

Date of transcription February 10, 1984

Report of Interview

[REDACTED] Reactor Construction Programs Branch, Division of Quality Assurance, Safeguards, and Inspection Programs, Office of Inspection and Enforcement, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, was interviewed concerning his actions during the Construction Appraisal Team (CAT) Inspection 50-440/83-21, 50-441/83-30, conducted on August 22 - September 2 and September 12-23, 1983, at the Perry Nuclear Power Plants Units 1 and 2. During the interview, [REDACTED] provided the following information:

During the CAT inspection, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], Senior Reactor Construction Engineer, were responsible for inspection of electrical and instrumentation construction at Perry I and II. [REDACTED] and Rohrbacher each interviewed about three Quality Control (QC) inspectors of the L.K. Comstock Company, the electrical contractor at Perry. These inspectors were interviewed about their inspection activities, competency, and technical evaluations. [REDACTED] and Rohrbacher also interacted with Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company (CEI) (the licensee) inspection personnel pertaining to electrical issues. As a result of their interviews with Comstock QC inspectors, [REDACTED] and Rohrbacher determined some of the inspectors believed inspection procedures needed improvement, some desired more training, and some thought they were overworked. The interviews conducted by [REDACTED] and Rohrbacher were designed to determine technical concerns and not to inquire into issues of harassment or intimidation of QC inspectors. The responsibility to determine the existence of non-technical problems of harassment and intimidation was the responsibility of [REDACTED] Inspector Specialist, another member of CAT.

[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] received no allegations of harassment or intimidation from the QC inspectors they interviewed; however, at the team meeting held at the end of each day, [REDACTED] reported that he was receiving indications of harassment and intimidation from some of the L.K. Comstock Company QC inspectors he interviewed. [REDACTED] then expanded his data base and interviewed additional QC inspectors in an attempt to further substantiate the reports of harassment and intimidation. The additional interviews resulted in more indications of harassment and intimidation; therefore, a meeting between members of the CAT was held to decide how to resolve the issue. [REDACTED] attended the meeting to provide his opinion on the possible validity of harassment and intimidation complaints against the L.K. Comstock Company. [REDACTED] was asked for his input because he worked for Comstock in 1974 and again in 1978. The meeting resulted on a decision to notify the NRC Region III Administrator and to not release any information concerning the name of the contractor or the origin of the complaints of harassment and intimidation until Region III and NRC Headquarters Inspection and Enforcement decided on the appropriate action. It

Investigation on February 9, 1984 at Bethesda, MD File # 84-12

by George A. Mulley, Jr. Gam Date dictated February 10, 1984

THIS DOCUMENT IS PROPERTY OF NRC. IF LOANED TO ANOTHER AGENCY IT AND ITS CONTENTS ARE NOT TO BE DISTRIBUTED OUTSIDE THE RECEIVING AGENCY WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR AND AUDITOR.

was also decided that during the exit briefing with CEI management, specific information identifying the contractor or the extent if the problem would not be discussed. The only comment to be made by [REDACTED] was there were concerns of harassment and intimidation developed during the CAT.

[REDACTED] denied discussing QC inspector complaints of harassment and intimidation at any time with the L.K. Comstock Company [REDACTED]. Although [REDACTED] worked with [REDACTED] between April-September 1982, at the Enrico Fermi Nuclear Power Plant in Detroit, MI, where both were employed as contract technical consultants for Detroit-Edison, they were not close friends. [REDACTED] emphasized that during the CAT he received no allegations of harassment or intimidation; therefore, he had no first hand information to provide [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] also asserted that the language used in the quote he allegedly made to [REDACTED] was of the nature he would not use. [REDACTED] does not use profanity. On several occasions during the CAT inspection, [REDACTED] informally discussed with [REDACTED] in his office some generic technical problems that were identified by [REDACTED] during the CAT; however, this was an accepted procedure used to develop additional information. Because the matter of harassment and intimidation of QC inspectors was not the responsibility of [REDACTED] never discussed these issues with [REDACTED].