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SUBJECT: INVESTIGATION OF ALIEGED E&R TERMINATION I: HOLATION OF
ENERGY REORGANIZATION ACT, AT CPSES
(Investigation NO. C4-02. OSIt)
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## 

telephonically advised the reporting Control Inspector at CPSES was terminated for attempting to sub-it an NCR regarding inproper Hilti bolt installation


## 

$\qquad$

GARDEE5-59 PDR
persons working that shift: With regard to the situz:'gr *lat allegedly resulted in wong termination, Manta, Holland, Kazan, and Pane sta:az the problem was not one which recut red ar ven and that Manner has agnes with the corrective action taken at that time. Holland and Pagan relates that the termination of grand resulted from anther matter which occurred on June 17, 1982, subsequent to which Holland had discussed with nummary nim performance. During this discussion, foment made the statement fire me now or fire me later."
(Investigator's note: During the $7 / 9 / 82$ telephonic interview of stimson, he commented that he made this statement to Holland.)
 stated this statement was interpreted as a display of mindididerespect and his failure to understand that his performance should improve.
5. On July 29, 1982, Mr. Robert Fortran advised the resorting investigator that his determination, relating to quancomplaint, was that evidence did not vertu that discrimination was a tactendin the actions which mes- 'ted in
 this dacistion is attached as Attachment 2.
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Attach-ents:
1. Sttacnment 1 - DOL letter dt& 7/8/SQ
Z. &%%achment 2 - DOL 1etter dtd 7/27/$2
cc: \therefore Collios, RIV
    \therefore Gagliardo, RIV
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Investigation of alleged electrical deficiencies that occured from August, 1979 to January, 1980 in the construction phase of the Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant at Glen Rose, Texas, included an interview of the contractor's electrical Superintendent, the review of numerous electrical records, and the inspection by NRC personnel of identified alleged electrical "deficiencies." Investigation disclosed that three of the four basic alleged "deficiencies" were in the areas of non-safety wiring. During August and September, 1982 all alleged deficiencies were examined and no irreguiarities were found. Review of nonconformance report records did identify similar deficiencies discovered in the December 1979 through January/February 1980 time frame; however, these deficiencies were properly addressed in 1980.

Purpose of Investigation
The purpose of this investigation was to investigate allegations of electrical "deficiencies" during the 1979/1980 construction phase of the Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Glen Rose, Texas.
 Sound Energy (CASE), nat with iRC Investigator R. K. Herr at the dit offices in Arlington, Texas. Mrs. Ellis provided reporting investigator a spy pe az

© C Fiction site in the Electrical Department.
Mrs. Ellis remarked that Chandler allege at electrical raul iss of
ualisuruction" at the Comanche peak site located in Glen Rose, Texas.

## Interview of CHARLES BRETT

On August 31, 1982, Charles Brett, Superintendent of the Electrical Department, Brown and Root, contractors for Comanche Peak construction, was interviewed by NRC Investigator R. K. Herr at the construction site located in Glen Rose, Texas. Brett explained that he was present during the 1979 time frame, and in December 1979, the electrical department created a "termination crew." Brett stated that this crew would check out all electrical (safety and non-safety) wiring to ensure that work had been accomplished and that the work was done satisfactorily. Brett remarked that the men assigned to the work crews would submit handwritten reports to show what work was done, where the work was done, and the status of the work. Brett emphasized that this crew checked the electrical wiring before the Quality Control Inspectors were advised that the electrical wiring was ready for inspection. Brett explained that the termination crew conducted a preinspection review of all electrical work. Brett also pointed out that, if a deficiency was noticed and reported, the deficiency would be addressed before the Quality Control Inspector would conduct his inspection. Brett explained that this extra "check out" by the electrical personnel was used as a management tool to show the electrician where problems arose and to point out various potential deficiencies. Brett stated that the Quality Control Inspector could still find various deficiencies, and that the practice of utilizing "termination crews" to check the electrical wiring is no longer being used. Brett remarked that "termination crews" were not a requirement in the Brown and Root procedure or instructions, but were merely an extra check for the electrical department itself, and therefore, none of the handwritten reports or status sheets were kept.
tire cumanche peak constructionsion, utem rose, Texas was accomplished. This review disclosed that TWMWracd for Brown and Root (contractors) from According to the records. worked for the "termination crew" from

## Interview of

On (asumment a former electrician employed at the Comanche Peak construction project, Glen Rose, Texas, was interviewed by NRC Investicator R. K. Herr and NRC Inspector L. E. Martin atcachinent $(2$, , whepenne rentified four areas of alleged "deficiencies" and drew a map depicting the exact location of these deficiencies. . Ifurther described these deficiencies as follows:
(1) Motor control center located in the circulation water system: use of 1000 MCM cable, using 750 MCM lug that was drilled to accept larger cable.
(2) Auxiliary Building, Reactor No. 1: lug designed for an approximate screw size of $3 / 8$ inch was used on a terminal block designed for $\# 10$ screws.
(3) Switch Gear Room, Reactor No. 1, black cable: lug designed for 4 inch screws were used on terminal blocks designed for $\$ 10$ screws.
(4) Annuncfator logic panels, Control Room, Reactor No. 1, black cable: improper cable splicing and wiring to the wrong side of lugs.


#### Abstract

Oother general allegations of deficiencies identiffed in his previous statement of June 14, 1982, were addressed in the following manner. Thennen expressed concern with the improper installation and check-out of Cannon type plugs. was provided NRC Inspection Report $50-445 / 80-13$, dated May 21,1980 . Nrmistated that after reading the NDC inenection Report, the report answered all his concerns in this area. Whad also expressed concern regarding the patching/repairing of damaced_cable, faulty grounding, and wiring not protected from abrasions. Was provided eight nonconformance reports covering the above general allegations that were issued from December 20, 1979 to March 18, 1980 and subsequently corrected. amplafter reviewing the nonconformance reports, stated that the deficiencies identified in the nonconformance reports and subsequent corrections appeared to address the concerns that he identified in his previous statement of June 14, 1982.


```
explaty explained he was not in ä position to determine if his concerns were addressed properly, pointing out that he did not have access to the nonconformance reports or NRC inspection reports. Further, 7 remarked that most of his work was with non-safety cable. However, he stated that between January 2 and January 11, 1980 he was assigned to the Electrical Department "termination check-out crew" that went around to ensure that all work was done properly, and that some of the items he checked could have been safety related.
```


## Inspection of Alleged Deficiencies

On August 31, 1982, Dennis L. Kelley, NRC Senior Resident Reactor Inspector (SRI), asssigned to Comanche Peak, Glen Rose, Texas, met with NRC Investigator R. K. Herr to review the allegations set forth by

Allegation Number 1: Kelley was able to physically locate the motor control center (MCC) located in the circulating water system, as described in the allegation concerning the use of 1000 MCM cable with a 750 MCM lug. Kelley stated that he inspected the area in question and found no 1000 MCM cable in the motor control center. Kelley reported that he did find one 750 MCM cable in MCC XB3-2 that is matched up to the proper lugs. He also found that the MCC 183-2 contained paired 350 MCM cables properly terminated. Kelley remarked that as of August 31, 1982, no improper wiring was evident in the MCC's of the circulating water system.

On September 17, 1982, Kelley advised that the areas of the alleged deficiencies that were identified by his statement of September 2, $198 ?$ (see below), were located with the assistance of the maps drawn by
Allegation Number 2, Auxiliary Building, Reactor No. 1, improper screw size for lugs: Kelley stated that he physically located this area utilizing Map No. 1, and found that there were no washer/screws in panel 5 or 6 . However, he did discover a number of screws with attached washers. Kelley explained that upon close examination he found that the washer attached to the screws is an intricate part of the screw (manufactured together) and it not an add-on as it may appear at first glance. Kelley stated that some screws contained brass plate and some contained chrome plate. Kelley remarked that the chrome plate gives the appearance of a steel washer and could easily be mistaken for steel. Kelley concluded that as of September 1982, there was no improper wiring in this area.

Allegation Number 3, Swith Gear Room, Reactor No. 1, improper screw size for lugs: Kelley stated he physically located this area utilizing Map No. 2 and found that the same conditions existed as per Allegation No. 2, above. Kelley added that as of September 1982, when he inspected switch Gear Room, Reactor No. 1, no improper wiring was observed.

Allegation Number 4, Control Room, Reactor No. 1, splicing and cable termination to wrong side of fuse block with some shaving of the lugs: Kelley stated he physically located this area, using Map No. 3 , and found no evidence of shaving or erroneous termination of cable. Kelley further stated that he checied the section in question as well thio other sections in the control panel and found that there was no evidence of lugs being shaved and added that blocks were of such a nature that it makes no difference which side accepts power cads. Kelley remarked that there were three blocks located in this area at the time of his examination. He did not find any improper wiring. Kelley confirmed Chandler's statement that the wiring in this area is black cable wiring, and is non-safety.

Kelley stated that during his inspection effort, he also examined safety and non-safety cable in the location of concern, utilizing Map No. 4 , to determine if any cables were pulled too tignt. Kelley explained that the cables are tied off with tie wraps and anchored with adhesive clips to hold wires down and stated he found adequate slack in these cables. Kelley pointed out that these conditions are in existence ac the present time. However, he could not comment on the conditions as they existed in January 1980.

## Status of Investigation

## The status of this investigation is CLOSED.

Attachments

| Attachment $1-\square$ | signed statement |
| :--- | :--- |
| Attachment $2-\infty-14-82$ COPY ALL |  |
| signed sworn statement | $9-06-82$ ORIG OI:RIV/CY |

 of saveral faulta in tho oloctrical phase of conatraction at Conapcha Pask a of feauary 11, 2980. Havinc been enployod_as a fourdugan olootrictan by Drova \& Root, Iac. durlag tha latter part of y Cgancks Poaix, I worked in the olectrical "teraination cretw doing the actial phyeical torriation of the wiring anc latar on the "checkout crev". Thas latter crey shecks the yiring done by the ternituation crew as to agcuracy and proper carmioation tochaizue. I t:as roplitec to turn in a sritten anc ad ssed report on gach cable checkei by me. sore, ir not all of theae foulwa cas be rorimed and lccatod through thest reports. ibest fanlts inclond improper lug sialog and actual physical alteration of lugs, oplioting of casla, patailing of danageo cablas, improper pin setting on "canon" typo pligs, faulty grounciog, wiring not properly protected fron abrasion, wlro tonad oa too high, and improper protection of cables nuring theraal weldiag.

Lugs are a wiring devles thet attach te the onns of whres or cables as an ald to termidation and coms in a variety o' styles ard sisas. The "ring typa" 12360 at Cavanche Peak has a hole in its tongue to accept screms froa torkinal blocke. Theae holas can be of varying aize dependent spon what diseeter or stud sice screw the terminal block is entroeerad for. A stad sise six 13 mallar in dianeter in boin the threaded portion and the bead of the screy that a atuc size 8 or 10 . The lu:f for theas, ir. order to 113 tba different terminal block: and screw size anc at the ome tioe maintais the gaparaze canacity they aze ratec for, are manafacturec with a difforant ahapoc tongu. For oxanyla, th2 copper wirs has an anporaje rating of 20 aps, and a $2 u g$ dasigned to accept tho vire musi have the fant or larger apacity. Tha rating of the whrs is detarained by the त1anetar of the copper conductor. Thas ratias of a lug is dotemived by the size und shape of the tongua. It $m \times 3 t$ have a apocific ares of its surface in cootact stin the teraival clock or its mphacity will be lezsonod. A luc ith its toufue desizea for a alu acrou has a bols in its toinjue thist is larper than the hole in one dosijgad for a fif or 38 sorev. The totgue is also wider and thinner. If a luz designod for a 320 screy $1 s$ usod ou a tarminal plock designed $i T$ ues with ty screvs, 1 ts capoce ty 13 lessonod becanse a po scrov havin; a simaller beac size caly applias prasours to tha inner riag of the lu; tongua cauain; a "balling" affect. If samsos tha outar adges of tho tcagua to curl sutuard, aloo less area undar tho soray haad Is in corbact vitt the tortinal unck bocauss of its largor holo. Thuro ars aany instances whare thts :is sapponod at Conanche Poak. Scan of thave aret

1. Auciliary Duilding Reactor al---Luy, desi mod for an approchanta acrov also of 3/80 was uasd oa a tomian blook slusigned for $j 10$ porons. Tita zas deas
 trolyois batwaso tha two dealailar aotals.
t. Sritahgear hoon. Soveral lags desigced for $1 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ screve vere ued an ternimel blooks ceatgned for 110 screvs.

These two inatances stand out in my mind but there are many more in partianiar scooeraing the eiroulating vater ayote and fire cuetrol; movever xithout refarance materials I canmot be more speciric. Hewever, there is at leat coe ingtame I can reeall-in fact for which I an at least partially reapoasible. This is the ternination of a 2000 MON eable xdith the use of a 750 MCM $\mathrm{lug}_{\text {that }}$ was drillod to aecopt the larger eable sise. It was done after proteat by both syself and Dende lisaves, soothar Jocragman veridig as martaer on the ternimation orow. Drilling the lag affected its apecity in two manners: one, it reduced the amount of sotal to ecactrot electrioity and it was a volt ifpe mechanical lug, meaning that the lng ane seourod to the asble by means of a bolt or set screv in its bedy. Drillitag the lag body had the offect of lessening the monber of threads to not more thea three or four for the set screv to be screved into. This was in a Moter Control Center in the Circalating Water oystech. Any failare in the olreulatily water arota wich provides coclant vater for the reactor roulh peesthly gave very aerious problase.

At leant ane aeble is the Ammaciator bogie Panels in the coutrol roen for teaster \$1 vas apliced in the annunciator panal iteelf and covered over with other airee to hide it from sight. The cable vas too largo (it ve assumed) to termizate on the fuse blook to which it was desiguated. Upoe exadsation of the fase block I founc the cable terainated to the veag side af it. Hed it been terminated an the correct aise the oriadnal eable woyld have fit. The aplice was made on the ordars of Frank Platt, the Geaeral Forean over termination. Niso in the Annuaciaror pasele there vere several "Cason" type plugs in wich the pins vere not eested properly. Thit ean sause the consector plas to be pushec beck into the boay of the plag causigg the pin or pins to have poor contact. The Annunciator loghe Pamels cive the alarm if any part of the systan malfuncticos. Any malrasetion In the annunciatce systan oan cames no alara to be civen io any margency to which the plast may be aubjeot.

Portions of the grounding syaten for the cable trays in the Spreader Lioen vere daasged either by an aplayee collecting oapper or deliberate vadalis. Strands ware cat from tho cabies it eeveral places. The coacucrore were novar cut ontirely in two bat the reacvel of a strand of no matter whet length rechuces the eapacity of the conductor.

In the Control Ceater for feactor \#l Literally huncrecs and possibly thousands of wires wert brought out of their metal raceway and pulled aharply over their sharp, unprotected ecges, saking themerticularly releerable to abrasice and Fioration. Erery portion of evory gysien is the plant could be adversely affected by this faulty prooechare.

At least oce eable in the Svitchgear Room was dawaged whilo being pulled. Ite insulation was aioiced in several places and parched with beat sheriak tabiag inatead of boing replaced.

In at lonat two instanoes wres or caules were too short by only a matier of isobee for proper ternination. Those were pulled very tiantiy and teradasted. They were pelled tight sonough that there is the poseibility of their being priled from their $1 u_{\mathrm{z}} \mathrm{s}$. One of these is in the Spreader Ioens another is in a Moter Control Cenver in the Ciroulating itar Syatem.
"Cad velding" or thar...ik ati in. N tie spoundin: con uctore on the cable traya was done after many rahles hac alreacy bow: philuu through them. I could not inspect for analaje, wit ithe enlz protection used on til cables vas an anbestoc blanket that jrotectet only ti.e e3bles in the iameaiate vicinity of whe adid.

I en necenemply tazae on wifion varticilar qalinet or panel or aven systen to which f rafer dat to tina oliop.ad an.. the larke number of systase on mich 1 workec. Ath raforwice natarial: the lucation of those faulte culd be much sore closely iduntified ac could others not meationoc specざically beroin.


I worked at the Comanche Peak Construction site for Brown \& Root as an elec trician from August 21, 1979 to January 11, 1980. I worked about 3 months on the termination crews and from January 2, 1980 to January 11, 1980 I worked on the termination check out crew.

On June 14, 1982, I prepared a statement covering areas of concern that I had with various practices that the electrical department was doing. I prepared my statement upon the request of a friend of mine, Lawrence pope, who ask me if I had any problems or concerns with the electrical department and told me that these concerns would be made known through the upcoming hearings on the Glen Rose Comanche Peak Nuclear Power site at Ft. Worth, TEX.
Mr. Herr and Mr. L. Martin of the NRC have gone over with me the concerns that I mentioned in my statement.

I would like to point out that most of my concerns deal with Black Cable that is non-safety

## niflivil

In my June 14, 1982, statement I mentioned signed reports that could identi fy faults. These reports that I refer to are cable termination cards and cable pull cards. These cards have sign off blocks for the craft, their supervisor and Q. C., also $h$ there is an area for comments. Any comment tha I may have made on these cards would have to be addressed by $0 . C$. and/or corrected before Q. C. sign off, however, I was not present to observe all of the corrective action. To the best of my knowledge I documented all of my concerns on the above cards. However, most of my work was in non-safety related areas.

I have drawn a map of the Auxiliary Building Reactor \#1 and located the are of my concern. This area or control panel has both safety and non-safety wiring. Mr. Herr stated he would contact me later and report the results o the NRC inspection in this area.

I have also drawl. a map of the Switchroom area and have located my cencern in Reactor Building \#1, Grould Level, just left to the door entrance. I worked with black cable and I recall that Black Cable is non-safety related
I have also drawn a map of the Annunciator Logic Panels, in the control room, Reactor $\$ 1$ and have located my area of concern. I worked with Slack Cable and I understand that this area is also non-safety related.
Mr. Herr and Mr. Martin discussed my area of concern in the Manzalotor control Center in the Circulating Water System. In my statement I said that 1000 McM cable was present in the Motor Control Center, however, upon re-thi: this could have been 750 mcm . I am not sure. Mr. Kerr told me as of August 30,1982 , this area was inspected by the NnC and the lugs anc wire Twere found to be correct. Apparently my concerns were identified and (frxas corrected after I left in January 1980.
My concerns with improper installation and checkout of cannon type plugs was
Page, of 1 Pages
subseque.: mafied by the Nhw wocumentec in ikC inspectian repoz: $50-445 / 80-1$. ... I have read toda: (Septemier ? 195.7) and addressed $: 9$ satisfaction:-

As to the rest of my concerns regarding damage, cable by sharp edges, and/c other means, Mr. Herr has shown me a number of Non-Conformance Reports (NCF that address these concerns. Most of these NCR were discovered and correct after I left the site.

My concern about the repair/patch of cable damage have been addressed by a procedure that was published in October 1980 , that outlines the repai= procedure requirement. I did not know about this procedure because it was pubilished after I left, however I have raead the procedure (EEI-13 Rev. 2) and have no further concerns.

I cannellocate the exact area where cables were too s.urt and were pulled tight for termination however I realize that on safety-related cable, Quality Control checks and pre-requisite testing would have identified and corrected my concerns. In the MCC Rm, BLK Cable, CCN(1 cable too tight). In the Spreader Rm, either BLK or orange as per the map I gave to Mr. Hezz. I would like to clarify as statement I made on cadwelds. I said that I could not check for damage but what I meant to say is that I did not check for damage. My concern is that the asbestos covering was only for an area of three feet and believed it givid, have,hicovered an area of six feet.
I now realize that subsequent megaer tests and Q. C. Survelliance would hxave identified damaged cable.
3
Mr. Herr has asked me if I have any other concern or area of concern that I wish to convey and I have no other concerns except as identified on my Gune 14, 1980, statement and in this statement.

I have read the foregoing statement consisting of $\sqrt{2+\operatorname{cosen}}$ have made any necessary corrections and have initiater typewrittendazourizseh pages I the marain of each name Thic etatomoms is thatalec them. I have signed my nate in belief. I declare under penalty of pertiuny that the foregoing is of my knowledge and Executed on SEPT_2, 14S at perjury that the foregoing is true and correct

subscribed and smanamey it
Subscribed and sworn to defore ne at 1306 , this zno day boseor .1932 at WITNESS


> NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION USS. H:
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ASSISTANCE TO INSPECTION REPORT
COMANCHE PEAK.
ALLEGED IMPROPER CONSTRUCTION PRACTICES

REPORT NUMBER: A4-83-005

1. On February 3, 1983 , Robert L. MESSERLY provided on affidavit to the Citizens Association for Sound Energy (CASE), an intervenor that included three alliegations regarding improper construction practices by 8 frown \& Root personnel a the Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station. MEJSERLY alleged the following:
a. That Brown \& Root employees drilled undocumented unauthorized holes throw: rebar, and such cutting of rebar was done at the direction of supervisors
b. That the main stear line pipe in Unit I was moved using the polar crane, thereby placing the pipe under unsafe tension.
c. That a Brown $\&$ Root employee used a cutting torch on hanger materia in
violation of procedure.
2. On April 6,1983 , NESSERLY was contacted by the reporting investigator, and a meeting was arranged with MESSER, Y for the following day. MESSERiY contacted reporting investigator on April 7, 1983, and requested the meeting be changed
to April 8,1983 .
3. On April 8, 1983, NRC OIFO Director R.K. HERR and the reporting investigator met MESSERLY at a restaurant in Fort Worth, Texas. MESSERLY was accompanied by Ms. Juanita ELLIS, a CASE representative, and Ms. ELLIS husband. Ms. ELLIS wished to record the meeting; however, 01f0:R1l was not previously informed of her intended presence nor of her desire to record the interview. OIFO did not have a recorder, and in accordance with 01's policy, the meeting was rescheduled. On April 10,1983 , arrangements were made to use a room at the U. S. Attorney's office, Fort Worth, Texas, and for a court
reporter to transcribe the inter. reporter to transcribe the inter:ien of MESSEPLY.
4. On April 14,1983 , KESSER.Y was interviewed at the U.S. Attorney's office with Ms. ELLIS present. MESSEF, Y's testimony was taken under oath, Attachment (1), and Ms. ELLIS made her ok ferscial recurcing of the interview. In his testimony, NESSERL? expanded in d三tali or his original allegations. MiSERLY named Brown o Root employees responsible for the alleged improprieties arc those who could substantiate rise alieçtionis. uESSER.Y also identified numerous employees by title, and agreed to later provide the corresponding names when he was able to refresh his memory with his personal records located at his residence. MESSERLY also provided the hî́C with a copy of a log. MESSER.Y explained that he maintained this log to document the cutting of rebar af Comanche Peak. (Note: KESSERL? did not allege that tl the entries in the $\log$ documented unauthorized cuts through rebar. but rather that some of the entries in the log may have been for holes drilled through retar that may not have had the appropinate accompanying authorizations.) During this intervien, MESSERLY made a fourth allegation regarding instances of

$$
\text { FOlIA }-85-59
$$

Brown a Root welders failing to purge stainless steel pipes during welcing.
5. On April 21, 1983, a copy of the recorded testimony was mailed to MESSERLY at his residence. On April 27, 1983, MESSERLY was contacted by HERR, and acknowleoged receipt of the transcript, but postponed giving the names of the Brown \& Root employees he had identified by title in the transcript. MESSERL stated he had not as yet had an opportunity to read his entire testimory. On April 29, 1983, MESSERLY was again contacted by HERR, but he aga in postponed providing the names, explaining he was very busy. On May 1, 1983, the reporting investigator telephoned MESSERLY at his residence, and MESSER.Y provided twelve, additional names of Brown \& Root employees at Comanche Peak he alleged had knowledge of unauthorized cuts through rebar.
6. On May 3, 1983, interviews were initiated at the Comanche Peak site acsessing the four allegations. MESSERLY identified 38 individuals allegedly responsibit for, or having knowledge of, the allegations. Revien of employment records determined that eighteen individuals were no longer employed at Conanche Pear.
7. Eetween Kay 3,1983 and May $10,1983,19$ Srown \& Root employees and 10 -avo Constructors inc. employee (fomerly employed by Gibbs $\delta$ Hill) named by MESSERLY were interviewed, and signed, sworn statements were taken fro- 19 of ther. One Brown and Root employee interviewed left on vacation before a signed, sworn statement was obtained from him, and his testimony was rezorded in the for of a Results of Interview. One Piping Design Serfickes inc. engineer was identified by the reporting investigator as responsible for the moverent of the main stear line. This engineer was interviewed, and executed a signec, sworn statement.
8. Nine individuals alleged to have knohleoge of improper, unauthorized cut:ing of rebar were interviewed and provided sworn statements. These individuals deniec having knowledge of rebar that was cut without proper authorization. : 10th individual responsiole for issuing the Componen: Modification Caros ( $\mathbf{c} 10$ ), authorizing cuts through rebar, was interviexed and provided a signes, srom statement denying knowledge of any procedural violations. Testimony wein.ifié instances where rebar was accidentally cut, but this testimony also cistaziisheo that in these instances, $\mathrm{CmL}^{-1}$ s were obtained after the cuts were repories so the erfioneers. There was no testimony received indicating that holes were crillec or rebar was cut without proper documentation, and no evidence nas found to contradict the testimony of these individuals.
9. Three brom \& foot emfloyees alleged to have knowledge concerning the use of the polar crane to move a oortion of the main steam line in Unit 1 were interviewed and provided signed, sworn statements. A Piping Desion Services inc. engineer responsible for relocating the steam line, provided testumony of his evaluation and direction of the relocation of the line. The testimony taken from these four witnesses indicated that the relocation of the me in stea-line was done under the direction of engineers, and was accomplished to renove stress on the line and to return it to its designed location. Mo testirsny was recieved to indicate that the line was "cold sprung" or installed under stress.
10. Eight Brown \& Root employees alleged to have knowledge concerning the improper use of cutting torches on hanger material were interviewed. Two witnesses stated they remembered an instance during the redesign of a hanger in which a piece of tube steel was discovered to have had the bolt holes enlarged using a torch, which was a procedural violation. The testimony of the two witnesses indicated that this hanger was scrapped because of the procedural violation, and was replaced with new material. The other six had no knowledge of imprope use of cutting torches or hangers.
11. Two Brown \& Root employees were interviewed concerning their alleged ki:owledge of lugs improperly welded onto stainless steel pipe without purging the pipe. Both executed signed, sworn statements, and indicated that they did not know $0^{\circ}$ any instances where welding was done on stainless steel pipe which required purging by procedure unless a "purge deletion" was received from the engineers.
12. All of the employees mentioned by RESSERLY in his affidavit who were still employed or available for interview denied the allectations made b MESSERLY. to evidence was uncovered during these inquiries which indicated deception on the part of the witnesses. The witnesses ranged from pipe fitter helpers to Brown $\delta$ Root superintendents. A Piping Design Services Inc. engineer and the Oravo Constructors Inc. project manager also provided testimony which contracicted the allegations.
13. The signed, sworn statements are maintained in OIFO:RIV. No further inquiries are anticipated unless staff inspections identify additional pertinent information that would tend to substantiate the allegations or discredit the
interviewees.
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IN THE MATFER OE:
                                    SHORN STAFEMENT OF ROBERT MESSERLY
PRESENT AT THE TARING OF STAFEMENT:
        MR. ROBERT MESEERLY, ふitness;
        MR. B. BROOKS GRIFEIN;
        MR. RICEARD R. EERR, Interrogators;
        MS. JOANITA ELLIS
        MR. DAVID COGEURN, COUYt RepOFter,
```

        SWORN ORAL STATEMENT IE QUESTION AND ANSWER
        PORM of ROEERT MESSERLY, taken before David CoGs
        a Court Reporter in and for the state of Texas a
        the united states Federal courthouse in the city
        of Fort Worth, County of arrant on the 14 th day
        of Apsis, 1983 at 2:00 po., at which time the
        following proceedings were bad:
    O6 pp.

$$
P R O C E E D I N G E
$$

MS. ELLIS: For the recozd, we sho: indicate that ye have banded the NRC officia. an Aptil luth letter from Case addzessec to Edward Markey regarding this matter, and alsc copy of an affidavit of J.R. Diliingham, $D-i-1-1-1-n-g-h-a-m$. And $I$ believe $M r$. Messerly has a copy of some documentation wh: he $\forall 111$ be providing a1s0 to the NRC. MR. GRIPFIN: Anything else, Hs. Ellis?

$$
\Sigma X A K I N A=I O N
$$

BY MR. GRIPFIN:
Q Mr. Messerly, this investigation is be: taken pursuant to the rules of the Nuclear Regulatory commission and we are at the $U, S$. Feder Courthouse, a part of the o.S. Attorney's ofsice, Root 524 in Port Worth, Fexas. This is Thursday, Apili the $14 \mathrm{th}, 1983$ and we're commencing this, it looks like, at 2:01 p,m. Present for the NRC is Richazd $K$, Yert, the director of office of investigations and myself, 日. Brooxs Grifin.

I understand, $X r$. Messerly, that you are former employee of Broun f Root and yere employed. Comanche Peak Stear Electric Station in Glen Rose,

Texas. Is that correct?
A yes I vas, uh-huh (affisaative).
Q And present with you is Ms. Juanita E1115.

MR. GRIFPIN: MG. Elis, if I $\begin{gathered}\text { agr }\end{gathered}$ ask you, what is your role in gelation to my Aesserly?

MS. ELLIS: All right. Mr. Musset is one of the individuals which we had plant to call in hearings which have been postpone for the time being, at least, in the Comanch Peak operating license proceedings.

MR. GRIPFIN: All rIght. And you bere in his behalf?

MS. ELLIS: Hell, yes. Be asked t I come and join him so that the would have someone here that he felt comfortable with. felt that he would feel a little =ore comfortable with someone else hera.

MR. GRIPFIN: DO you represent hit any way oui other than just an associate o in the manner you have already described?

AS. ELLIS: In the heating s -- I' In not an attorney f: sst of all. In the hearing though I am CASE's primazy representative an
as such co what an attorney. I should say, gouda do for CASE. And 30 to that extent I guess sort of a quasi representative status. Q Ail Eight. our purpose here today is ask MI. Messerly questions concerning an earlier statement that I believe he made to you in which identified a number of issues that are of concern the NRC, and we would like to find out wore speci details about these issues. So =y questions will directed to you, Mi. Mesibidy.

A Okay.
Q The first issue I would like to go into is the use of a debar drill or a distil at Comanche Peak that I believe you have indicated was used, that, you used in your job and was also used to dz: through cement and rebar; is that correct?

A That's correct.
Q Mould you mind telling te in more deva: chat chis dzil1 is?

A Nell, it's like it says. They call it rebate eater, $\ddagger t^{\prime}$ s made by Drilco manufacturer who out of Miami, Florida and it's a meld, they have a diamond tip on them or they have a real hard ste tip on thess that cuts through other steed, conctet anything else that gats in its way, And they are
operated by anywhere from a half to a three-guar horse electric motor.

Q Okay. And did you use this machine 1 your capacity as an employee of Brown Root?

A Well, I was foreman over the crew the used this machine.

Q All right. Did the use of this mach: require documentation from --

A It did.
Q -. from engineers?
A It did.
Q And these were Brown Root engineers:
A Right. Not Brown foot, they were $G$ :
and Bill. They are the ones that first started: when they first come on the job.

Q All right.
A A guy named Dean Fellinger is the one you want his name.

Q Be was the one that issued - -
A Be was the one that started out with on the rebar drilling, and later it changed into fourteen different people if you want to know the truth about it.

Q What was his last name?
A Fellinger. Be is still with Gibbs and

Hill and he is out of the Dallas office now. (MS. ELLIŞ): I believe that's F-e-1-1-i-n-g-e-r. I have seen his name. THE WITNESS: DO you know who I'E talking about?

Q During the time that members of your $C$ used rebar eater, did they make sure they had this documentation?

A Most of the time yes, but there are tiv that $I$ was ordered by my superiors, a guy named f. Sanders, to order or go out the gate, as i stated my affidavit before.

Q Are you saying he asked you or told yo. or ordered you to drill holes or use this drill it the manner in which it was to be used without documentation as required by procedure?

A I am saying that.
Q Bow many instances did this occur?
A I wouldn't -- I mean, just to give you number, I couldn't do it. Many times.

Q Okay --
A As far as number, you're going to say more than this or less than this, I cant give you number. I von't give you a number because I don't have that much -- well, how can I say it, Ie just
not there. The drill - I was ordered to doent: drill out at times. I was ordered to loan a guy drill bit that he would go get a motor, a drill motor out of the tool rooz and i'd never see thes three, four, five, six bits again. Now, how many holes were drilled with it there's no telling how much rebar was cut.

A man comes up and says, I want you to give so and so six diills, he's got a pipe hangez that has to go down or a cable tray that bas to g down - a cabletray support - and we have got tht holes in it and we need the fourth one bad. And went to my general foreman at that time who was p Mason, and I told pete, I said pete, Mike keeps giving me these orders to get this drill out, doa it out to drill holes that are not authozized. I haven't got the paperwork from Dean Fellinger. I said, what can $I$ do? Be said, man, he's my boss, what do you want me to do?

Q Do you know for sure that the people t you ioened this drill to did not acquire the documentation that they needed to stay within procedure and use this drill?

A I'm positive they did not get the procedure, because any time the procedure paperwor
came through it came directly to we fror. Dear. Fellinger and i banded it to my wen and seen that the job was done. Because there were areas out there that there was - strictly was illegad at a to drill any kind of rebar or cut any kind of rebi Reactor one was one of them. No rebar of any kinc was allowed to be cut in that building anywhere.

Q Is this the containment building?
A Containment building, Reactoz One.
Q What the NRC would like to know in this instance is the specific locations where holes wer drilled without proper documentation. Is there ar way that this information or these locations can determined, reconstructed or anyplace we can go, anybody we can go talk to to find out specific locations?

A Let's see, Danny Brown borrowed it several times to drill holes. Ee's still working out there. Other than getting ahold of Mike Sanders, Danny Brown is the only one $I$ can think o And as far as $\quad$ itting here and telling you locations, evidentiy you haven't been out to that plant.

Q I bave, yes.
A Well, $I$ had access to every building on
that place. I have been in every building. I he cut rebar in every builàing but containment one, except the dam. Now, does that tell you anything Now, to go tell you to go to a certain wall and b if the rebar is cut is impossible.

Q You understand what we'retzying to do with the information. We'retrying to find cut specific locations - -

A Right.
Q - so that we can verify what you're saying. Let me ask you, $\quad$ n your statement that $y$ made cołks. Eliisto you icentified a diary that yo have kept and in this diary -- it's my undezstand. in this diary you loggedin instances or times wht this rebar eater was used to drill holes when you did not bave the proper documentation; is that correct?

A No. This is --
Q Was this just a work -
A This goes from 9-7-78 to 10-17-79. Tbi was the period in which $I$ was in charge of the ret eater. And this documentation, there's some of th most of them have documentation. It also has the CMC number, and like at the beginning it was a $D C D$ or something. I got it wrote on there someplace.

DCDDh iz what they etazted dridilng rebar bith. Then they ifind out this was not the right documentation. Then they changed it to a CAC, bu when they firat got it they were doing it on three-part memos.

Q But --
A And this is every hole that I drilled, legal and illegal, and except for the ones wheze: equipment -- I vas ordered to loan wy equipzent o: Q All right.

MS. ELLIS: Just for the reco:d, Ni probably should mention that Mz. Messeriy is referring to a -- looks like a twenty-four pa 1isting which he had preparad of these different items and he will be giving that tc you.

Q Is this a coaplete rendering of this
diazy --
A Oh-huh (affismative).
Q 50-.
A It is in complete form.
MR, dERR: Is it gazked? You said
Legal and illegal. Gave you got the i11egal
stuff marked on it?
TEE MITNESS: No, I seally havon't

were supposed to take out a percentage of th rear. If you cut a hole in the rebar it should have been reported and thus and so forth.

Q In those instances, cid you report it?
A Yes, I'm legal. So is this thing.
$Q \quad$ okay.
A But it gives the direction of the reba which way it was running, north, south, east, wis It gives the depth that $I$ cut the rear and it al gives the percentage of rebar, just me looking at piece of cedar and saying i cut fifty percent, te: percent or if $I$ just nicked it, just whatever after the hole was drilled.

Q But on each of those entries, does it tell the location on the site out there?

A It tells you the location, what buildi: what print number it was taken off of or the henge number itself. So all you got to do is look up te hanger number and it will give you the area and exact location of this particular hanger.

Q Ane right. So any - which column show the authorization?

A Tits one here.
Q Okay, So if that column is left blank,
then thet would be an example?
A Not necessarily blank. I don't know $t$ in the hell to put that without sounding silly. Q Weare going to need to identify -- we not interested in the ones that were done proper: We're only -- we want to look at the ones that we done without documentation as required by procedu (MS. ELLIS): We're referring to the fifth column now on the far right.

A No, there's really not no way of telli not without looking up the hanger number and find out what was done on the hanger. You will just $h$ to go over each individual hanger and check the $C$ and see what was legal to cut and what was not le to cut.
(MS. ELLIE): You might mention, too in this column the ones on the front page al seer to have items by them, but on several o them throughout the listing there were none. So it's not -- each one of these items, in other words, doesn't have rebar cut necessarily. It's just as indicated on ther Q At this point $I$ was just trying to lif it to boles drilled without proper authorization, regardless of whether rebar was cut or just
concrete. If the drill was used improperly, we'r trying to identify those instances.

Can you think of any way with this
document or any other documents you may know exis that would lead NRC inspectors to specific locati where holes were drilled without proper authorization? Do you see what we'retrying to g

A I see ezactiy what you're trying to de you'retrying to make your gob real easy and ther no easy way way to do it. I'mesious as hell there's just no easy way to go to it because you have 50 wany things out there that's been like th and for me to pinpoint and give you an exact area this or any other means - I might be able to wal out there and show you things if $I$ walk with you say, this was cone here and this was done here. you're asking me to remember back three, four yea too, and if you have ever been in that area, if y go in there week later it's all different.

Q I understand what you're saying. Can think of any way that $I$ can transmit this informainion to an inspector or to a group of inepectors where we might be able to identify the You're right, we are trying to make it easier in that we can't reinspect ell the holes drilled at

Comanche Peak since its beginning, since the foundation was poured.

K This rear didn't come in until this c here.

Q In other words, we want to address th i potential problem.

A I cant think of the guy's name. Their one area down in the tunnel what they call the tunnel area, and he was foreman over it when he borrowed that drill. Be cut a Lunch of rear dow in there and it would be a damn good place to sta

0 If we talked to this man, do you think would be willing to tell us?

A I cant think of his name. Yeah, I do I really do. I'm trying to think of his name; I cant think of it.

Q If you cannot remember his name today would you mind giving us that name when you do remember it?

A Be's still working out there. He got fired and he was -- he went into the pipe departme at Green lat now. He's a welder.

Q Do you think you will remember the name eventually?

A If I don't I've got it at howe I would
call you, but he might testify. And if you could get should of a Richard Montjar (phonetic), be was man - -
(MS. ELLIS): Do you know bow to ape that?

A $\quad M=0-n-t$, something like that. It's pronounced Montjar, but he's in Germany now, I' Il tell you that much.

Q Now?
A yes. Well, be married a girl in the service is the only reason - well, he was a year ago. Be might be back over bette, now but be's married to a girl in the service.

Q Okay.
A But he worked and drilled a lot of bol, 111 egal1y.

Q Now, these illegal holes that you are referring to that he drilled, this was when the rebar was, or the rebar eater was on loan?

A No, he worked for me. But he was also around and could be a character witness to what I Eating as to when I was ordered to do this. And you could pin that Danny Grisso (phonetic) down, Danny Grisso used to work for me, too. And if you put him on a stand and square him in, he will edith
perjure himself or tell you about holes he drille when he was working for me and now he is in charc of that operation.

If you could pin him down, but that company has got him sewed down tight. Be's a puppet.

Q First of all, let me tell you, I'm not engineer. I have an engineering or technical background, but let me see if 1 can phrase this.

In the boles that vere drilled by your crev members without proper documentation, can yo rexember any instances or did you vitness any instances where damage was done to containment or any of these other areas where the drlil was used that would constitute a safety or bealth hazardo possible weakening of the structure?

A Well --
Q I know that's detailed.
A I'mimot an engineer either. I bave 1 net in steel, I have been in supervision, I bave been out there vorking. And when an engineer designs something, he designe it for that particular thinc for that particular strength. All right. If somebody comes in there and cuts part of that out without documentation, there's your answer. But:
not an engineer.
Q So you're saying, if I understand you correctly, you're saying that if it's done, then knows what the effect will be?

A Well, the egineer knows, the engineer that designed it. If be puts in fourteen rebars there and you cut out geven of them, then you bav weakened half of ther, what he designed it to hol And $I$ bave went down walls in that particular tun that $I$ was talking about and we were putting up t hold tbirty-two inche lines down there. I wasn't this guy was if $I$ could think of his name. And w had to cut a bneb of rebar down in there.

This was, I'm - well, quote meif you want to, I think, I'm not sure, but I think this an area that wasn't supposed to have any rebar cu out of it.

Q All right. Let we ask you one woreti because you have accused me of looking for the ea way. I would like to be able to valk out of this room todey and go find examples or instances of holea drilled down there without proper authorization. I hope there's some way we can figure out how that can be done because ve would like to follow up on this.

A
If I could just think of one exact hol that I could remember. I know of three on the turbine deck, but I'll be damed if I can remembe what area. There's another deal where $I$ would ha to go out and it's completely changed over now, a it would be a spot check between three or four hangers.

Q All right.
A In fact, out of the three or four, I think you will find a filti-bolt welded on the bac side because they couldn't get a boie in the grour

Q What would it take to zefresb your memb as to a poseible location?

A I have no idea. The documents you coul get is - now, this would be Turbine one area whic would cut it down quite a bit. It's around them tanks that they covered with the aluminum siding a insulation. I don't know what tanks, what they ar called, them big long tanks up on the turbine deck And it was right alongeide one of them tanks there that three holes rebar was cut in without cocumentation.

Q Was there anybody else present that mig be able to further identify, belp us identify this location?

A There was Richard Montjar. I should h brought my time books with me. I'm not really bu if Danny Grisso was there or not.

Q Is it your personal belief that Gesso could identify locations?

A Yeah, I think he could, but I doubt if you will get him to do it.

Q Is he still employed by them?
A Yes, he's very much employed.
Q All right. Well, Ill tell $\because$ iou, let's move on. We have got several other ( H S. ELLIS) P Perhaps if you had Kr. Grisso appear under these circumstances, you know, sworn with a stenographer and so forth maybe it might enable bim to say things that might not feel comfortable saying not under oath.

A I seriously think Danny would. I have known Danny for quite few years. I went througt divorce with him and everything else when be was working for we. But right now that company bes ge him bought and paid for.

Q I can assure you the NRC is not bashful: about going and asking, so we will--

MR. HERR: I have one question $I$
woulo like to ask. Dic you see any of these people using the drill improperly? I know y said you loaned theit the drill out, but did ever see them use it?

TEE WITNESS: On, yeah.
MR. $\quad$ ERR: And that was during the timeframe --

THE WITNESS: That wag during this time frame that this covers.

MR. EEत̂रि: Okay, That's the only question $I$ have.

Q Will that document thet you are provid: us, will examination of this document, say, by an engineer, would it lead to any locations where suc holes were drilled? Seems this fifth coluris see: to be filled in.

A What I would do if I was you, I woulds pull these CMC's and DCDDA all through it with an engineer, bump it againgt the number of the hanger and see what was authorized to cut and what was nc authorized to cut, and then come back and bump it against this, like a bundred percent cut out and i that was really legal in that area to cut out a hundred percent.

Q Do you think, then, a random sampling
done like that is going to reveal instances of ho cut without autborization?

A Oh-buh (affirmative). Ireally do.
(MS. ELLIS): It would seem to me on that third column there vere it shows the amount that was cut out, that it would be prudent at least to check all the ones where says a hundred percent or maybe as much as fifty percent have been cut out.

A Because the way I understand that, on first part, all this - these DCDDA's and all tha and the three parte were all illegal.

Q Yon mean where it says DCDDA?
A Yes.
Q Those are illegal cuts?
A At the beginaing they were, and then ty changed it to a CMC. Now, if they went back and covered their butts on that DCDDA I don't know.

Q If we checked all the ones that -- the DCDDA and checked that number it wight lead us to locations?

A I would try that firgt and find out if this was a legal document, because according to De Fellinger the engineer, that was all wrong until $h$ come up with the CMC -- talk Bob -- CMC idea that
had to be wrote by specific engineer.
Q As I flip through here, I only see that DCDDA recorded twice. Are some of these other it also that type of number?

A All right. Gere's one that was wrote an RPIC. That was illegal, too. And a DCDDA -(MS. ELLIS): Are all of these number here, are those all --

TEE NITNESS: They could be CHC's they could be DCDDA's, I'm not real sure ab which they were. God, that's been, '78?

Q Right.
A I really need to sit down -- I haven't looked at this other than a couple of days ago si I have been out of it, and i could probably bit di with somebody, and be glad to, to try to more or less interpret exactly how it was wrote and what is.

Q Okay, We would greatly appreciate that A I would. I will; I'll be glad to do it MR. GRIPPIN: DO you have any more questions, Dick?

MR. GER: NO.
Q Tell me now, you say, if I understand correctly that this unauthorized use of this retar
eater, is it true you were threatened with termination if you failed to loan it out --

A If Ifailed to do anything that this said as far as that rebar eater loan-out or drill bite or the whole operation or failed to drill something myself and my crew, I was told that I would be terminated if I didn't do it.

Q Tell me what his name is again.
A Mike Sanders. You have to understand there exactly what the deal was. At that time ina. Goodson was the superintendent. Mike Sanders was guess, twenty-six, twenty-seven years old and had never done any $k i n d$ of work like that in his life and he was right underneath gal Goodson as a three-stripe general foreean. And gal Goodson hac one thing out of his mouth, and that was productic Ee didn't come out and say it, but be didn't give damn how you got it --
$Q$ okay.
A -- as long as it shoved up on paper. E wanted production, he wanted pipe hangers up, he wanted cable tray supports up and he wanted them $c$ the wall and completed and bought off. Be didn't give a dam how they vere put up, and this is what Mike sanders did. And in doing so, if they ran in
a problem, you've got to to figure ape holes yer drilled, a hundred and something holes for one hanger to try and find a decent $3 p o t$ to bang it without hitting rebar. This brings on frustration on the men, they go to their foreman, the foremen goes to Mike Sanders, Mike Sanders says go down a see Messezly and drill the damn thing and put it

Q I understand. Let's move on, You sta in your affidavit to CASE that you observed or Witnessed the use of the polar (phonetic) crane to pull up a piece of thirty-two inch pipe, is that correct?

A That is absolutely correct.
Q I'z not an engineer, I Bon't understand the significance of this. Could you explain it ts me, please?

A Ali fight. What it amounts to is the main steam pipe has a condensation joint like for expansion joint is what it's called. It's a buge horseshoe type shape, and this thing is coming out of the turbine building. All right. Isis thinty-tuo inch jain steam pipe, it's coming out it's anchored in concrete all the way around it, it's a fixed object, you cant move it, tight? it comes into this expansion joint, makes buge
horseshoe shape and it goes down into each one of the steam generators, which there's four of them, the containment building.

It was attached through the wall and it was also attached to the team generator in the compartment inside the containment building. Somebody come along after these pipes bad been in there, because 6 somebody else was hollering, production, production, production, and found out that the main steam line was six inches off of location on the vertical way and four inches on the horizontal way off of location. There is a guy -TEE WITNESS: Whet was that guy's name? lave I got his name down there? (MS. ELLIS:) I don't think you have got a name in here.

A I'm hell on names today, ain't I? But what this gold hat did was ordered his people to raise it $u p$ with the polar crane. I cant remember the exact tonnage that was put on this because they had a big gas ge on it that showed tonnage when you pull on it. A big round gauge looks like big clock and whatever tonnage -- seemed $i j k e$ to me it was eighty-five tons, it was ungodly because everybody scattered when they seen that needle going up as th i
crane was puliing on it. The reason $I$ know this $f$ a fect is because $I$ was pipe hanger foreman at tha time between 860 and 905 elevation in the containment building. I had all of main steam and all of fourteen-inch feedwater lines that run all through that area.

Q Supports for them?
A I had all the pipe supports. And i had to undo my pipe supports, let him pull this up, Re Q:cem, which is a guy about -- I don't know, if yo. seen him you would think he's eight foot tall, but he's only about seven feet tall and four foot wide, I'm serious. Look him up out there, you will-he's got a head on him that big around.

Be was on three tons come-alongs pulling the horizontal way. And they put it into position and once they got into position, I had to go back and change my pipe support dimensions and hold that thing in position. When they cut the temporary bookup that they had welded to the steam generator loose, it flopped like fourteen inches and echoed through that whole containment building.

Q So you're saying they put this complete pipe under tension in this movement?

A (Node head afficmatively).

Q And it was secured into the wall on one end and temporarily unsecured to the steam generators?

A It was temporarily secured, welded to t steam generators with temporary pipe. It's a thirty-two inch line that goes into the steam generators.

Q So the pipe was attached at both ends a the center portion or $s$ ome portion in between the two ends --
A. The expansion chambers is where they moved the pipe at.

Q And they were -- this is a complete uni so it was put under tension; is that whet you're saying?

A Yeah.
Q And then you put in the supports to bolc it in that position?

A The supports vere already there. In fact, several of my stpports could not be used no longer, that's how far they moved the pipe because was allowes so many degrees for my pipe hangers tn be off of dead center of that thirty-two inch main steam pipe. And when they moved it with these come-alongs, and the overbead crane -- several of $x$

Pipe hangers had to be completely removed and started over again and redesigned to move over to the center of the pipe. They moved it six inches horizontally or six incher -- damnit -- six inche up vertically and four inches horizontally.

Q And yet the ends remained in the same place?

A (Nods head affirmatively).
Q Today would that game -- would it be in the same condition as far as you knew it was when was -- when your supports weze put back in place, reconnected or -

A What do you mean, the same position?
Q In other words, is it still under tension?

A I would say yeah. Because i know they did -- well, they moved from where it was welded tc the steam generator with the temporary pipe. I would imagine now that they have the thirty-two inc pipe going down after they got it on its last location, that they have got permanent pipe in ther now, which would still put where it comes through the vall in the same bind that it was originally when they done it.

Q When did this occur? Do you remember
what year?
A Bad to be right before I got fired, in that summer I'm pretty sure.

Q Summer of what?
A 82.
Q Summer of '82?
A Might have been earlier than that.
Q From the way you described it, sounds
like everybody knew this was taking place?
A Hell, yes, anybody that was in the reactor. My general foreman, Ed Dean told we to ge my people and get the hell out of 860 and go someplace and tide until that idiot got done.

Q Was there an engineer in charge?
A Bell, no, there wasn't no engineer up there. It was just that stupid gold hat that they got up there that they call the pipe fitters. A good friend of mine got fired -- what the hell was his name - he got fired once because of his.MR. EERR: What's his name, the gold
hat?
TEE WITNESS: Damn, I cant remember his name either. I should brought my paper; I had all that crap wrote down.

MR. GERR: was he the guy in charge
of moving this thing, the goid hat?
T日E HITNESS: Yeah.
MR. BERR: Is there any documentatic on that?

T日E WITNESS: To my knowledge, no. knew the foreman real vell. Don't ask me bis name. All of a sudien naxes escape me. I got his name at home, too.

Q You may not know the answer to this question, but just for my information, is it possible for all these people to be involved in wha sounded like major operation and management all through the company not know that this event was taking place, including the engineere that would have -- might have an opinion on any kind of wovement of such a large piece of material? I'm just asking your opinion.

A I want to give my opinion, but i want to try and explain sometining to you. It's very possible, because you got no communication out ther between the crafts. You bave a pipe engineer -- sa you're a pipe engineer and ar a cabletray engineer and so forth and so on down, just name any branch in there. We'resitting across from each other in the same office, but we don't tell each
other a damn thing. We don't talk to each other about coffee and yes, it was possible decause your management out there, your upper management contro the place. If they want to do it, all they have t do is say, do it. Well, we haven't got the correc paper works. I don't give a damn, I said do it. Now, what choice have you got? You're o there trying to make a buck and feed a family. Yo ain't got no choice and most of your upper supervisisi out there at that particuler time, the were all a clique that came up from North Carolina and all buddy-buddies, and wost of the upper supervision -- how in the hell I ever got to be a supervisor out there I don't know because I don't know anybody and $I$ ain't got no kin out there, but that's what all your upper supervision was, and ninety percent of your foremen out there are the same vay.

* I noticed that at one place in your affidavit here -- moving on to a different subject now -- you talk about the fact that you reinstallec hangers on the feedwater eystem?

A Oh-huh (affizmative).
Q This was, I guess, what, a major rework project?

A I would call it a major rework. I wist had them books. I would like to show you how many times I rebuilt hangers out there.

Q The same hangers?
A Same hangers over and over and over again.

Q I've only got one question on this. Yo say you worked at that for a long time. Was the work done by your crew done properly as far as you know?

A Yes, sir. It was done exactly right, bought off by $O C$ and everybody else and somebody came through there and said, hey, they have been redesigned wrong, let's tear them down and redo them. And as far as i know on December 7 th, 82 when l left there they were still working on feedwater lines and ind them ell completed on the big feedwater that floods that whole containment area.

Q A different subject again. I notice in your report that you make reference to notice to employees. This is a notice -- I believe it's called a form three NRC document?

A Yes.
(MS. ELLIS) That's a two -folding
a cutting torch on hangers. I don't personally know, is it improper to use a cutting torch to tear down or alter a hanger?

A Not to tear down and alter, but it's illegal to use it in the containsent building where I was the entire supervision, when $I$ was hanging pipe supports. You drill everything and everything has to go on the wall according to the drill size. I took down a hanger -- took down several hangers that was put up by this general foreman out there that i tried to fire.

Q Which one is this?
A Oh. boy.
Q Was it your general foreman?
A No, be wasn't my general foreman. Be worked for me. I tried to fire him while he was working for me.

Q You were a forman?
A Yeah. They call them supervisors out there. You got a supervisor, a general supervisor, a threestripe general supervisor and then a superintendent.

Q I see. Is \& foreman higher than a general forman?

A No. The general foreman's got two
stripes on his hat.
! Q So this guy was your boss?
A Buh-uh (negative). Be later made genera foreman because he went out to Raymond $\begin{aligned} & \text { ebert's }\end{aligned}$ house and built him a little sun deck and a little porch and patio and all that, and then he became a general foreman overnight over in pipe hangers. I heard he got fired, which $I$ hope he did.
ge had taken a torch and cut the back sid of a tube out because a lot of boito are put in link this, the holes in the wall. They are supposed to be straight, ninety degrees off the wall. They're anchored in the wall, poured into the concrete. (MS. ELLIS): Richman inserts.
A Yes. And you go to hang a pipe hanger o that and they give you a threaded piece of steel an you're supposed to stick it in there and it's supposed to come ninety degrees off the wall. Well they come off this way and come off that way and come off this way and this way --
(MS. ELLIS), For the record, could yo i kind of try to describe those angles that you are talking about? That's kind of hard to do sometimes.

Q Let me just ask you, maybe it would be
more clear at least to we that -- were these, I think these are called anchor bolts or something like that?

A You got Richman inserts is what are in the concrete wall, poured in around the concrete.

Q And you say these were installed at improper angles --

A Yes.
Q -- for the supports that they were to b attached to?

A Dh-huh (affirmative).
(\$S. ELLIS): Off the record.
(Discussion off the record.)
(Brief recess.)
Q These bolts that you are discussing, do you know where they were located at the site?

A Are you talking about the Richman
inserts?
Q Yes.
A Well, narrow it down between 860 and 905 I had that whole elevation and all of your compartment rooms.

Q Well, do you know specific ones that wer
A The only way $I$ could give you a specific would have -- my record of my hangers that $I$ done
and be able to say, well, this hanger or that hang. was done that way.

Q Would you have recorded the traveler fo the hanger if one of these bolts or these inserts.

A No.
Q -- were improperly installed?
A No, because we drilled holes this way, drilled holes up, we drilled holes down due to the installation of the insert.

Q If you found an insert that was improperly installed or not at the correct angie, did you drill these holes to repair it?

A No. You don't drills holes in concrete. Not in the insert.
(MS. ELLIS: I misunderstood, so
explain how that works with these deals. How do they get into the wall to start with?

THE WITNESS: They tie in the rebar when they pour the concrete, and they got a piece of foam in them to plug the hole, and al you do is dig the foam out and stick your threaded rod in there.

MS. ELLIS: so cather than drilling hole to put them in to begin with, they have some kind of a form or something and they are
poured－－initially when they pour the concre they are in there to start with？

THE WITNESS：Criginally their plan were to put in so many inserts in a wall area or ceiling or whatever．They just put in a bunch of inserts；ever so wany feet they put an insert．And hopefully what they were hopi was they could come back and put a pipe support，a cable support or electrical suppor whatever，a conduit and use these ingerts tha were put in there－－which turned out they didn＇t use half of them－－and they had to be grouted over the ones that weren＇t used or hac to have a hole drilled in there by a $⿴ 囗 ⿱ 一 一$ ilti drill in which they changed the entire operation on unit two and went to a solid stef wall imbedded in the concrete with studs welde right to the steel wall and the concrete poure around them．

Q Are you saying that they put this steel in the wall and started welding to that steel？ A Started welding direct in unit two．It takes in safeguard two，auxiliary two，containment two．

Q Are you saying that the problem then tha
we're discussing was in containment one?
A Yes.
Q Where there was no steel wall --
A Well, they started on the -- I think on the 505 pour, when they poured 905 floor and beams in there, they started putting steel in them. But from 905 , the bot om of 905 down, there wasn't any steel imbedded in the wall, just a few plates and stuff.

Q The use of the steel in the wall took t: place of these inserts because you could attach directly to the steel?

A Well, it had a sheet of steel there you could put whatever hanger you wanted to.

Q Okay. When your crew ran into these incerts that were at the wrong angle, placed at the wrong angle, how did you attach the inserts normall or how did you attach your hanger to these?

A I drilled the hole in the tubing at an angle, whatever the angle was, because you don't bend inch and a half threaded rod. Normally you don't.

Q You drill a hole?
A Drill a hole at an ange, and then $I$ hav seen them put in documentation on some of the
hangers they put a tapered washer on it to allow f the angle that the threaded rod came out.

Q And then you gay they grouted over the other hole?

A Unused ones had to be grouted. You had dimension from one hole to another that you could drill. There was dimension in your nine point s documentation out there how close you could drill a Richman insert, how close you could drill to another Eillt f -bolt or how close you could difil to another attachment or steel plate or whatever. There's all kinds in your nine point six.

Are you saying that these redrillings o these angled drillings into these inserts constituted a procedural violation on unathorized dzilling?

A Well, there again, you can go back to being that neither one of us are engineers. These inserts are tied to rebar with wire, ali right? T be at a hundred percent, they have to be surroundec by concrete a hundred percent, and they have to be ninety degrees off the wall. When you stick something in it, it should be ninety degrees off tr wall. If you have got this thing in thereat, say, at a ten-degree angle, you've not got the same
pulling capacity or coming out of the wall as you have if it'g straight.

Q Let me ask you this, then. How many instances do you know of in which there were -many?

A Eow about ten that were right and the rest wrong.

Q Is that right?
A Now, that's the percentage.
Q What did QC said?
$A \quad Q C$ never seen thex. $Q C$ didn't see nothing but the finished product.

Q So the finished produrt they saw was a bolt sticking out that was attached to a hanger anc it looked to be proper?

A (Nods head affirmatively). QC don't get in behind the hanger. You had a one-inch plate the goes in behind, say -- for instance, we used a six-inch tube vertical on the wall and say we had two of these inserts. All right, we drilled completely through the tube, used a one-inch washer in the back of the tube, one-inch washer in front of the tube, and this one inch or inch and a half threaded rod went through the washer, the tube, the washer and into the wall.

Now, if it was at an angle, QC never see this because there's a nut on top of that.

Q Were the engineers aware of this manner of altering these inserts when they were at an improper angle?

A Man, I tell you what, I have been around a lot of places in my life but $I$ have never seen anything out there -- if they call themselves engineers -- I don't know what you'd call me, a nigger aviator, $I$ guess. But $I^{\prime}$ m telling you, the: don't communicate, they don't go out in the field. How in the hell can you solve any problem if you s: in this office and you don't go out into the plant: That was their problem.

Q Would you mind telling me the original instance of this manner of correcting these, the angle of these inserts?

A Only way to correct it is not use it and drill. around it and drill a straight hole. You don't put a Richmen anchor in after the concrete is poured.

Q Who was directing that they do it, though?

A The Richman --
Q These redrillings.

A Your building department.
© Who specifically? Somebody had to decic that it was going to be done this way. Do you know who?

A No. I imagine that comes from your original Gibbs and Hill drawings or something.

Q I'm talking about the variation, this changing the angle without -- to make it improper, where the angle is wrong.
A. I'm losing you someplace. I don't know what you're saying.

Q You're saying it's supposed to be at ninety degrees angles to the wall?

A Yeah.
Q And you-all were changing the angles so it would fit --

A We weren't touching the Richman now. Only thing we did was take the threaded rod, and whatever angle it is, we would drill it at that angle so that it would come through the tube and when it come out the other side of the tube, it coal out as close to center as we could get it.

Q When you talk about tube, are you talkint about tube steel?

A Oh-huh (affirmative).

Q On the hanger?
A On the hanger. There was no way of changing the insert.

Q So the insert remained the same and the angle on the tube steel was changed?

A Wed, the holes through the tube steel wa changed.

Q Okay. So does that mean that the tube steel had at least two holes in it, one of which wa used and the other unused?

A No. No. I don't know how to describe that to you. Say that's the insert. All right, yo know me ard my drawing. You got a piece of tube steel here. Were going to run this one horizontally. All right, looking at it, here is th hole in the front like so. All right, this back hole, weill say that this angle runs this way to our left. The back hole, if you know anything about a print at all, might be drilled like that. Understand what $I^{\prime}$ saying, looking straight throug. the tube?

Q I think so.
A Then this one here might be drilled like thus. But when it come out the front it was straight, so that means that this tube, if $I$ was
sticking it in the wall bere, would be at this ang. or -- no, this angle, in order to get out, and this here be at this angle and get out. But when you tighten on an inch-and-a-half screw, whatever gives I don't know, but it's flat on the front. And see, you got a big one-inch washer that goes here, the size of the tube and also on the back side of it tc space it away from the wall.

Q Okay.
A So we don't change the insert.
Q And you are saying because it's not at the proper angle that it is less than whatever the load factor of its ability to support whatever weight it is supporting?

A Well, again, I'm not an engineer but if something is designed to go in a certain way and it's not there, it's not in that way, then it's not designed right. And it is a weaker point. Q Okay.

MR. EERR: Did you bring this to anybody else's artention.

TEE WITEESS: Yeah. It don't do no good.

MR. EERR: Do you know who you brought it to?

THE WITNESS: Oh, you could Just about mention anybody else's name of my superiors from tal Goodson to Mike Sanders to Mike Robinson to Ed Dean to Jim Starkey. There's a jewel you ought to hang.

MR. $\quad$ ERRR: What did they say when yo brought it to their attention?

TEE WITNESS: Do you want a quote? "Eang the damn thing". What do you do? And that is all my upper supervisors. you don't know how glad I am to be away from that place. I ain't got no job, but I'zestill glad to be away from it. I've never seen anything in my forty-three years on earth run like that place Q Can you think of any way that we can identify specifics again of hangers that were, wher these holes were improperly --

A I tell you what. I just about bet you, Mr. Griffin, I'w telling you what i bet you. Just go out there and pull any damn stodded rod out of there, pull three of them and two of them is crooked.

Q And these were never addressed by QC fror that inspection?

A There's no way of checking it. No way of
knowing what angle that thing is in there unless $y$ pull the hanger off and screw a straight rod in there and look at it. But $I$ would say, I would jus. damn near bet you that out of three rods you get $t$ of them that's crooked.
(MS. ELLIS) Just to be sure I understand, when you look at this straight on like $Q C$ would come and look at it, everything looks all right from the front and all of the part that you are talking about that's at an angle is, in effect, hidden?

THE WITNESS: Its inside the concrete. Nobody knows it. It's inside of solid concrete.

Q Can you think of any way that we can identify particular areas where this was done? Is this all the areas that don't have steel plate against the wall?

A No. Most of the places that had the threaded rod would be in the compartments, compartments one, two, three and four, and then you have a lot of your other buildings, safeguard and auxiliary, they all got the threaded rod imbedded inserts.

Q Okay.

A But in the containment itself, you woulc probably find them in the compertments would probably be the major part of them.

Q All right. Let's go back to this, the use of the cuiting torch. Is that --

A That's what I'm saying. This hanger in these compartments, if they didn't have enough intelligence to find out what kind of angle it is and how to drill the hole from the back and make it come cut center from the front, what this foreman done out there or general foreaan on nights, what $h$ done was take torch and cut about a three-inch hole. And you can see, if I cut -- if I got this angle here and say wave another one here and the back was at another angle, we just cut that sucker out like that so we can move that thing any way we want to to get it started.

Q How do they fill in the hole or is it -A They den't fill it in; it's covered with a washer. The only reason $I$ found it out, the hanger that was particularly put up by this guy was designed wrong. I had to go down there and tear it down. And $I$ went to my superior Ed Dean and $I$ gad what are you going to do about this? I mean, I got my butt tore up yesterday because I put something it
wrong or because one of my men had forgot to grout behind a plate. I got called up to the front offic about a plate $I$ put up three or four years ago. Ar it wasn't grouted, the holes wasn't grouted behind the plate. And $I$ was called in and told if they found one more hanger like that that $I$ was going ou the gate. I said, Raymond, what the hell are you talking about? I can't stand there and watch fifteen men every five minutes put up every plate, and you're going to fire me for something that happened four years ago, fire me.

And then $I$ go down there and $I$ report something like this to my general foreman. He reports to Raymond lebert -- well, this eame guy is the one that built the little sun deck or whatever you want to call it at Raymond Eebert's house.

MR. EERR: What's his name?
THE WITNESS: Raymond Bebert.
MR. HERR: No, the guy that did the building.

THE WITNESS: That's the nave I can' remember.

MR, HERR: The night foreman?
THE WITNESS: Be was the general
foreman. I sold him a car. Hell, he used to
be good friend of mine. I don't have nothin against the guy except he don't know nothing. Q Can you think of anyody else that we ca go talk to that can identify some hangers where the specifically remember that this was done, these cut were made in the tube stef?

A Let me go home and I can give you a call and $I$ can give some names. If they are going to talk I don't know. If they arestill out there, ninety-nine out of hundred of them are in the clique and they ain't going to talk unless they are utterly threatened, because their jobs are on the Iine. 且ell, they are making thirty-five, forty thousand dollars a year for doing nothing and they ain't going to come over here and take a chance on losing their job. Several of them are still there. I think about seventy-five percent of my crew is there. But if they would talk, I don't know.

Q Okay.
MR. GRIFPIN: Off the record.
(Discussion off the record.)
Q Now, you say the fellow that was drillinc the holes with the drill, is that this guy --

A The one $I$ was drilling for. He was foreman in that area. I was drilling holes for him.

0 And his name is Nathan?
A Nathan Aammers or something like thit, gammers.

Q And Eammers might know specific holes drilled -

A True.
Q - with the rebar eater?
A Yeah. If you could corner himi I think he would go.

Q All right. Now, the use of the cutting torch on this tube steel, you say this was at the direction of the general foreman?

A No. Be wasn't a generad foreman at that time.

Q He became --
A He became general foreman later. He was boy, I tell you what, if you could get in my print shack out there and get my log that I kept on every damn hanger I got in there, I could tell you who worked on $1 t$, the name of the person that worked on it and when he done it. I kepr a daily log, but I turned that over to the new foreman. When they busted me back, I give him that so he would have a record of all the hangere put up. In that log is all the feedwater hangers that were reworked and why
and who the person that worked on them, because if anything ever fell back I went to each of them mer and said, why was it done this way. Because when you got two or three guys bere and two or three guy here and two or three guys here and soforth and so on, you can't be at every place at one time.

But if you could get ahold of that log that was in my print shack, I can narrow them hangers down real close for you.

Q How many would there be?
A Every hanger between 860 and 905 that $I$ put up. Every CT line, every main steam line, feedwater line. It should still be in my print shack.

MR. $\operatorname{HERR}$ : Who did you give the log to?

TEE WITNESS: Bere we go again. I'g not very good on names as you found out. I ca: give you his name, too, because I got it in my time book. He was my lead man for me for about six months. He was an ex-foreman down there; bis foreman lasted about month before they busted him back.

MR. $\quad$ ERRR: When did you give it to him?

TEE WITNESE: When I got fired -- ro no, in June of ' 82 when they busted me back is when $I$ gave himeverything in that print shack except that document you got there, which was none of his business that $I$ took with me.

MR. ERRR: And you weren't firec

## until when?

THE WITNESS: December 7 th .
MR. HERR: Of '82?
TEE WITNESS: '82.
MR. HERR: ge had it six months?
THE WITNESS: Hetad it six months, and everybody liked the vay I kept that log because they could go right to that book and open it up and it would tell what percentage o that hanger was done, who vorked on it and the rework and CMC's and so forth on it.

MR. HERR: Was it a black or green book?

THE WITNESS: No, it was a notebook with paper in it, a regular black notebook.

MR. GERR: Three ring?
THE WITNESS: Yeah. And in there is everything $I$ have done in four years out there MR. EERR: Was there any printing on
it?
THE fITNESS: No. Yaah, it would just have -- let's see, I Eorget what I had c the front of it. I had this whiteout that yc uae on typing paper. I had something printec on that, main stear or containment one banger or something like that. I don't remember wha it was. You can't miss my shack.

MR. GERR: Where vas yous shack located?

THE WITNESS: It was locared on 860 but now it's outside of the entzonce to containaent one. Ir's a bright red shack out there. I painted it bright red because I got in trouble for putting a christmas tree on it one yeaz. And it's got my name all over it, Bot Messerly, 8895.

MR. GRIPPIN: Do you have any more questions?

MR. GERR: Is theze anything else outaide of your affidavit that you wish to go into or describe to us at this time?

TEE KITNESS: No. NeIl, I don's
zealiy know. If you are going so get into something besides what I have discussed
already, I know it's been brought up before, but if you can get ahold of guy named red I gave you his name the other day. I ain't it with me. I wish I had his address. He v a weld tech out there and be can tell you ab a lot of that welding. That's another name I'll have to get for you. I have got it on of my affidavits or something. And there's Joe Gray that was a welding foreman out ther that done a lot of welding illegally without documentation, such as lugs on pipes without purge, and --

NR. GERR: Did he tell you this?
THE WITNESS: I seen him do it.
MR. HERR: Can you give me the
location?
THE WITNESS: It was down on the 8 : elevation. Roy Estes was foreman at the time and you might get ahold of a guy named Gary Hill who was foreman down on 808 elevation which had some bad lugs welded on by Joe Gray 11lego'ly. Ed Dean was general foreman and they done it on the sly, Raymond Hebert knew about it.

MR. EERR: Who gave the order?

THE WITNESS：Raymond Hebert．
MR．HERR：He gave it to Dean，and Dean passed it－－

THE MIFNESE：Dean then passed it Joe Gray because he was the foreman．He wo go down there and do it and didn＇t want any the welders to know about it．
（MS．ELLIS：Was there anybody else maybe on the crew that you know of－－

THE WITNESS：Joe Gray＇s crew or $\quad$ a crew？

道S．ELLIS：－－that would have knot about this particular thing that you are talking about？

TEE WITNESS：Other than Joe Gray i there＇s another name $I$ need to find out．I＇ give you a bunch of names on stuff that was done wrong down there that was seen by thee ， stuff like that．The only thing you can do： if they are still working down there－I bet Joe Gray got fired，too．

Q Okay．Why don＇t we wrap this thing wii We discussed three issues outside of jus those notices posted，and we have asked you or you have mentioned names or knowledge of names of
people, although you cannot recall the names right at the moment regarding the use of this rebar eat the polar crane, that incident and the use of the torches to cut hangers. And do you agree that yo will call we and let me know --

AI do.
Q -- fill in these names with these situations as you have described them --

A Yes.
Q --so we can put a complete package together?

A I can give you every name that was in rebar crew from the time $I$ hadst. I have my tim books at home. I kept my own time books.

Q We are looking for people that know ab these instances of illegal or improper or work do out of procedure.

A These are all the people that were dol it. My entire crew was.

MR. HERR: They were doing that at
your direction --
THE WITNESS: At my direction, but several of them were there when Mike Sanders came down and ordered me to do so. And when your superiors tell you to do something and
your job is on the line, that's what you dio
HR. HERR: There improper weldings Gray and some of these, did they tell you thi they had actually done it improperly?

THE WITNESS: I have seen them do: Any time you weid stainless steel lug on, : have to purge line after a certain size. you don't purge it, it causes a sugar coatinc on the inside and sucks that pipe into the piece of steel that you are welding. So what you have is you have a void area inside of a slick steel piece of pipe, just a sunk-in are The stainless - on stainless it just sucks i right into that lug you're welding. We're talking about a little lug like half an inch long and maybe three-eighths of an inch high. What it is, it's a lug that keeps the pipe fr doing this motion. You veld like four lugs o this side, fuur iugs on this side around a pipe, and you put a clamp in between it and struts back to a fixed object on the wall and it stops that pipe from going in this tution up and down, whichever way the pipe is locate
tMS. ELLIS: And the purpose of it $i$ to keep the pipe from woving?

THE WITNESS: Right.
Q Wouldn't that Ehow up on adiograph?
A It should.
Q And aren't such things radiographed before they are finally accepted by QC?

A No. On a stainless you get a -- hell, they $r$ un that dye test on it.

MR. $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ER}}$ : Penetrant test?
TEE WITNESS: Yeah, penetrant.
That's the only thing, as long as the weldi pretty and all that, it will pass penetrant. But that's all on the inside.

MR. EERR: DO you know one way or other whether these are involving safety-related or nonsafety-related, or do $y s$ know offhand --

THE WITNESS: No, I'm not a nuclear
power plant -- it's all put in there for something. Now, what particular thing this did, I don't know -- I couldn't be honest wit you and tell what you it did without remembering the line.

MR. EERR: The exact location.
TEE WITNESS: The exact location an line number. If you had the line number I'd
tell you what it did.
MS. EL亡IS: Nus it like in the containment?

THZ जITAESS: Everything I done wa. in the containment. Everything I have mentioned here, except for the rebar eater, concerns the containment building in Reactor One, which the reactor is inside containment one. But everything $I$ have mentioned in here was happened in here that b have personally seen done.

HR. BERR: Do you have anything ede you wish $\pm 0$ add?

T日E WITNESS: No. I'11 give you a dist of names.

MR. HERR: Thank you very much, Mr. Nesserdy.
(End of statement).
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