



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS FIELD OFFICE, REGION IV
611 RYAN PLAZA DRIVE, SUITE 1000
ARLINGTON, TEXAS 76011

DO NOT DISCLOSE

CONTAINS IDENTITY OF
CONFIDENTIAL SOURCE

REPORT OF INQUIRY

March 7, 1983

SUBJECT: WOLF CREEK
ALLEGED IMPROPER ELECTRICAL FABRICATION

REPORT NUMBER: Q4-83-005 (Transferred from 4-82-009)

1. On March 15, 1982, NRC Reactor Project Chief R. E. HALL received a telephonic allegation from [redacted] who identified self as a prior [redacted] at the Wolf Creek electrical fab shop. [redacted] alleged that during a period between June and late Fall of 1980, cable tray supports which were supposed to have been fabricated from A36 steel were in fact fabricated from other unknown steel due to a shortage of A36 material. [redacted] stated that [redacted] was aware of this substitution. [redacted] further alleged that during the fabrication of tubular supports, 1/8 inch weld rod was used instead of 3/32 inch rod as specified. [redacted] also alleged that [redacted] directed that tubular steel supports be reworked in the fab shop without proper documentation and QC inspection. [redacted] stated that [redacted] brother, and [redacted] could support [redacted] allegations. [redacted] stated [redacted] had been terminated from Wolf Creek in July of 1981, following a disagreement with [redacted]
2. During the latter part of 1982, NRC Investigator D. D. DRISKILL contacted [redacted] by telephone on several occasions in an attempt to make an appointment for an interview. During these telephone contacts, [redacted] repeatedly stated [redacted] was not available for interview because of pressing schedule as a truck driver and of various personal family problems.
3. On February 16, 1983, [redacted] supra, was interviewed by NRC Investigator H. B. GRIFFIN at Wolf Creek. When [redacted] was asked whether [redacted] knew of any instances where cable tray supports have been fabricated from steel other than A36 steel, [redacted] stated [redacted] did not. [redacted] was asked whether [redacted] knew of any shortages of A36 steel at the fab shop between June and late Fall of 1980, and [redacted] stated [redacted] did not know of any such shortages. [redacted] was asked whether [redacted] knew of the use of 1/8 inch weld rods instead of the specified 3/32 inch weld rods on tubular supports at the fab shop during June to late Fall 1980, and [redacted] stated [redacted] did not. [redacted] was asked whether [redacted] knew [redacted] and [redacted] stated [redacted] was a fab shop engineer at Wolf Creek. [redacted] was asked whether [redacted] had directed that tubular steel supports be reworked without proper documentation or QC inspection, and [redacted] stated [redacted] did not know of any such instructions given by [redacted] and [redacted] stated that both [redacted] and [redacted]

~~DO NOT DISCLOSE~~

~~CONTAINS IDENTITY OF
CONFIDENTIAL SOURCE~~

worked at the fab shop together. [] stated they had been close friends at work and also socially, but they had eventually had a falling-out.

(INVESTIGATOR'S NOTE: [] indicated [] had been fired from Daniel because of disagreement with [] indicated that [] was very unhappy with [] and attempted to get even with [])

4. On February 16, 1983, [] supra, was interviewed by NRC Investigator H. B. GRIFFIN at Wolf Creek. When [] was asked whether [] knew of any instances where cable tray supports have been fabricated from steel other than A36 steel at the fab shop, [] stated [] did not. [] stated [] did remember an instance where they had run out of A36 steel and they asked to use A575 steel, but were told they could not because "it was too good." [] was asked whether [] knew of the use of 1/8 inch weld rods instead of the specified 3/32 inch weld rods on tubular supports at the fab shop. [] stated [] knew of no such instances. [] further stated that 1/8 inch rods were better for longer welds and that they sometimes used it for that purpose. [] also stated they had to use 3/32 inch on unistrut welds because 3/32 inch required less temperature. [] stated if 1/8 rods were used, it would burn a hole in the unistruts. [] stated [] did not recall anybody attempting to use 1/8 inch rods in this manner. [] was asked whether [] knew [] and [] stated that [] was an [] When [] was asked whether any of the engineers at the fab shop had ever directed rework on tubular steel supports without documentation or QC inspection, [] stated [] did not know of any such instructions or rework done without proper documentation or inspection.

5. On February 17, 1983, [] was interviewed by NRC Investigator H. B. GRIFFIN at Wolf Creek. [] indicated [] knew of no materials that had ever been substituted for A36 steel in the fab shop in the construction of cable tray supports. [] stated that [] was not involved with the use of weld rods. When [] was asked whether tubular steel supports were reworked in the fab shop without proper documentation and QC inspection, [] stated that Bechtel described the figuration of such supports. [] stated that as an engineer, [] set the dimensions, and the fab shop did the fabrication of the supports. [] stated the supports had no design documents which traveled with them. [] further stated if the supports needed rework, the pieces were returned to the fab shop with a speed memorandum describing the changes that were needed. [] stated that when the changes on the supports were completed, the welds were re-inspected and the heat numbers reverified. [] stated that after the rework, the support along with the speed memorandum was returned to the field. When [] was told it was alleged [] had knowledge of and

~~OFFICIAL USE ONLY~~

DO NOT DISCLOSE

CONTAINS IDENTITY OF
CONFIDENTIAL SOURCE

participated in these activities, [] stated this was untrue. []
stated [] believed these allegations originated from a friendship which
[] had with a supervisor at the fab shop by the name of []

[] complained to a Daniel supervisor. [] stated
a supervisor at Wolf Creek []

[] indicated that [] believed these allegations
were unfounded, and that they were an attempt by [] to get even
with []

6. During the February 16, 1983, interview with [] the alleged's
[] was told that if [] wanted to be contacted or inter-
viewed by the NRC, [] could telephone this reporter. [] has not
returned NRC's telephone calls nor taken the opportunity to contact this
reporter. It is recommended this inquiry be closed at this time.

H. Brooks Griffin

H. Brooks Griffin, Investigator
Office of Investigations Field Office
Region IV

APPROVED BY:

Richard K. Herr

Richard K. Herr, Director
Office of Investigations Field Office
Region IV

cc: W. J. Ward, OI:DFO
P. E. Baci, OI:DFO
J. T. Collins, RIV
E. H. Johnson, RIV

CONFIDENTIAL

10/24/82

Truck Driver Cutler Re-Paving -
been in Mrs.


a) everywhere \rightarrow CFB/CEC/CED 9, 10, 11
not built right
a)'s used in reactor B.


b) possibly vice versa
all supports on job site
compare, not receipts - procedures -

2) lot of brackets welded
never inspected by QC

used old #'s after rework
to avoid having to have
insp's - - -

d) remember Eng. chg something brackets
pres in Reactor Control B's

 present and SSK ---

c) some brackets on hqrs didn't
have note angle - remarked &
sent them back to field.
--- most of people there (in shop)
not working anymore
I couldn't know where 

MR. O. SP. on floor

cable tray hqrs - mistrut - A-36
tube steel $5 \times 5 \times \frac{1}{2}$
long piece

OK

See Les Gilbert's
reports

Les says back to investigators

WOLF CREEK

→ NOCP?

for

Don Driskill

He be in Daniel Adam. Hly in
wanting to look at some personnel
records. Tom

Q4-83-005

2-17

for
Daniel for (almost five years) - started as ind.
Knows of no substitutions for A-36

Was not involved in weld rods tho
does know difference between $\frac{1}{8}$ & $\frac{3}{32}$.

Beethel describes configuration I
set dimensions. The shop fab.
No a design document. If the support
needs rework the pieces at that
time were returned w/ a speed memo
describing the changes. When
the changes were made the
welds were reinspected ^{and} the
heat number reverified. Then the
support along w/ a speed memo
were sent back to the field.

These allegations as they relate to
me are untrue. I believe they
originated from a friendship ~~and~~
I had with

I explained to
my supervisor in Daniel and
the Davis supervisor.

before

Doesn't remember not using A-36.
One time when they ran out we
asked to use A-575 and were
told no because it was too good.

Because $\frac{5}{8}$ was better for
large welds we sometimes used
it. We had to use $\frac{3}{32}$ or
instruct to instruct because of
the you could use less
temperature. If you tried to
use $\frac{5}{8}$ it would burn a
hole in the instruct.

Doesn't recall improper use
of $\frac{5}{8}$ this way.

Doesn't recall engineers ever
having work done w/o documentation.

2-16-83.
Interview of

Is [of]
Does not know anything about allegations
Was aware of ORC's attempt to locate

Said

and

were

then had falling out.

Cannot confirm or deny any of
original statement.

ALLEGATION DATA FORM (Instructions on reverse side)

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

RECEIVING OFFICE

1. Facility(ies) Involved:

(If more than 3, or if generic, write GENERIC)

(Name)

WOLF CREEK

BURLINGTON, KANSAS

Docket Number (if applicable)

2. Functional Area(s) Involved:

(Check appropriate boxes)

X

operations

construction

safeguards

other (Specify)

onsite health and safety

offsite health and safety

emergency preparedness

3. Description:

(Limit to 100 characters)

S	E	N	S	I	T	I	V	E											

4. Source of Allegation:

(Check appropriate box)

X

contractor employee

licensee employee

NRC employee

organization (Specify)

other (Specify)

security guard

news media

private citizen

5. Date Allegation Received:

MM DD YY

0	2	2	8	8	3
---	---	---	---	---	---

6. Name of Individual Receiving Allegation:

(First two initials and last name)

H.B. GRIFFIN

7. Office:

R	I	V	
---	---	---	--

ACTION OFFICE

8. Action Office Contact:

(First two initials and last name)

R.K. HERR

9. FTS Telephone Number:

7	2	8	-	8	1	1	0
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

10. Status:

(Check one)

✓

Open, if followup actions are pending or in progress

Closed, if followup actions are completed

11. Date Closed:

MM DD YY

--	--	--	--	--	--

12. Remarks:

(Limit to 50 characters)

Q	4	-	8	3	-	0	0	5											

13. Allegation Number:

				-				-	A				
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	---	---	--	--	--	--