

TRANSCRIPTION OF TAPED INTERVIEW
WITH MRS. DOBIE HATLEY
ON FRIDAY, MAY 18, 1984
BY MESSRS. RICHARD L. BANGART AND RICHARD P. DENISE

Mr. Denise: This is Friday, May 18, 1984 approximately 9:38 a.m. A meeting and recording of the meeting between Mrs. Dobie Hatley, Mr. Richard Bangart, and Mr. Richard Denise, at Mrs. Hatley's home in Glen Rose, Texas.

With the permission of Mrs. Hatley, this meeting is being recorded. We do not anticipate that this meeting will end in a sworn statement. The purpose of the meeting is to receive information from Mrs. Hatley relative to the operations at Glen Rose Nuclear Power Plant. That is the Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant.

Now, Mrs. Hatley, is it correct that we have agreed to have this conversation and that we do it voluntarily, and you do it voluntarily and that you agree that there is no problem with the recording, is that true?

(Mrs. Hatley) That's true.

Mr. Denise: With respect to this conversation, if we come to a point where you request some specific confidentiality as to our followup on the items that you mention to us, would you specifically identify it at that time.

Mrs. Hatley: Yes, I will.

Mr. Denise: O.K. Thank you very much. I have given Mrs. Hatley a copy of the transcript from the tape made at an interview between Mrs. Hatley, Mr. Check and myself on February 10, 1984, along with a copy of the sworn statement taken on that same day and also a copy of a letter from Richard P. Denise to T. A. Ippolito dated April 19, 1984, which transmitted that transcript and that sworn statement to Mrs. Hatley. Mrs. Hatley asked about whether that tape could be made available to her, that is, a copy of that tape. I agreed to send her a copy of that tape. Secondly, Mrs. Hatley asked whether that tape includes some comments made by Mr. Frank Strand during our visit to the Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station. I replied that I didn't recall seeing any on the transcript attributed to Mr. Strand but because of the nature of the interview taking place in the satellites, it was entirely possible that most of the comments made by Mr. Strand, were not recorded. However, we can determine that from the tape. That tape has remained in my personal possession since it was made, and no copies have been made of the tape. I will give Mrs. Hatley a copy, however.

Mrs. Hatley asked whether I recall that Mr. Strand's statements about her being a good employee, and performing well in her work at Comanche Peak while she was there. I responded to Mrs. Hatley that I do recall Mr. Strand making the

8506270495 850624
PDR ADOCK 05000445
T PDR

statement that Mrs. Hatley was a good employee and had performed well, and had been one of his key people in setting up and running the satellites. Whether or not that particular statement got recorded at the time of our visit to Comanche Peak on February 10, 1984, doesn't mean that Mr. Strand didn't make the statement. I do personally recall his making that statement that Mrs. Hatley was a good employee and performed well while she was employed there.

So at this time we would like to begin our discussion with Mrs. Hatley, unless Mrs. Hatley, you have something to add to that particular preamble that I have just given.

Mrs. Hatley: No, that's OK.

Mr. Denise: I'd just like to place it, the tape recorder, there in the center of the table so that we can have altogether the best chance to pick up the conversation that we are having. I wonder if you would tell us basically what you want to tell us, but I would prompt you in saying I wish you would bring to Mr. Bangart's attention, and refresh my memory, about some of the items that we talked about on last Wednesday on the telephone, which in that conversation prompted our visit here today. Thank you.

Mrs. Hatley: What we were referring to whenever I talked to Mr. Denise was the fact that the people in the area and everybody concerned has a hard time trying to get some kind of trust in our Federal government in the sense that Region IV of the NRC has betrayed on many occasions the workers at Comanche Peak. They have been involved in a direct coverup of a lot of information, and we have the testimony that was turned over to the Office of Investigations that makes this accusal statement. As a result of that, we're having a hard time getting, we don't want to give the information that we have to Region IV because the minute that we do, then they give it to the utility and the coverup begins. And then whenever the investigation starts, as with Mr. Ippolito, the coverup is already in place. The problem is that among the inspectors for the NRC, they don't know how to deal with the coverup. It looks good on the top, and they don't know where to dig to find out that it's wrong. And that's where our problem has been in dealing with any of the investigations that have taken place out there. Our main problem with Region IV, another problem, is everybody on Comanche Peak site knows that Mr. Taylor was the person who betrayed the workers who are out there that are still unemployed and on food stamps, because his statement says so in that thing, and yet he is still on the plant site every day, or any day that he chooses to be out there.

Mr. Denise: OK, Mrs. Hatley, let me get some clarification here. You talked about Mr. Taylor, you were referring to Mr. Robert Taylor.

Mrs. Hatley: Yes sir, the former resident inspector at Comanche Peak.

Denise: OK. And the other person you referred to specifically is Mr. Atchison.

Hatley: Chuck Atchison.

Denise: Do you have some knowledge that people other than Mr. Atchison was identified by Mr. Taylor as an informant or a whistle blower to the NRC?

Hatley: Yes. We have evidence that the Steiners and one other person whose name is still being held in confidence by the Office of Investigations whose testimony is recorded and held by the Office of Investigations, we have that evidence that I cannot give you today.

Denise: OK, so, you're saying that there is some evidence or statements that Mr. Taylor identified other people other than Mr. Atchison as one who is providing information to the NRC and he identified those people to either TUGCO or Brown & Root, without saying what the name is.

Hatley: I will say there is a possibility of that, I'm not going to rope myself into that kind of a statement, no. Or he'll shoot me in the head (laugh). Ya'll know that.

Denise: Well, I want to respond a little bit in saying that to Mr. Bangart and myself, we're the only ones present here who can speak to that. We have a strong and abiding interest in the integrity and reputation of Region IV. We're part of Region IV, and anything that reflects badly on Region IV also reflects badly on us. And we want, if we know what the problems are, certainly, I don't say you haven't identified a problem, but if we know what the problems are, at least we have an opportunity to make some corrections and we're very interested in that. On the other side of the coin, Region IV is tasked as the onsite representative of the NRC, and it's necessary for us to represent the NRC and have information available to us to do that job and so I think we have a double pronged problem.

Hatley: OK, you remember my daughter. Teree, you remember Mr. Denise.

Denise: Hi, Teree, I understand you are going to get married.

Hatley: And this is Mr. Bangart.

Denise: I'll turn this off for a second while w're away.

Denise: We're now back on the tape.

Hatley: Ippolito and company.

Denise: Now Mr. Ippolito is from the NRC headquarters in Washington.

Hartley: But his investigators were garnered from what area?

Denise: Some of the people who came down came from Region II centered in Atlanta, but we've had, on these team approaches, we've drawn resources from Region IV, Region II, Region I, Region III, and so we'd bring in additional people to help us here.

Hartley: Well, that's good. We never had any quarrel with that as far who was going to do the investigation. What we do quarrel with, and are quarreling with today, is the method that the investigation was done and the result of the investigation as it was done.

Denise: Can you say more about that?

Hatley: Yes I will. The items were given to Mr. Ippolito on the day that I returned from Washington, a list of 24 items to be investigated, and they were very confidential items, they were items that had been given to us by other whistle blowers that were currently inside the plant. There was a lot of information, direct, positive information given to him about the activities that were going on at the plant at that time. We know that he gave that information to the utility so that information could be, or someone gave that information to the utility, as opposed as to going in and doing the investigation as an independent body. They said to the utility, "here, we have found some problems in this area, you go and fix them." This is again a coverup, this has nothing to do with doing an independent investigation as I think that the poeple want it done. I'm speaking for the people who want that thing investigated correctly.

Bagart: Did you say that you felt that there was more information given to the utility that was just addressed in the one or two line statements regarding the 24 that spelled out the 24 allegations?

Hatley: Yes I do. Yes I do.

Bangart: You believe there was more information given to the utilities?

Hatley: Yes, I think they told them what they had found also. What Ippolito had found in his investigation. He told the utility, "yes, we have identified this problem and we want you to fix it." This is the allegation made by GAP and its people. This is the problem that we found. This is what we want you to fix. See, that's not the way it works. It works like, here is the problem that we have found, somebody get a fine.

Bangart: I do want you to understand that the agency believes that those listed 24 allegations that were transmitted to Texas Utilities were largely general in nature, and there was not a lot of specificity provided with any of the 24, and it would require such an inordinate amount of work on the part of the agency to look through essentially thousands and thousands or tens of thousands of pieces of paper to try to ferret out what a specific instance might be, and that because of that, this method of turning over to utilities

certain types of allegations, and this list of 24 is one of those types, where we would indeed charge the utility with conducting it's own internal investigation of the allegation, and then we in turn would review what his activities were. And if there were coverups taking place on the part of the utility, our chance to determine whether or not that cover up had occurred would be in our review of what they'd done.

Hatley: And when does that review come out?

Bangart: That review would be taking place not only as the progress of the utilities investigation is going forth, but then at the end when it is concluded and we have the overall assessment of whether he feels there is validity associated with such an allegation. This is a technique that is also being used at Waterford, and probably will continue to be used at other NTOLs.

Hatley: I think that, to me, it's an acceptable technique, except for the fact that at Comanche Peak, it has been proven in the past that between the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the utility and the constructor, that there is too much hanky panky going on. The constructor being Brown & Root. Well, ok, this gets out of the realm of what we are talking about, except for the fact that we know that the bond rating broke on Texas Utilities, it dropped to double A. Halliburton jumps in and says to Texas Utilities, "don't worry about that, as long as you let Brown & Root construct all your stuff, we'll finance you, Interfirst will take care of you." Now, see that's the violation of antitrust, that's where Washington likes to get involved in stuff. So, this is going on out here, and I think that you all are aware of it. That's why it bothers me that you would continue to let them talk to each other about confidential information that way.

Denise: Let me respond to say that I am not aware of any financial connection between Halliburton and Texas Utilities and Brown & Root. I mean I know Brown & Root is a Halliburton company.

Hatley: That's what is going on. We will have when the time comes, there are people who are willing to testify, I'm not making this stuff up in my head, it is not important for me to do that. The important thing for me to do at this point in time as I see it, is to, and if my lawyer knew I was talking to you she would probably just die, but I don't care, I feel like there has to be somewhere that somebody has to trust somebody.

Denise: Right

Hatley: If we're ever going to get to what I think is the real problem out there. And the real problem is covering up of bad practices of construction and they are getting by with it, and if you will excuse the expression, through the ignorance of the investigators because they don't know where to look. And, like you just said, they turn it over to the utility and let them look. Well,

let me tell you, I was in the business of looking for 5 years. I know how. I know how to cover up, and I know how to look.

(Phone rings)

Denise: Turn off the recorder for just a moment while the phone is answered.
(recorder off)

Denise: We are back on the tape now. Let me, Mrs. Hatley, prevail upon you to repeat for us again on the subject since the tape recorder went off, if you would say again about your concern about the inspection, because we have talked about the 24 generalized statements which went to the utility from Mr. Ippolito, and we have had some discussions about how the NRC inspectors (tape goes inaudible here, about 10 seconds) would we go look, and I wonder if you would come back to that statement that you were making if we were told, would we go look and then you went into the identification of a hanger.

Hatley: If you were told where a problem area lies, would you look at more than just where it hangs? That's my question. Would you look at more than just the current revision of all the drawings that exist at the time, the package as is in the vault? Would you check the heat numbers on it to make sure that there was not 2,000 feet of heat numbers assigned to 3,000 feet of pipe? In other words, we bought 2,000 feet of pipe and the same heat number is on over 3,000 feet of pipe that is installed so the heat numbers were not, just assigned.

Denise: Multiplied like rabbits.

Hatley: It certainly has, as Chairman Block said, Brown & Root is our very industrious people, they bring their own material from home because whenever he went out to see the, after being told all day long by Mr. Baker and friends that Brown & Root knew where every one of the welding rods was that they had a complete control over them and then whenever he himself went to the site and they were laying around in stud buckets and laying on the floor, he knew that, gee, they sure are nice, they bring theirs from home. So, there's a whole big area of circus-like atmosphere, I call it, involved in this whole investigation. It's like its being poo-pood as opposed to investigated. I don't think that the investigation that is going on now by you all, or by Ippolito is going into in-depth investigation, which is what we asked you to do the very first.

Denise: Can I also ask you to say something about your concerns about hangers and unbolting and taking down a hanger to see what is behind it and welded Hiltite bolts?

Hatley: The information that we have, which is available to you at the plant, the statusing of the NCRs and so forth as this is just a small part, about I'd say 60-80 pages. They are identified individually, hanger numbers, and the

problem that existed at the time as in CC214545S43K which happens to be in Unit 2 and that it had a problem with the drawing. And it is not statused yet and it had an NCR written against it. I think that is one of the ones where the Hilte bolt is, they drilled it for it 4 times and it also has the tolerances. Now they have recently found out that there is over 1,000 hangers out there that were bought with the wrong tolerances. They are going to have to do something about it. Now they can't as-built those tolerances, they can't as-built them and let us sit still and go for it. What I'm referring, do you know what I'm talking about, where's there a hole too big and the Hilte bolt has got too much tolerance in there and it could be ripped from the wall in just a minute. They best not try to as-built those, and that's what they are trying to do on these when they are statusing this stuff. Let me give you an instance here of what the thing we are most concerned with - Most of these that I have are the ones that are modification because that's where I'm working on this printout right now. For instance, we have one here that is in the aux building, it's SWIAB01404004-3, there was an NCR written against that because there are 2 hangers out there with that same number. Now what are they going to do about it, how are they going to fix that problem? Traceability on materials BRXAB99, how are they going to fix that traceability problem? I can tell you how they are going to fix it, they are going to go to the box where that package is already installed and they are going to get someone who has recently been certified to go in and recertify that that material is where it needs to be (inaudible about 10 seconds). The in-depth investigation has to (tape inaudible about 7 seconds). The utility is saying that we are a bunch of kooks out here, we're not. We have a lot of technical information here that is drawing as they came in and where they were assigned and all this kind of stuff and what happened to them, all the (tape inaudible about 18 seconds).

Denise: And you believe that if we were directed by some specific (?) in our investigation we have a better chance of finding these things?

Hatley: Sure, because they are there and now let me tell you what I'm interested in telling you now about why hasn't somebody gone and asked them why are they retraining real fast all of the (the remainder of Tape 1, side A is inaudible, about 17 minutes).

(the first part of side B of Tape 1 is inaudible, about 4 minutes)

Denise: I've now turned the tape over, and we are ready to go back in business again.

Hatley: identified and sent to where it goes whenever the time comes and that's how we are able to know what is going on. Besides John Griffin as people that we have knowledge of that have been involved in some things that have happened out there, we have turned over the names of different people, some of which have been talked to by Brown & Root and the utility but not by the NRC yet. We don't understand what the delay is, why is it that given this information back in February, why have those people not even been talked to?

Why are some of them getting away? Why is the retraining process going on? Why hasn't that problem been identified by the NRC? You've had people out there since the day of February in mass, lots of people out there, either doing O&I or all kinds of things. Why are they not aware of the violations that are taking place, and if they are aware of them, then why does the utility deny it in the newspaper?

Denise: I don't, with respect to the retraining, I simply in answer to that, you say that some of this took place yesterday on the testing?

Hatley: Day before yesterday, and all of them but 5 failed that and everybody is very, very upset because we still don't have anybody to sign off that documentation. Now the question is, what about everything that was signed off prior to this when we did not operate under the ASME or ANSI standard. See, they discovered through our telling them that we were not operating under ANSI and ASME standards, that we did not even have anybody that was qualified to sign off the documentation. And do you know how we found out about it? By applying for jobs at other companies. We sent out credentials of people that are working out there and they said, you all don't have nobody, none of these that you sent are qualified to sign off nuclear documentation.

Denise: And so you put two and two together that says that if the other people require them to be qualified and the people aren't qualified, they should have been qualified down here but weren't, and therefore, bingo.

Hatley: Right, bingo. So we turned that information over and all of a sudden they came in and they decided that, bingo, we are not trained. And they did not even know where to go to find the task, this is what's really strange. So they started digging through Virginia Wassinger's old stuff, she's gone to another site now, and she was the only person we had out there that was qualified to get to another site, that's how come she's at another site or she would still be out here probably. And they dug through all her old notes and everything trying to come up with a test and a program that would be acceptable you know, that they could teach so they got these two boys out there, Ralph and Bill Darby, who don't know from straight up but they have extremely good communications, ability, and they have given them the job of designing this program, them and, now the man that you would need to talk to out there that really tell you what is going on, he's been there for a long, long time, he knows exactly what is coming down, and his name is Richard Wheeler. And he has the, he really knows a lot more than what I know about what is going down out there.

Denise: Is he Brown & Root?

Hatley: Yeah. And he's been in this program for a long time and he won't be fired for you talking to him or anything like that. The Darby boys, if you would just talk to them you would find out that they haven't got enough sense

to be doing what they are doing, so it's because of them that nobody passed the test. They're very upset about the fact that nobody passed the test.

Bangart: Were they conducting training? Were they helping conduct the training?

Hatley: Uh huh.

Denise: They're not Brown & Root employees?

Hatley: Yes, they're Brown & Root, Brown & Root QC, QE. So what's happened is they've taken Ralph Darby downhill, what happened is, that it turned out that the welding engineering part of it did better on the test than the quality control people did. See they're all taking the same test because we've got to get some qualified inspectors out there, if we don't, what's going to happen. They'll be in the same boat they got in Midland. And so they brought in everybody who wanted to take this course could take it and become \$11.95 an hour inspector if you could pass this course, so naturally they had a lot of people that wanted to take the course. That's why we're happy about at least other (phone ringing, inaudible) that's what they've been promised. And we've got that on tape so they got to give it to them or we'll take it to the EEOC, so anyway, they, the welding engineering people did better than the quality control people did. So they sent Ralph Darby down and he's working with them and they are the only ones that are signing off documentation right now. He's letting them review it and then he's signing as having been reviewed because somehow or another Ralph and Bill got certified.

Denise: They're ASME certified?

Hatley: Right. The two Darby boys that taught the course got certified. I venture to say that if they were given a level 2 inspector's test, they couldn't pass but that's my opinion, unless they had the book open. But that's what we're trying to get at, is that right now we don't have anybody out there, period. Linda Barnes quit and she was the one who was directing the whole program out there and she was being paid like \$7.00 an hour and they brought these QC hands up on the hill to sign off documentation and they didn't know how. They didn't even know how to do inspections. Yet they're level 2. This is one of the problems that we have widespread out there. Our quality control out there was in shambles and it still is in shambles because now they're trying to get them certified and they don't know how. Now any level 2 inspector should have been able to pass that test with flying colors. They shouldn't have had to have a 20 hour training course in order to be able to, they've been out there signing off stuff all this time as a level 2 inspector and yet they were not even able to pass the test that you have to pass in order to be a level 2 inspector. So, this has been going on ever since I've been there for 5 years now. Our quality control has been in shambles and it's Brown & Root's quality control. It's what got them in trouble in Houston. I don't know if you're familiar with Bay City or not.

Denise: South Texas project.

Hatley: Houston Power & Light kicked them off the site, kicked Brown & Root off the site, because they did not have a quality assurance program, the NRC busted them for it. Those same people that they kicked off of that site down there, you can go get the paperwork, it's very obvious, all the same ones that did not have a quality assurance program in South Texas, were shipped right up here. That's where they all are. And they got rid of all of our QC that did have qualifications. They run them all off and put Gordon Purdy and his bunch in there to take the place of Hock and all the ones that were there before. You could go back and look at the records and you could see where our qualified inspectors have gone to working on other jobs and you could see what has happened to the quality assurance program since they came up here from South Texas. And yet, now the utility allowed that to happen. The utility has to know that they were fired down in South Texas somehow or another, if Houston Power & Light kicked them off, Texas Utility's got to know that they did.

Denise: You mean kicked off Brown & Root? I'm confident that Texas Utility knows that they got kicked off the site.

Hatley: Then why don't they look at it from that angle up here?

Denise: They may have, I simply don't know.

Hatley: You don't know the answer to that. But instead of defending everything that Brown & Root is doing out here, publically, I'll put it that way, instead of crucifying all of the people who have information that they want to give about what's wrong out there, the utility is not taking that attitude at all. They're not coming in and saying, that any of us might have a legitimate gripe. I have not been allowed to go public as you know, I've got press this thick, but I have never been allowed to say anything to the press. and, I want to talk to the press. I want to talk to you. I want to talk to the utility, because I feel like that the whole story is not being told. But until we get past where we're going right now as far as this Washington thing is concerned, then we can't talk about what's going on with any degree of accuracy to be able to pinpoint things. But I think it's going to be, when we call, when we break this to the press, they'll probably do it around noon today, about the quality assurance program at Comanche Peak. And one of the things that they are going to hit right on the top because it's really important to them to keep knocking on Region IV is that all this time Region IV has had the opportunity to find this out and they never did. All this time we have not had quality inspectors at Comanche Peak that have proper quality assurance and nobody found it out until the whistle blowers decided to apply for jobs and found out they were not qualified because they were, and they never were qualified while they were at Comanche Peak. That's why the press eats it up, you know that, you read the press books where they do. Then Mr. Hendricks comes in and he says what he says about the utility knew it all along and they have already taken the remedial action and that they are in the

process of retraining and retesting right now, see. But don't you think that the public and everybody involved can see through that? What are they going to do about all of that stuff that was inspected prior to the time that we had qualified inspectors out there?

Denise: I simply don't know the answer to that question but it will have to have a good answer.

Hatley: Well, I want it more that just paper, pencil whipped. That's what they are doing with it now, is just doing it on paper down there with those QEs that recently made QEs out of the welding engineering department, and they are putting new cover sheets on pencil whipping that paper to make it look that all that inspection was done at a legitimate time when it was not. The cover up is going on at night in the vault.

Bangart: You're saying they're falsifying the records?

Hatley: I'm saying, falsifying the records, yes. And we have evidence of that.

Denise: Falsification, you mean by back dating?

Hatley: Yes. I'm saying that work was done when it was not. By saying that tests were done when they were not. By saying that heat numbers are actually assigned to pieces of steel that it is not assigned to. But we can put it on paper and we can make it look just like that it was. And the only way, like you said, it is going to take these mountains and mountains of documents to go through and they know that. If I had a heat number that applies to 2,000 feet of steel, and you're going to have to go in there and somehow or another you're going to have to computerize that. You're going to have to do the inspection to find it, you're going to have to go through every piece of paper to find out just how many feet of steel that there is with that heat number. Well that is a, like you said, that would cost them their 22 million dollars a day they talk about anyway, just to do that type of test, and I don't even know if it could be done or not. But I know that the person that was involved in that work, that worked in the vault with the ANI, the persons that were involved in that work with the ANI and all that kind of stuff, are giving sworn testimony to the fact that that's exactly what they did. So when it comes to the place to where this all goes public, and all the people that are involved go public on it, there's no way that the utility, and Brown & Root, and all them can cover up any further. There's too much believability in the people that are talking now, the people that are actually involved. And the only reason that there is not lots and lots and lots more talking that what are is simply because of the fact that they don't know if they are going to be protected. One way we'll know we've got one going out today, going to another site to apply for a job. We'll find out whether she's got protection or not. That's the only way we can do this stuff, is with trial and error and hope and that kind of stuff. You'd think that they would be tickled to death to have a whistle blower on the site

in some of these other places, but they are not necessarily tickled to death, you know, I don't know why.

Denise: What do you mean by protected? I was trying to really understand the

Hatley: OK, we have had people come out of the, that are still out at the plant, that have given sworn statements to Brooks Griffin and some of the other people from Washington. They are still employed at the plant. That tells us one good thing. OK. That so far that hasn't, and they are still employed in the place where they were, they haven't been shifted around, they still have access to the documentation. That tells us that those people are being protected.

Denise: The NRC is not violating their confidentiality.

Bangart: There's a great deal of sensitivity in the agency to do the best possible job that we can right now because of some of the events that have happened. And we are going to be more careful about revealing people's identity. In fact, I was in Washington yesterday sitting in the office, in Mr.? office and we were discussing matters associated with Comanche Peak and even for people who haven't asked for confidentiality, names are not even being used when people from the NRC are sitting in an office. The identity of people is, even within our own agency, is being determined on a need-to-know basis. Whether or not they've asked for confidentiality. So there's a great deal of sensitivity and we are taking extra measures to protect the identity of people.

Hatley: I really believe that.

Bangart: And I couldn't believe that even in a room with ?,

Hatley: With your own people.

Bangart: We couldn't use the names of people and in fact, most of the names of people were already known but we still were referring to them as individual A or B.

Hatley: Right. And that's how we have to refer to them too. The reason being for that is that we don't know, I don't think that anybody in your office or any other office is deliberately attempting, I do believe that some of them are attempting, I'd put one or two, somebody somewhere is leaking, it's not being leaked by accident, in the past now. The reason that nothing has leaked, I feel like nothing has leaked out of Region IV is, as far as I know, today is the first day that anybody has talked to Region IV of our people. I'm not saying you haven't talked to people from Comanche Peak that don't talk to us but from our people have not been, the ones that come to us when they come out, when we give them the, you probably have seen these because they are all over the place, the GAP rapsheet, and they come out through that. We have these

available for them as soon as they, those are pretty widespread all over the plant.

Denise: Gap Rap, huh?

Hatley: To tell them that they have someone available to help them if they have a problem and they want to talk about it, call these numbers and you can call collect, and they will send an investigator down to take care of it, take care of the investigation. So these people come out and we call the the GAP witnesses. Some of them have talked to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, some of them have talked to justice, some of them have talked to Congress, but they all have a story to tell.

Denise: So when you say your people, that's who you're referring to.

Hatley: The GAP people.

Denise: The GAP people, what you mean is our people.

Hatley: Yes, because I don't, the government ? project is the only agency right now that I feel like that really cares about the nuclear worker. They're also concerned with safety and safety-related items and all of the things that go with that. But they're more concerned with the fact that most of the whistle blowers are on food stamps and cannot get work in another area. They're concerned that even though as in Chuck's case where it was proven that the allegations that he made were true, and that the NRC knew about those allegations, that they covered it up so as to make him appear like a fool so he couldn't get work.

Denise: Chuck --

Hatley: Atchison. We know that Henry and Darlene Steiner were in the main telling the truth in their allegations and that has been proven in the hearings as well in the OI investigation, and yet they were forced to live on a poverty level for a long period of time. Henry has since gotten work and we won't tell anybody where, but it's not in the nuclear industry. Darlene and the baby will go to Washington with us but Henry won't get to go. That's why that he won't to get to go. And, so, the only people that have come to us and said let us help, if we can, in taking care of your needs during this time. We do not get financial assistance, GAP has no money, no big deal there. They do have legal protection for us. They assign the attorneys to us that need it, in fact, we had them come down, there'll be one here over the weekend taking statements on the whistle blowers that just came out in the last couple of weeks. They take a signed statement and it's written up so they have that information, sworn statement from the individuals when they do get out of there. If they want to file Department of Labor suit against the utility, then they will help with that in getting the filings done. The main thing that they try to do is get them established with the Texas Employment Commission so that we can get

unemployment started for them and food stamps where necessary if the person is that much in need. So, most of the time whenever somebody comes out, let's say prior to the time when I came out, they really didn't know where to go and if you call the Department of Labor, they're not really responsive. I will say from the depositions that I have that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission was not responsive either whenever they would go to them, because Henry and Bill and several of the others did go to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and gave their statements after they came out. That was how the investigation, have you read the OI investigation? I think both of you need to.

Bangart: Which OI investigation?

Hatley: ? Young did it.

Denise: Oh, that's not OI.

Hatley: Well, who is that?

Denise: That's IE. I have to see because, oh yes, I have read that. This is the one you are talking about dated January 3, 1984 from Mr. Durks to Chairman Palladino, yeah, I had, and this is the OI investigation that touches on Mr. Taylor's activities and disclosure of identity of people who provide information to the NRC. I guess that dealt with Mr. Atchison.

Hatley: Yeah, this is just this one investigation that was done.

Bangart: Nearly everybody in Region IV is well aware of that.

Hatley: Well, I didn't know whether everybody had read it or not because if you do it also says that they found some of the allegations to be true that the Steiners had made and that if that being the case, then why didn't the Nuclear Regulatory Commission itself, its attorney at the hearing, side with the utility. In fact, it was Mr. Muncio who questioned Ms. Steiner for 5 hours, from 5 in the afternoon until 10 at night.

Denise: I believe your're telling me that that was a very great physical strain on Darlene Steiner.

Hatley: She had been with the baby all day, they had to bring the baby to the hearing and she had been taking care of the baby all day. They had been sequestered at the NRC's insistence, sequestered man and wife from each other.

Bangart: At Judge Block's order, or what?

Hatley: Yeah. But it was at the NRC's request. Yet the other witnesses were not sequestered apart from each other. They were sequestered as a group but our witnesses were sequestered from each other, this is during hearings. Darlene had taken care of the baby all day and then that night at 5:00, they

called her to start her testimony. Then they kept her on the stand until 10:00 that night.

Denise: No dinner?

Hatley: No dinner, no coke, nothing. Muncio was shaking his finger in her face, telling her that she had perjured herself. That's all in the licensing hearing testimony.

Denise: You're referring to Gary Muzuno, I think.

Hatley: I don't know. I'm quite sure that's what his name is, I just feel like that if he was working for me, I'd fire him. Because, and he is, as a public official, working for me.

Denise: Working for you, yes.

Hatley: But I would not tolerate that if it was mine, but I don't have that authority. Anyway,

Denise: But you're concerned that he was abusing Darlene?

Hatley: Yes, I don't think that whether or not I'm concerned, the fact is that the testimony's down here in the library along with every other thing that has come about and that particular part of the transcript which is probably about the same size as mine there because the 4 hour interview or 5, speaks for itself. We don't have to defend Darlene and we don't have to accuse Muzio, all we have to do, what's his name, Muzuno, all we have to do is make that available to the people who do not know it exists. Once we have made that particular thing available to the people who do not know it exist, then, they say, "what was the NRC doing to this person who is supposedly a witness for the NRC?" And the method that he did it. So, that's why the other organizations are involved in this instead of just the NRC.

Denise: Now, you said she was a witness for the NRC. She wasn't an NRC witness.

Hatley: She was a witness for the people. She represents the people. The NRC is supposed to represent the people. So therefore, we as one should be for the people as opposed to for the utility.

Denise: I agree with the concept, I was just trying to be sure that when we were talking as Judge Block, we talked about the parties, he would talk about the utility, he would talk about the NRC, he would talk about GAP as being separate parties, but I don't have any problem with your concept that the NRC works for the people.

Hatley: Supposedly. But, if you go through there, and this has been one of my jobs since I've been off of work, and I'm pretty good with documentation, you can go through there and see how many times has the NRC ruled with the utility or sided with the utility on, whenever Judge Block has taken the panel ideas on whether something should be left in or taken out, whatever, and it doesn't matter what it is, they just say, if the utility says yes, it's yes, if the utility says no, it's no, and never have they ever gone against the utility and I find that quite interesting that they didn't ever choose to rule with CASE or with the PEC. They rule with the utility. They ride on the airplane with the utility, coming down from Washington, meaning Nick and his crew and the NRC attorneys all ride together on the same airplane. I think they ought to change that. We have to fly Piedmont. We can't afford Braniff. They ought to have to fly Piedmont.

Bangart: Piedmont is cheaper?

Hatley: Piedmont \$249, Braniff's \$300. We'd really rather fly Braniff.

Bangart: Let me just clarify the air fare thing. Whenever we fly on an airline that offers the Federal government rate. There's a special set of fares.

Hatley: Is there, for you?

Bangart: We only fly, generally as rule, on those airlines that offer. Braniff is one that does offer the government fare.

Hatley: Wonder if we can do that?

Bangart: Talk to Braniff.

Hatley: Well, we'd like to, on this case where we're going up through Piedmont has a layover.

Bangart: We don't, in a fair amount of certainty, the fact that attorney from the utility and NRC people may end up on the same flight is only because of coincidence. Not because they plan to fly together and discuss matters during the flight and

Hatley: I'm sure that that's true.

Bangart: It perhaps it was the timing of the flight that got into DFW at a time that they needed to and the timing was such that both parties, that was a convenient time to arrive so it was just by circumstances. We have a very strict code of conduct that we're very aware of, and I won't say there aren't instances where the code of conduct was violated. In a sensitive matter like this I can speak that there would have been no attempt to conduct business between ourselves and

Hatley: Well, then if that's the case, then why is Mr. Taylor allowed to go into the utility room and get coffee and talk to the people if he's with the NRC? See, we associate Mr. Taylor directly with the utility because that's where he always was, with the utility, and at the hearings, when we're at the hearings, he goes into the room and drinks coffee with the utility personnel, just like he did when he was at Comanche Peak. If he's NRC, it would seem to me like that would be against the rules.

Denise: Well, whether it would be against the rules is one question, but it's certainly a bad image to think, and I'll see if we can't fix that. If things look cozy they might be cozy....

Hatley: Well, it's always been cozy in the past and there's been nothing done to change it. That's what, when you called me, and you said what's going on and I told you what's going on, that's what's going on. You all ain't changing nothing. Here we got 4 months later, we have given what information that we have, we've channeled our people into the NRC, we've tried to do everything possible to help in this thing to get it done and the thing that we get more than anything else is that article that Ippolito put in the paper, if that was meant to damage us, it did damage us.

Denise: I don't know what you mean.

Hatley: The, Ippolito gave the utility the list of 24 things. He, according to his quote in the paper, did not find any problem with those areas. And Mr. Hendrick and all of them said that that was true. And they're going to change the scheduling date back to where they said it was going to be because everybody says that everything is ok and the allegations made were not in fact substantiated in the investigation. Now that is the way....

Bangart: You're referring to the 24? I don't believe there has been, the statements that the 24 were acceptable were made only in the context that that practice of giving them to the utilities to assess and then have the NRC review is an acceptable practice. The resolution of those 24 allegations has not yet taken place.

Hatley: But that wasn't in the paper.

Bangart: Well, I don't have the article in front of me but I know what the intent of the words were.

Hatley: Well, that's what Finn said, on Friday the, on Wednesday, we got one story, on Thursday we got another story, both of those were damaging to us. And on Friday Ben put the article in the paper saying they can build on that stuff as long as they want to but we aren't licensing until it's ready. That's where we got to where we had to be as far as our people were concerned because the minute that came out, our telephone started ringing out here saying, hey,

they done come out here and said this place was clean after all, and we know that it is not. That's what it looked like the paper said.

Bangart: The plant will not be licensed until the allegations that I mentioned are dispositioned. If the corrective action has been taken or we find there is not a safety concern on the matter behind the allegation. Either a specific one or the generic implications of the allegation.

Hatley: How will you, or do you know who will be in charge of the VCD program?

Denise: I don't know because there will be team leaders in a number of different technical areas. The inspection team leaders have not been selected yet. The matter is before Mr. Durks right now till a crew, getting people from different parts of the agency and assembling them to the task force. So, as you understand, one of the reasons for the delay on the part of the agency in following up on the allegations that have been identified,

Denise: We don't need any more.

Hatley: I'm listening, go ahead.

Bangart: is that when we create a task force, we're gathering bodies from different parts of the NRC. To do that, we're delaying other work every time we do it. What's happened to this point in time is that there was Diablo Canyon task force that addressed allegations at that plant. There now is a Waterford task force addressing allegations at Waterford. The next task force in line is the Comanche Peak task force. The agency at this point in time has decided we cannot concurrently have task forces going because of the drain that they place on the other work. That decision may change but up to this point in time that's the way Mr. Durks has chosen to operate. Waterford work is winding up. We anticipate that the Comanche work will begin within the space of the next few weeks.

Hatley: I agree that it's causing all this problem with everybody scattered out everywhere trying to get the task force done. I was in Washington during the hearing on ??? dropped the bomb on them about

Bangart: Mr. Young became famous all of a sudden, didn't he?

Hatley: Jim was famous in my mind a long time before that. Mr. Young just grew 9 feet tall. Whenever he did what he did and I still agree that Mr. Yen is right. In fact, if one of the issues that we will be addressing here is that our hangers were the same, built in the same time frame, they are all Grenell or MPSI built in the same time frame as the Diablo Canyon and we don't feel that ours are a bit better than anybody else's. Well, hello, come here. Come here to your grandma. What'd you bring me?

Denise: We're going off the tape a second.

Denise: We're back on tape.

Hatley: On the problems that I was talking about that I feel like have not been addressed and I don't know how they will ever address them without going way, way back are the ones that they have as-built or VCDs. We have, started to go through this

Bangart: VCD means

Hatley: Vendor certified drawing. I don't know how they come to get a VCD. I never have figured that out yet and I've been out there for a long time. A lot of it happens in the field and a lot of it happens other places but we have, probably starts back here, ok, on a situation where, for instance, CS1240007A42R, has an NCR against it and the NCR is M07673S. The reason that the NCR was written is because it has an incorrect weld symbol, the hanger has an incorrect weld symbol. So, what they did to remedy that situation was to revise the drawing. Now how can you revise a drawing to reflect an incorrect weld symbol?

Denise: Now, let me be sure I understand this. You're saying that the drawing had an incorrect weld symbol on the drawing.

Hatley: No.

Denise: Ok, what did you mean?

Hatley: When the quality control inspector went out to the field to look at CS1240007A42R, the documentation that that person held in their hand signified that there was a weld made and it was made by a certain person who has a certain weld symbol.

Denise: OK.

Hatley: Ok, but the person who signed it off as having the weld symbol and the weld symbol that was actually on the weld are different. So how can they change the drawing to make that, to rectify that situation?

Denise: I think they went out, I'd just give you a guess that they have to find who made the welding where they were certified and

Hatley: But they didn't do that.

Denise: NO. What did they do then, they just changed

Hatley: They eliminated the weld off the drawing. The weld is still there, it still has the improper weld symbol on it but it doesn't show up if you look at the drawing.

Denise: It doesn't show up on the drawing. What do you mean when you say weld symbol? You mean the welder's identification?

Hatley: Yes. So this

Bangart: Could it be that they said what Dick was describing and you just don't know whether or not they did the proper analysis and then changed the drawing or do you feel that people provided information that they know with a reasonable amount of certainty that they did not do the justification before they changed the drawing.

Hatley: That's what I was telling you. Because in order to have done that they would have had to have cut out that weld and have it rewelded. And they didn't do that. They have a weld symbol out there, this is just between the three of us, you made a weld, he come along and put his symbol on it, ok for some reason or another that we don't know because that's why that happened with some cases, so that he doesn't really know what's in that weld. You were the one that made the weld.

Bangart: I understand.

Hatley: OK, cosmetically, if he'd just looked at it it could look fine. But come along and if they call me out there and they say look at this and tell me if you think it's ok and I look on my paperwork and I see where there has been a penetration test on it and it looks like it was ok, and somebody signed that off, and I look at it visually and I don't see anything wrong with it, then I would sign that off as being a correct weld but I wouldn't know what was underneath it. So the importance of it would be that you welded it and you stamped it so you don't know what was underneath what you did.

Denise: I understand the potential importance, the only point I was exploring is I believe that with the kind of situation described there, there are administrative control ways to resolve the issue if you document the resolution problem.

Hatley: I don't know how they could that because what I think has happened in this situation

Bangart: Without having to go cut out the weld.

Hatley: What we're talking about on this particular one, I think, cause this is just one of many as you can see, that one with the little red check on it, and these are page after page after page of this stuff. On this particular instance the reason that the weld symbol does not match what should be there,

the fellow who stamped his weld symbol on it did the cover up work on it, not the actual welding on it and that the rods were drawn for. Do you know what a weld data card is?

Denise: Yeah.

Hatley: And how they document all this kind of stuff? It has to be documented all the way through and so this is just one of the ways that the cover up was discovered. On this particular one, I do not think that it has been fixed. I think it's been VPD'd. A lot of these, here's the one with the material problem, DD101911A33R has a material problem so they revised the drawing to match the material. CS135806S53R welding dimension, what'd they do, the welding dimension was off on the drawing on the actual hanger that was in the field and they revised the drawing to match the hanger. Now you say that there is engineering judgment and all this kind of stuff taking place and that is why they are allowed to do that but whenever it's in the whole scheme of things, the trending and everything that is going on with it, whenever there is more than half of the ones that are VCD'd or as-built in the field, then it would seem that we have some design problems, that we're having to redesign it as we go out in the field

Bangart: That's what I say when, in looking, following up my allegations, the efforts of the inspection teams. We will not only look at the specifics but when I say we'll look at the generic issues and general management control? will be associated with the specifics. We'll look to see that they pictured. That's being done right now in the area of intimidation. The agency is questioning, we have allegations regarding intimidation on a number of different places right now and there's some generic assessment being made. What do these individual pieces of information taken collectively mean about the way the work and the inspections were done at the site. And there's going to be a decision made as to whether or not the utility needs to be challenged on the intimidation issues in a general sense and what it means for the overall quality of the plant. I don't know if they will be or not but that question is being asked right now.

Hatley: Well, it should be asked, that's true.

Bangart: So the same kind of thing will follow in this area. If there is a pattern developing that shows that things are being perhaps dispositioned in a way that, there isn't a sound analysis behind it, then we'll attempt to look at that also.

Hatley: Well, the person that seems to be doing, or the persons that seem to be doing the best investigation at this point in time is A&I. A&I has discovered quite a lot of things, in fact, they are discovering that a lot of these documents are signed off by people who were not even there that day on the payroll. The NRC could have investigated that, couldn't they? To find out if people on these questionable documents that we have produced as far as there

being falsification of documentation, falsification of weld symbols and all this kind of stuff, they could have investigated that and found that in many cases, the person was not present on the site when it happened. The girl that signed off the entire ? wasn't even onsite whenever the welds were made and yet she signed it off. Now how could that be?

Denise: What did she sign off? That the welds were made correctly?

Hatley Yes. The weld ?

Denise: I'm not trying to be evaluative, but you have to look at the details of what you mean by that.

Hatley: In order to pass A&I and to get by the NRC by its own directive, there were certain things that had to be done as far as getting the documentation to match where it had to be. This was after the CAT team report in 1982, after, I think it was in October, was it, or March, CAT team. This one comes back from, I don't know the date on this because I don't have it marked. But at that time, and this has been back, I think this CAT team report is why the satellites came into being which was over a year ago. At that time is when the NRC said that our current way of doing things out there as far distribution documentation was concerned was not acceptable and therefore changes had to be made so we went to the satellite system which was over a year ago. At that time the NRC made it's directive to whoever it is they give these to, because I only got two pages of it and I don't know where the rest of it comes from. I only know that these were brought to me by some of the people from out at the plant. The part of it that it refers to is back in 1982 when all this investigation was going on, one of the things that was identified in that was that the NRC CAT inspector could not determine when a component was finally inspected. This was back over a year ago. That problem has not been addressed yet. The design change process that CPSES is complex and at all times cumbersome. The NRC CAT inspector's review of design change processes in the various disciplines revealed that a design change program with control incorporated under design construct design review philosophy. The philosophy resulted in a large number of design changes and a repetitive instation process. "Note: There are approximately 70,000 CMCs and 15,000 DCAs that have been issued. This number does not include the revisions." It goes on and on to tell us what they found over a year ago at Comanche Peak and identified as problems. This is our only NRC doing this thing. And yet the final part on that paragraph says "Thus, the final adequacy of these controls could not be determined by the NRC CAT inspector." These problems that we're trying to get to the public or to get someone to address have been in existence and identified as being in existence for a long, long time.

Denise: Apparently, even by the NRC.

Hatley: Certainly.

Denise: Since that's our report you're reading from.

Hatley: Right. They set up the satellite system to take care of, but at the same time, what they were supposed to do and according to their directives in the thing, was that they were supposed to stop writing design changes, start work on incorporating design changes, make sure that they were being incorporated correctly and all this kind of stuff, that the utility's supposed to do that and they didn't do that. They started piling it all into that computer and hiding all the problems. And that's where they're at now, they're hid in the computer. You all don't know how to look. I'm sorry to tell you but you don't know how to look. And you won't know because it's a very intricate process. Unless you do start with page 1 and go through but whenever they started putting the stuff into the computer, the whole purpose, see that's what they told me from day one when I started the satellites a year ago yesterday. They said, it's all going to be all right, it's all going to be ok when we get it into the computer. Don't worry about fixing this audit, don't worry about covering that up, it's all going to be ok when we get it into the computer. It will all be hid then and we won't have to worry about it. Well, as it turns out, it was not just hid, it was covered up and a lot of the things that were supposed to be right were hidden. They were wrong and they were supposed to make them right and they hid them instead. I know that this is true and I know where to go and find the problem. The problem that I'm saying is that you all knew this, the NRC knew this way back before the satellites were ever started and I didn't know about the CAT team report and all of the stuff that went with it except that we were setting up the satellite under the directive of the NRC and that the utility had hired SIGNA to investigate because obviously, the NRC does not have the personnel to be able to do it. I might mention on tape right here that I was never audited in the satellite by the NRC and I set them up from the day that I started until the day that I left and they were never audited by the NRC. They were audited twice by SIGNA, once in October and once in July. The July is another audit altogether that we talked about in Washington but we don't talk about here. That's going to that much more substantiate that there was a conspiracy going on at the time.

Denise: Did you talk in Washington to Mr. Ippolito about the July audit?

Hatley: No we did not not. We talked to Bruce Griffith.

Denise: To Bruce Griffith?

Hatley: Isn't that his name, Bruce Griffith, Brooks.

Denise: Oh, you mean Brooks Griffin from OI.

Hatley: Yes, I think he's beautiful. He wears \$500 dollar shoes. And Brooks Brother suits. He is a pretty person. I like him. He was extremely nice to me too. But yes, they have all the conspiracy that's gone on.

Bangart: Let me just clarify, that's not the CAT inspection itself, those are excerpts from inspection reports.

Hatley: This just happens to be a couple of pages that someone brought me because it substantiated some of the allegations that I was

Bangart: Somebody has taken different paragraphs out of that report and tabulated them as examples of areas of concern that were identified in the CAT report. Is that not correct?

Hatley: Well, it looks as though as it was done, this is an intricate part of it if you'll look and see, these are just some copies of some pages that were taken from the

Denise: Taken from CAT report. Right.

Hatley: These were the areas of concern that I was addressing and everybody was acting like this was the first time that they'd ever heard this story before. Someone out there at the plant said that's a bunch of bull cause we'd heard this a long time ago and over a year ago, that the problem existed then they wanted me to have this before I went to Washington so I'd have it to take up there to substantiate the fact that I'm not the first one that's come out of there screaming about things being wrong as far as documentation. The thing that we get real tickled about with the NRC is that they keep saying safety-related, is it safety-related. There's not anything that goes on at Comanche Peak that is not safety-related when it comes to the construction of that plant. There are certain cables that are not identified as being safety-related. But if those cables catch on fire and burn safety-related cables then they become safety-related. I don't like the idea that part of this thing is addressed as safety-related and other parts of it is not. The thing that we were talking about is this deal with my son whenever we go into a critical situation and there has to be some work done on an area as they had it TMI. Mr. Denise has seen the documentation out there that I'm referring to. I would like to see

(tape 2, side A)

Denise: We just started a new tape now.

Denise: You were saying that TMI

Hatley: OK

Denise: Or, I've seen it.

Hatley: The documentation that we looked at out there and the volumes for one drawing, the amount of design changes and stuff that effects it, and no final thing to look at on stuff that has been bought off before fuel load, that's in the fuel building out there right now and the drawings are this thick. If we get into a problem say a hanger breaks loose out of the wall and that causes the pipe to break that might put us into a cooling motor situation or something like out there. This can happen in our house, you know, just on a day-to-day operation. It's entirely possible it can happen out there. When it happens in your house you go and find out where does that pipe goes and how is it effected. Out there to go and pull the documentation that is supposed to be affected by that pipe would be impossible and then to sort it out would take two or three days. What we want is for them to have our blueprints the way that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission said they had to have them in order for us to operate so that whenever something breaks they can go in there and say, this is broken, let's see how to fix it.

Bangart: Will there not be final as-built drawings that summarize in one place all the changes that have been made during construction?

Hatley: There was not. Let me say this

Denise: There's not now.

Hatley: Well, they turned over now, don't forget, we turned over two areas and those two areas that were turned over, meaning that construction was finished and they are in their final phase, they were not.

Denise: But there is a requirement for accurate as-built drawings to accomplish just exactly what you said so that you can know where things are when you need to do something.

Hatley: When is that requirement going to be enforced?

Denise: I can't answer that question, in terms of fuel load or licensing, they need to have it at a reasonable time. In general, I'd say before plant goes into power operation there's not a direct need for the as-built because the plant is accessible. You can get in and if there is, as you say, a pipe broken you can go look at it because you're not involved with radioactive materials at that point.

Hatley: That's why we were concerned about Diablo Canyon going hot because at that point in time you could go in and do stuff, now you can't. Now you have to put on all the gear and go in and fix it.

Bangart: As a matter of fact, we obtained copies of piping - diagrams for important systems in the plant because we maintain them as a part of our own

emergency response readiness, so that something happens at the plant, we can pull up drawings and review what's happening and hopefully,

Hatley: It might be interesting for you to know that in the hearings that just went on last week up there, correct me if I'm wrong in assuming that you all think that the SIGNA audit was to, the SIGNA on the welding issues, they were to go in and do the audit to say that everything was complete in the field building and in the radwaste program, and that it was good, complete, and it was good. That was what the hearings were all about. And yet, at the hearing we find out that the drawings are changing revisions even though they've been turned over. Because whenever they presented a drawing into evidence it was in Rev 6 and they asked Nancy Williams how come, she said that was not the drawing that she did it on, that it was on Rev 5. She did her investigations final report on Revision 5 of that drawing, and yet Revision 6 had come out since she did her investigation, which was to have been the final investigation by the utility.

Bangart: I don't have any knowledge

Hatley: And Chairman Block, he said this can't be. You did your final analysis based on the final product that was out there. That's what your job was, to go out there and look at that thing and tell us that it was ok, meaning, telling me and ?, that's what they hired SIGNA to do, to go out and look and see if it's ok. That's the utility hired them, at the NRC's request and that SIGNA does report to the NRC. And yet, they are not, and that was what they were supposed to do and they're still revising that stuff out there after Nancy did it. After she made her investigation out there of the final thing, they're still working on it. Now, you can't keep on if, I mean you can't have 20 final drawings, there's only 1 final drawing.

Bangart: I'll have to agree to that statement.

Hatley: But they are not agreeing with that.

Denise: There is a final drawing at some point in time, it doesn't mean there won't be revisions. But at whatever point in time that she was doing her evaluation, she should have had the current drawing at that time.

Hatley: She did have and it was, even by her own testimony, it was presented to her as the final drawing. She was not aware that a Revision 6 came out.

Denise: After her visit to the plant.

Hatley: After her visit to the plant. She thought she was doing a final markdown on a turned over part, so she was just as much surprised that they're still working on the part that she had investigated as anybody was. What I'm trying to get across to you is that in itself tells you that there was cover up done prior to the time that Nancy came on to do the investigation. They told

her this area was complete. During the time she was there there was no work going on but yet the work was not complete and it was not correct because they are still going in there doing work in that same area today. And that was supposed to be turned over. I'm going to be real honest with you to say that I do not think that they would have found the 1,000 hanger packages that are not right in reactor 1 if we hadn't told them where to go. Now the question is going to be what are they going to do to cover them up.

Denise: Have they found them now?

Hatley: Yes, they ?

Bangart: 1,000 hanger packages. You mean Brown & Root identified them?

Hatley: Mmhuh. The utility has identified them.

Bangart: Can you help them identify them?

Hatley: Yes.

Denise: And your question is, what are they going to do about it now that they found out 1,000 hanger packages, whether it's a replacement or

Hatley: It's a healthy violation. The holes are too big. Now the only way they are going to be able to correct that and do it right, unless they just all go up there and say engineering judgement says ok, they can go and pull that Hilti bolt down and they put a washer behind it. I don't know if that's acceptable with the ASME/ANSI standards or not, to cover up that hole, or that they get a new plate to go in where those violations took place and have it redrilled. What we are wanting them to do is make them pull those plates once and for all. I mean, you say you go in and pull six, there are 1,000 of them. You said that all that you could pull was six, I think that if you pulled six and they were right, it would be extraordinary.

Bangart: Have you or your people done some analysis that lead you to believe the improper size of the holes leads to unacceptable structural weakness?

Hatley: No, we didn't but the ANSI Standards and the ASME Code did and we violated the code and the standard in every instance. There is room for 1/8 inch tolerance. The way it was interpreted at Comanche Peak is that it could have an 1/8 inch on all sides which put it into 1/4 inch which is in violation. So that doesn't take an engineering judgment. That just takes a violation that they are all, the holes are too big, according to ANSI and ASME Standards. The part that you don't know about that we do know about because we've all worked out there is that when you pull some of those plates down off the wall you are going to find where the holes were drilled in there several times and in some instances regouted and in some instances not regouted.

Denise: And you're saying they should have been regouted?

Hatley: Well, yeah, you don't want holes up there in the wall in the reactor. Just left there where somebody drilled in and hit rebar. That should be documented somewhere that you done, we can rebar structure and that there's a hole in there.

Denise: Oh, you mean that they cut rebar.

Hatley: Umhum, and we've got the witnesses that are coming out right now that got the rebar readers and can tell you exactly where to go and find the cut rebar that is not documented. I know it's difficult for you all to work when you don't know what we know but what the problem is that when these people come out and they talk to you all, you won't go do nothing about it so

Bangart: Give us a couple more weeks and we'll be there in-mass and what I would encourage you to do is to encourage your people to provide specific information to the team members who are going to be asking for clarification about the allegations.

Hatley: OK, I want to ask something here, if we do that then are we entitled to an answer as to what they found whenever we gave them information?

Bangart: The agency has a policy right now that alledgers will be informed of the disposition of allegations that are made. What we did and the findings that we made as a result of that.

Hatley: That's what we're seeing done and what we're hearing is being done and what is being done, a lot of time we have to read it in the newspaper. We don't like that, but

Bangart: We read a lot about ourself that's the first time we hear it, too.

Hatley: Well, you ought to ask Mr. Hendrick. He's the spokesman for all the big business up there. But as I say we do have a lot of specifics on a lot of these. This is the print out that is available to you all. It's made by everybody everywhere.

Denise: What kind of print out are you

Hatley: It's tracking.

Denise: Have you got a Brown & Root print out of tracking?

Hatley: Yeah, it's a listing of all of the NCRs that were current at that time and some of them, the status of them, this is in the reactor building whenever they started to turn unit 1 over, everything is ready to go in reactor 1, and so, at the time that the turnover was supposed to take place, we've got all

these NCRs that were written against it at that time and the disposition that they did of those NCRs is what we find questionable. Like whenever a weld symbol and excessive grinding, a weld symbol's been ground off and there's excessive grinding on a hanger, how can you revise the repair process sheet and the drawing to make that right? There would have to be, somewhere there will have to be some documentation of an engineering judgment. There's going to have to be some new tests made if there is not a weld symbol present on that weld, then they are going to have to retest that weld and get somebody to stamp it off as being correct in order to make that particular issue right. You can't just revise the paperwork and make it all go away. That's what they are doing. In many instance I'm sure that they are able to revise the paperwork, but does that make it right. On this one where it says the welding is not per procedure, and it hasn't been statused yet, we don't even know what the problem is on it, it's NCR No. M9046. But what I'm trying to say if you all go in, you don't even, the NRC as of last week did not know that this existed and whenever they asked the utility or Brown & Root for it they did not know what they were talking about, therefore, it was not provided for them. There is another

Denise: Is that called by, the thing you are referring to, called by a specific name?

Hatley: No, it doesn't have a name. This an internal document, not one that is given to every Tom, Dick and Harry that comes along.

Denise: I can understand that but I'm just

Hatley: But all things have to have names, right, identification. We're not real sure that this one has one.

Denise: When you tell me that the NRC can't get it because the do not know how to ask for it, then I want to solve that problem. How do we ask for it?

Bangart: It's a computerized NCR status printout.

Hatley: But there's two. There's two. Let me show you the other one. So when you ask for it, you don't get what I've got, you get another thing which looks like that.

Denise: OK, that says that's in the master data system.

Hatley: This is the one that the public gets to see, this is the one that's covered up.

Denise: So the thing that Mrs. Hatley's referring to is a trend description and status of NCRs that starts out with a column "ID," second column "NCR/Room," third column "Issued," under which are dates, fourth column "PRPT," fifth column "trend," sixth column "Description/Status," sixth column "Subsystem," seventh column "Item," and eighth column "Individual

Responsibility," under which individual responsibility are a number of letters, that is TF, MPS, N-E, etc.

Hatley: I thought I could find that front page, but I can't. This doesn't have the real front page on it.

Denise: OK, now, is that thing I just looked at, is that the same, can I just, because because, when I go to look for it, you don't have to give me that, when I go to look for it and say, ok, if I find a report that goes across and has ID and NRC/Room, Issued, PRPT, trend, etc., then I'll know that that's what I'm looking at which is different that something else called a master data system and other information such as that that you refer to, so I could now find that system. That's correct. Appreciate that kind of clarification, again I'm concerned about looking for the needle in the haystack and not knowing what to ask for that you said if we just knew what to ask for we could do a better job.

Hatley: This is a print out that I assume was made up for the task forces because as the individual responsible for solving this problem often out here on the site, it has TF, so I'm going to assume that this print out was done for the task force to get these problems taken care of so that the building could be turned over as a unit.

Denise: You're talking about the utility task force?

Hatley: No, I'm talking about Brown & Root's task force.

Denise: Brown & Root's task force.

Hatley: I didn't know the utility had one but I'm not surprised if they do because everybody has task forces.

Bangart: We're not saying we know about how many task forces there is out there.

Hatley: So, since I had not seen this print out and was not aware of its existence until after I had come out from the inside, then this is the only print out that we were able to identify or try to get to what the NCR problems were on this, that we were real anxious when we got this one to have some of these items checked out which we did by our own people that are out there. There is a lot of spare time, people standing around doing things so they have time to go and check stuff. We have a lot of people that are working in the vault and still in the satellite. I say a lot of people, I just say they are Brown & Root employees that care about what is going on and if we ask them to go and look at something, they will go and look at something for us. That's how we're able to get clarification on some of this documentation that you say how do I know that this is not done or that that's done, or whatever, that we get it from those people and the sources that we have so far have been extremely reliable.

Bangart: The significance of this printout you say that we haven't seen is that it has the trending information in it that shows that

Hatley: It shows that trending did take place and that the amount of trending that took place. This trend right here, see where it says trend, somewhere in that computer you should be able to punch that button up and find out what percentage of those were VCD'd as far as the problem is, what percentage of the problems on the NCRs that were written out there did they VCD, 40, 50 percent? Is that how they solved it all was with paperwork? Or did they actually go in and do what had to be done because according to what we have they did not go and make repairs, they did not cut out things that were wrong and fix them. They revised the paperwork to make it right.

Bangart: I understand now how that printout fits into your concern.

Hatley: If you all have this printout then you were talking about specifics, where can we go and get specifics, well it's got right here all you need. It's got a drawing number, it's got location, the reactor building, it's got the problem and everything. These were problems before, these were problems that were identified by the utility. Now that they've been identified by the utility what did the utility do in order to, or Brown & Root, I'll put it that way, what did they do to make it right?

Bangart: You understand that we are not going to go back behind every NCR to see that every NCR was

Hatley: I didn't ask you to.

Denise: But within that list you have some knowledge either personally or the people that you're in contact with, that some of those in your view were not handled correctly and you could identify those, too? Then we'd be both looking at the same sheet of paper. And our investigation could be better reigned and more directed with that kind of information.

Hatley: But I may say this, on the specifics, we do not know what Ippolito's report is going to say on the specifics that we have given him, but he was given specifics and we don't what the problem, how the problem is going to be addressed on some of the things that could not be corrected that we identified as problems. That's going to determine a whole lot about what happens and hopefully his report will be out soon. He promised, didn't he, mid-May?

Bangart: Was this the report of the activities by the group from Region II who came in for a period of a couple of weeks?

Hatley: Came back in, how long has it been since I got back. About April something, around the first of April they came in and they started their investigation out there.

Bangart: I was not involved with that at all. I don't know what the status of the report is.

Hatley: In that instance, we guided Ippolito and the group that was doing that investigation, we gave them specifics. We gave them NCR numbers that need to be looked at, we told them CMCs, we told them drawing numbers that were changed and this kind of stuff. We don't know what the results of their investigation was from the information that we gave them and until we see that information we certainly wouldn't want to give anybody else the additional information. Till we know. See, in one case, there's a piece of out of round pipe out there that is in concrete. What are they going to do about that? Somebody's going to have to do something about it because it's leaking and the concrete's wet. It's not something that we can just say blow it off.

Denise: The out of round pipe is leaking. Is that what you're saying?

Hatley: The pipe is out of round where it connects to the other pipe and what they did to cover that up, there was an NCR written against the out of round pipe, and so once they, they couldn't solve this problem by changing it, cut the piece out and put a new piece in there, because it is inbedded in concrete. What they did is change the documentation and as you are going along there and you're looking, you saw those massive amounts, and we only saw what was current. Now, we only was what was current. But if we had had in that same package that I showed you, if we had gone back on that CS1SB14 drawing, if we had gone back and pulled all the documentation against that, you'd see that back at CMC80104. CMC80104 Rev 3 calls for a piece number 38. Rev 4 doesn't call for any piece at all. Rev 5, which is the one that is current this time, calls it piece number 48. So it changed the piece number on the drawing number and that made it all ok because all that spool pipe was out of round that piece number 38 came out of. So they said that in that CS1SB14 that particular pipe, they just changed the number of it from piece number 38 to piece number 48.

Denise: You were telling me the other day what level in containment that was on. Do I recall that was 840 level.

Hatley: 840. And he probably just went in there cause the wall's wet. This is what kind of flows I had opened because it's

Denise: I can understand a piece of pipe being out of round but I'm not sure I can understand your direct connection with why that makes the wall wet unless the piece of pipe was leaking.

Hatley: Where that piece goes into the other piece, the joint. On one side of the joint is good pipe, on the other side of the joint is that pipe that's out of round and it's leaking. Where they interjoin. You can't match up like that. So it's drip, drip, drip. Only when they hydro those, so you have to, it's not always got water in it.

Denise: To talk about more specificity, do you happen to know what kind of system that pipe is associated with, fire water system, containment spray system?

Hatley: CT1SB14, that's the drawing number on it. That information has already been turned over.

Denise: Is that some of the information you gave to Mr. Ippolito?

Hatley: Yeah. We don't know how they addressed that problem. If they say that it didn't exist, how do they take care of it. In reference to this one right here, CT1SB14, that's the hours sheet on it. Here's the other pieces of pipe that were out of round in that system.

Denise: OK, this is the one you're referring to, NCRN4015, because it's from the pipe fab shop. It's got a drawing and a heat number and, well, this is an NCR. It doesn't have anybody's name on it. I guess it's reported by

Hatley: Yeah. That's your inspector.

Denise: Inspector 99282. Again this refers to a training category M13. It says a stainless 10 inch stainless schedule 40 steel pipe, heat number F11744 is one half inch out of round. Four piece of pipe were cut from the fault pipe. Pull tags have been applied to all four pieces remaining fault pipe.

Bangart: Period.

Denise: Yeah, period. ? in piece numbers listed below. So there's, we're unable to tell except it now says the disposition is CT1YD01ITT8

Hatley: Under M4942

Denise: M4942. M4942S.

Hatley: I put this on there, it's got my initials on it.

Denise: OK, you've initialed these personally.

Hatley: That's after I got this out. Then we got further information.

Denise: Did you disposition this?

Hatley: No. We have further information that this is how they dispositioned this.

Denise: Ok, cause this looks like an original piece of paper.

Hatley: No that's not because it doesn't have any

Denise: Xeroxing is so good these days.

Hatley: No, that I think is an original piece of paper, but it is not the original that went through review right here. When it goes all the way through it will look like that. See here, where it's signed off here and then it will be signed off by somebody else and then it goes through all of this stuff and it goes all the way down. This is on a different problem.

Denise: I was just saying this looks like the original writing made in pencil, not just a xerox copy of it.

Hatley: It is. It is the original just as it is.

Denise: So this is the original turned in NCR....

Hatley: No, ~~no~~, no, no, no, that is a copy of it that was handwritten as opposed to copied on a copy machine, so the original is in the vault.

Denise: Ok, but it also has somebody's, that reported by S.A. Neurmeyer on 9/2/82. I was, it's good because it relates to this trending thing that we talked about earlier. And this is the kind of stuff that some of this has been given to Mr. Ippolite but you don't know his disposition of it.

Hatley: This is the kinds of things that we decided that would be important for them to have so that they wouldn't have to go through all of the rigamarole.

Denise: You're certainly correct there.

Hatley: There's not anything here that is illegal or immoral or anything else for anybody to own because there's no stolen documentation or anything like that here. This is parts of what are available, this is not an NCR as such because it's not signed off as a legal channels and all this kind of stuff, this is a handwritten copy of an NCR.

Denise: I just didn't understand it when you showed it to me.

Bangart: Is that Mr. Neurmeyer's signature on there or is that somebody who just wrote down that NCR was signed by them?

Hatley: I don't know.

Denise: OK, we want to go off the tape now.

Denise: We're back on tape.

Bangart: Do you have more things that you could tell us about now or should we say that we've got enough but the future arrangement is to try to get some additional specifics from the task force people. What I don't want to do is to burden you with our coming down and then another group of people says, ok, I'm down here to get the specifics that I can look at and then they burden you with taking up your time, and so forth.

Hatley: We don't mind that in the least and it's not something that we, like I said on this stuff that we've got, cause this is things that, this batch right here now is ready. I've got it pretty well ready to go on up to Washington so there's no reason for it not to be sent on up. This batch right here, I'm still working on because until I get this one sorted out I won't know what to do, which ones of these that needs to be investigated directly, but until we see what Ippolito's report is and how they have handled the information that we have given them so far, which did deal in specifics, you couldn't imagine that we would be giving any more, would you.

Denise: No, no.

Hatley: That's what we're waiting for now is to get some idea with what he did with what we gave him. And then, whenever that happens, as you can see we have lots of more that comes out everyday. This is what came out, in this little package over here, this part right here, this part right here, tellsm ooh, I've got cobwebs in my house, as it comes out in pieces and it has the NCR numbers on it that need to be, that somebody needs to look at and it has the people's names who need to be contacted and all that kind of stuff. And this comes out in little pieces like this and little pieces like this with little writing on them, it comes out in all kinds of forms.

Denise: And your're sorting them and making sense out of it.

Hatley: When it gets here, I will take this, all right, we have an NCR number that Allen wrote, NCR 391350 on 1/13/83 and on a later date another QC inspector found something wrong, bolt on the flange and wrote another one, NCR 45685R1 was written and a hold tag applied after this craft brought NCR 39135 to him and asked him to close it. He closed it and was accused of falsification of documentation because there was another NCR against it. OK, NCR 49895 was written as unsat and has not yet been dispositioned and this tells us that this goes against hanger number, or BRP number VA1RBO2 flange 2MP831365A4500. So what we do is take all of that off of this little sheet of paper and we put it onto a sheet of paper along with the concerns that we think need to be addressed. And we give those specifics and we ask them to go out there and check into this and see whether or not this NCR 49895 has, in fact, been dispositioned and if it was dispositioned in the same way that it was written, because in this case where when he wrote NCR 39135 the, I think probably what they are trying to tell me here is that the flange, the bolt

holding the flange, there's something wrong with the bolt holding the flange, which would mean that you couldn't cover that, you'd have to replace it. You couldn't cover it with paper, but it may be covered with paper. OK, then we have, this a colored boy that got into trouble out there and I think this one is going to be on intimidation because this is one of the ones where the Darby boys were involved in setting him up, this is the documentation that we have. Anthony Patterson was a colored boy, I don't know what that means except that his mother's name is on here. Oh, this is the list of all of the ones that were, the t-shirt incident, the names of all the people that were involved in the t-shirt incident, which we were not able to get. We need to get that to Washington so they will have that to work with. This is how it comes out to me.

Denise: So you're trying to sort it and make organization.

Hatley: Everyday I spend a little time.

Bangart: You need to develop some standard forms that people can use.

Hatley: There's only one problem with any of this staying in here for more than a day or two at a time. Because when the utility asked for me to come to the plant they said that they wanted to see all the documents that I had in my possession, they wanted all the documents that I had seen since I had left the utility that had anything to do with Comanche Peak. Well, I don't have those documents and I don't know what I've seen, cause I don't keep a catalogue on anything that I run through here. It's not important for me to do that. But the thing that is important is to get some credibility established somewhere to where these people who do have problems don't have to come to us with their problems. They could go to somebody that's inside and say, I like my job, I like eating and yet I know that the utility holes are too big.

Bangart: These people, as I understand it now, there is a thing like they call the hot line or something, have the people that are bringing these concerns to you, have they tried whatever system the utility has in place now to see whether or not it works maybe any better than they thought it worked in the past?

Hatley: I don't think so. I don't think they've tried it. I think that the credibility was shot before they instigated the quality hotline phone number. They put a thing in their checks yesterday, everybody got a little thing again telling the utility really wants to know if you have a problem.

Bangart: If you have any brave souls I would encourage them to test the utility system.

Hatley: They did that. The only time it was ever used that we were told about and of course, it was pretty well documented at the time was whenever they fired me and they got about 160 phone calls telling them that they had messed

up whenever they did that. That was about the only time that I'm aware of that there was anything going on like that. Now, two or three of our people have called with some specific problem about intimidation and they are not interested in intimidation. They have made that quite obvious that they don't want to know about drugs and drugs are a very, very big item out there. And they don't want to know about that and they don't want to know about intimidation, the utility doesn't because neither of those is safety-related and they will tell you that they are not safety-related. They'll listen to what they have

Bangart: We don't feel that drug use is isolated . . .

Hatley: Well, I don't feel that it is either and when one of my employees had her arm twisted behind her and was forced to smoke dope in the satellite on the jobsite and she came to me and voiced her concern and I took that concern to my boss who took it to his boss and took it to all of the people's concerns, the people who should be concerned at Comanche Peak as far as security and all that kind of stuff is concerned, and the incident involved three other people and all of them testified that the incident happened and that it did happen at the time we said it did and the whole bit and the man, he replaced me when I was fired. The man that held the girl's arm behind her and forced her smoke dope. He is now satellite supervisor at Comanche Peak.

Denise: And so the utility did,

Hatley: They don't want to know about that. That's narctoics related.

Denise: That's Brown & Root stuff? He's a Brown & Root employee?

Hatley: Mmmhuh. And that's not significant, the girl doesn't work there anymore, but we do have her testimony. The girl that was her supervisor at the time came with her to my house and told me and I was supervisor over all of them and then I took her and me to my supervisor who was Frank Strand, and we told Frank Strand the story and Frank Strand told Hayward Hutchison the story and then they told Tommy Roberson the story and everything, and with all that much evidence, and that many people that were involved in it and everything, they didn't do anything to the

Denise: Brown & Root didn't do anything, right.

Hatley: Nobody did. The utility didn't . . .

Denise: He was a Brown & Root employee. You all basically used the Brown & Root management structure in reporting this because Frank Strand is Brown & Root and so is Hayward Hutchison.

Hatley: Mmhuh. Who is it? (telephone rings) OK. Just a second. Well I know that is part of what is going

Denise: We're going off the tape now.

Denise: What's come out of the woodwork?

Hatley: Whistle blowers. And you have to get . . .

Denise: Is there a lay off happening?

Hatley: Must be. And so we've got to get them all to where they can get in touch with somebody to come and take their statement as soon as they come out of the woodwork.

Bangart: Getting back to the drug issue, has this concern been raised to the NRC?

Hatley: Yes, when I told, is it Brooks instead of Bruce?

Denise: Brooks.

Hatley: In our transcript with Brooks and they went off tape and everything and they all screamed and yelled and hollered for 30 minutes saying that we don't do drugs. That's not our baliwick, that they would turn it over to the drug enforcement group or whoever does drugs.

Bangart: Brooks said we don't do drugs.

Hatley: That we don't handle drug issues.

Bangart: We don't handle drug issues directly, that's true, but we do want to make sure that the utility and the people that he hired like Brown & Root have programs in place that address drug use onsite and whether or not that's going to impact the quality of construction.

Hatley: OK. After that happened, after the incident happened, on three different occasions we made the management aware of when there was drug busts going on in the satellite and nobody ever got around to getting over there to get things taken care of whenever they should be. They did go in with the dog several days later, several weeks later even and the dogs were unable to find anything on that day, but they did sniff some of the girls' purses and they were able to identify the purses and so the handler made them dump their purses and when they dumped their purses they had paraphernalia but they did not actually have the drugs inside their purses at the time. But, then we were told that they were prewarned that they were coming in that day. So I'm not surprised. Drug use and abuse at Comanche Peak is really something else.

Bangart: I don't think there is any large construction site that probably doesn't have some drug use associated with it, unfortunately. But it is supposed to be a program that the utility is addressing. It sounds like at

least there is something in place if they're using dogs and doing some searching.

Hatley: The dogs can smell cheese real good.

Bangart: I can't speak of the quality of the dogs' noses.

Denise: And I don't want to comment on that comment cause I know what else can smell cheese.

Hatley: Well, that's it. I'm sure, the thing is, they do have a security dog program in effect but I will tell you and so will any of the people that have come out, cause it's just a common thing that happens out there. On the parking lot, if you get there at 6:30 in the morning, you can walk up and down the aisles and get high cause everybody's sitting out there smoking dope before they go into work and as you're going in you can smell it coming out of the cars. Now, if they want to do some real drug related cleanups, why aren't they out there at that parking lot at 6:00 in the morning, 6:30, sometime like that? But they don't, they wait until everybody is inside and then if they do any at all, they go to specifics, because when we told Frank Strand about this and how that the people involved brought the drugs to work everyday and bragged about the fact that they did, bragged about the fact that as soon as they got in the cars they lit up and all this kind of stuff, and we told him about that, and so he was kind of like you all, he wanted specifics. We had to have a license number and make and model of the vehicle, and all this kind of stuff. Well, if the dogs are all that great they should have been able to go up and down and find it.

Denise: Well, I'm not saying that in order to do our job that we have to have the specifics, it just makes it more likely that we'll be able to do it well if we have specifics and more likely that we'll find what's out there rather than a hit and miss shotgun approach. But that's . . .

Hatley: Let me explain to you again about the, and as you read in these reports and we then haven't got the final reports and all that kind of stuff, but in those areas where the whistle blowers that came out before us came out, they did identify specifics. And those problems were cleaned up by the utility. We all know that because we could stand there and watch them and that was when I was still on the inside. We knew what problems were being addressed and what were not as far as clean up is concerned. That's why I'm saying that everybody is kind of reluctant, they don't know where to go with their information. I didn't what to do. All this stuff that has happened to me has happened just by, it's kind of like the events that happened, and you're are just pulled along in the events that happen. Today is the first time that I have ever done anything on my own as far as talking to anybody, and that's talking to you all. Every other time I have been told when I could talk and what I could say and all this kind of stuff by different lawyers cause I have a

whole bunch of lawyers. I may not have any lawyers when this interview is over.

Denise: Don't worry about that.

Hatley: It's not important. What is important to me is that, I don't want to be compromised by anybody, I don't want the publicity, when I was at at Justice, he said? something about all this publicity having, like I had brought it upon myself. My lawyers and I both told him I had never had a press conference, I have never been involved in any publicity whatsoever, what is written about me has been written about me, not what I said

Denise: Not what you said.

Hatley: Or any interview that I've ever had with anybody or anything else, it's what has been guarded out or what has happened around me. There's no way that we're in this thing to go for publicity. If it was I would have took the first offer I got which was from the National Enquirer for \$75,000. I should have took it and run. But I didn't. Instead, we're out of work. That all happened so fast.

Bangart: You're holding out for a higher offer.

Hatley: Well, no it all happened so fast that, and we really didn't know what was coming along, what was happening, I didn't, I'm a brand new whistle blower and here I am it just happened that my information that I had fell into the realm of what was going on at the hearings at that very moment which is why it his the press, or it would have never, I don't think it would have ever happened. The other thing was that the thing that was under investigation at the time was the SIGMA issue, which was something that I had knowledge about. So that made it even more so. And then it smacked of Watergate and Silkwood and all this kind of stuff so the attorneys that called me, the first they got me was Ralph Hager. He said "it's Silkwood written again." He was the one who did the Silkwood investigation, I mean argued the Silkwood case before the Supreme Court and won. So he knew what he was talking about and offered to represent me. The others says it smacks of Watergate so the Watergate lawyers call and say come, and let us take you to justice and do what has to be done and things like that. None of this is done by GAP or by me it was done just by people who are pulling the strings as the thing goes down the road, and you don't know what to do, but I know what I have been told by everybody is that I learned about 10 CFR 50, which I did not even know was a factor in anything in the whole wide world. I learned what violation of the Atomic Energy Act is, by voluntarily or involuntarily. I learned a whole lot of things since I have come out. I don't know whether you have been made aware of the fact that the Labor Board has already ruled in my favor. The Department of Labor ruled that Brown & Root had to reinstate me.

Bangart: Yeah, I'm aware of that.

Denise: Yeah, I'm aware of that.

Hatley: They won't do it.

Denise: I presume if they don't do it, they'll appeal it.

Hatley: They have already appealed it and I was supposed to have gone out last Thursday for a deposition with them cause they've been chomping at the bits saying everybody got to talk to me but them and they never have got to so I was ready to go last Thursday and they walked into the GAP office up in Washington and told them that, an hour before it was time to go, and said they were not ready yet. After all this time they're not ready yet to take my deposition. So, I wonder why they're not ready yet. I wonder how many delays that they will get and if it will be like Chuck's and it will be 2 years later before your final hearings are. That's why the families are going to Washington to show that they wrote a whistle blowers act in Congress. They gave us protection. They said if you tell what you know and it's proved that what you know is right and that it was a factor in the safety of the people of the United States and you suffered monetary damages because of that, that you won't have to, we, the Congress of the United States will protect you. And they're not doing it. They put the diving board out there and let us walk off and then whenever you saw it off, they saw it off while we're out there and we don't get any help. Three and one half years it's taken to get, and no final disposition on the Department of Labor suit for Chuck.

Denise: Chuck Atchison, yeah.

Hatley: You know why they keep delaying that, keep it tied up in court. If they ever rule in favor of one then the dam's broke, and everybody will know that they can come out, if Chuck Atchison ever gets ?, then that will break the dam for everybody else because they will know then the precedent's been set and they'll come out and be protected. Right now there is no protection for the whistle blower. I'm not talking about just the nuclear power, I'm talking about whistle blowers. In your industry,

Denise: In our place, yeah. Hatley: If you have evidence that someone in your organization was in fact guilty of passing along information and you went and told somebody about this and they said, you can't do that because it makes us look bad and they fire you, well then you are a whistle blower just the same as all the rest of us are.

Bangart: Surely.

Hatley: So that's why we can't, why we have to get somewhere, to Washington or somewhere to get them to protect us. Like I said, the little girl that got fired the day after I did, they trumped up some kind of charge on, she has two

small children. It didn't hurt me to be fired and it didn't hurt me to quit cause we have independent income so it's not, I'm not going to starve to death and I can do whatever I please as far as working, whether I want to go back or not, but the people around me is what's bothering me. They all want to talk to you. I didn't know who was going to get hurt. I thought it would be my immediate family or that it would be the ones that were involved with me that day. But it hasn't been them. It's been the people that were close to me that were my employees for over a year that have small children and no way to fight. She was told, this will come out too when we go to justice, that if she would tell them that what I was telling was lies, then they wouldn't fight her.

Denise: No problem.

Hatley: But she said that they had already fired her and she did not know what to do other than that. She was just desparate all of a sudden, she didn't know what to do and so she could not go along with the idea that they would make it all right if she would give a sworn deposition saying that all of the things that I had said were not true. She had already done, she did not get to do hers because she got fired the next day. But anyway we have a Department of Labor suit pending. Mine and hers is going to go together now. We have filed a motion for combining the two because they are definitely related.

Bangart: In closing, I want to be sure that you don't have any, I want you to be aware that we're going to use the tape today and one of the things that we'll do is to review it to see if there is new information that would be classed as an allegation that we'll enter into our tracking system and they'll be followed up as far as the task force effort to look into the concerns that have been identified. As we discussed some of them already have been made known to Brooks and/or Mr. Ippolito but we'll be reviewing them for additional ones.

Hatley: Well, on that be sure that you know, on that NCR that we really need to look in depth, in the event that it hasn't already been addressed is M4015 and that is the one that I would surely like to know what is found out about the whole thing.

Denise: OK.

Hatley: Because it is the one that changes the piece number on that out of round pipe.

Denise: And Mrs. Hatley, other than the one time you mentioned when we went off tape to protect the identity of a person, we don't have a confidentiality request from you,

Hatley: No, you don't.

Denise: You would like for us to have this information and to use it and do the right thing with it and to follow it up.

Hatley: Yes, that's what it's for.

Denise: Well, we appreciate that very much and we appreciate the time you spent with us today and as Mr. Bangart has made clear, we're assembling our troops so that we can get on with the major task force effort down here at Comanche Peak. But it simply hasn't started as of today, but all of this is very helpful in aiming us at the target. We appreciate that very much.

Hatley: Well, what needs to be, what I feel is most important is to try to get back to some degree of credibility. Now how we're going to that I don't know. I want it more than you do, number 1, I want the plant operational, I have never been anti-nuke, I've been pro-nuke, I've always said that the plant is well built. I believe that it is. I believe that it is extremely well built. I think that we have some problem areas that were covered up in the interest of time, in the interest of hurry up and get it done and get it bought and get it sold and this kind of stuff. I think those things need to be looked at more than just on paper. Because I think they are going to be a factor when it's all over, when it's running. And, now how we're going to get to that place and still get an operational plant and all this kind of stuff, I don't know.

Denise: It's going to take some effort, obviously.

Hatley: How you're going to be able to convince all of the people as well as myself that those problems have been addressed, I don't know. I really don't know, but I know that like they said in the paper they had hired 100 painters to go in and address the paint problem, well that's covering up with another coat of paint is not going to address the problem. There's problems down underneath in the coatings and those are going to flake from now on. It needs to be blasted off and started over.

Bangart: I can tell you that we are also right at this very moment addressing generic issue of adequacy coating, we're in the process of making a decision on what kind of information we feel we need from the utility to justify whether or not the work has been done prior to this point in time in terms of surface preparation, inspection of services, and technique or application of coatings have been such that we, the NRC, can have an assurance that things have been done properly and are not a safety problem. Those decisions are being made right this very moment so we are looking at that and I think as the days and weeks stretch out ahead of us, you are going to see that many of these problem areas that have been identified will be addressed by us and not only in the specific instance but the general message that they might convey.

Hatley: That's what you need to see. Sometime you see a problem and that problem has been addressed, and ok, we've took care of that, but it's only the surface problem. You've got to look deeper. Anyway, if you can do that and

get it back to the people someday, whether it's in a daily report, a weekly report, to the press or to whoever, somehow or another let them know what's going on out there even if it's through the Circuit Breaker, you know, their little own newspaper out there, that we have gone in, we have found this problem, we have fixed it. We went in, we looked at this problem, it was nonexistent. Whichever way it goes, if you just let them know what's going on. Would that not be someday of ...

Bangart: Certainly we will at least be informing people of the final disposition and I guess we haven't thought about this particular point not to see whether or not we are going to make an effort to provide people on the status of...

Denise: That's a good suggestion, yeah.

Bangart: What's a good idea we will consider.

Hatley: The press is going to give, they are going to put out what they know. If it comes from you all then they'll put it out that way, if it comes from us they'll put it out that way. They are not, I don't feel they're all that concerned about accuracy, they're just want to know about what makes headlines and they're going to hear from whoever they're going to hear it from. And people read it, don't think for a minute they don't and they read it from all the way from the courthouse to the statehouse and they want to know what's going on. They call me for instance, and asked what is going on with this particular issue and I say I don't know. Well, you told them about it, why haven't you been informed. I do not know. On the drug issue. That was one place that we're going in more directions than just to the NRC and to the utility with that.

Bangart: ?

Hatley: Because we have all those signed documents saying that all that took place which is enough to send somebody to the penitentiary. So we are asked what has been done about it and everybody says nothing. The little girl that was involved doesn't work there anymore so nobody has bothered to stay in touch with her except us so therefore, they're saying that the witness involved is no longer there. Well, she didn't leave the planet of the Earth, she just left the employment of Brown & Root. Just because she's not involved with Brown & Root anymore doesn't mean that she is not still a witness as to what happened on that day. But when they called and asked about that and you say you don't know because that nobody has, except that the person, the little girl who was affected by it, she's a little girl, she's 22 years old, which to me is a little girl, she is no longer employed at Brown & Root because the pressure was so great that (tape runs out)

(Tape 2, side B)

Hatley: Try to make your concerns known and kinds of stuff like that, why you get persecuted till you can't handle it anymore and those that do it to you, they get to stay forever and have good jobs.

Denise: So you're saying the person that did it to her has now got rewarded. We talked about that earlier.

Hatley: Sure, by moving into a higher management position. See, all he was before was just over a satellite with five people, now he's back over 25 people, with higher salary. I'm thrilled to death about his salary because everytime he gets a raise I do too because the EEOC has that and they're going to pay me the difference between what we have and what we don't have. What I'm saying is that all of those same people, they're the people that worked for me for 5 years. Some of those girls were in my employ for 5 years. They are not only just former employees of mine they are friends, we married them, buried their kids, did the whole thing, been through all the aspects of life with those kids. They can't expect them to immediately become disloyal to me just because it's paycheck time. I don't think that they have been because too many of them have come out since then. But they're not going to lie. They started out lying right at first and they all said that there was no such thing as the SIGNA list. They got them all in there and they got them all on tape saying there's no such thing as the list. No, nobody ever saw it, none of the supervisors or anybody else out there ever saw the list. Then SIGNA admitted that they gave it to them. The list that they never saw. Everybody decided that they best tell the truth, hadn't they, because SIGNA said they gave it to us and we said we gave it to them so it wasn't just Obie lying it was the whole thing so then they had to admit it. My advice to them ever since then has been tell the truth. I'm not telling any lies about what went on at Comanche Peak while I was there or while you're there, so if you will tell the truth then you won't have anything to worry about, we'll all, when it comes together in the end splattering or otherwise, tell it like it is, cause I was hard to work for. I won't tell you that it wasn't hard and I did make them work 8 hours a week and that's hard to make anybody do.

Denise: Eight hours a day.

Hatley: 80 hours a week.

Denise: 80 hours a week.

Hatley: Many weeks we worked 80 hours a week. We were pushing hard for a deadline that we had to meet and I don't deny that I had a hard job to do and it was hard to push for it. The girls that worked for me respected me and they will tell the truth. They'll tell you that I was hard to work for. But they'll tell you that I was just as easy when it came time that they had to be off and stuff like that, that we could work together. But that's another

thing, if you will just go out there and pull the satellite personnel record and look at the hours that we were putting in from the time we started in May until I left the following February. Then look at how they restaffed it. Once they saw, they done knew they made a mistake. So they started hiring gobs and gobs and gobs of more people to put on the night shift and all this kind of stuff that I begged for all the time I was out there and was unable to get. All I could do was just push my people harder and harder and harder. No raises, couldn't get any money for them. The girls were not making, at that time, hardly any of them were making more than \$5 an hour. The people all around them making lots and lots of money, \$11, \$12, \$13 an hour, and them having to do the hard work. The most critical job on the site was keeping up with so that everybody on the site had the most current thing to work with that was available and these girls had to be good documentation clerks in order to do that. I said they had the worst of everything. They had me pushing them, and like I say I wasn't easy to work for, they had the pressure of the craft, having to have exactly the right thing and if they were wrong, they will tell you that I yelled and screamed and hollered. I wanted perfection and I usually got it. There was very seldom any time that I had, well I had two NCRs written against the satellite and both of those were written as examples, they were trying to get to the hill, what we call the hill, when we went on the computer. They were covering up, blowing stuff off the computer and all that kind of stuff so that it would never be, it wasn't against the drawing. But they wouldn't let us address that problem from the satellite. We had to, if it was in the package, we put it in the package and sent it to the field. If it was not in the package and we knew that it was supposed to be in the package, we were not allowed to put it in the package, we could only put what the computer told us to put in the package, so the QC hand wrote NCRs against the satellite because the package was incomplete. They wouldn't let her write it against Mike Strange and the computer group because it was hands off of that bunch for the duration. It was always hands off and it still is, as far as I knw, because that's where the cover up is going on.

Bangart: The documentation (unintelligible)

Hatley: You need to look at the. Again, I keep stressing this over and over again, don't just look at currents, unless you make them pull all that was ever written, you're not going to even get a portion of it. Then once you get all of it that was written, go through there and make sure that all of the revisions are there, like 1 through 16, there should be 15, 16 revisions there, and there're not. So where is that documentation.

Bangart: I understand.

Hatley: I can't see how, if two hours after you got there you wouldn't shut it down, myself. I don't know what's safety-related and what's not safety-related, I really don't know, and what you all can do and what you can't do. All I know is that somewhere, someway, somebody has got to look at it and make it right. And I think that somebody will, but I just wanted them to

hurry, I guess. Get it done before we have to go through all this stuff like this. I think if they would just go ahead, fire Brown & Root, get a decent set of people in there that knows how, number one, Brown & Root doesn't know how, as I said before, call out there, talk to Bob Seger, Richard Wheeler, call the QC department extension 322 and ask them what's going on with your training program out there? How come you're retraining all these people?

Denise: Would you spell those last names.

Hatley: S-e-i-v-e-r, Bob Seiver. Wheeler, W-h-e-e-l-e-r, Wheeler.

Denise: Yeah, I got that.

Hartley: OK. Darby, Ralph Darby, D-a-r-b-y. Bill Darby, B-i-l-l.

Denise: The Darby brothers you spoke about earlier.

Hatley: Right. Ask them how many people passed their test and what did they do with the test and who has a copy of the test now. When they all failed it, what did they do with the test. First they may deny they gave a test because they destroyed all the tests. Whenever they all failed it was obviously too hard so they just threw them all away and go write a new test.

Denise: You know that they destroyed the test?

Hatley: They said that there was a copy of it available but when the people went to ask for it they were unable to get it. I have a copy of the test answers on one of them but that's all that I have right now. The question part, we were told that they already did destroy those because it was so atrocious the way that everybody failed it. They did not want any evidence existing. That's the truth, I'm not just making that up. But why are they having to do it to start with. How come they don't have any people out there that can sign documentation.

Denise: I think that's clearly a difficult question. If they're supposed to have them and they found out they didn't have them then they have to do something about and then we and they have to decide what this means to the past work. As we spoke about earlier.

Hatley: Do you know about that?

Denise: Do we know about this

Hatley: Has your office been informed of what was going on?

Denise: I was not personally informed and that's all I can speak of. How about you Dick?

Bangart: Nor was I.

Hatley: I don't know why they haven't told you about that. They told all these people that have taken this test and that's why everybody is, or taken the course that as soon as they get certified that they will be making \$11.95 an hour, so everybody at \$6.50 and \$7.00 an hour clerks jumping in their....

Bangart: It's not surprising to me, though, that we may not know that this occurred recently because we do have just a small group of people onsite now and they are doing an inspection of turnover or systems that have been turned over (unintelligible) so we're concentrating them in that one area right now with just a couple of people.

Hatley: But it is in containment that those 1000 hangers....

Denise: Right, but we wouldn't necessarily know about some training that is going on in some building if it was somewhere near the area of the site. Or even perhaps not even onsite.

Hatley: Incidentally, another thing that is happening right now is that we need for somebody to look at is why they are moving welding engineering to another location.

Denise: Is there something suspicious about that?

Hatley: Yeah, the movement of it itself is significant in that it's always been located in one place and that's where the documentation has all been, all of the traveler packages and that kind of stuff, and now they're moving them and their personnel to another area on the site. I think it's significant. I don't know the significance of it at this point unless it is just what I think it is, which is to cause confusion so that you won't know where to look and what to do, where to look and how to look. That was the practice when I was there, that's how we did it. If the NRC was coming onsite we would say, well if this is a mess over here, if they come over here to look at this and it's a mess, we say, well tell them that we're in the process of combining this one and this one and that's why this is not ready to look at yet. Or that we're in the process of auditing that ourself so they can't look at it. That's the way we dealt with the NRC if they came out there or were supposed to come out there. I think if you were at the hearings and read the intimidation part of it we were all instructed to do that. My girls will tell you that I instructed them over and over that if the NRC should talk to you that you are to say I do not know but I will find somebody who does. Just like little drops of water falling on their head. If you went out there and asked one of them a question, they can't answer the question, they just say I don't know but I will find somebody who does and then they go and get me.

Denise: And did you do it?

Hatley: Huh?

Denise: Then what did you do?

Mrs. Hatley: If I could bullshit my way through I would, if I couldn't I'd tell them to go see my boss.

Denise: Say that you can't answer the question but you will find somebody that can.

Hatley: Yeah. If I didn't know, but see I was supposed to know. I think when you are going around out there you probably hear that a lot. You go up to a crafts person and ask them if that's the document you're supposed to be working with and they will say I don't know but I'll find somebody who knows, when in reality they know. The important thing is not to let the common people talk to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission at Comanche Peak because the first thing you know, they might say something that they're not supposed to say. Even if it's just in casual conversation, you two guys walk up and there's a couple of welders there and you say, that looks like you're doing a real good job on that or something, then that old boy's probably going to tell you, yeah, we could if we'd just get some rods that weren't wet, or something like that, and he don't even know who you are. But he'd just start griping because most of them gripe out there and they'd be able to tell you some areas of concern that he had that may or may not be safety-related. Most of the time they are not. For the longest time it was because we couldn't get pencil grinders. Nobody had a pencil grinder and everybody wanted a pencil grinder and now everybody's got two because right after the hearings started and that came up that there was a shortage of them and there had only been like x number of them bought for Comanche Peak which didn't even give one per 100 welders pencil grinders and they all needed one, and then during the hearings, what was funny, is that all those welders, they brought in 12 welders from Comanche Peak, to say that Harry and Darlene Steiner were lying. They all got up there one at a time like ticky tacky and said the same little story and everyone of them have two pencil grinders, because Chairman Block asked them, do you have a pencil grinder? Now they all have two. He asked why do you need two. They all are going to live here when it's all over, when the job is completed. Chairman Block thought it very interesting we're going to have a heck of a bunch of welders living here. They're all concerned with the safety of the plant, they all knew about well rodded control, they all had heat markers, and all this kind of stuff. After about the third one, I think they got kind of tired of listening to them. Chairman Block come in and he asked one of the guys, did somebody tell you that you were going to live there when it was over. Did someone suggest to you that this might be a good place to live whenever it was over, and he said, yeah, yeah. Mr. ? did that. From that point on, they struck all the testimony that had to with staying here forever. It was obvious that they had paraded the little people up there, 13 of them just to reenforce what was wrong. What they

didn't count on was that they didn't know they were going to have another person there who would substantiate everything that they had said and back it up with documentation. And that's what happened.

Denise: You mean back up the Steiners?

Hatley: MMmhu. See, Henry was fired because he reported a gouge mark in a pipe. And everybody at Comanche Peak knew that. He was fired because he told them of a problem that existed. Now they trump up the charge on him that he was fired because of excessive absenteeism. I was fired for a failure to follow instructions and believe me, nobody followed instructions better than I did. So everybody gets these little charges trumped up on them, but what Henry had not had was anybody to substantiate that. He didn't have the information that he needed to get the documents out that he was talking about where the gouge mark was. What happened is, for two years there they fought a year and a half in the hearings, over an NCR that was supposedly the one that was written at the time that he was fired. And it didn't exist and he didn't know the number of it, he did know the pipe number and everything, but the utility said that there wasn't one. They didn't, until this last hearing, they produced it. Not at this last one, but the time before that, they finally produced it whenever they saw the lady that wrote the thing walking down the hall with a copy of it in her hand. Mr. Taylor run back in the room and he grabbed it and brought it out and said is this the one that is in question that we have been trying to get them to get out for us ever since, you know, for a long time.

Denise: You say Mr. Taylor, you mean Bob Taylor of the NRC?

Hatley: Yes sir, I do. He produced it when it became evident that we were going to. The testimony, it's down there at the thing, and it shows what everybody says. They've got those people that transcribe that and it's all in there. How many times, there's six different occasions we asked for it. As it turned out it was not an NCR and so, it was an NDER, a non destructive something, anyway it's just the same, it requires disposition the same as the NCR does. That's why that they were not really guilty of saying they didn't know exists or that they did not have an NCR on it because Henry kept calling for an NCR and he thought it was an NCR but it wasn't, it was an NDER. And until the lady that wrote the NDER came out public and said that she wrote it, and at the time, and we had the people that were all standing there when Henry told her that I will be fired for this, and he was, and she testified to the events happening around it as the same as he did testify, that the welder that was going to fix the pipe that had the hole in it was coming down the stairs, and the foreman was there, the whole circumstances that backs up what Henry has to say has now been completely made public and it was not until it became necessary for them to produce that document that they did it. They had it all the time because he got it just like that when it became obvious that we were going introduce it. But they didn't introduce it until it became obvious. That's another reason why we don't like Mr. Taylor because he's still on the cover up wherever he is, he still on the cover up, he's still trying to cover

himself, I think. So that he doesn't get sued or something happens like that. But if they had that document all the time and they knew it, why didn't they go ahead and let, we're talking NRC now, we're talking representing the people. How come Mr. Taylor to him, yes Henry, here is the NDER that was written the day you got fired. And it does concern the area that you're talking about. Why didn't they call the lady that wrote the NDER in as a witness instead of calling 13 welders that were not even in the area and some of them not even at work that day as we found out later, that two of them had testified they were there were not even at work that day. Looks like the utility would have caught that, wouldn't it. The same thing is happening, that's what I'm talking about, why we can't feel real good about that, why is Mr. Taylor still allowed to run around out there on that site when he has done stuff like this. Why is he still allowed to stay with the NRC?

Denise: It's a good question as to why he's running around onsite.

Bangart: My understanding is that he's only been down there, at least within the span of the last couple of weeks, he's only been down there on a couple of occasions, I think about three days of, I think week before last or something like that. My understanding is that he hasn't been on the site a great deal.

Denise: That's true.

Hatley: I won't deny that he hasn't been because I know most of the days when he's out there because somebody calls me and tells me. The point is why is he even there period? What value could he possibly have based on his performance in the past, how could he be of any value to you at this point? To the NRC?

Denise: Well, he has a lot of experience and background in some of the things that were ongoing at Comanche Peak and can bring the factual information of the documentation forward and again I'm trying to differentiate between factual information and his interpretation of what it means and what you should do about it and so forth, he does have a lot of knowledge of where things are and this is where we try to focus Mr. Taylor's efforts. Not putting him in a position of judging the significance of something or in the position of making a determination for the NRC what should be done, but rather, ok, where is the information, what are the facts in the matter, and where do we find those facts. It's similar to what you were saying earlier, you worked out there so long, that if somebody said to you, go find a piece of documentation, you would know right where to go and how to find and you'd know what the system is and how to get into the system to find it. Because of his long stays out there or his long time out there as resident inspector, Mr. Taylor has a lot of knowledge of where things are and who to go to ask to get what I refer to as factual matters, copies of NCRs, copies of this, copies of that, which makes him highly beneficial to utilize in mode. Apparently, from our discussion today, you think that that also has a significant downside in the sense that he is viewed by many people as a untrustworthy yet he's still onsite.

Hatley: Well, that's the truth.

Bangart: Well, I think that's an important view.

Hatley: What's coming right now from the people that are still on the inside is that he obviously was taken off of that site, I don't know where he was put, but he was replaced by somebody else at about the same time this report came out. Whether that was done because it was time for him to move or what was the reason, I don't know. All I know is that he's back out there and we all knew when he worked there, of course I didn't know cause as you well know, I didn't even know we had any NRC out there. I had been there for 5 years and I had never, I didn't know there was any NRC on the site. But I did know that there wasn't noway you could get hold of them if you were, because of the hours that the NRC works, is the same hours, you know we went to work at 7 in the morning and we worked until 7 at night.

Bangart: (Unintelligible) in your phone book here?

Hatley: Yeah, but how are you going to call them.

Bangart: We have a 24 hour number.

Hatley: Oh, I didn't think you had one, do you? Do you now or have you always had?

Bangart: at least, the last 2 or 3 or 4 years there has been.

Hatley: A 24 hour number for

Bangart: There's either been a 24 hour number or somebody in the office. For one period of time Regional Office had somebody in office 24 hours a day. But this is over the span of more than 2 or 3, it's 5 or 6 or 7 years.

Hatley: Is that in all of the phone books or just the Glen Rose phone book?

Bangart: Well, that's we'll check out, I wanted to know.

Denise: Do you have a Glen Rose phone book. We might just look at it.

Bangart: I believe now you get a message that says if you have something of importance call collect Washington and give them.

Denise: That's a recorded number.

(Looking through phone book)

Hatley: What would it be listed under, government offices?

Bangart: It ought to be in the white pages.

Hatley: That's our book. That's three cities.

Denise: Look under United States government.

Hatley: Is it in that one? Which one? The one before it?

Bangart: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Hatley: What does it give as the phone number? Call collect.

Bangart: Call collect, 817-860-8100, yes, ok. so now the system is that this gives you a recording that says if this is an important matter, call Washington collect, and it gives you another numbers, we do have an operation center...

Denise: Those are our two offices down at Comanche Peak, right above, resident inspectors.

Hatley: One of them is TUGCO and the other is Brown & Root, or ..

Bangart: No, these go right into the NRC office.

Denise: You don't have to go through TUGCO or Brown & Root switchboard.

Hatley: To get there?

Denise: Right, you can dial this number here.

Hatley: Is it in there?

Denise: It's been in the 82s and 83 phone book, and I can't speak of anything before that.

Hatley: Before that time. All I know as you well know we had no, that night when we were out at the plant, we couldn't find the NRC nor could we call them because there's no way you can call out. You can't call out on the Brown & Root phone, you understand what I'm saying?

Bangart: Were you in the NRC trailer?

Denise: No, no we were walking through the

Bangart: Oh, ok.

Denise: through the Brown & Root trailer seeking to meet some of our people and try to get on the Brown & Root phone and call our office.

Hatley: Is that not in this thing? Somewhere? That report? If it's not I'm going to have to document it.

Denise: I don't, I don't think I would have been recording the fact that we were trying to call out, because you picked up the phone and I picked up the phone and we finally found one that we could make an outside call on.

Hatley: Well, what I was saying is that while we were doing it, some of the times we were talking in there about going into the different areas and things, that's why I'd like to have a copy of the tape. We couldn't find a phone first of all that we could call out on and the only phone that we did find that could be called offsite in was inside that manager's office. So in order to call one of these numbers we had to go to the project manager's office or stay at home. The other problem that we had that night, is at that time, they didn't have an extension, the NRC didn't have a Brown & Root extension so the only way you could get them was to call offsite. I understand that has been taken care of since then. But the funny part was that very night was when we called safety, we called security and we called the time office, and those would be the three busiest places on the whole site, and none knew where the NRC was either. Or if there was any out there onsite that night.

Bangart: This was a Friday, or late in the evening?

Hatley: It was 9 o'clock at night. But there's a night shift out there.

Denise: It was late.

Hatley: It was 9, 10, 11 o'clock. But at 9 o'clock is when we got there. But the shift stays on until 3 a.m. But what I'm saying, even the night project manager came over to talk to us and he didn't know where it was either.

Bangart: We don't make a practice of keeping project manager informed of whether we're onsite or not.

Hatley: Well, no, I'm talking about...

Denise: She was talking about the Brown & Root project manager.

Bangart: I know, that's what I'm saying.

Hatley: We're trying to find, we were out there trying to find the NRC resident inspector or his office and nobody from Brown and Root knew where his office was.

Bangart: Oh, where his office was. I thought...

Hatley: Or where he was. So if you wanted to report something, first of all you wouldn't have had a Glen Rose book unless you lived in Glen Rose and I don't think there's anything except the Brown & Root books out there. The Brown & Root phone book, and there's no extension for the NRC, or there wasn't then. So what I thought was very funny, is all this time I think you people have labored on the impression that we knew how to get hold of you when in reality, nobody really does know how to get hold of you.

Bangart: Do you remember seeing the posters with the outline of the United States on it and has the different NRC offices on it, one of the purposes for that being posted...

Hatley: Where's it at?

Bangart: Well, I don't know how many places it is,

Denise: I've seen it a half dozen places at the site.

Bangart: You do have NRC documents

Hatley: We didn't see one that night.

Bangart: that are like this that do tell people how to get in touch with the NRC.

Hatley: I know that that's a law according to 10 CFR 50 that it be posted, but I know that whenever Chairman Block was there it wasn't on the board, I know that whenever we were out there, it wasn't on the board. I know it's posted out there in two or three places now because Billy Darby told Chairman Block that if he didn't, if the NRC didn't want to put their little posters up that we'd put the Gap Rap sheet up. Chairman Block thought that was kind of funny.

Bangart: I bet he did.

Hatley: I think that it has been Brown & Root's practice in the past to have discouraged anybody going to the NRC for any reason. I think that in a sense they were afraid of the NRC, in a way they knew that they were going to get by with murder as long as it didn't get past Taylor. But I think they knew, I mean what we would hear every day of the week from Frank Strand was that Region IV's coming in. Now if Region IV's going to come in that meant Jesus Christ himself was going to come and make this judgment. That's all, I didn't know Region IV from a big eyed bug. But I knew that if Region IV ever came we were in trouble. Cause I heard it every day. Yet Region IV never came. Every day they'd tell us, in April Region IV's coming, then April would come, and they'd say in June, Region IV's coming, and Region IV never came. Region IV was something to be feared while I was out there in that I guess they do their job

and we'd all be fired if we didn't do it right or something. But Region IV never came to do the inspection. We only had some local people and I don't know who they were, NRC, that would come and do just little things. We had Tugco QA, that's ? that's a funny bunch of people. Then we had the SIGNA people who came but this little report that I showed you where they did the CAT team thing, this one right here, that was done in '82, I believe, and the report itself didn't come out until '83?

Bangart: Now the inspection would have been done in '83.

Hatley: December?

Bangart: No, it's just the 12th report, that's just a document number, the year, and this is the 18th report within this year.

Hatley: So it would have been late in the year probably. That tells me that Region IV was out there. I guess this is from Region IV.

Bangart: CAT was a combination of people. It was a team,

Denise: Some headquarters and Region IV.

Hatley: Whenever they did their inspection and everything, I know there was a lot of concern about this at that time and somebody got fined for something but I never was completely sure about what happened. Somebody got a \$40,000 fine about something.

Denise: Probably Tugco got fined.

Hatley: I remember my boss and Frank Strand would tell me about all these things as they were going on out there and this is when the satellite system came to be and he called me in and told me and started reading to me parts of the things that had to be done then we talked about this is how we were going to set the satellites up so we knew what we had to do. And I was always led to believe during that time that Region IV was someone to be afraid of as far as doing your job correctly. I never was told by anybody that if you go to Region IV, they'll tell them, until October of '83, that's when it became known that(unintelligible). That's when Region IV became the big bad dog that tattles on everybody that whistle blows. So prior to that time, I have to say that nobody had any problems with it because we didn't know any better.

Bangart: I ask you to, if you can to try to look on the instance of the? as isolatedWe're doing our best to make

Hatley: I think that you are.

Bangart: It's nothing like ...

Hatley: I think that that's true. But what we all want to see is to see the problems through. They are your problems. You even told us that a long time ago. And hopefully they will be. But like I said, I just hope and you can ask, of course they don't allow me to say anything to the press, but when I talked to them off the record and everything, to Bruce and Jack and Walker, they'll all tell you I never said that anybody except Mr. Taylor in the NRC was bad. But I will say that he is guilty as hell as far as I'm concerned. I could never serve on a jury where he was because of the fact that I have evidence before me that he betrayed the people that he was supposed to help. Therefore, I feel like he's guilty. If it was me and he worked for me, I would fire him. If it was me and I had the chance of getting after seeing what's happened with Chuck and his family and Henry and his family and what they've had to go through as a result of his actions, he ought to be made personally supportive for the rest of his life because Henry and Darlene were absolutely on food stamps and everything else until the GAP intervention. They had, Henry couldn't get a a job. And if they hadn't spent their money wisely whenever they were employed, they bought their place, so their rent was paid for, they had utilities, which incidently, had to get cut off because their mother had to get put back on this kind of stuff. It's a long, hairy tale, it will be on 20-20. So you'll get to see it. And the culprit in the whole thing comes right out of that office right up there. What all else that we do to stop it we can't stop it when it hits the press

Bangart: It's that kind of impact that we're trying to do a much better job...(unintelligible)

Hatley: But who is in a position to make them go away. Who is in a position to make him suffer the same way that everybody else has suffered.

Bangart: Management of NRC.

Hatley: Who is his boss?

Denise: Mr. Collins is his boss, I'm his boss, he has a section leader who is his boss and a branch chief who is his boss, then I'm his boss. Whether or not anything ever happens to Mr. Taylor or not I couldn't say at this time, except it's clear that we are all very disappointed and unhappy that the situation happened to develop this way. And have considerable concern for people who have been hurt by it.

Hatley: Then it would seem that maybe the utility could have that same amount of concern instead of continually prosecuting them, that they could find some time to ask them on a one to one basis, just like we are, about some of the issues that they have instead of getting into the courtroom and calling them liars and stuff whenever there really is a concern there.

Denise: Now do you mean utility or Brown & Root.

Hatley: I'm talking utility. Utility owns that place out there. It would seem to me that when anybody comes out that has a real problem or a problem that should be addressed like the, for instance, when I came out and I said that SIGNA that I was given the stuff to fix the SIGNA on it, that, you know the first person, if I had been a part of the utility, and the minute that I read that in the paper, if I had been Lou Fiker or one of the persons that is president of the utility, I would have been trying to get down here to find out what in the world is that lady talking about. Because that effects my nuclear plant out there and all the stuff that goes with it.

Denise: But you haven't hear from them?

Hatley: No. And the only thing that they say is, oh well, she's just disgruntled. Well they're going to think disgruntled. I wasn't when I came out. I wasn't, in fact, as you remember I quit. I got a resignation and I quit. They wouldn't let me quit. They fired me because quitting was too easy. That's why, if the utility is really sincere in getting these problems addressed, why don't they address them. Why don't they go to the people as they are coming out and say, don't give us a quality hotline a 800 number to call. Get somebody that has some knowledge out of that office up there in Dallas to get to these people, and off the record under a shade tree if that's what it takes. Get out and talk about the issues that we're talking about. Why won't they do that? Why do they label everybody that comes out as a trouble maker. They use whatever influence that they can to see to it that they don't work again. Why?

Denise: If they're doing that, I certainly couldn't explain to you why. I know that some utilities do have an exit interview program for people who quit, get fired, or are just in a laid off because the job is coming to an end. It's obvious that some of the construction work is coming to an end and the job is finished and people are going to leave. Some utilities have a program of simply interviewing people and saying how did you do while you were here, did you do good work, did you observe any unsafe acts, do you have any concern for the safety of the plant, and so forth. Then they get those people, they encourage them to tell them.

Hatley: Whenever they have an employee that comes out and they have those concerns listed on there, do you know who they take them to to talk about it.

Denise: I know that some utilities have the technical and investigative staff that are looking at those.

Hatley: Well, they take them to(unintelligible)

Denise: Boyce-Greer?

Hatley: If you want to talk to them. And if you don't, there's so many ...Incidentally, do you have access to those, those exit interviews?

Denise: I'm sure we would.

Hatley: Try and see. Go and look at some of them then get hold of some of those people who wrote, not at this time, or what I have been involved with can't be discussed at this time. Here's a couple to look at the exit interviews on. See how you feel about what they had to say.

Denise: I heard you start down the path that said that people when they had the exit interview, they were asked if they had safety concerns and they said not at this time. Are you implying that they did but simply didn't say so.

Hatley: Exactly.

Denise: We almost seem to have an impossible position if you set up a program to find out if people have problems, and they won't tell you or that they tell you that they don't have any problems but later on they say that they did but they didn't tell you that they did. Is this distrust or....?

Hatley: Yes, we've established this little method of signing out out there, even since I came out because incidently the exit interview has started since I came out. So the ones that are coming out now, what we have gotten the word out there, that if they have concerns and they don't want to address them at this time, don't say no because they will use that against you in the future if you do say that you have got some. If you come forth at a later date and say I wanted to tell them but I didn't at that time, so don't say no, write not at this time, or don't write anything at all, but don't say no because if you do then they will crucify you with it in the courtroom whenever the time comes to go to bat for the issues that you feel should be addressed. That's why we're having them to sign out now, as not at this time. No, what it is ...

Denise: Does that mean that you are encouraging people not to disclose the safety concerns to the utility?

Hatley: If they don't want to because if they don't want to disclose those and I wouldn't if I was out there now, I would never do it, I would disclose it to the people that I wanted to know it but I woul never disclose it the way that it's been disclosed now. Because they, if you give them safety concerns you tell them go look at this hanger, they will go and fix it so that it makes it look like you are not a ? person whenever somebody else goes and looks at it. That's been the policy in the past. Now on the people that want to come forth in witnesses in the future that are leaving out there right now and are going to work on other sites because they haven't been involved in anything and they've gotten good jobs on other sites, that's what we're talking about.

Those are the ones that on their little exit interviews, they either addressed those concerns, those two people right there addressed their concerns on their exit interview. A lot of them just say not at this time or just don't write anything. It would be a good place to start looking if you wanted, I didn't even think to tell Brooks to do this as far as intimidation out there is concerned, but it would seem to me that would be a good place to start looking for intimidation. Everybody that's left has an intimidation story to tell. They don't have too many that have left out there under real good circumstances. In fact, this one little girl, I don't know why they did it, Gordon told them in a meeting just the other day, he said we have got a really, really serious problem in that this one girl that is coming out, she knows more about all the cover up out there than anybody in the whole wide world and she's finally decided to go public. He's really concerned about that. They were really concerned when this other girl came out and made her statements to the NRC, but this one, they're even more concerned about.

Denise: Is this somebody you've identified by name once before?

Hatley: No, we've haven't.

Denise: But Brown & Root knows about it. Strand isn't there anymore, but ...

Hatley: No, he doesn't work there anymore. We have never found anything. He called my lawyer one day, that's all we know about Frank. We don't know why he called my lawyer. He called Tony?... We know that Tolson is supposed not to be working there any more, Tony ?..... which is ha, ha, ha, has taken his place. There is so many areas, it is such a complex thing for anybody going in to do an investigation. I know you probably think that how in the world can we address all of this. All of the different areas that you are looking at from intimidation right down to welds and heat numbers and stuff like that. I don't know how you are going to do it.

Denise: We don't, sometimes we might wonder how long it will take, how much resources but we can understand the....

Hatley: What will be the difference between how you do an investigation and if there is a Congressional investigation? How will that be?

Bangart: Congressional investigation will probably be of us. A large part of it will be how well we do our job.

Denise: I don't think Congress would investigate how well Brown & Root has done the welding job, what hangers at Comanche Peak, simply won't do it.

Hatley: Then we don't need to be saving all this stuff for them, do we?

Bangart: They will consider our question of wrongdoing and so forth and that's where our OI people are getting involved in, if there is evidence of criminal wrongdoing, it in turn goes to the Department of Justice.

Denise: When they make a Congressional investigation, they say, "Mr. Department of Labor, why has it taken you so long to deal with Chuck Atchison's case, and what's happening to him in the meantime?" And the Department of Labor will say, "you set up this law with these procedures and there's appeals, etc., and people are going through that," and the Congressman may say, "NRC, there's a lot of problems down there, apparently, what do you think of these and what are you doing about them, and why did you do this or not do this and so forth." I don't think Congress will come down and investigate how well Brown & Root welders did welding on pipe hangers, but they will say, "NRC, how well did you inspect how well Brown & Root welders did welding on pipe hangers?" So that will be a different, you may send a lot of information but I don't think that Congress is going to investigate Brown & Root for Tugco.

Hatley: Does Justice order the Congressional investigation?

Denise: No.

Hatley: They convene?

Denise: If they have a case, civil or criminal case. But Congress will order its own investigation from their own standing. They might get some Department of Justice help.

Hatley: Well, that's all, like I say, somebody like me, the most I ever worked for was the juvenile department in Somerville County. Trying to understand, I love Washington, I'll be delighted to go back.

Denise: Spend a little time.

Hatley: I spent 10 days in, I had a very good visit with all the people up there. I loved it. I got to go to Bull.....Have you every been?

Denise: Yes, you must have been down on Capitol Hill. It's walking distance.

Hatley: We had dinner the night that I had finished up with Brooks upstairs and they summoned us to the White House. (unintelligible) The next day, I had to go home. Besides that, I had one Saturday, I got to go and see the sights, and the rest of the time I was in meetings, meeting, meetings. Evidently, they just want to know what was going on. We're all going back the 21st. Not the 21st of May, the 21st of June. Will you be up there then?

Denise: Who knows. Might be. Where are you going to be?

Hatley: The first meeting will be with the House and the second meeting will be with the Senate, wherever those are.

Bangart: You may want to be out of sight. Keep our head down.

Hatley: It's a Wednesday, so Wednesday, we have a press conference in Charlotte, N.C., then we'll have a press conference in Washington when we arrive, (unintelligible), and then we have a meeting with the people in the House then we have a meeting with people in the Senate on Thursday and Friday. On Saturday, we (unintelligible) with all the other people, all the other sites. That's what we have tentatively. Then after that, is when all the intimidation hearings will start before the ASLB. That's when all the major fireworks are supposed to be. The one thing that all of us are concerned with more than anything else is that nobody wants the plant shut down. Nobody want to stop the operation of that plant (unintelligible). Sometimes we get the feeling

Denise: That other people think that.

Hatley: That other people think we are anti-nuke and we're not. And we don't deal with anti-nuclear people. Gap is not an anti-nuclear organization. Because it deals with many other things than just nuclear whistle blowers. Anyway, that's why we're kind of excited about the interest that it is causing (unintelligible). And if it's going to take them until June for us to find out what happened (unintelligible) we'll have to wait till June to find out. That's my story as far as

Denise: Well, we appreciate again your taking the time this morning and this afternoon and just for the record, I'm going to say into the tape that we completed our discussion, it's now 1:45 p.m., on the 18th of May, 1984, and we appreciate it very much.

Hatley: Would you like to have a copy of the