his
14 Division. He knows it to be true, and then furthermore,
15 Xeroxed by his people and provided to me.

16 MR. REYNOLDS: This has got not similarity to
17 what we had introduced. These were documents that are
18 produced by his Division and for which his Division is
19 responsible. This is a newspaper article out of some newspaper
20 with respect to which Mr. Locke has absolutely no connection.

21 Anyway, I am stating the objection on the record.
22 Obviously it is something which can be argued later, but I
23 want to make sure that the record is clear that we are
24 objecting to the admission of this document and any testimony
25 by Mr. Locke with respect to it.

MR. CLARK: Sure, right.

Sim 6-10

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

BY MR. CLARK:

Q I will repeat my question, Mr. Locke, of whether or not this is a true and correct copy?

MR. BERRY: The NRC staff is not prepared at this time to object to either Mr. Locke's testimony regarding this Applicant's Exhibit 1. We really would wait and reserve as to what the nature of the testimony is before we would decide that we would like to object.

BY MR. CLARK:

Q My question, Mr. Locke, is whether or not this is a true copy?

A Yes, it is. It is a Xerox copy of a clipping from the Dallas Times Herald dated Thursday, September 9, '82.

Q Would you please tell us whether or not this article was a part of the mass of materials gathered by your staff during the course of the hearings at that time, the licensing hearings?

A Yes, it was pulled together and put into our files.

Q Please tell us whether or not this is one of the articles which was the basis for the response by the company which showed up as Exhibits 2 and 3?

A Yes, it is in fact a general media article that appeared prior to our Circuit Breaker of the 14th.

MR. CLARK: Thank you. I want to enter that

Sim 6-11

1 in evidence.

2 I will hand you a paper, please, marked
3 Applicants' Exhibit No. 2 and ask you whether or not this
4 is a true and correct copy of an article from the Forth
5 Worth Star Telegram of Thursday evening, September the 9th,
6 1982, with a caption "In-Plant Engineer To Testify"?

7 MR. REYNOLDS: I object on the same grounds
8 previously stated.

9 MR. BERRY: The staff takes the same position.

10 THE WITNESS: Yes. It is in fact a Xerox copy
11 of an article that appeared in the Star Telegram and was
12 pulled and was in our files.

13 BY MR. CLARK:

14 Q And I would ask the same question as I did with
15 regard to Exhibit No. 1 of whether or not this is one of
16 the articles that formed the basis for the response in
17 Exhibits 2 and 3?

18 A Yes, it was this type of article.

19 Q Mr. Locke, I hand you a paper that has been
20 marked as Applicants' Exhibit No. 3 which was discussed
21 earlier in your testimony and referred to by you in response
22 to some questions from Mr. Reynolds, and I ask you whether
23 it is a true and correct copy of the front page of the
24 October 1975 issue Volume I, No. 1 of the Circuit?

25 MR. REYNOLDS: I object in the following respect.

Sim 6-12

1 I don't think we have any objection with regard to the
2 portion of this that refers to the Circuit News Breaker,
3 which is a very small paragraph in the middle right-hand
4 part of the page, but with respect to anything else on that
5 page, except for the date, we are going to object on the
6 grounds of relevancy.

7 MR. CLARK: All I am trying to do is to show
8 the two together, Joel, just this first paragraph. It
9 says "I introduced the Circuit," and then this, and I have
10 no intentions beyond that.

11 MR. REYNOLDS: To the extent that the document
12 refers to Circuit Breaker, we don't have an objection, but
13 to the extent that it refers to anything else, we object
14 on the grounds of relevancy.

15 MR. CLARK: Okay, fine.

16 BY MR. CLARK:

17 Q I would ask you, please, Mr. Locke, to read the
18 first paragraph in the first column to the left, which is
19 in italics and starts with the words "To all employees of
20 TUCO."

21 MR. REYNOLDS: I am going to object for the
22 same reasons that I object to the document, and I am going
23 to object to his reading anything from the document into
24 the record, except to the extent that it refers to the
25 Circuit News Breaker.

Sim 6-13

1 MR. CLARK: We are pursuing this of course
2 because you raised the question of the Circuit News Breaker
3 of how it came about and when it came about, and by doing
4 so and in looking at this document asked certain questions
5 with regard to it and Mr. Locke responded to it.

6 We introduce it simply to show the birth of
7 the Circuit News Breaker. It started out of the Circuit,
8 and the date of its birth is clearly shown by the introduction
9 of this exhibit.

10 MR. REYNOLDS: Again, I have no objection to
11 any discussion that there may be there with respect to the
12 Circuit News Breaker.

13 MR. CLARK: Fine.

14 If you will read the first paragraph in italics
15 starting with the words "To all employees of TUCO."

16 THE WITNESS: "To all employees of TUCO, TUFCO,
17 TUGCO and TUSI: I am pleased to introduce this first
18 issue of the Circuit -- the first newspaper to be published
19 monthly by and for employees of all four companies."

20 MR. CLARK: Fine. Thank you.

21 Now if you will read, please, Mr. Lock, the
22 little paragraph in the block on the right-hand side that
23 is marked "Bulletin to supplement The Circuit." This is
24 the block to which Mr. Reynolds have no objection.

25 THE WITNESS: "Even though The Circuit will try

Sim 7-1

1 to cover all of the news, there will be times when we must
2 communicate more quickly than is possible with a monthly
3 publication. That is why the Circuit News Breaker is being
4 introduced. It will serve as a news bulletin and be published
5 whenever information must be communicated rapidly. It will
6 be distributed to managers and supervisors and for posting
7 on bulletin boards."

8 MR. CLARK: Thank you.

9 In conclusion, I would like to renew our objection
10 to the utilization of any of the testimony elicited from
11 Mr. Locke or any other employee of the family of companies
12 in the Texas Utilities Group that relates to the question
13 of harassment, intimidation or threatening by means of
14 articles which appear in the Circuit News Breaker. To do so,
15 or for the N.E.C. to rule, or any other government agency,
16 to rule that such intimidation could exist in effect is an
17 unconstitutional restraint on freedom of expression and
18 speech by these companies or by the applicant in that it
19 abridges the First Amendment guarantee which says that
20 Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech.

21 The case is clear that the outreach of that
22 constitutional provision is that no government action may
23 ensue which abridges the freedom of speech and the Circuit
24 News Breaker is a clear example of the free expression of
25 ideas by the Applicant.

Sim 7-2

INDEX

1 MR. REYNOLDS: I have a few questions on redirect.

2 EXAMINATION

3 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

4 Q One of the things I want to clear up here is
5 something that was raised on cross-examination by Mr. Berry,
6 and that has to do with again this question that we talked
7 about at some length of whether or not these are in fact
8 what they purport to be, Exhibits 2, 3 and 4, whether they
9 are Circuit News Breakers.

10 Now what apparently you said on cross-examination
11 is that they are "very similar to actual Circuit News
12 Breakers."

13 What I want to make very clear is to elicit
14 from you whether or not there is anything on these which
15 would suggest that they are in any way inaccurate or
16 fraudulent or not what they purport to be, Circuit News
17 Breakers for the dates stated.

18 MR. CLARK: Again, we are willing to say, Joel,
19 as I have said earlier that we are not questioning whether
20 or not in fact these are true copies. The difficulty we
21 have is simply that we have no true copy against which to
22 read that, and you provided us with those. They didn't
23 come out of our own files.

24 Mr. Locke in his answers is not trying to
25 mislead or dodge in any way. It is just simply that we

Sim 7-3

1 don't have the original against which to check, and therefore
2 we cannot say that that is a true and correct copy. But
3 we are certainly willing to allow it to be admitted into
4 evidence and bound in.

5 If in fact a comparison of that at a later date
6 with a true copy reveals some differences, then we would
7 say that the differences are wrong because the true copy
8 is elsewhere. We don't question it, but you have just asked
9 us to do an impossibility. We just can't say for sure
10 that it is a true copy simply because we don't know, and that
11 is all.

12 MR. REYNOLDS: Fine I appreciate that. And my
13 question was specifically is there anything on them which
14 suggests that they are anything but a true copy?

15 THE WITNESS: No.

16 MR. REYNOLDS: Thank you.

17 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

18 Q You mentioned also that you in preparation
19 for today's deposition that you thumbed through the Circuit
20 News Breakers for, what was it, this year?

21 A Yes. I just thumbed through them.

22 Q Approximately how many were there?

23 A Oh, I probably looked at maybe 30 or 35.

24 Q And that was the total for 1984 thus far?

25 A Well, I thumbed through a stack. I didn't read

Sim 7-4

1 specifically every one, but I thumbed through the 1984 and
2 back into 1983.

3 Q Okay. So the ones that you thumbed through, there
4 were approximately 30 for '84.

5 A Ask one at a time. You asked about '84.

6 Q Okay. How many would you estimate for 1984?

7 A Twenty to 30.

8 Q Okay, fine. Can you give any kind of an estimate
9 for 1983?

10 A I would imagine there were about that same number
11 in '83 roughly.

12 Q And what about '82?

13 A I have no idea.

14 Q You mentioned also that you had a personal
15 calendar for 1984. Did you also have a personal calendar
16 for 1982?

17 A No. I threw it away.

18 Q So that is no longer in existence?

19 A I just keep a little pocket calendar, just a
20 week at a time type thing, and I enter those. At the end
21 of the year I transfer over and dispose of the one for the
22 prior year.

23 Q So you don't have another calendar that reflects
24 meetings and things of that sort?

25 A No.

1 Q Are there any documents, company documents which
2 would reflect how the reporter for the particular articles,
3 Exhibits 2, 3 and 4 went about their job of gathering the
4 information and any meetings they may have held in preparing
5 the articles?

6 A Excuse me, you started that question saying?

7 Q Are there any documents ---

8 A No.

9 Q As a matter of course, are your employees
10 required to document things of that kind when they are working
11 on a project like the Circuit News Breaker?

12 A Any documents?

13 Q Documents through diaries or any other ---

14 A Time sheets or something like that?

15 Q Any other written form.

16 A No.

17 MR. CLARK: Let me make a point, Joe. As I
18 understand the Board's ruling, this sounds to me like pure
19 discovery that you are in right now. It is surely not
20 evidentiary. It is the purest kind of discovery.

21 As I understand the Board's ruling, if we are
22 involved in discovery, you are supposed to so state it to
23 be that and segregate it which in essence we are almost
24 doing so that the Board may consider what is evidentiary
25 and what is discovery, and we are in classic discovery.

Sim 7-6

1 MR. REYNOLDS: Well, no. I would disagree on
2 the ground that this is simply redirect which follows cross-
3 examination which brought up this issue. So I am trying
4 to clarify exactly what the situation is with respect to
5 an issue which was brought up on cross-examination.

6 MR. CLARK: You would enter Mr. Locke's answer
7 of yes or no in evidence?

8 MR. REYNOLDS: Any decision with regard to what
9 actually goes into evidence is ultimately going to be made
10 down the road as I understand it.

11 However, in the course of an evidentiary hearing
12 one often has questions on cross-examination or on redirect
13 which follow up on prior examination, and that is precisely
14 what I am doing here.

15 MR. CLARK: My understanding of an evidentiary
16 question is to evoke which is entered into a record which
17 becomes a part of the consideration of the record by the
18 trier of the facts, and discovery is to elicit responses
19 which in turn lead to additional inquiries with regard to
20 the existence of information or data or whatever it may be.
21 I think that you are in the discovery area and not in any
22 kind of follow up. You are following up, indeed, but you are
23 following up purely in a discovery sense and you should so
24 mark it as such and keep within the guidelines.

25 MR. REYNOLDS: Well, my intention is purely to

Sim 7-7

1 be focusing on evidentiary matters, and that is what I
2 will definitely attempt to do.

3 MR. CLARK: All right.

4 MR. REYNOLDS: Another point you made on cross-
5 examination I think had to do with the difference between
6 editorializing and simply stating facts. Do you recall that
7 discussing?

8 THE WITNESS: Yes.

9 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

10 Q I think you defined editorializing as "going
11 all the way to one position," correct?

12 A I didn't say it exactly that way, but that is
13 generally correct.

14 Q In essence going all the way to one position.

15 A That is generally the essence, yes.

16 MR. CLARK: He doesn't remember the response.
17 How about answering the question and he will answer it.

18 A Yes, we could do that.

19 (Laughter.)

20 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

21 Q Wouldn't you agree that editorializing may also
22 include or consist of a slanting of facts to a particular
23 point of view which may not encompass simply an explicit
24 statement of adoption of a particular position?

25 MR. CLARK: What do you mean by slanting?

Sim 7-8

1 MR. REYNOLDS: In other words, selectively
2 choosing facts or any way that facts can be slanted to a
3 particular point of view.

4 THE WITNESS: You may say it that way, but I
5 wouldn't.

6 BY MR. REYNOLDS:

7 Q You don't believe that editorializing encompasses
8 that?

9 A That is correct.

10 Q So editorializing is simply wholesale adoption
11 of a position and doing so explicitly?

12 A Yes.

13 MR. CLARK: I object. That is argumentative.
14 Joel, you went to the other extreme with no middle ground
15 in there.

16 MR. REYNOLDS: I just asked him and he said
17 yes.

18 MR. CLARK: No, no, but you went all the way
19 the other way.

20 MR. REYNOLDS: And he said yes.

21 MR. CLARK: I didn't year the answer.

22 (The question and answer were read by the
23 reporter.)
24
25

Sim 7-9

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

BY MR. REYNOLDS:

Q You indicated also on cross that certain investigations had been conducted of Darlene Stiner's allegations regarding the Circuit News Breaker, correct?

A I indicated that investigations were made of her allegations.

Q Okay. And how do you know that?

A Communications with other employees.

Q And with whom did you communicate about that?

A Oh, I don't remember specifically.

Q Was it somebody involved in the investigation?

A It probably would have been somebody in Nuclear Operations at a higher level.

Q Do you know in fact that that was the case?

A I don't remember. As I am sure I stated on the record, that has been two years ago and I don't really remember.

Q So you don't remember specifically who was involved in any of the conversations you might have had?

A Correct.

Q Do you remember specifically having those conversations?

A I think I testified that I did not remember having those conversations. It has been a long time ago.

MR. REYNOLDS: No further questions.

Sim 7-10

1 MR. BERRY: I just have a couple of questions
2 that I would like to ask you, Mr. Locke.

3 EXAMINATION

INDEX

4 BY MR. BERRY:

5 Q Do you agree that the Company Organ, like the
6 Circuit Breaker or the Circuit could be used as a tool to
7 harass or intimidate or embarrass employees?

8 A You are asking for my opinion only?

9 Q I am asking you, do you agree that company news-
10 letters like the Circuit Breaker and the Circuit Breaker News
11 could be used to embarrass or intimidate or harass employees?

12 A It is possible, I suppose, that something like
13 that could occur.

14 Q What actions has the Public Affairs Department
15 taken to ensure that that is not the case and that does not
16 happen?

17 A Well, I think our review process.

18 Q Your review process?

19 A Yes.

20 Q Could you explain a little bit more about that?

21 A The reporter writing the facts, being looked at
22 and then having me look at it and check it off to make sure
23 it is appropriate.

24 Q And you are conscious that even though that a
25 certain story, while true, might be embarrassing or lead

Sim 7-11

1 to intimidation or harassment, that you would take action
2 to make sure that that did not occur?

3 MR. CLARK: That question has been asked. You
4 asked whether or not if in fact the story would in the
5 opinion of Mr. Locke embarrass or intimidate, et cetera, would
6 he go ahead with the story, and he said that he would be
7 definitely receptive to that.

8 You have asked it and it has been answered.

9 MR. BERRY: I didn't remember the answer, and
10 I am not sure I asked the question.

11 (The parties asked the reporter if she could
12 read the question and answer referred to, but the tapes
13 had been picked up and sent for typing.)

14 (Laughter.)

15 MR. CLARK: Ask it again.

16 (The pending question was read by the reporter.)

17 BY MR. BERRY:

18 Q Mr. Locke, in reviewing a story, after having
19 reviewed the story, if it was your opinion that this
20 story could lead to embarrassment or harassment or
21 intimidation and the story, even though true, if it could
22 lead to embarrassment or intimidation or harassment, would
23 you take action to make sure that that did not occur?

24 A Yes.

25 Q I want you to look at Intervenor's Exhibit 3,

Sim 7-12

1 which is in the February 14th Circuit Breaker with the
2 headline "Dunham Hearing Begins Monday."

3 MR. REYNOLDS: Exhibit 2 you mean?

4 THE WITNESS: I have got mine and it says 4.

5 MR. REYNOLDS: Oh, you are talking about 1984?

6 MR. BERRY: Yes.

7 MR. REYNOLDS: Then it is Exhibit 4.

8 MR. BERRY: Okay, Exhibit 4.

9 I believe you discussed this in your earlier
10 testimony, and I want to direct your attention to the last
11 two paragraphs of that story starting with the words "The
12 company is committed to building and operating a safe plant."

13 Could you explain why the last two paragraphs
14 of Internvenor's Exhibit 4 is not editorializing?

15 MR. CLARK: I am going to object to that. We had
16 a long discussion with regard to whether or not -- Mr. Reynolds
17 asked that question of whether or not that was in fact not
18 facts, but instead something other than facts, and we
19 discussed it and discussed it, and Mr. Locke gave a response
20 that you cannot deal with those two paragraphs out of
21 context. They have to be dealt with within the context
22 of the situation and within the context of the whole story
23 reported and they were facts and that is his testimony.

24 MR. REYNOLDS: I don't recall that that was his
25 testimony specifically, but I think the record will speak

Sim 7-13

1 for itself.

2 MR. CLARK: Yes.

3 THE WITNESS: That was my intention to testify
4 in that context. If you lift those out by themselves, that
5 is right, but if you put them into the context of this
6 particular story and how it works into the story, then I
7 believe it is ---

8 MR. BERRY: So that I understand, it is your
9 testimony that if you lift out the last two paragraphs of
10 Intervenor's Exhibit 4, that that could be construed as
11 editorializing, but if you read the story as a whole, it is
12 not editorializing?

13 He said that is his testimony, and I am asking
14 him if that is what he said.

15 MR. CLARK: But that is a trick question and
16 we are not supposed to ask trick questions because what you
17 are trying to get at is how can something be construed when
18 it is construed other than the way it in fact exists. It
19 exists as a part of that story and not somewhere else.

20 And Mr. Locke stated that that is company
21 policy and it is a fact that that is company policy.

22 MR. BERRY: Answer the question.

23 THE WITNESS: What was the question?

24 MR. BERRY: That the last two paragraphs of
25 Intervenor's Exhibit 4 could be construed as editorializing

Sim 7-14 1

if taken out of context?

2

MR. CLARK: I object to speculation, and you don't have to speculate, Mr. Locke.

3

4

THE WITNESS: I don't know how to answer it the way you asked it. If they are there, they are part of this exhibit. They are facts in this exhibit and maybe that is the way we ought to leave it.

5

6

7

8

MR. BERRY: Okay. So this story, Intervenor's Exhibit 4, "The Dunham Hearing Begins Monday," that in your opinion is a fair reporting, a fair story, a factual story?

9

10

11

THE WITNESS: Yes. It is information that was communicated to the employees and they had a need to know it and they appreciated it.

12

13

14

MR. BERRY: No further questions.

15

16

MR. CLARK: I have none. Do you want to handle, Joel, the binding in of these various exhibits by stipulation, or shall we just say Yea?

17

18

MR. REYNOLDS: Sure. Just one point with regard to the Board's order. This is where I would end the evidentiary portion. I don't have any questions which I specifically intend to segregate off as discovery questions. I don't know if anybody else here does.

19

20

21

22

23

(No response.)

24

MR. CLARK: I have no further questions.

25

MR. REYNOLDS: All right. With all counsel

Sim 7-15

1 agreeing there are no further questions, my understanding
2 of the way these deposition transcripts are to be handled
3 is the original is to go to the witness and then ultimately
4 to the NRC. Then any copies of the transcripts are to be
5 handled consistent with the handling of all transcripts
6 in this series of depositions with the additional fact that
7 certain transcripts have been ordered by individual parties.

8 MR. CLARK: Thank you.

9 MR. REYNOLDS: Thank you for coming.

10 (Whereupon, at 1:03 p.m., the taking of the
11 Deposition of THOMAS R. LOCKE, JR., concluded.)

12
13
14 THOMAS R. LOCKE, JR.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF PROCEEDINGS

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

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the
NRC COMMISSION

In the matter of: Deposition of Thomas R. Locke, Jr.
TUGCO - Comanche Peak, Units 1 and 2

Date of Proceeding: Glen Rose, Texas

Place of Proceeding: Glen Rose Motor Inn

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original
transcript for the file of the Commission.

Mary C. Simons

Official Reporter - Typed

Mary C. Simons

Official Reporter - Signature

Int. Ex #1 7/10/84

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Name: Thomas Ruel Locke, Jr. (Tom)
Home address: Fort Worth, Texas
Business address: Texas Utilities Services Inc.
2001 Bryan Tower Rm 1900; Dallas, Texas 75201
214/653-4632

History: Born April 17, 1936, in DeLeon, Texas

Education: Hamilton High School; Hamilton, Texas (1954)
Texas A&M University -- Degree: B.S. -
Mechanical Engineering (1959)

Experience: Texas Electric Service Company (1959-1981)
Division Manager; Big Spring, Tx. (1972)
Division Manager; Wichita Falls, Tx. (1976)
Director of Personnel Relations; Fort Worth (1980)
Texas Utilities Services Inc. (1981-Present)
Vice President

Personal: Married (Wife, Marion)
Two children (Twin daughters, Keely and Kemberly)

Past organizations: Chamber of Commerce
United Way

Present organizations: Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) - Member
South Hills Christian Church; Fort Worth

Professional: Registered Professional Engineer in Texas
Member: Texas Society of Professional Engineers

E-42 7/10/84

news

circuit breaker

September 14, 1982

COMANCHE PEAK HEARING RESUMES; ATCHISON CLAIMS PLOT

The Comanche Peak licensing hearing resumed Monday in Fort Worth with return engagements by several intervenor witnesses and the start of rebuttal testimony by the company.

The hearing, before an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, began with resumption of testimony concerning the quality assurance program at the plant.

Testimony on quality assurance started during the June hearing session and continued in July. Developments involving witnesses for the intervenor - Citizens Association for Sound Energy - Monday included:

- Disclosure by former welding inspector Charles Atchison that a Department of Labor Investigation has resulted in an order to reinstate him in a job at a Louisiana nuclear project - a job from which he was fired after the hearing session in July.
- A new claim by Atchison that he is the victim of "muck-raking," "discrimination," "financial duress" and other "devious deeds" by Texas Utilities, Brown & Root and companies involved with the Louisiana project.
- Cross-examination of a former employee, Henry Stiner, and his wife, Darlene, presently a quality control inspector at the plant, about allegations they've made concerning welding and the adequacy of NRC investigations.
- Brief appearances by two other former employees - Mark Walsh and Jack Doyle - who have made allegations concerning use of computer programs to analyze the strength of pipes and pipe supports.

Atchison was hired by a subcontractor at the Waterford III nuclear plant, being built by Louisiana Power & Light, at the same time the last hearing session in July began. He was fired after he returned to Louisiana from the hearing.

TU attorney Nick Reynolds also touched briefly on a finding in a Department of Labor investigation that Atchison had been discriminated against when he was fired from a job at a Louisiana nuclear project.

Among reasons the Department of Labor gave for ruling that Atchison should be reinstated was the fact that some Comanche Peak employees - including Brandt - once worked at the Louisiana project and some Louisiana employees now work at Comanche Peak.

Reynolds established that Atchison himself had told the investigator that Brandt once had worked at the Louisiana plant. After Tuesday's session, Brandt said he not only had never discussed Atchison with anyone at the Louisiana project, but had never even been contacted by the Labor Department investigator.

"It is noteworthy to point out," said TUGCO QA manager Dave Chapman after the session, "that during these proceedings we've been hearing from a few individuals, most of whom are disgruntled and misguided former employees. Not a single safety issue has been identified by any of them."

"For every one of these people, I can identify a hundred capable, hard-working, credible employees who are doing good quality assurance jobs every day at Comanche Peak," he said.

Also testifying Tuesday was a former employee in the pipe support stress analysis area at the plant, Jack Doyle. Doyle admitted that, until he talked to plant experts while giving his disposition for the hearing a month ago, he had not been aware that his group did not have the final word concerning pipe support safety.

He admitted he had not known that a series of reviews are done - including the final stress analysis - to make sure the pipe supports are safe.

A panel of witnesses for the company began testimony late Tuesday to refute the testimony of Doyle and one of his co-workers, Mark Walsh. The panel will continue Wednesday.

Mrs. Ellis said at least three people will appear when the session begins Wednesday to make "limited appearance" statements opposing Comanche Peak.

news

Ex #3 7/10/82
SEE 141 P2d 308 [10]

circuit breaker

September 15, 1982

COMPANY WITNESSES REFUTE INTERVENORS

Witnesses for Texas Utilities took the stand Tuesday during the Comanche Peak licensing hearing to refute allegations by intervenor witnesses, including former inspector Charles Atchison.

Testimony by a panel called to give evidence rebutting Atchison and other witnesses for the Citizens Association for Sound Energy (CASE) took most of the day, primarily because of tedious and repetitive cross-examination by CASE president Juanita Ellis.

The hearing is being conducted in Fort Worth by an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board of the NRC. ASLB chairman Marshall Miller several times asked Mrs. Ellis to speed up her questioning, saying at one point, "We're taking so much time that it seems purposeless."

The TUI panel was made up of C. Thomas Brandt, mechanical/civil quality assurance-quality control supervisor; Gordon Purdy, site QA manager for Brown & Root; Raymond Vurpillat, power group QA manager for Brown & Root; Ron Tolson, site QA supervisor for TUGCO, and Randall D. Smith, who was Atchison's immediate supervisor.

After testifying, members of the panel said they felt their evidence refuting claims made by Atchison and others had been persuasive.

For example:

- Linear indications alleged by Atchison to mean faults in welds were shown to be actually nothing more than cracks in paint on the welds.
- Less than 20 percent of what Atchison had thought were indications of rejectable welds were actually rejectable, and none has any safety significance.
- "Weave bead" welding, claimed by some intervenor witnesses to be prohibited, is in fact permitted by the industry for weld beads with a width up to four times the size of the rod used to make the weld.
- Torque seal, said by allegers to have been used at Comanche Peak by persons not qualified to possess and use it, isn't used at all at many nuclear plant construction sites, and the control of its use is not required.

According to a Labor Department letter he produced Monday, the department's investigator concluded Atchison should be reinstated because he was fired after he testified at the Comanche Peak hearing. Under the law, he was - according to the investigator - "engaging in a protected activity" for which he cannot be fired.

CASE Monday offered supplemental testimony by Atchison in which he claims Texas Utilities is part of a conspiracy against him. Among other requests in the testimony, he asked the licensing board to recommend that "financial relief" be granted to him.

Outside the hearing room, TU officials told reporters Atchison's latest claims were "ridiculous," pointing out that neither TU nor any of the companies involved with building Comanche Peak would have any reason to care if Atchison is employed elsewhere.

"Neither Texas Utilities nor any member of Comanche Peak management had anything to do with Atchison being hired at the Louisiana plant, or with his being fired," said TUSI manager of nuclear services Homer Schmidt. "We only know why he was fired from Comanche Peak, and that was because he was not competent to perform his job."

The board will rule on the admissibility of Atchison's new testimony Tuesday. Both TU attorney Nick Reynolds and the NRC legal staff objected to its admission, pointing out its irrelevance to the Comanche Peak licensing.

The Stiners made a number of allegations concerning welding practices at the plant and also claimed the NRC had not investigated their allegations adequately in the past.

Through cross-examination, Reynolds pointed out persons might see what they believed were problems, but have the NRC decline to substantiate their allegations because it recognized the alleged problems did not exist.

In his direct testimony, Henry Stiner acknowledged he has a criminal record. Reynolds began cross-examination to get details from Stiner about his record, but was stopped by ASLB chairman Marshall Miller. Miller said the board would take under advisement the question of whether Stiner could be questioned about his record and said a decision would be announced Tuesday morning.

Also Tuesday, Jack Doyle is scheduled to be cross-examined further about his allegations concerning the strength of pipe supports.

news

7/10/84 EX #4

circuit breaker

February 14, 1984

DUNHAM HEARING BEGINS MONDAY

A hearing in the case of William Dunham, a former Brown & Root employee at Comanche Peak, began Monday in Fort Worth before a Department of Labor administrative law judge.

The hearing is on the issue of Dunham's firing. However, it is possible that Dunham will attempt to make allegations concerning the quality assurance program at Comanche Peak. The case is being covered by the news media.

Dunham, who was a lead quality control inspector in the painting program, was fired in August 1983 for insubordination. He claims he was fired because he complained that his supervisor was trying to intimidate him.

A number of witnesses will be offered during the hearing to substantiate that Dunham was dismissed for valid reasons and that his dismissal does not reflect adversely on the quality assurance program.

The company is committed to building and operating a safe plant. This necessarily includes finding and correcting any construction problems. Comanche Peak has always had a good quality assurance program, and, in fact, in recent months an extensive program has been underway to reemphasize the commitment to the goals of that program.

This has included making certain all employees know they are free to report any problems they see or believe exist and making sure they know how to report those possible problems. No effort has ever been made to intimidate any inspectors at Comanche Peak in order to prevent them from reporting unacceptable conditions. To the contrary, identifying and reporting such conditions are what they are hired to do.

A.P. Ex # 8
1 7/10

Comanche Peak probe criticized

By JACK BOOTH

Staff Writer

A former welder at the Comanche Peak nuclear plant has charged that the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission conducted an incomplete investigation of his allegations about faulty welding at the plant.

"The investigation was not carried out to the fullest extent, and in some cases this report contains what I consider to be downright lies," Henry A. Stiner said in written testimony prepared for presentation to the U. S. Atomic Safety and Licensing Board when it resumes hearings on the plant Monday in Fort Worth.

The hearings are being conducted to determine whether the plant, located in Glen Rose, about 80 miles southwest of Dallas, was constructed safely enough to warrant the issuance of an operating license.

Stiner, who worked at the plant for two years before being fired in 1981 for alleged excessive absences, testified that the NRC's main investigator, Donald D. Driskill, failed to look into many of his charges, took incorrect notes and confused the testimony of some of the witnesses.

"There were many omissions of allegations," Stiner said, "and some of the information contained in the I&E Report (NRC report) did not match the investigator's own notes, and in some cases his notes even appear to contradict his own I&E Report."

Stiner of Walnut Springs said he told Driskill he had observed many faulty welds at the plant and was even instructed by his superiors to make bad welds to speed construc-

'The investigation was not carried out to the fullest extent, and in some cases this report contains what I consider to be downright lies.'

— Henry A. Stiner

did not check any allegations that did not refer to a specific weld on a specific pipe.

The NRC report concluded that there was no validity to Stiner's charges of improper welds.

Contacted for comment on Stiner's charges, David Chapman, the manager of quality assurance at the plant, said he has been "impressed" by the thoroughness of NRC investigations. Chapman also said it was impossible to investigate allegations of faulty welds without knowing where the problem welds were. "Otherwise, somebody can keep you running in circles," he said.

Stiner said he found many confusing or inaccurate references to his allegations in the "sanitized" copies of Driskill's notes he was allowed to see.

Those notes and similar notes, all containing sections where names

and dates have been deleted by the NRC, are the subject of a dispute between the NRC and the licensing board.

In an Aug. 4 order, the licensing board warned the NRC to either turn over uncensored notes or face possible sanctions. The NRC responded that it could not provide uncensored notes because of the need to protect confidential informants. The issue is expected to be aired at the hearings Monday.

Licensing board Chairman Marshall E. Miller said he was suspicious about the NRC's inability to reach a conclusion in some investigations, and he said it was necessary for the board to see the uncensored notes to draw its own conclusions.

Ap Ex #2

N-plant engineer to testify

By MICHELLE SCOTT
Star-Telegram Writer

A former Comanche Peak engineer says he resigned his job at the plant in June after management said heat-stress tests he was conducting on pipe supports were unnecessary and ordered them stopped.

The statement is included in pre-filed testimony of Jack Doyle, who will testify next week at a licensing hearing for the nuclear power plant. Doyle's co-worker Mark Walsh made similar charges to the board in July.

Doyle, a former field engineer at the plant, will testify that 5,000 pipe supports in the plant's two containment areas must be replaced to ensure safe operation.

He is a former member of an engineering group that ran computer studies on pipe supports at the plant. Several other former and current plant employees who have criticized the system also will testify.

The hearings for the Texas Utilities-owned plant, which is under construction 45 miles southwest of Fort Worth near Glen Rose, began in April. They will resume at 8:30 a.m. Monday at the downtown Metro Center Hotel under the direction of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Atomic Safety and Licensing Board.

Doyle said the faulty pipe supports are in both containment buildings at the plant site. He said it would take a year to a year and a half to repair the supports, at a cost of \$1.5 billion.

If the faulty pipe supports are not replaced, a loss of coolant in either of the reactors could create a "melt-down" in which reactor material would sink into the ground, hit ground water and cause clouds of radioactive steam to spew into the surrounding atmosphere, he said.

The supports hold piping that carries cooling water to and from the reactors.

Plant supervisors said Doyle and Walsh misinterpreted their computer studies and applied the wrong engineering standards to the pipe-support systems they analyzed. In a March 8 memo to Doyle, management told him to stop conducting heat-stress studies because professional engineering codes did not require them.

Doyle will appear at the hearing, which is expected to last five days, as a witness for the Citizens Association for Sound Energy, the only intervenor in the plant's licensing procedures. Also scheduled to testify at the hearing are Darlene and Henry Stiner of Glen Rose.

Stiner, a former welder at the plant, has charged that he was instructed by his supervisor to make illegal "weave welds" at the plant. He said he reported this to the NRC in the summer of 1981, but the NRC report was not carried out correctly.

He also said notes made by NRC investigators D.D. Driskill and Richard Herr were "sanitized" and do not reflect all the allegations he made.

Mrs. Stiner, a quality control inspector at the plant, will tell the

board that there is a general lack of control over welding rods and other weld filler material used at the plant.

She said illegal weave welds made at the plant could damage safety-critical pumps or tanks, and that plug welds made at the plant could create weak areas where the weld could break.

Mrs. Stiner said some hilti-bolt quality control inspectors do not properly ensure that the bolts are correctly installed and torqued prior to documenting satisfactory installation.

"There is a lack of control on a product called Torque Seal, which is used on hilti bolts once they have been torqued and inspected," she

said. "This lack of control could lead to the questionable integrity of bolts which are marked with this substance."

Torque Seal is a quick-setting fluid used to ensure that nuts and bolts cannot be tampered with after a quality control inspector has verified torque on the bolt, she said. It is a controlled substance and is supposed to be used only by quality control personnel.

The plant, originally scheduled for completion in 1981 at a cost of \$779 million, is now scheduled for completion in 1984 at a company-estimated cost of \$3.44 billion. However, some nuclear energy experts have predicted the plant's cost will rise to more than \$5 billion by completion.

THE CIRCUIT

October, 1975

Volume 1 Number

Introducing The Circuit

To all employees of TUCO, TUFCO, TUGCO, and TUSI:

I am pleased to introduce this first issue of the Circuit—the first newspaper to be published monthly by and for employees of all four companies.

You will find that much of the news in this and future editions will be about employees and their families. The Circuit will also report news and activities throughout the Texas Utilities Company System as well as significant industry news. In these times when our business is undergoing rapid changes and there is so much interest and concern about energy problems, I believe it helps all of us in our jobs to be better informed.

The Circuit is part of an overall effort to improve our communications and provide information for you. I am confident that it will succeed because of your comments, your suggestions and the news that you provide to The Circuit's correspondents and reporters.

Burl B. Hulsey, Jr.

About "The Circuit"

The Circuit has been "energized" with this October, 1975 issue and we think you will find it to be unique in many ways. The size, the color of the paper, the type style and layout are all intended to make The Circuit distinctive and easy to read and handle.

The paper will be published each month by the Company Public Affairs Department and will be mailed to employees' homes. The Circuit editor is Steve Blankinship, who transferred from Dallas Power & Light Company last July. Steve had been co-editor of the DP&L Synchronizer.

Assisting the editor will be Circuit correspondents who have been selected for each Company location. They are each employee's direct line to the publication. Correspondents will report on happenings in their area and will rely to a great extent on information given them by individual employees. Names of the Circuit correspondents are listed on page 2 in this issue. In some areas there will be reporters to help cover the news and their names will be listed in future edi-

tions of The Circuit.

Not only is The Circuit new, but so is our mailing list. If you know of someone who didn't receive their copy, please notify your correspondent. Correspondents will turn in address changes or corrections and will also have a supply of extra copies of The Circuit.

Bulletin to supplement The Circuit

news
circuit breaker

Even though The Circuit will try to cover all the news, there will be times when we must communicate more quickly than is possible with a monthly publication. That's why the Circuit News Breaker is being introduced. It will serve as a news bulletin and be published whenever information must be communicated rapidly. It will be distributed to managers and supervisors and for posting on bulletin boards.

New service award program to begin Jan. 1

A new service award program will begin in 1976 to recognize service anniversaries of all employees of Texas Utilities Company, TUFCO, TUGCO, and TUSI. Award pins will be presented to employees on their service award dates observed every five years. Terms of service will be recognized from the date a person has been employed in the Texas Utilities System. Plans also call for the presentation of pins to those who have been with the Texas Utilities System more than five years but have not received pins because such a program did not exist. These employees will receive awards commemorating their most recent service award date.

The pins feature a System map on a white background. A number appears above the map designating terms of service. Color of the map varies with each successive service anniversary.

Appearance of each successive pin is as follows: 5 years—green map, 10 years—blue map, 15 years—red map with ruby, 20 years—green map with emerald, 25 years—blue map with diamond, 30 years—red map with diamond, 35 years—green map with two diamonds, 40 years—blue map with two diamonds, 45 years—red map with two diamonds.



This is what the new service pins will look like. Beginning in January of 1976, pins such as this will be issued to employees of TUCO, TUFCO, TUGCO, and TUSI celebrating service anniversaries. Twenty-five year service anniversaries will continue to be recognized with the presentation of a watch.