

2000 Crystal Springs Rd. #911
San Bruno, CA 94066
January 27, 1988

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Washington, D.C.

Gentlemen:

I read with great interest a recent article in a trade journal concerning your hold up of licensing consideration for the South Texas Nuclear Project.

Since I worked on that project at one time, I might have a few things to contribute to your deliberations.

The high point of the project probably occurred at the "topping off" ceremony for the Unit I Reactor Building, in the summer of 1983. At that time, Ebasco, the prime contractor on the project, and Bechtel, the engineer, had a close and cooperative working relationship, which resulted in great accomplishment. For instance, the Unit II turbine building was about 51 weeks ahead of schedule. There few visible quality or safety problems. The technical problems that cropped up were quickly and efficiently dealt with. The major partner in the enterprise, Houston Lighting and Power (HL&P), had nothing but praise for the personnel working on the job, and publicly expressed that praise at the aforementioned topping off ceremony. HL&P's comments were echoed by the minority partners and by Ebasco and Bechtel executives who were there.

Then things started to deteriorate. It began with a visible change in the attitude of top management. They changed from a "can do", a "lets-get-the-job-done", "let's built a quality product" attitude to a "let's-see-who-we-can-blame-oth-er-than-ourselves" attitude.

Ebasco and Bechtel engineers and supervisors were aware of the pressures under which the managers were operating: There was an ongoing lawsuit with Brown and Root. One minority partner was actively seeking a buyer for his share; costs were going out of sight, and HL&P and its owner, Houston Industries, were facing an enormous cash flow problem. The upshot of these pressures was that management no longer seemed to want the plant to get built; instead, they seemed to be looking for an excuse for the inevitable failure. They were looking for someone to blame.

They finally hit on something. It was very neat, given the political atmosphere of the area and of the period. They grandly announced that they were engaged in a massive program to eliminate drugs from the project. Not just SOME

8803210436 880316
PDR ADOCK 05000498
A PDR

EEO---003519

drugs, mind you, but ALL drugs. First, they "trained" the personnel about the evils of drugs. Then they started circulating threatening memos telling people about all the things that would happen to them if they were caught with drugs. Then they started searching people's briefcases and lunch pails, and even deployed "drug-sniffing" guard dogs to intimidate personnel.

The situation continued to deteriorate until at last, by 1985, Houston Lighting & Power actually claimed that significant numbers of personnel working on the project were drug addicts and alcoholics and demanded that they urinate into bottles to prove that they were not! This insult and the accompanying abusive demand was contained in a memo to all plant personnel written by one of HL&P's vice-presidents. This obscene, disgusting, offensive policy was directed not just against HL&P personnel but also against Ebasco and Bechtel people on the job, against exempt employees and craft alike. (When the U.S. secretary of state, George Schultz, was confronted with a similar abusive demand, he promptly threatened to resign.)

The outcome was, of course, predictable: The best left first. The most articulate, intelligent, experienced people at the South Texas Project simply accepted offers elsewhere and departed.


That left the "drug addicts and alcoholics" to complete construction of the nuclear plant. In a word, since 1985, the South Texas Nuclear Project has been engineered and constructed by persons who have felt it necessary to urinate into bottles and to have their bodily fluids examined by hostile strangers in order to keep their jobs! The drug-testing program was known locally on the job as the "piss-test", and some people showed up to work wearing tee shirts bearing the legend "I pissed and passed!" Some of the people remaining on the jobs tried to rationalize the insult by mouthing the various slogans against drugs conveniently provided by HL&P. It is quite probable that other personnel were and are strongly motivated to sabotage the project any way they can. Such sabotage can be made virtually undetectable, especially since the "best and brightest" are long gone. For instance, certain inexperienced persons might argue "If an inch of weld on a joint is good, then two inches of weld must be better." Pretty soon they're cooking the hell out of key structural joints, and no one knows that they are actually weakening these joints! From such things come the Chernobles of the world!

The best the NRC can hope for, in terms of plant safety, if it is planning to license the South Texas Nuclear Project,

is that the latter stages of the project was built by persons of indeterminate competence, but whose urine was free from certain substances at a certain time.

Frankly, gentlemen, unless there has been a massive change in the attitudes and policies of the management at the South Texas Project, I suggest that the NRC would be out of its collective mind to even contemplate licensing the South Texas Project at this time. The people managing the construction of the project are simply not qualified to build a nuclear power plant!

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Jerry Greenberg". The signature is stylized with a large, sweeping flourish that extends to the right and then loops back down and left.

Jerry Greenberg, PE

1 EDO



Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C.

MAR 16 1988

Mr. Jerry Greenberg
2000 Crystal Springs Road #911
San Bruno, California 94066

Dear Mr. Greenberg:

Thank you for your letter on January 27, 1988 in which you communicated your impressions about the management of construction at the South Texas Project. The two issues you raise are that (1) management of the fitness-for-duty program caused considerable dissatisfaction among the workers and (2) the competence of the workers who participated in the final construction stages may be questionable.

The NRC is sensitive to the difficulties raised by implementation of a fitness-for-duty program. We recognize the potential adverse effects on workers' morale and that it is important for such a program to be administered in such a way as to protect the rights of individuals. However, we support utility efforts to ensure that personnel involved in the construction of safety related structures, systems and components be free of the influence of illegal drugs.

The NRC staff has also examined your letter to determine whether you provided information regarding any deficiencies in structures, systems or components. Although you allude to such potential deficiencies to illustrate your argument, you did not provide sufficient detail to suggest that the matter you refer to is anything more than a hypothetical illustration. Hence, the staff has determined that no safety-related matter is raised by your letter on which action can be taken.

On the matter of competence of personnel, we would like to assure you that the NRC staff does observe the licensee's activities for any systematic breakdown in regard to competence. Inspection staff at the site and at the regional office observe construction activities and provide their assessment in periodic reviews of the licensee's performance. The subject of integrity and competence of the South Texas Project's management was also examined in adjudicatory hearings. In addition, for many categories of work, for example, welding, specific regulations exist which require certification of proper competence for both the craft and quality control personnel. The staff has found that the South Texas Project meets the applicable regulations and that the construction at Unit 1 has been accomplished in a satisfactory manner.

Sincerely,

Thomas E. Murley

Thomas E. Murley, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File
EDO # 003519
F. Miraglia
DR4A/J. Collins
SECY
P. Shea
J. Calvo
R. Brady, PMAS

NRC PDR w/cy of incoming
EDO Reading
PD4 Reading
OGC-Bethesda
V. Stello
P. Kadambi w/cy of incoming
P. Noonan
T. Rehm

Local PDR w/cy of incoming
T. Murley/J. Sniezek
D. Crutchfield
GPA/CA
D. Mossburg, PMAS (EDO#003519)
w/cy of incoming
PD4 Green Ticket File
R. Martin

*See previous concurrences:

PD4/LA*	PD4/PM*	PMAS*	PD4/D*	Tech. Ed.*	OGC*
PNoonan	PKadambi:sr		JCalvo		LChandler
03/04/88	03/04/88	03/09/88	03/09/88	03/09/88	03/10/88
DRSP:D*	ADP*				
DCrutchfield	FMiraglia:sh				
03/11/88	03/11/88	03/14/88			



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

Mr. Jerry Greenberg
2000 Crystal Springs Road #911
San Bruno, California 94066

Dear Mr. Greenberg:

Thank you for your letter on January 27, 1988 in which you communicated your impressions about the management of construction at the South Texas Project. The two issues you raise are that (1) management of the fitness-for-duty program caused considerable dissatisfaction among the workers and (2) the competence of the workers who participated in the final construction stages may be questionable.

The NRC is sensitive to the difficulties raised by implementation of a fitness-for-duty program. We recognize the potential adverse effects on workers' morale and that it is important for such a program to be administered in such a way as to protect the rights of individuals. However, we support utility efforts to ensure that personnel involved in the construction of safety related structures, systems and components be free of the influence of illegal drugs.

The NRC staff has also examined your letter to determine whether you provided information regarding any deficiencies in structures, systems or components. Although you allude to such potential deficiencies to illustrate your argument, you did not provide sufficient detail to suggest that the matter you refer to is anything more than a hypothetical illustration. Hence, the staff has determined that no safety-related matter is raised by your letter on which action can be taken.

On the matter of competence of personnel, we would like to assure you that the NRC staff does observe the licensee's activities for any systematic breakdown in regard to competence. Inspection staff at the site and at the regional office observe construction activities and provide their assessment in periodic reviews of the licensee's performance. The subject of integrity and competence of the South Texas Project's management was also examined in adjudicatory hearings. In addition, for many categories of work, for example, welding, specific regulations exist which require certification of proper competence for both the craft and quality control personnel. The staff has found that the South Texas Project meets the applicable regulations and that the construction at Unit 1 has been accomplished in a satisfactory manner.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "T. Murley".

Thomas E. Murley, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

*DMC
Can we
discuss?*

ACTION

EDO PRINCIPAL CORRESPONDENCE CONTROL

FROM:

DATE: 03/11/88

EDO CONTROL: 003519

DOC ID: 01/27/88

FINAL REPLY:

JERRY GREENBERG
SAN BRUNO, CA

TO:

NRC

FOR SIGNATURE OF:

** GREEN **

SFOY NO:

MURLEY

DESC:

ROUTING:

CONCERNING SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT

REHM
RMARTIN

DATE: 02/24/88

ASSIGNED TO: NRR

CONTACT: MURLEY

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS OR REMARKS:

NRR RECEIVED: FEBRUARY 24, 1988

ACTION: DRSP:CRUTCHFIELD

NRR ROUTING: MURLEY/SNIEZEK
MIRAGLIA
MARTIN
GILLESPIE
MOSSBURG

ACTION
DUE TO NRR DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
BY max 9, 1988

2000 Crystal Springs Rd. #911
San Bruno, CA 94066
January 27, 1988

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Washington, D.C.

Gentlemen:

I read with great interest a recent article in a trade journal concerning your hold up of licensing consideration for the South Texas Nuclear Project.

Since I worked on that project at one time, I might have a few things to contribute to your deliberations.

The high point of the project probably occurred at the "topping off" ceremony for the Unit I Reactor Building, in the summer of 1983. At that time, Ebasco, the prime contractor on the project, and Bechtel, the engineer, had a close and cooperative working relationship, which resulted in great accomplishment. For instance, the Unit II turbine building was about 51 weeks ahead of schedule. There few visible quality or safety problems. The technical problems that cropped up were quickly and efficiently dealt with. The major partner in the enterprise, Houston Lighting and Power (HL&P), had nothing but praise for the personnel working on the job, and publicly expressed that praise at the aforementioned topping off ceremony. HL&P's comments were echoed by the minority partners and by Ebasco and Bechtel executives who were there.

Then things started to deteriorate. It began with a visible change in the attitude of top management. They changed from a "can do", a "lets-get-the-job-done", "let's built a quality product" attitude to a "let's-see-who-we-can-blame-other-than-ourselves" attitude.

Ebasco and Bechtel engineers and supervisors were aware of the pressures under which the managers were operating: There was an ongoing lawsuit with Brown and Root. One minority partner was actively seeking a buyer for his share; costs were going out of sight, and HL&P and its owner, Houston Industries, were facing an enormous cash flow problem. The upshot of these pressures was that management no longer seemed to want the plant to get built; instead, they seemed to be looking for an excuse for the inevitable failure. They were looking for someone to blame.

They finally hit on something. It was very neat, given the political atmosphere of the area and of the period. They grandly announced that they were engaged in a massive program to eliminate drugs from the project. Not just SOME

drugs, mind you, but ALL drugs. First, they "trained" the personnel about the evils of drugs. Then they started circulating threatening memos telling people about all the things that would happen to them if they were caught with drugs. Then they started searching people's briefcases and lunch pails, and even deployed "drug-sniffing" guard dogs to intimidate personnel.

The situation continued to deteriorate until at last, by 1985, Houston Lighting & Power actually claimed that significant numbers of personnel working on the project were drug addicts and alcoholics and demanded that they urinate into bottles to prove that they were not! This insult and the accompanying abusive demand was contained in a memo to all plant personnel written by one of HL&P's vice-presidents. This obscene, disgusting, offensive policy was directed not just against HL&P personnel but also against Ebasco and Bechtel people on the job, against exempt employees and craft alike. (When the U.S. secretary of state, George Schultz, was confronted with a similar abusive demand, he promptly threatened to resign.)

The outcome was, of course, predictable: The best left first. The most articulate, intelligent, experienced people at the South Texas Project simply accepted offers elsewhere and departed.


That left the "drug addicts and alcoholics" to complete construction of the nuclear plant. In a word, since 1985, the South Texas Nuclear Project has been engineered and constructed by persons who have felt it necessary to urinate into bottles and to have their bodily fluids examined by hostile strangers in order to keep their jobs! The drug-testing program was known locally on the job as the "piss-test", and some people showed up to work wearing tee shirts bearing the legend "I pissed and passed!" Some of the people remaining on the jobs tried to rationalize the insult by mouthing the various slogans against drugs conveniently provided by HL&P. It is quite probable that other personnel were and are strongly motivated to sabotage the project any way they can. Such sabotage can be made virtually undetectable, especially since the "best and brightest" are long gone. For instance, certain inexperienced persons might argue "If an inch of weld on a joint is good, then two inches of weld must be better." Pretty soon they're cooking the hell out of key structural joints, and no one knows that they are actually weakening these joints! From such things come the Chernobles of the world!

The best the NRC can hope for, in terms of plant safety, if it is planning to license the South Texas Nuclear Project,

is that the latter stages of the project was built by persons of indeterminate competence, but whose urine was free from certain substances at a certain time.

Frankly, gentlemen, unless there has been a massive change in the attitudes and policies of the management at the South Texas Project, I suggest that the NRC would be out of its collective mind to even contemplate licensing the South Texas Project at this time. The people managing the construction of the project are simply not qualified to build a nuclear power plant!

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jerry Greenberg". The signature is stylized and somewhat cursive, with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jerry Greenberg, PE

Mr. Jerry Greenberg
2000 Crystal Springs Road #911
San Bruno, California 94066

MAR 16 1988

Dear Mr. Greenberg:

Thank you for your letter on January 27, 1988 in which you communicated your impressions about the management of construction at the South Texas Project. The two issues you raise are that (1) management of the fitness-for-duty program caused considerable dissatisfaction among the workers and (2) the competence of the workers who participated in the final construction stages may be questionable.

The NRC is sensitive to the difficulties raised by implementation of a fitness-for-duty program. We recognize the potential adverse effects on workers' morale and that it is important for such a program to be administered in such a way as to protect the rights of individuals. However, we support utility efforts to ensure that personnel involved in the construction of safety related structures, systems and components be free of the influence of illegal drugs.

The NRC staff has also examined your letter to determine whether you provided information regarding any deficiencies in structures, systems or components. Although you allude to such potential deficiencies to illustrate your argument, you did not provide sufficient detail to suggest that the matter you refer to is anything more than a hypothetical illustration. Hence, the staff has determined that no safety-related matter is raised by your letter on which action can be taken.

On the matter of competence of personnel, we would like to assure you that the NRC staff does observe the licensee's activities for any systematic breakdown in regard to competence. Inspection staff at the site and at the regional office observe construction activities and provide their assessment in periodic reviews of the licensee's performance. The subject of integrity and competence of the South Texas Project's management was also examined in adjudicatory hearings. In addition, for many categories of work, for example, welding, specific regulations exist which require certification of proper competence for both the craft and quality control personnel. The staff has found that the South Texas Project meets the applicable regulations and that the construction at Unit 1 has been accomplished in a satisfactory manner.

Sincerely,

Thomas E. Murley

Thomas E. Murley, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File
EDO # 003519
F. Miraglia
DR4A/J. Collins
SECY
P. Shea
J. Calvo
R. Brady, PMAS

NRC PDR w/cy of incoming
EDO Reading
PD4 Reading
OGC-Bethesda
V. Stello
P. Kadambi w/cy of incoming
P. Noonan
T. Rehm

Local PDR w/cy of incoming
T. Murley/J. Sniezek
D. Crutchfield
GPA/CA
D. Mossburg, PMAS (EDO#003519)
w/cy of incoming
PD4 Green Ticket File
R. Martin

*See previous concurrences:

PD4/LA*	PD4/PM*	PMAS*	PD4/D*	Tech. Ed.*	OGC*
PNoonan	PKadambi:sr		JCalvo		LChandler
03/04/88	03/04/88	03/09/88	03/09/88	03/09/88	03/10/88
DRSP:D*	ADP*				
DCrutchfield	FMiraglia:4				
03/11/88	03/11/88	03/14/88			



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

Mr. Jerry Greenberg
2000 Crystal Springs Road #911
San Bruno, California 94066

Dear Mr. Greenberg:

Thank you for your letter on January 27, 1988 in which you communicated your impressions about the management of construction at the South Texas Project. The two issues you raise are that (1) management of the fitness-for-duty program caused considerable dissatisfaction among the workers and (2) the competence of the workers who participated in the final construction stages may be questionable.

The NRC is sensitive to the difficulties raised by implementation of a fitness-for-duty program. We recognize the potential adverse effects on workers' morale and that it is important for such a program to be administered in such a way as to protect the rights of individuals. However, we support utility efforts to ensure that personnel involved in the construction of safety related structures, systems and components be free of the influence of illegal drugs.

The NRC staff has also examined your letter to determine whether you provided information regarding any deficiencies in structures, systems or components. Although you allude to such potential deficiencies to illustrate your argument, you did not provide sufficient detail to suggest that the matter you refer to is anything more than a hypothetical illustration. Hence, the staff has determined that no safety-related matter is raised by your letter on which action can be taken.

On the matter of competence of personnel, we would like to assure you that the NRC staff does observe the licensee's activities for any systematic breakdown in regard to competence. Inspection staff at the site and at the regional office observe construction activities and provide their assessment in periodic reviews of the licensee's performance. The subject of integrity and competence of the South Texas Project's management was also examined in adjudicatory hearings. In addition, for many categories of work, for example, welding, specific regulations exist which require certification of proper competence for both the craft and quality control personnel. The staff has found that the South Texas Project meets the applicable regulations and that the construction at Unit 1 has been accomplished in a satisfactory manner.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "T. Murley".

Thomas E. Murley, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

*DMC
Can we
discuss?*

ACTION

EDO PRINCIPAL CORRESPONDENCE CONTROL

FROM:

DATE: 03/11/88

EDO CONTROL: 003519

DOC DT: 01/27/88

FINAL REPLY:

JERRY GREENBERG
SAN BRUNO, CA

TO:

NRC

FOR SIGNATURE OF:

** GREEN **

SFCY NO:

MURLEY

DESC:

CONCERNING SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT

ROUTING:

REHM
RMARTIN

DATE: 02/24/88

ASSIGNED TO: NRR

CONTACT: MURLEY

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS OR REMARKS:

NRR RECEIVED: FEBRUARY 24, 1988

ACTION: DRSP:CRUTCHFIELD

NRR ROUTING: MURLEY/SNIEZLK
MIRAGLIA
MARTIN
GILLESPIE
MOSSBURG

ACTION
DUE TO NRR DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
BY mart 9, 1988

2000 Crystal Springs Rd. #911
San Bruno, CA 94066
January 27, 1988

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Washington, D.C.

Gentlemen:

I read with great interest a recent article in a trade journal concerning your hold up of licensing consideration for the South Texas Nuclear Project.

Since I worked on that project at one time, I might have a few things to contribute to your deliberations.

The high point of the project probably occurred at the "topping off" ceremony for the Unit I Reactor Building, in the summer of 1983. At that time, Ebasco, the prime contractor on the project, and Bechtel, the engineer, had a close and cooperative working relationship, which resulted in great accomplishment. For instance, the Unit II turbine building was about 51 weeks ahead of schedule. There few visible quality or safety problems. The technical problems that cropped up were quickly and efficiently dealt with. The major partner in the enterprise, Houston Lighting and Power (HL&P), had nothing but praise for the personnel working on the job, and publicly expressed that praise at the aforementioned topping off ceremony. HL&P's comments were echoed by the minority partners and by Ebasco and Bechtel executives who were there.

Then things started to deteriorate. It began with a visible change in the attitude of top management. They changed from a "can do", a "lets-get-the-job-done", "let's built a quality product" attitude to a "let's-see-who-we-can-blame-others-than-ourselves" attitude.

Ebasco and Bechtel engineers and supervisors were aware of the pressures under which the managers were operating: There was an ongoing lawsuit with Brown and Root. One minority partner was actively seeking a buyer for his share; costs were going out of sight, and HL&P and its owner, Houston Industries, were facing an enormous cash flow problem. The upshot of these pressures was that management no longer seemed to want the plant to get built; instead, they seemed to be looking for an excuse for the inevitable failure. They were looking for someone to blame.

They finally hit on something. It was very neat, given the political atmosphere of the area and of the period. They grandly announced that they were engaged in a massive program to eliminate drugs from the project. Not just SOME

drugs, mind you, but ALL drugs. First, they "trained" the personnel about the evils of drugs. Then they started circulating threatening memos telling people about all the things that would happen to them if they were caught with drugs. Then they started searching people's briefcases and lunch pails, and even deployed "drug-sniffing" guard dogs to intimidate personnel.

The situation continued to deteriorate until at last, by 1985, Houston Lighting & Power actually claimed that significant numbers of personnel working on the project were drug addicts and alcoholics and demanded that they urinate into bottles to prove that they were not! This insult and the accompanying abusive demand was contained in a memo to all plant personnel written by one of HL&P's vice-presidents. This obscene, disgusting, offensive policy was directed not just against HL&P personnel but also against Ebasco and Bechtel people on the job, against exempt employees and craft alike. (When the U.S. secretary of state, George Schultz, was confronted with a similar abusive demand, he promptly threatened to resign.)

The outcome was, of course, predictable: The best left first. The most articulate, intelligent, experienced people at the South Texas Project simply accepted offers elsewhere and departed.


That left the "drug addicts and alcoholics" to complete construction of the nuclear plant. In a word, since 1985, the South Texas Nuclear Project has been engineered and constructed by persons who have felt it necessary to urinate into bottles and to have their bodily fluids examined by hostile strangers in order to keep their jobs! The drug-testing program was known locally on the job as the "piss-test", and some people showed up to work wearing tee shirts bearing the legend "I pissed and passed!" Some of the people remaining on the jobs tried to rationalize the insult by mouthing the various slogans against drugs conveniently provided by HL&P. It is quite probable that other personnel were and are strongly motivated to sabotage the project any way they can. Such sabotage can be made virtually undetectable, especially since the "best and brightest" are long gone. For instance, certain inexperienced persons might argue "If an inch of weld on a joint is good, then two inches of weld must be better." Pretty soon they're cooking the hell out of key structural joints, and no one knows that they are actually weakening these joints! From such things come the Chernobles of the world!

The best the NRC can hope for, in terms of plant safety, if it is planning to license the South Texas Nuclear Project,

is that the latter stages of the project was built by persons of indeterminate competence, but whose urine was free from certain substances at a certain time.

Frankly, gentlemen, unless there has been a massive change in the attitudes and policies of the management at the South Texas Project, I suggest that the NRC would be out of its collective mind to even contemplate licensing the South Texas Project at this time. The people managing the construction of the project are simply not qualified to build a nuclear power plant!

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Jerry Greenberg". The signature is stylized with a large, sweeping flourish that extends to the right and then loops back down towards the name.

Jerry Greenberg, PE