UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the matter of:

Interview of Terry Bunting

Docket No.

Location:

Pages: 1 - 40

Date: July 13, 1982

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Interview of Terry Bunting

July 13, 1982
Palo Verde Nuclear Station

Investigators: John Berdoine

Owen C. Shackleton, Jr.

INVESTIGATOR: This is an interview of James Terry Bunting, July 13th, 1982.

And, Terry, do we have your permission to tape record this conversation?

MR. BUNTING: Yes, you do.

INVESTIGATOR: What we are basically interested in is your knowledge of the incident involving Charlie Wright.

Do you recall previous allegations concerning the (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: Right.

INVESTIGATOR: Would you relate what you know about the situation?

INVESTIGATOR: This goes back a year ago.

MR. BUNTING: Right. I can't place what he was talking about.I can't say that there was no cheating whatsoever. I wasn't the electrician right with Charlie. And I did his work for him, and he was doing mine.

INVESTIGATOR: What was the composition of the (inaudible) at that time?

MR. BUNTING: Two electricians and one pipefitter.

INVESTIGATOR: Okay. The pipefitter is Charlie Wright and you were one of the electricians. Who was the other electrician?

MR. BUNTING: At the time, I say again, I really can't place what Charlie could possibly have been talking about. There was -- Bill Baker was a foreman, my foreman at the time. And there was another man who was there around that time, by the name of Thompson.

INVESTIGATOR: Was that (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: That's what they -- what we (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: Now, you, as an electrician, did you work for a foreman?

MR. BUNTING: Now, when Bill Baker was here I did.

INVESTIGATOR: Bill reported directly to Steve Bell.

MR. BUNTING: Right.

INVESTIGATOR: And Bell was then the superintendent?

MR. BUNTING: Yes.

INVESTIGATOR: All employed by (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: Right.

INVESTIGATOR: Was that the total composition of the group that was working there at the time?

MR. BUNTING: Yes.

INVESTIGATOR: The best that you can recall, right?

MR. BUNTING: Right. We have some friends come

in every now and then for a couple of weeks and

INVESTIGATOR: (inaudible) Out of curiosity, Terry, how many electricians do you have now?

MR. BUNTING: Two.

INVESTIGATOR: And one foreman. One is considered a foreman.

MR. BUNTING: One is considered foreman. It isn't necessary but it works better for us.

INVESTIGATOR: (inaudible) supervisory, the authority position to make decisions.

MR. BUNTING: Yes, sir. (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: Our understanding is that this occurred some time in April of 1981; is that correct?

MR. BUNTING: That was about the time that Charlie was laid off, yes.

INVESTIGATOR: Is that the time that you have knowledge of the initial allegation coming up?

MR. BUNTING: Yes.

INVESTIGATOR: When did you first become knowledgeable that Charlie was unhappy or made an allegation or there was a problem area?

MR. BUNTING: About a week I guess, or maybe two after he left. Steve Bell approached me and said that he had made allegations.

INVESTIGATOR: Can you recall specifically what

the allegations were?

MR. BUNTING: That we were -- I think he said that Jack Donaldson and himself were cheating on the welds. (Laughter) Or something to that effect. I can't remember how it was. Almost laughable at the time.

INVESTIGATOR: And this would have been then some time, one week, two weeks after he was terminated?

MR. BUNTING: Yeah.

INVESTIGATOR: To the best of your knowledge, would this have been some time in May of 1981?

MR. BUNTING: It was a couple of weeks after he was terminated.

INVESTIGATOR: Do you recall whether or not there was an investigation or inquiry conducted at that time?

MR. BUNTING: There wasn't for me.

INVESTIGATOR: Did anybody interview relative to your knowledge of what occurred based upon Charlie Wright's allegation?

MR. BUNTING: Jack Donaldson was involved in some paperwork, I guess he called it. That's all I know.

INVESTIGATOR: Do you recall talking to him relative to the incident and the comments made by Charlie Wright?

MR. BUNTING: Oh, no. No. I did -- I did later.

INVESTIGATOR: Later when?

MR. BUNTING: Well, I think after Jack got done and there was a report that Steve had, and we discussed that.

INVESTIGATOR: Steve who?

MR. BUNTING: Steve Bell.

INVESTIGATOR: Bell.

MR. BUNTING: We discussed at that time what Charlie had said about the welding. He referred to Charlie being in the wrong building on the day he said, things like that.

Like I said, at the time I was just (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: Yeah. Do you know whether or not Bell maintained any copy of the report (inaudible)?

MR. BUNTING: Maybe (inaudible) has a copy of that report, but Jack Donaldson has it.

INVESTIGATOR: Is Bell still around?

MR. BUNTING: He's in Canada right now.

INVESTIGATOR: Is he still employed by (inaudible)?

MR. BUNTING: No.

INVESTIGATOR: He is still employed by (inaudible)?

MR. BUNTING: Right. And I've been told by our manager (inaudible) he will be available to you (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: Do you recall specifically any other than what you have personally discussed here, what Charlie Wright's claims were?

MR. BUNTING: No. I was a very good friend of Charlie's, a personal friend. I would go to his house and he would come to my house, and stuff like that at that time. And I heard nothing whatsoever from Charlie (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: Are you still a friend of Charlie's?

MR. BUNTING: No. No. One day I saw him at a stop sign and honked. He just glared at me and drove on, so --

INVESTIGATOR: Did I understand you correct, Terry, you said at the time you worked together you were a friend of Charlie's, socially, both on the job, and he never claimed to you about any problems he thought he had at work?

MR. BUNTING: No.

INVESTIGATOR: You are not friends now?

MR. BUNTING: No. I haven't seen him since then other than at the stop sign.

INVESTIGATOR: Why do you feel your friendship is not in tack today?

MR. BUNTING: Well --

INVESTIGATOR: Was that your chosing or his?

MR. BUNTING: Well, I would say it's probably his. At this point in time, I think perhaps it would be mine. To do something like this is so far fetched, in my

opinion (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: Do you feel that his being discharged or laid off by Western (inaudible) had some relation with your friendship?

MR. BUNTING: Yes. I heard -- Steve Bell informed me that Charlie had contacted him. Charlie was mad because I had known he was getting laid off -- so he said -- and didn't tell him.

I was with him that evening, and I left about a half hour before he did. He was terminated that night.

INVESTIGATOR: You were with him that evening here at the site?

MR. BUNTING: Correct. I didn't see him (inaudible). I found out about it when we went back in the trailer and grabbed my hat to get out of here. Steve was there with his check and termination (inaudible), you know.

Being they were both friends of mine, I really didn't care to be there at the time. But I saw it coming with Charlie's attitude towards the job, being very grumpy and seen Steve watching him very close, that he didn't go too slow and cause too much of (inaudible).

INVESTIGATOR: What shift were you working at that time?

MR. BUNTING: We always worked one shift.

INVESTIGATOR: Days?

MR. BUNTING: Days. And this was just an old time situation, and it shouldn't have been. (Inaudible) six hour, seven hour cycle that Charlie stretched to about a twelve at times.

INVESTIGATOR: And Baker was at that time the foreman of the operation, or the electrician?

MR. BUNTING: No. I think he had quit before that.

INVESTIGATOR: Okay. What period of time did you actually associate with Charlie? You were here for almost three years. When did Charlie come to work?

MR. BUNTING: Same time.

INVESTIGATOR: Same time.

MR. BUNTING: Same time (inaudible).

INVESTIGATOR: Okay. And then until his termination some time in April, you basically worked together?

MR. BUNTING: Yes.

INVESTIGATOR: And in a situation like that, is there any reason why any representative of Western (inaudible) would like to extend the working time on the site?

Do they get paid more for it?

MR. BUNTING: You mean I, as a supervisor --

INVESTIGATOR: No. I'm -- (inaudible) I'm talking about management level. Is there any benefit to

them monetarily or otherwise to extend any work over a period of time, other than the obvious, of course, if you are an employee?

MR. BUNTING: No. The contractor (inaudible) you pay your own bill (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: So, you bid -- not you, but (inaudible) is bidding (inaudible) by diameter inch flat rate bid? No matter how long it takes.

MR. BUNTING: Right.

INVESTIGATOR: Okay.

MR. BUNTING: Rather than alternate at a time situation. It wasn't at that time. It still isn't. It still is not.

So, if something had a different rate like (inaudible) required to go a hundred (inaudible) an hour, then you give a different price for that type of (inaudible).

INVESTIGATOR: Well, in the situation of -- you indicated that Charlie Wright apparently (inaudible) in the work period, Western (inaudible) does not monetarily benefit from that. They, in fact, lose money (inaudible)

Was there at that time any collusion between you, yourself or Charlie, all the craftsman, during this period of time -- you were all on an hourly rate, I assume --

INVESTIGATOR: Actually, at the time we were working so much overtime that we (inaudible) well, the

electrician did anyway, tried to get the work done so we could get finished, you know.

INVESTIGATOR: In the period of January, February, March and April of 1981, what would be a normal work week, in hours? You said you had a lot of overtime.

MR. BUNTING: Well, probably sixty.

INVESTIGATOR: Sixty. Is that just on site itself? Did you get paid (inaudible)

Anything over forty is overtime?

MR. BUNTING: Time and a half.

INVESTIGATOR: Did you have any incentive to shorten the cycle?

MR. BUNTING: No.

INVESTIGATOR: The reason I asked that, Terry, is that I understand that in contrast with Charlie, Mike was the key operator who tries to shorten the cycle to the maximum practical extent.

MR. BUNTING: Yes.

INVESTIGATOR: Is there any incentive for him to do that?

MR. BUNTING: No, not per se. If he gets his work done, he can go home. He likes to go home. He is the type of person who really doesn't like to work forty hours. And it's a very good job for a pipefitter.

INVESTIGATOR: Well, then he does have an incentive

to shorten the cycle.

MR. BUNTING: Yes. He gets to go home. There is no monetary.

INVESTIGATOR: No monetary. But he gets to go home because his job is done?

MR. BUNTING: Right.

INVESTIGATOR: Now, when a craftsman, an electrician or a pipefitter is working for Western (inaudible), on any given day to go to work, is there a minimum time required he has to work that day?

MR. BUNTING: No.

INVESTIGATOR: If he arrives at the site, he automatically gets paid for a full day?

MR. BUNTING: For a full day unless we have a problem and we knock off half a day. It's happened.

INVESTIGATOR: But if have seen half a day, you get paid for a full day, right? If you knock off after six you get paid for eight?

MR. BUNTING: Right. That's (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: That's the standard arrangement for all crafts, for all contractors.

MR. BUNTING: All except for your factory workers. (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: I know Bechtel doesn't. And (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: All the other sub-contractors are (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: So, basically back in, say, the early part of '81 now we have Baker, Thompson, Bell and yourself that are basically involved in (inaudible) at the time.

Whose responsibility would it be to insure that the work is accomplished as directed, according to specs, and on time?

MR. BUNTING: Steve Bell.

INVESTIGATOR: Steve Bell. He would be responsible for the supervision of Charlie Wright?

MR. BUNTING: Right.

INVESTIGATOR: Any reason why -- apparently there is a lack of direct supervision over one individual (inaudible) is extending overtime. I can't seem to understand that. Do you have (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: Well, yeah. I think that at one time Charlie and Steve were really friends. And they had a falling out at some time or another. And Charlie started doing that.

INVESTIGATOR: You take a normal welder and a normal (inaudible) seven or eight hours, and I would assume most people, especially (inaudible) working together, you would all expect to go home, say, four or five o'clock, all

the same time. And when you start extending that period, somebody is being -- somebody is (inaudible).

MR. BUNTING: Well, you have two different crafts. Charlie and his (inaudible), he ran out. I mean he was very touchy about it. (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: (inaudible) being in touch situation?

MR. BUNTING: Yeah.

INVESTIGATOR: Now, when you have a particular weld you need, the pipefitter operates the electrical control, controls the temperature. I guess then the electricians are on standby so they can handle any electrical problems that might develop.

MR. BUNTING: Plus (inaudible) the following day.

INVESTIGATOR: So if the man at the console wants to slow the process so he will get overtime, then it means that the entire crew has to stay?

MR. BUNTING: Well --

INVESTIGATOR: Until that cycle has been cleared?

MR. BUNTING: One person has to stay.

INVESTIGATOR: One electrician.

MR. BUNTING: (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: Does the superintendent (inaudible) have to stay?

MR. BUNTING: Superintendent (inaudible). The foreman is on with the electrician and the foreman is not required to (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: Okay. Back to the time frame that I (inaudible) what would be the normal work composition on a safety related piping that you were going (inaudible) say this morning, how many people would be there?

MR. BUNTING: First thing in the morning, everyone.

INVESTIGATOR: Everyone. And, again it would be the responsibility of the superintendent to get everybody going in the right direction.

What would a pipefitter do at that time?

MR. BUNTING: His jobs are to change (inaudible) if they need changing. Get his (inaudible) for the welds. And also to keep bulkhead inside the pipe. There is no electrical connections or anything like that. He puts basically a plug (inaudible) to keep the draft from flowing through the pipe.

INVESTIGATOR: What is the specific title for that?

MR. BUNTING: CIP (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: Construction, inspection and plant. And what is the piece of equipment specifically called, (inaudible) the pipefitter (inaudible), what is

that called?

MR. BUNTING: The console.

INVESTIGATOR: Yeah. Does it have a specific name?

MR. BUNTING: No.

INVESTIGATOR: On the form that they complete on a graph, there is a TM operator. What is a TM operator?

MR. BUNTING: TM operator at the time (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: Okay. Back to this handling of the safety related situation (inaudible), would it be right to assume in most of the cases (inaudible) had been placed there the day before?

MR. BUNTING: Oh, yes.

INVESTIGATOR: All that would be done without any observation or basically the knowledge of (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: Most of the time he didn't even know where the weld was that he was (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: What would be the normal (inaudible) located

MR. BUNTING: It would be behind (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: A different level.

MR. BUNTING: Yeah, right.

INVESTIGATOR: So, consequently to the best of your knowledge, the heat treatments that were done by Charlie were different than the ones we observed today which

are being done in a (inaudible).The ones he was doing were done inside one of the containments or one of the other (inaudible) out of the site.

MR. BUNTING: I don't know what welding he is referring to, but the ones in the building are (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: Is that where he worked? Only in the building, or did he work in the building and over at the (inaudible) shop both?

MR. BUNTING: He never worked in the (inaudible) shop in the past few years.

INVESTIGATOR: Okay. So all of his work was done in the building, and he did not see the electricians attaching thermal couples necessarily and all these other things. (inaudible)

So basically all he would see during the actual stress release in operation was the activities at the console. (inaudible) more behind the console, right?

MR. BUNTING: If he had a problem how (inaudible) he would contact us. We would (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: Procedurally, was he allowed to leave the console?

MR. BUNTING: No, I don't think so. No.

INVESTIGATOR: What happened if he had to go to the latrine or something of this nature?

MR. BUNTING: Usually, Steve would stand by.

These are (inaudible) with a (inaudible) weld, it's just a -- well, you have (inaudible) period there because it doesn't have to be monitored as closely while it's on automatic control and he can go (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: Why is that?

MR. BUNTING: Because the machine controls it. That's when it (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: Once he is adjusted.

MR. BUNTING: Yeah, right. (inaudible)other than sitting there and screaming (inaudible). He usually has his (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: In reference to a safety grade situation now, okay. A pipefitter is in a situation, the QC inspection of a safety related pipe (inaudible) done necessarily when the electrician is putting the thermal couples on. Do they have a requirement to be there (inaudible) at the start of the (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: QA --

INVESTIGATOR: QA, QC.

MR. BUNTING: Sometimes I know -- I don't think it is required, although (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: (inaudible) random selection, he might be around.

MR. BUNTING: And sometimes he inspects thermal couples after the (inaudible) but always before (inaudible)

the unit is put on and we have to, you know, watch when you are doing an actual draft.

INVESTIGATOR: We have information (inaudible) Mr. Wright claims to have overheard a conversation, including yourself, and Bell and Donaldson concerning paralleling of two thermal couples.

Do you recall that conversation?

MR. BUNTING: Not at all.

INVESTIGATOR: Does that conversation, that statement make any sense to you at all?

MR. BUNTING: No.

INVESTIGATOR: Is there such a thing as paralleling two thermal couples?

MR. BUNTING: I would imagine it is. I don't understand -- I can't understand how it would work.

INVESTIGATOR: Can you imagine (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: I could do it. I could take a spare thermal couple and a thermal couple (inaudible), tie all the red wires together and all the yellow wires together, basically you have a parallel. (inaudible) You get a false reading, a low reading.

INVESTIGATOR: Can you imagine, or do you know specifically whether or not you (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: I know -- yes, we (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: Could you draw that? Just show me

how you (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: Okay. This would be, say, one thermal couple. And this is another one. The control thermal couple and this one is the safety, the spare. This wire is red, this wire is red, this is yellow and yellow. And here is your console coming in with the thermal couple (inaudible), and one of these is red and we -- one would be yellow.

And the only way I can think of to parallel is to --

INVESTIGATOR: Okay. What is the normal configuration?

MR. BUNTING: Well, okay. Yellow to yellow. Red to red. And then this is just sitting there waiting to be used if something goes wrong with this.

INVESTIGATOR: Okay. Then these -- the wire off of these thermal couples then go up under your installation or blanket, right?

MR. BUNTING: Right.

INVESTIGATOR: And they are -- what we saw today, they would just be available in the event you lose one or the other.

MR. BUNTING: I think what you saw today, they were both hooked up at the weld. And off that cable we have two thermal couples going out to the weld.

INVESTIGATOR: Right.

MR. BUNTING: So we just hook them both up (inaudible) and then if we have any problems we can swap it behind the machine instead of working on the (inaudible) welds.

INVESTIGATOR: Oh, yeah. Right. Yeah. So, then --

INVESTIGATOR: Mike did this for us.

INVESTIGATOR: Yeah. Right. This wire runs all the way, (inaudible) to the back of the console.

MR. BUNTING: Right.

INVESTIGATOR: All right. So it would be red to red, yellow to yellow. And how would you do it in the event (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: This would be a parallel situation. That and like that. There is just no advantage to doing that.

INVESTIGATOR: Why do you think you get a lower reading by doing that?

MR. BUNTING: Well, because -- well, to begin with you can't get a higher reading. Your best reading would be off the (inaudible) couple. If you are (inaudible) a thermal couple that was bad or a thermal couple that was good, you would get an average somewhere in between.

INVESTIGATOR: Assuming they are all good now,

would an electrician --

MR. BUNTING: Assume they are all good --

INVESTIGATOR: -- puts it in --

MR. BUNTING: That would just be a mistake. It would be too low.

INVESTIGATOR: It might be (inaudible), his question: Why would it be too low?

MR. BUNTING: I don't know.

INVESTIGATOR: In a situation like this, if you did run it low I assume that would mean the register would be low, the reading would be low.

MR. BUNTING: There is something I would like to ask.

INVESTIGATOR: The heat would be, in fact (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: (inaudible) Donaldson (inaudible) those thermal couples are creating a --

INVESTIGATOR: (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: No. They create a potential.

INVESTIGATOR: Well, I -- yeah. They are generating a (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: What you actually have, if you (inaudible) you could go higher.

INVESTIGATOR: I'm not sure about that, but picture two dry cells on a flashlight battery, one is fully

charged and the other one is only half charged --

MR. BUNTING: Yeah.

INVESTIGATOR: The one on half charge draws down the fully charged one, because it's trying to feed juice into the not fully charged battery. So, as a result that is an average reading, something close to an average.

So that's why I'm sure what you have there is they weren't producing identical millivolts. One would be trying to feed into the other. And that would be drawing down (inaudible) so you would get a lower reading.

It might not be a lot lower but it would be something lower.

MR. BUNTING: It would still probably be within (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: If they are good thermal couples they are probably --

INVESTIGATOR: You are right. They are so close (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: (inaudible) it wouldn't make any difference.

INVESTIGATOR: And then the only other -- if you are in a situation like this, (inaudible) electrician, if you lose one then what does?

MR. BUNTING: Then you wire it just like here.

INVESTIGATOR: Yeah. A parallel (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: Right. It would go back to being a normal thermal couple.

INVESTIGATOR: Right. So, basically you can have a very small differentiation depending on (inaudible)

Well, as a general rule, do you hard wire to the rear of the console, the pipefitter changes (inaudible) coupler or does the electrician?

MR. BUNTING: The electrician does that. (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: So basically (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: Yeah.

INVESTIGATOR: The electrician is required to do it. This would only save you fooling around under the -- if you had to, if you lost both of them (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: Generally, we would do that. You would choose the thermal couple (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: What you are saying is there is no apparent value to parallel thermal couplings?

MR. BUNTING: No.

INVESTIGATOR: And you don't recall any conversations between -- again, to reiterate, between yourself and Donaldson and Bell which was overheard by Mr. Wright concerning whether or not you were attempting to parallel two thermal couples?

MR. BUNTING: None whatsoever. Not involving

(inaudible). A lot of times, talk of other jobs and such with Jack Donaldson and Steve Bell about different situations, no. I don't know. (inaudible) Jack made reference to someone who at one time was a (inaudible) so on. There was conversation like that going on.

INVESTIGATOR: How often?

MR. BUNTING: I heard it once.

INVESTIGATOR: What was the purpose of the conversation?

MR. BUNTING: It had to do with something at (inaudible) I think.

INVESTIGATOR: Who was the conversation between? You said you overheard --

MR. BUNTING: Jack --

INVESTIGATOR: Jack and Steve?

MR. BUNTING: Probably myself, having coffee or something like that. Probably Charlie was around, for all I know. But that was with Steve and Jack, knowledgeable about this situation, so they had the conversation.

INVESTIGATOR: So was this conversation in gist?

MR. BUNTING: No. It was more or less how the stock market was and what the world situation was.

INVESTIGATOR: (inaudible) you indicated -- I'm only very interested relative to the job itself, whether any conversations fell within (inaudible). Maybe I just

misunderstood what you said. Was there a conversation relative to cheating, relative -- concerning what questions (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: No.

INVESTIGATOR: Were there any conversations in gist as to how to beat the equipment, the machine, the wiring or anything else (inaudible) that you can recall?

MR. BUNTING: I don't know about that. I know that I asked Jack why he was doing the short-out test (inaudible) back of the console. I didn't know why he was doing that. He said he needed to be sure that each -- every thermal couple didn't control another thermal couple. I don't know whether he said (inaudible) we had eight thermal couples going and he would short one out on the machine. If there was something wrong going on, then two of them lead the pack on the chart.

And he would make sure just one did. And he would go through the thermal couple that way.

INVESTIGATOR: Periodically, then, he would run this check on (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: (inaudible) this is about Unit 2. (inaudible) nuclear on every --

INVESTIGATOR: Up to the time when Charlie Wright left, did he work both on Unit 1 and 2?

MR. BUNTING: Yes.

INVESTIGATOR: Anything in Unit 3?

MR. BUNTING: (inaudible) 1 and 2.

INVESTIGATOR: Strictly 1 and 2. Relative to Charlie Wright, what is your overall evaluation of his mental (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: (inaudible) his ability to understand conversations as to (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: After I had been here for two years, of course, I was completely familiar with what the machine was doing, I was involved with problems of -- all sorts of problems, to keep the maximum hour (inaudible) of the machine.

Charlie had no idea what went on other than in front of that screen. You couldn't even talk to him about it. He liked to run eight points, or eight thermal couples, and if there was any more than that he was mad and grumpy, irritable, hollering and screaming back and forth because he had twelve diodes, ten diodes. And he had his (inaudible) out and (inaudible) about it.

He (inaudible) do what Steve says. He is responsible for (inaudible) the conversation. (inaudible) you just couldn't help it either. He was just very, very mad at Steve. When he got laid off at first we thought it was some way, I guess, he would get even personally with

Steve. I really don't -- I really don't think these allegations are against myself and Jack as much as they are directed right at Steve.

INVESTIGATOR: I got the impression back in these days everybody was basically on a friendly relationship?

MR. BUNTING: Everyone was, except (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: Charlie.

MR. BUNTING: Charlie.

INVESTIGATOR: From what I saw this morning, (inaudible) a little bit (inaudible) building, what is your evaluation on how busy a pipefitter is when he is operating a console? I don't see where eight diodes or twelve diodes, it wouldn't make much difference. You could probably sleep all day and the machine probably (inaudible) itself once you (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: That's right. I don't know. I just think it's something that Charlie and Steve had.

INVESTIGATOR: Any reason for the apparent dislike?

MR. BUNTING: No. I never could figure it out. They were also very, very good friends before it started and I just don't know --

INVESTIGATOR: When did this disassociation begin? (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: Okay. It happened when Steve was

here and he went back to (inaudible) Los Angeles. And Gus (inaudible) he is another superintendent was in charge. He was here about six months. And then he went back and Steve returned. And after that it (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: When did Steve return?

MR. BUNTING: I still can't -- the time (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: Was it -- he was terminated in '81. Would it have been '81 when he came back? About the end of (inaudible) 1980?

MR. BUNTING: Yeah.

INVESTIGATOR: January?

MR. BUNTING: No, it was Dec -- it was 1980.

INVESTIGATOR: So, basically from December of 1980 to April of 1981, did Charlie Wright make many comments relative to being unhappy with the performance of the equipment and console?

MR. BUNTING: Oh, yes.

INVESTIGATOR: Such as?

MR. BUNTING: Well, he would always find something wrong with the thermal couples, go out and check the weld it would be fine. Come back and he would say -- just for example, one day he stopped my work and called me down to the console and had me go check a thermal couple. I walked (inaudible) at the time and talked to Steve and Jack for a few minutes, and when I came back in, I said: Is that

any better, Charlie? And he said: Yeah, that's a lot better.

He was just creating work for everyone.

INVESTIGATOR: In a situation like that, don't you look at the chart before you go --

MR. BUNTING: Oh, yes. Sure. I looked at the chart.

INVESTIGATOR: Well, can't you tell whether or not you lost one?

MR. BUNTING: It wasn't lost or I would have (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: No. That's what I'm saying. Why would you give Charlie -- the inference that you are not going to look at it and then turn around in a situation like that and (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: Because he had -- like I said, he would never get into the field and see actually what was (inaudible) off. And at this time when he was complaining so much, you have a weld like here and a weld like here. And this one would be going too fast, so he would turn it off. Normally it would go straight up or drop off, you know. But it (inaudible) still climb a little bit. That's because right here you are heating also. The runoff would come down there. And he just couldn't grasp it. That, you know, there could be other sources of heat rather than one (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: In these situations, did Charlie convey his comments directly to the electricians for corrective actions, or did he go to the superintendent?

In other words, what was his normal chain of command if he had a problem with (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: He felt it was the thermal couple, he hollered at us and then if we couldn't correct it he would go to Steve.

INVESTIGATOR: Did Charlie appear ever to have any interest in what was happening beyond the console?

MR. BUNTING: No. He had no interest in working the (inaudible) electricians, or the technology, the metallurgical technology, let's say, what's happening in the weld structure itself.

INVESTIGATOR: To your knowledge, he did not show any interest?

MR. BUNTING: No.

INVESTIGATOR: So you would not classify him as having any particular knowledge about welding, metalurgy?

MR. BUNTING: No.

INVESTIGATOR: Were there situations where Charlie possibly didn't understand a lot of things, didn't people tend to jest with him or play jokes on him or engage in conversations that he wouldn't necessarily understand?

MR. BUNTING: No. His personality was really

overbearing. I think if you were around him, you would just basically listen to him and --

INVESTIGATOR: Why do you say overbearing?

MR. BUNTING: Well, he knew everying and no one knew anything at all, you know. He just --

INVESTIGATOR: He tried to take command (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: Right.

INVESTIGATOR: Was he the type of individual that one might have the tendency to look on as a fool, that you could send him out for a left-handed wrench or a sky hook and that sort of thing?

MR. BUNTING: Not quite that bad. We used to refer to him as colorful, so (inaudible) or something like that. We would hear the same job maybe two weeks in a row every morning, and he would forget he had told us.

INVESTIGATOR: Do you -- I know you have answered part of the (inaudible) but I will paraphrase it.

Do you have knowledge of or any situation in which Tiny Tim told Charlie that he knew how to wire around a non-working thermal couple?

MR. BUNTING: No. Tiny was not here long enough to (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: (inaudible) Tiny was qualified as an electrician, then?

MR. BUNTING: (inaudible) by the (inaudible) as a

qualified electrician. I personally (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: What time frame do you recall Charlie worked for Western (inaudible)?

MR. BUNTING: Charlie worked --

INVESTIGATOR: No. Excuse me. Tiny Tim.

MR. BUNTING: Ah --

INVESTIGATOR: To the best of your ability.

MR. BUNTING: Yeah. About January to April, '81.

INVESTIGATOR: Of '81.

MR. BUNTING: He was laid off about two weeks after Charlie was.

INVESTIGATOR: Now, when you expressed "my full satisfaction with Tiny Tim's ability as an electrician", I know that some electricians are good and (inaudible) and some are good and graceful stallers. Was that perhaps the difference (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: He never worked anywhere but power houses. He only knew the trade, the (inaudible). And he wasn't -- again, he wasn't interested in (inaudible) work loads for the day, (inaudible) you know, saturated with getting more if you could out of the machine, like that.

He was just more or less a follower. (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: Are you aware of any situations in which Charlie Wright apparently was in conflict with the manner in which maintaining the charts that were inspected

by the KI (phonetic)? Was that your inspection?

MR. BUNTING: Would you ask that again?

INVESTIGATOR: Yeah. Do you recall any situations where -- it was during a visit by the ANI, he made some comments to Charlie that Charlie wasn't performing the way he should have been. Do you recall any ANI references to that?

MR. BUNTING: Not by name.

INVESTIGATOR: Is he still around here on the site?

MR. BUNTING: (inaudible) Either 1 or 2, I think. He is still around here.

INVESTIGATOR: If Charlie had a problem -- not necessarily a problem -- he wasn't necessarily the brightest individual in the world, who established the -- was aware of the parameters? Did he meet the (inaudible) TIT (inaudible) Was he able to do that and perform?

MR. BUNTING: Sure.

INVESTIGATOR: Basically very simple. (inaudible) and as long as the print-out was in the parameters established he could understand --

MR. BUNTING: Plus everything was repetitious.

INVESTIGATOR: What was his overall -- (inaudible) an estimate of his overall efficiency in performing his job?

MR. BUNTING: Very careful.

INVESTIGATOR: Basically accurate, then?

MR. BUNTING: And no reason to question (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: Do you know anything about an individual, Sam (inaudible)?

MR. BUNTING: Sam (inaudible).

INVESTIGATOR: Is he still around?

MR. BUNTING: (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: What was his position?

MR. BUNTING: He was (inaudible) coordinator in Unit 2.

INVESTIGATOR: Do you know whether or not Charlie ever discussed with him any problem areas that Charlie obstensibly became involved in (inaudible)?

MR. BUNTING: No, I don't know. I know of Sam's attitude towards Charlie. He told Steve that he should have got rid of him a long time before. He complained quite often about keeping him, the amount of time Charlie spent.

INVESTIGATOR: We have heard some comments relative to -- it is theoretically possible to wire a machine wherein you wouldn't necessarily have to have thermal couples establish the (inaudible).

Would Tiny Tim be able to do that?

MR. BUNTING: No. Absolutely not.

INVESTIGATOR: Do you recall the reason for --

the -- for Charlie's (inaudible) -- the (inaudible) termination?

MR. BUNTING: Yes. He shut the machine down for a couple of days. (inaudible) with an air hose and repairs and things like that, a general maintenance. (inaudible) there was no work for (inaudible) at that time. So Steve laid him off. That was the reason for (inaudible) laid off.

INVESTIGATOR: And how long is that temporary shutdown of equipment, two days? So, in effect, this was an effort of getting rid of --

MR. BUNTING: Absolutely.

INVESTIGATOR: Who is the current pipefitter?

MR. BUNTING: Mike Pugh.

INVESTIGATOR: Pugh. Was Pugh already hired when Charlie (inaudible)?

MR. BUNTING: He had been hired when (inaudible) 1 and 2. (inaudible) Since Charlie had been here longer, he was trying to lay off he laid off Mike instead of Charlie. And I think it was three months later that we heard (inaudible) after Charlie was gone. We didn't per se hire him back. We (inaudible) call and call (inaudible).

INVESTIGATOR: With your experience, since you have been there, is there any situation, any documentation of (inaudible) repairs (inaudible) by Western (inaudible) as not being accurate and (inaudible). Is there any

inaccuracies (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: No.

INVESTIGATOR: You do not know if there was any falsification, any attempt to beat the system?

MR. BUNTING: None whatsoever.

INVESTIGATOR: Do you recall any instance, Terry, where a mistake may have been made (inaudible) the heat (inaudible) temperature on the high side?

In other words, where a stress leak is normally done, say, between the valve and twelve hundred degrees (inaudible) and size and such. Do you recall any case where a mistake was made and the temperature was, say, considerably higher than the specified (inaudible) or the temperature that should have been specified?

MR. BUNTING: Yes. I do remember that happening once in Unit 1. It was two different types of materials, P-1 and P-5. The (inaudible) material, the welding rods they used wasn't right for what we stressed at. I think we stressed at thirteen, fifteen, or something like that, as per CIT. But they found out later that (audible) had been used and then it had (inaudible).

That's the only time I can --

INVESTIGATOR: Do you recall any occasion where the temperature of the weld was taken above, let's say, fifteen hundred degrees?

MR. BUNTING: Not the weld. One time we did a heat alignment (inaudible). Sixteen fifty or seventeen hundred degrees and held it (inaudible) in place.

INVESTIGATOR: Do you know whether or not Charlie was involved in that operation?

MR. BUNTING: He was the operator (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: Was there -- to your knowledge, was there a later concern by the metalurgist that the temperature may have been taken too high?

MR. BUNTING: I heard nothing at all pertaining to that.

INVESTIGATOR: Baker (inaudible) He is presently with --

MR. BUNTING: Bechtel.

INVESTIGATOR: Yeah. How about Tiny Tim? Do you recall his first name? We are trying to find --

MR. BUNTING: Thompson is his last name.

INVESTIGATOR: Yeah.

MR. BUNTING: (Inaudible) Like I said, he was a (inaudible) electrician. And Bechtel has refused to hire him back. It was something he did before he came to work with us. And I know he tried several times to get back on with Bechtel and (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: Would it be possible to find out if (inaudible) is still around?

MR. BUNTING: It would be impossible for me to find out.

INVESTIGATOR: If we find out --

MR. BUNTING: I don't know.

INVESTIGATOR: Well, ask (inaudible) as a general rule, we are trying to (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: Unless he would be a local, I don't know. (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: Do you have some of these old (inaudible)

MR. BUNTING: No. I have (inaudible) but you wouldn't call these permanent. These are hourly.

INVESTIGATOR: Would the record show when they were employed?

MR. BUNTING: For the most part, yeah.

INVESTIGATOR: I would like to look at (inaudible) and Tiny's, if you've got it, and Wright, if you've got it, and Bell's. Can you come up with Bell's (inaudible)

Can we go through the home office and get that?

MR. BUNTING: Sure.

INVESTIGATOR: What was Bell's first name?

MR. BUNTING: Steve.

INVESTIGATOR: Steve or Steven?

MR. BUNTING: Steven, I think.

INVESTIGATOR: Unless you have something else,

I think that (inaudible)

INVESTIGATOR: No.

INVESTIGATOR: Okay.