

DO NOT DISCLOSE

7d

RECEIVED

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

TECHNICAL REVIEW TEAM STAFF

DO NOT DISCLOSE

Taken by: Carmen Gooden, CSR, RPR

September 17, 1984

8607030157 860623
PDR FOIA
GARDE86-A-18 PDR

Carmen Gooden
FOIA-85-59
2727 BUFFALO DRIVE
ARLINGTON, TEXAS 76013
265-3481

P/41

DO NOT DISCLOSE

1

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3 TECHNICAL REVIEW TEAM
4
5
6

7 TECHNICAL INTERVIEW
8

9 Monday, September 17, 1984
10 Granbury, Texas

11 This interview was commenced at 8:00 p.m.
12

13 PRESENT:

14 MS. R. C. TANG
15 Technical Review Team Staff
16 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
17 Washington, D. C. 20555

18 MR. THOMAS CURRY
19 Technical Reviewer
20 Comanche Peak Technical Review Team

21 MR. HERB LIVERMORE
22 Technical Review Team Staff
23 Nuclear Regulatory Commission

24 WITNESS "Y"
25

DO NOT DISCLOSE

1 MS. TANG: For the record, this is an interview of
2 Witness "Y" at Granbury, Texas. The purpose is to provide
3 Witness "Y" an opportunity to make some statements regard-
4 ing the fuel transfer canal at Comanche Peak. Present at
5 this interview are Mr. Tom Curry, a Technical Reviewer of
6 the NRC's Comanche Peak Technical Review Team; myself, R.
7 C. Tang, also with the NRC; and Mr. Herb Livermore, Group
8 Leader--QA-QC Group Leader, Technical Review Team.

9 You tell us what you want to say, then we'll ask
10 you questions later, as you go along. This will be locked
11 in our safe, sanitized before anybody gets a page. For
12 instance, Tom, when he goes on to review, he'll get a
13 sanitized page.

14 WITNESS "Y": [REDACTED]

15 [REDACTED] I was informed that the
16 stainless steel liner in the transfer canal would start to
17 be reworked. It had been quite inactive for some time, and
18 the Brown and Root quality control organization had been
19 responsible for it previous to that. I began to staff up
20 and picked up the travelers, the information on the stain-
21 less steel liner at that time to review it. I found many
22 missing hold points. I was quite concerned. I went to my
23 supervisor, [REDACTED] expressed my concerns to him,
24 asked him if he could get up with the Brown and Root organi-
25 zation.

1 Now, you thoroughly understand at that time we
2 had what you call the Brown and Root QA-QC organization
3 which is the ASME organization. You have the TUGCO non-
4 ASME QA-QC organization which does all inspections for non-
5 ASME items, items such as AWS, IEEE, whatever standards are
6 involved.

7 Again, as I informed my supervisor, we had many
8 missing hold points from what I could see in documentation.
9 He said he'd get up with [REDACTED] who was the Brown
10 and Root supervisor, and see what we could do. I was con-
11 tacted a few days later, and a gentleman by the name of [REDACTED]
12 [REDACTED] came on to the night shift to assist me to see
13 what he could do to clear up these items. He basically
14 asked me what I felt he ought to do to clear it up. I said,
15 "Take care of the hold points that are missing that you can;
16 what you can't, let's identify it on a non-conformance and
17 get Engineering evaluation, Quality Engineering concurrence
18 and we can move on with this thing."

19 He provided a review cycle and basically--I under-
20 stand somewhere in this review cycle where he was getting--
21 trying to clear up points; we had some allegations that
22 were made at that point, but I won't address that because
23 I really don't have any information that I can give you on
24 that.

25 I understand that during testimony given by [REDACTED]

9/20/84

Prior to the interview, Witness Y indicated that he would not talk unless he could be assured of confidentiality. I told him that we would have a confidentiality agreement executed at a later date.

- ② Although "Witness Y" was used instead of his name whenever he spoke (in the transcript), the individual mentioned his own name frequently during the conversation.

The transcript should not be released to the parties to the hearing unless the TRT has ~~been~~ obtained permission from Witness Y.

RC Tang
TRT Staff

1 [REDACTED] and others on these allega-
2 tions they kept referring to the fact that all this was
3 basically [REDACTED] idea and we were only doing what he told us
4 to do; that's incorrect. They acted on their own on anything
5 that they performed.

6 . It took [REDACTED] and his group a week, week and-
7 a-half or so to review, to get through with this review
8 cycle on the travelers and try to clear up what he could.
9 I was informed that he had cleared it up, and I was
10 delivered boxes of travelers, little blue folders,
11 travelers.

12 I took a look at it again. I really wasn't
13 satisfied with what I had seen, and I issued a non-
14 conformance report, which I have a copy of here. You'll
15 find that that's co-authored by a gentleman on the day
16 shift by the name of [REDACTED] The sequence of events
17 here started approximately the 1st of March, and you'll
18 notice the date on that non-conformance is around the 17th
19 of March. I basically issued it, said I'd performed a
20 random review of travelers that I had, and I felt that there
21 was missing hold points. What I was doing was identifying
22 a problem for Engineering evaluation and Quality Engineering
23 concurrence on what they decided to do with it.

24 I understand in the hearings that Judge Bloch
25 could not understand why it took 17 days after the first

1 initial discovery that we're missing hold points for some-
2 one to issue a non-conformance report, because that's the
3 sequence of events; it took that long to get back to my
4 supervision so I could take a look at it. Like I said, I
5 wasn't really satisfied with it, so I issued a non-
6 conformance report. You'll notice that there's been hold
7 tags applied, so basically we were shut down. We were
8 performing no work at any point in time here. In this
9 sequence of events we performed no work on the night shift.
10 No supervisors under my supervision performed any inspections
11 on any part of the stainless steel liner in the transfer
12 canal, fuel canal, any part of it.

13 MR. LIVERMORE: During this hold time, they had all the
14 paperwork, [REDACTED] had all the paperwork?

15 WITNESS "Y": [REDACTED] had all the paperwork. [REDACTED]

16 [REDACTED] is basically [REDACTED] right-hand man. He's a [REDACTED]

17 [REDACTED] I'm sure you've run across him out there.

18 It took them from about the 1st of March, first
19 part of March, up until about the 15th or so, and then for
20 me to look at it about the 17th before I could issue the
21 non-conformance report.

22 I understand that also in the hearings that it was
23 stated that, "You know, there's really no problem with this;
24 [REDACTED] this; [REDACTED] could accept that; he
25 directed us as to what we should have done." Well, that's

1 the misdirection that I'm talking about. I didn't direct
2 anybody. [REDACTED] works for Brown and Root. He does his
3 own thing. I made suggestions to him that he clear up his
4 hold points and what he couldn't, issue a non-conformance
5 on it.

6 MS. TANG: Do you know if that's the first time your
7 name was mentioned?

8 WITNESS "Y": I've been told that the NRC, because
9 of these allegations on this same thing, has investigated
10 and had testimony and depositions given out there. I never
11 could understand why I wasn't contacted when people kept
12 using my name in those depositions, making statements, "Well,

13 [REDACTED] told us what to do; [REDACTED] approved it; [REDACTED] did this."

14 I never did know that I gave [REDACTED]
15 [REDACTED] or anybody else any directions.

16 We sat inactive for a couple--another week,
17 basically because we had a hold tag on them. I wouldn't
18 proceed until I got some kind of direction from Engineering.
19 After much persistence--these are copies, by the way--from
20 crafts, I wrote a memo to a [REDACTED] who is the
21 non-ASME Level Three Quality Engineer responsible. You'll
22 see his name on the bottom of that NCR, [REDACTED] I
23 basically said this: [REDACTED] would you please leave me
24 some information on the status of the stainless steel liner
25 seam welds. The craft is holding off working same until

1 seam weld travelers are cleared and are released. Thanks,
2 [REDACTED] It's dated [REDACTED] I'm still the hold at 3-25-83.

3 You can read [REDACTED] answer to me.

4 MR. LIVERMORE: [REDACTED] I checked with [REDACTED]"

5 MS. TANG: Do you want to read it for us because you
6 would know--

7 WITNESS "Y": [REDACTED] the [REDACTED] is what
8 he's saying. That's all we knew him by.

9 MS. TANG: Do you want to just read this, and then the
10 reply?

11 WITNESS "Y": [REDACTED] "--again referring to [REDACTED]
12 [REDACTED] --"would you please leave me some information on the
13 status of the stainless steel liner seam weld. Craft is
14 holding off working same"--basically they were holding off
15 because I wouldn't let them proceed--"until seam weld
16 travelers are cleared and are released." What I'm talking
17 about "cleared and released" is I basically had a hold on
18 them for non-conformance.

19 Reply: [REDACTED] I checked with [REDACTED]
20 and he writes down here [REDACTED] and that's
21 basically who's responsible for the work on the liners,
22 the millwright--"and [REDACTED] --he's, I believe, a
23 [REDACTED] and he's got down behind him
24 Quality Engineer for the ASME group in parentheses behind
25 him, giving his title--"and they said that a review was

FORM 104
FISCAL CO. BOSTON, N.J. 07003

DO NOT DISCLOSE

8

1 performed of all travelers, that they had started work on
2 them, "--that's basically Brown and Root and that's all we're
3 interested in--"and the ones listed on the NCR"--which you'll
4 see on page 2, that's my handwriting on page 2 where I just
5 took a random and said, "Hey, here's a bunch of them"; why
6 I did that and why I said random is I think I established
7 a trend with that many; as you can see on page 2 I estab-
8 lished a trend that we did have some problems.

9 MS. TANG: I want to mention a number. Identify the
10 NCR for the record.

11 WITNESS "Y": It's NCR--I don't have to look at it; I
12 got it memorized--[REDACTED] Said "that a review was per-
13 formed of all travelers, that they had started work on
14 them, and the ones listed on the NCR are all the travelers
15 that had a QC hold point missed." The NCR has been revised--
16 this NCR had a bunch of rev one's--without my knowledge
17 to remove the word random in the non-conforming condition.

18 MS. TANG: This is the revision.

19 WITNESS "Y": No, ma'am, that's the original.

20 MS. TANG: A copy of the original.

21 WITNESS "Y": The NCR as you would read it is Rev 1
22 now and would say--the word "random" would be removed and
23 it would say "a review has been performed."

24 MS. TANG: And the date of the note?

25 WITNESS "Y": His answer is dated 3--it looks like it's

DO NOT DISCLOSE

1 3-25-83 also. You got to remember I wrote this at maybe
2 3 or 4:00 in the morning, and he answered me back the same
3 day. You'll notice the initials [REDACTED] match the initials
4 that [REDACTED] put down next to the closure there on the
5 [REDACTED] Do they appear to be the same?

6 MR. LIVERMORE: Yes, the initials [REDACTED] appear to be
7 the same on the NCR as the note.

8 WITNESS "Y": My basic concern was that possibly some-
9 thing was misdirected. Mr. Block didn't understand the
10 delay of so many days. Now I'm going to tell you the rest
11 of the story.

12 Based on the non-conformance, [REDACTED]
13 and I and the [REDACTED] had a heated discussion on the
14 fact that he would revise an NCR of mine without my knowledge.
15 Two days later the stainless steel liner program was removed
16 from the night shift, much to my--I felt real happy about
17 that. I was put directly under the supervision of [REDACTED]
18 [REDACTED] who was the [REDACTED] at that time, and con-
19 tinued under his direct supervision until he was removed
20 from his position.

21 MR. LIVERMORE: Prior to that, what was your chain
22 of command? Weren't you under [REDACTED] anyway but on a--

23 WITNESS "Y": Yes, but I was on the night shift,
24 basically as the night shift supervisor reporting back to
25 [REDACTED] and I felt quite relieved of the fact that the liner

1 was going back to the day shift. I had no Quality Engi-
2 neering support on night shift. I was basically a one-man
3 show: Quality Engineering, supervision, whatever else had
4 to be done in all the disciplines, anything that was going
5 on.

6 MR. LIVERMORE: And you reported to [REDACTED] at that
7 time?

8 WITNESS "Y": I reported to [REDACTED] directly back to
9 [REDACTED]

10 MR. LIVERMORE: When you went on days, you went back
11 on days and you still reported to [REDACTED]

12 WITNESS "Y": Ninety days later I was removed as [REDACTED]
13 [REDACTED]

14 MR. LIVERMORE: Oh, you were?

15 WITNESS "Y": I went to day shift as a [REDACTED]
16 Conduit Support Supervisor; 120 days after that I was
17 removed from that supervisory position. I am presently a
18 [REDACTED]

19 MR. LIVERMORE: So sequence of events after this note,
20 you say then you talked with--who was this fellow that
21 wrote the note here?

22 WITNESS "Y": [REDACTED]

23 MR. LIVERMORE: [REDACTED] and you had a heated discussion
24 with [REDACTED] about his changing your NCR. And shortly after
25 that then, you were relieved of your job [REDACTED]

1 WITNESS "Y": Within 90 days, yes. That was about

2 [REDACTED]
3 MR. LIVERMORE: Did they give you a reason why?

4 WITNESS "Y": I don't want to put the connotation that
5 it would have anything to do with this, no. Basically I'd
6 been on it for two years. You've got to remember also that
7 I was involved in protective coatings all through that
8 situation, through the NPC investigation where they found--
9 when they had the fine against the Utility for intimidation.
10 That was strictly done on day shift. I was told by the
11 NRC basically that my conduct, based on the inspectors that
12 worked under my supervision at that time, was exemplary,
13 professional and carried out with integrity. I never was
14 actually involved in that.

15 MR. LIVERMORE: I guess really what I was trying to
16 see was if you felt there was a link--

17 WITNESS "Y": No, I would not. I would not give that,
18 no, sir.

19 MR. LIVERMORE: All right. I had the feeling you were
20 implying that, but I wanted to ask you direct. So it had
21 no link with your argument with [REDACTED]

22 WITNESS "Y": No, sir. I wouldn't make that assumption.

23 MR. CURRY: Let's see if we can clear up a few of the
24 steps that you mentioned here. First you mentioned that
25 the first time you saw the travelers they had many missing

1 hold points--

2 WITNESS "Y": Numerous.

3 MR. CURRY: Numerous; okay. Then [REDACTED] was
4 apparently instructed to try to complete them, whatever.
5 Did you see them again after that? Did you see them later
6 on?

7 WITNESS "Y": After he finished, he basically come up
8 and told me it was bogging down, you know, getting them
9 cleared up. I went up, asked him what the problem was,
10 and he said, "Well, they're working on them." He said he
11 didn't think he'd get them done this week, it would probably
12 be the next week, and then all of a sudden, within that
13 Friday evening, he basically told me it looked like they
14 were going to have them all done.

15 MR. CURRY: Did you get a chance to look at them after
16 that?

17 WITNESS "Y": No, it was a few days later, three or four
18 or five days later before I got a chance to sit down and
19 look at them again; get them all back, get them together--

20 MR. CURRY: When you looked at them, had the missing
21 hold points been filled in?

22 WITNESS "Y": Some of them had; some of them had not;
23 that's why I issued the NCR; still missing hold points,
24 fit-ups had been missed, cleanliness checks left out. I
25 just wasn't thoroughly satisfied with the documentation, so

1 I thought I'd let Engineering take a look at them, and
2 issued a non-conformance.

3 MR. CURRY: You don't remember what date that was when
4 he basically had finished them and gave you a chance to see
5 them, do you?

6 WITNESS "Y": No, I can't. It had to be three or four
7 or five days prior to the issuance of that NCR.

8 MR. CURRY: That would be about [REDACTED] or
9 thereabouts?

10 WITNESS "Y": I can't remember the exact date that it
11 started, when they started--when they gave them to me and
12 when the sequence of events was going--I really can't get
13 a handle on when it exactly started.

14 MR. CURRY: Were you aware of what process they used
15 to sign off some of the hold points that had been filled
16 in by the time you got the chance to look at them a second
17 time?

18 WITNESS "Y": No. I could give you an idea what they
19 used, but I didn't actually see what they were using.
20 There were some chips involved, what they call fit-up chips,
21 or whatever, that I felt at the time were, when I first
22 looked at them, due to either lack of training or something
23 by the inspectors, were rather sketchy sometimes on how
24 they were made out, how the chips were made out. I didn't
25 feel real comfortable with them. How they arrived at what

1 hold points they did clear up, I can't tell you. That was
2 between [REDACTED]-he had a couple of inspectors up there
3 working on them with him and a supervisor that was working
4 on them. I sent an inspector up regularly to check their
5 progress--his name is [REDACTED]-I sent him up there to
6 see how they were doing, what was going on, whatever else.
7 At this point in time, I think I ought to tell you that I
8 went in to [REDACTED] today, had a meeting with him at
9 approximately 10:00 this morning, and told him the exact--
10 what I just told you. I told him the sequence of events
11 here. I had an obligation to inform the Utility about the
12 sequence of events.

13 MR. LIVERMORE: What reaction did he give you?

14 WITNESS "Y": He was concerned. I think he understood
15 a lot of it.

16 MR. LIVERMORE: Excuse me?

17 WITNESS "Y": I think he understood what I was telling
18 him. He asked me if I had a problem with the disposition
19 of the NCR, and I told him no, I did not. The fact that
20 they were going to do an LP of a vacuum box test, that's
21 Engineering's prerogative to say, "This is what we're going
22 to do, and we're going to accept it based on that." I'm
23 only a Quality Control Inspector. I report; I don't get to
24 engineer. Whenever Engineering comes back with the dis-
25 position, especially based on NDE methods, it's--

1 MS. TANG: What were his remarks on the revision to
2 NCR?

3 WITNESS "Y": What were his remarks?

4 MS. TANG: Or comments, anything.

5 WITNESS "Y": He basically went with--I showed him this
6 note and he basically went with that and said it appears
7 that they did review all of the travelers, so therefore a
8 full review was done and so therefore--I don't understand
9 how [REDACTED] could do a review after of the
10 NCR. [REDACTED] was basing his judgment on the review prior
11 to the issuance of the NCR. That's an assumption on my part.

12 MR. CURRY: This says Unit Two, so I would assume from
13 this they reviewed all the travelers for Unit Two.

14 WITNESS "Y": Which is transfer canal, whatever else,
15 stainless steel liner--

16 MR. CURRY: How would you interpret this where it
17 says "acceptability of weld shall be based on vacuum box
18 and hydrostatic tests"? That is intended to mean the
19 vacuum box tests that were already done. They're not going
20 to do additional tests is what I'm saying.

21 WITNESS "Y": It must be. That would have to be up to
22 Engineering.

23 MR. CURRY: Of course, the hydrostatic test is when
24 the thing is finished.

25 WITNESS "Y": I think that's a misnomer. I don't know

1 how you hydrostatic test--

2 MR. CURRY: It's a leak test; it's not a hydrostatic
3 test.

4 WITNESS "Y": I was hoping somebody would pick up on
5 that.

6 MR. LIVERMORE: Now, the NCR is dated disposition [REDACTED]
7 [REDACTED] and this note is dispositioned, signed [REDACTED] two
8 days later.

9 MR. CURRY: Can we have this?.

10 WITNESS "Y": I'd rather you didn't. I think you can
11 get your own copy out there if you want it.

12 MR. LIVERMORE: I think it's necessary that we have a
13 copy of this.

14 MS. TANG: Can we do that? What we can do is on the
15 way out we can make a copy and give it back to you.

16 WITNESS "Y": I can't give you a copy of it.

17 MR. CURRY: Of course, the words are on the record.

18 WITNESS "Y": I'm not making any allegations. I think
19 the panel, the review panel, everybody else clearly under-
20 stands that we had a problem. I think we identified our
21 problem and tried to handle it the best way we could.

22 MR. LIVERMORE: Let me ask you this: Why did you
23 object to that word "random" being taken out? Context,
24 really, or just the idea that someone changed your on-site
25 NCR without talking to you about it?

1 WITNESS "Y": To me, that's a totally unacceptable
2 thing. Quality Engineers goes from the inspector's report
3 on non-conformance down, and the non-conforming item belongs
4 to the inspectors and his supervisor which is above, which
5 is what we signed for. Also, I did not perform a review.

6 MR. CURRY: I think that's the intent of it. This
7 says random review, implying that you picked out some of
8 them and this is what you found; but it also means that if
9 you looked at all of them you'd probably find more. By
10 changing it, they've said a review and that implies, "Hey,
11 this is all there is."

12 MR. LIVERMORE: That's what you object to?

13 WITNESS "Y": Yeah. I also object to the fact that
14 Quality Engineers would--I don't know what Rev One says;
15 I don't know if it's got my name on it or what. I authored
16 Rev Zero and I said a random review, and that's exactly what
17 I did.

18 MR. LIVERMORE: So you're objecting to both aspects
19 of it, really.

20 MS. TANG: No, two issues actually.

21 MR. LIVERMORE: The fact that they revised it without
22 conferring with you and the other aspect that they took
23 the word "random" out, therefore implying what you looked
24 at was the whole works.

25 WITNESS "Y": (Nods affirmatively) And you can clearly

1 see by the notes that I didn't review. The review was done
2 by the Brown and Root QC, not me; not at any point in time
3 other than the random review, just a cursory look at it to
4 see what our problem was and give it back to them for them
5 to do the review. I did a cursory review to begin with and
6 went back to them for their review so they could clear up
7 their item. It came back to me again, and I did a cursory
8 review and issued the NCR.

9 MR. CURRY: Do you want to look at them anymore?

10 MR. LIVERMORE: No, that's fine. We can get copies
11 of the NCR's.

12 WITNESS "Y": I'm going to tell you right now that I
13 served a five-year apprenticeship as a steamfitter, and
14 you're going to say to yourself, "Well, what the hell
15 difference does that make?" Basically, I was taught crafts-
16 manship and the pursuit of excellence was a goal, and
17 mediocrity was unacceptable. Unfortunately, I still have
18 that attitude. I will make this statement: I don't believe
19 that's appreciated in the commercial nuclear industry. As
20 Mr. Curry can testify working for [REDACTED] excellence
21 was a standard, not something to be attained. It was the
22 standard, and it was maintained.

23 MR. LIVERMORE: How long have you been with Comanche
24 Peak?

25 WITNESS "Y": Approximately three years. Well, overall

1 period of time, I came to work in [REDACTED]
2 I worked here for approximately six months. I was right
3 in the middle of the [REDACTED] and I were
4 inspecting together on his problem. I terminated and went
5 to work for the [REDACTED]
6 [REDACTED] Then I worked there
7 for approximately three to four months, five months, termi-
8 nated, and was rehired back here by BASCO, returned here in
9 [REDACTED] I've been steadily employed since [REDACTED]

10 You can take all the names out of this you want,
11 but anybody that reads this is going to know exactly who
12 this is.

13 MS. TANG: We not only take out names but also titles,
14 where you work, anything that could possibly trace back to
15 you.

16 WITNESS "Y": I'm not sitting here making allegations.
17 I'm only here trying to give sequence of events, so I don't
18 feel that I'm--well, this is the first time I really sat
19 down and have done anything like this in my entire life; but
20 I feel the sequence of events needs to be understood so
21 misunderstandings or misdirections are not made in the
22 hearings.

23 MR. LIVERMORE: You said that Judge Bloch called you--
24 a telephone call?

25 WITNESS "Y": I received a phone call from Judge Bloch

1 from Washington, D. C. He identified himself as Judge Bloch.

2 MS. TANG: What did you tell him? What did you two
3 discuss?

4 WITNESS "Y": He asked me if I had any information on
5 the stainless steel liner. I said, "Not necessarily, but
6 I think I can give you a sequence of events that might help
7 you understand something a little bit better." He told me
8 that he was going to have somebody contact me so I could
9 give them sequence of events.

10 MS. TANG: Because over the phone you didn't know
11 whether he was the person--so that's why he contacted us
12 to talk to you.

13 WITNESS "Y": He could have been Joe-Blow for all I
14 know. That's why I wouldn't talk to you until I saw some-
15 body's badge.

16 MR. LIVERMORE: Do you have--in regard to the stainless
17 liners up there, we're talking Unit Two here. Do you have
18 any information on Unit One and the transfer canal at all?

19 WITNESS "Y": No, sir. That work was performed entirely
20 by Brown and Root so-called ASME Group. I had no involve-
21 ment or even any real knowledge of it.

22 MR. LIVERMORE: And your only involvement was Unit Two
23 later on when all of a sudden they said, "Hey, we're going
24 to get back to work on Containment Two, Unit Two.

25 WITNESS "Y": Right.

1 MR. LIVERMORE: At that time you were with the ASME--

2 WITNESS "Y": Well, that's part of it. You got the
3 transfer canal and--

4 MR. LIVERMORE: Do you have any knowledge of any
5 signing signatures after the fact, forgeries, or anything
6 along that line?

7 WITNESS "Y": No, sir, I do not.

8 MR. CURRY: Do you remember which week it was that
9 [REDACTED] took--that during that week that everything
10 suddenly became much better? Do you remember which week
11 that was? You mentioned that he took about a week--

12 WITNESS "Y": Somewhere around the first--end of
13 February, first part of March to the 17th. It had to be
14 within that time span. That's the closest I can nail it
15 for you.

16 MR. CURRY: I guess that's all I've got.

17 MS. TANG: Any questions?

18 MR. LIVERMORE: No, I don't have any further questions.

19 MS. TANG: Do you have anything else to say?

20 WITNESS "Y": No.

21 MS. TANG: We'll provide you with our phone numbers.
22 If you decide to contact us again--

23 WITNESS "Y": I basically give you about all the
24 information I have.

25 MS. TANG: That will conclude the interview.

DO NOT DISCLOSE

22

CERTIFICATE OF PROCEEDINGS

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the
Nuclear Regulatory Commission

IN THE MATTER OF: COMANCHE PEAK TECHNICAL INTERVIEW

DATE OF PROCEEDINGS: Monday, September 17, 1984

PLACE OF PROCEEDINGS: Granbury, Texas

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original
transcript for the file of the Commission.

Carmen Gooden

Certified Shorthand Reporter



Certified Shorthand Reporter

DO NOT DISCLOSE

7d

INTERVIEW FORMAT - FEEDBACK INTERVIEWS

1. Cover Page

- Interview of [REDACTED]

Date: 11/14/84

Time: 7:00 PM

Location: RM 225

Parties present . . . JIM MALONSON, LIVERMORE
CERYL WALKER

2. Proceedings

(on the record)

"For the record, this is an interview of — for the purpose of providing feedback regarding Technical Review Team assessment of certain concerns raised about the Comanche Peak facility.

BY YOU IN TECH. INTERVIEW

R.C. TANC
GRIFFIN
MALONSON

"The location of this interview is "

"Present at this interview are (names/organizations)"

"As agreed, this interview is being transcribed.

Describe mission of TRT

"I wish to clarify details of your employment at Comanche Peak" (Obtain details of employment/qualifications) —, if not previously obtained

"We spoke with you on ... and have reviewed your statement(s) of . . .

Turn over to Technical Reviewer

FOIA-85-59

P/50

3. Conclusion of Proceedings

"The results of our evaluation will be published in a SSER which will be available about January 1, 1985"

"Where appropriate we will require corrective action by TUGCO."

"Do you have anything further you would like to add for the record?"

— "Have we adequately covered your concerns?"

"Do you have additional concerns?"

"Have you given this statement to us today freely and voluntarily?"

. . . off the record

4. Administrative Guidance

"Ask if individual wants copy of transcript. ^Aadvise them that transcript will be part of public record (except for confidential sources, or if they request confidentiality).

5. Guidance

Limit to topic of interest

Ask:

Is this a new issue?

Have you provided this to NRC?

Did you do it?

Did you see it?

Seek: names, dates, locations, documents.

- o Be courteous and considerate
- o Be sure individual appreciates the importance of his concern(s) and the staff/technical effort expended to review and evaluate.
- o Be sure individual understands we will require corrective action and that we are dedicated to safety.

When presenting negative findings (i.e., when allegations are found to be of no merit), do not tell individuals that they are "wrong", ask if the TRT has possibly missed his points

set up file

WRONG [REDACTED]
NEVER LOCATED CORRECT [REDACTED]

7c
DO NOT DISCLOSE

Telephone Conversation Record:

10/25/84

Tried to call [REDACTED] and spoke with [REDACTED] According to [REDACTED] is [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] He has resigned from CPSES [REDACTED] currently attending North Texas State University. The brother suggested that we send [REDACTED] a letter. All his mail will be picked up

[REDACTED]
cannot guarantee giving [REDACTED] our message.

[REDACTED]

R. C. Tang
TRT

DO NOT DISCLOSE

FOIA-85-50

2/62