

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3 INVESTIGATION OF
4 DIABLO CANYON UNITS 1 & 2
5 INTERVIEW OF
6 MICHAEL R. TRESLER
7
8

9 Pacific Gas & Electric
10 Headquarters Offices
11 Law Department Conference Room
12 77 Beale Street
13 San Francisco, California

14 Wednesday,
15 December 30, 1981

16 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing,
17 pursuant to notice at 10:07 a.m.

18 APPEARANCES:

19 On behalf of the NRC Staff:

20 OWEN C. SHACKLETON, JR., Moderator
21 B.H. FAULKENBERRY
22
23
24
25

ERRATA SHEET

Interview of Michael R. Tressler, December 30, 1981

The following corrections should be made:

- ° Page 496, Lines 18-24 - Change entire sentence to read: The comment that I made on the draft I received was that before conclusions be drawn by Cloud, potentially based on incomplete data submitted by PG&E or an incomplete review by Dr. Cloud, I requested the opportunity to provide the missing information.

The above corrections were identified by Michael R. Tressler and Bobby H. Faulkenberry.

P R O C E E D I N G E

10:07 a.m.

MR. SHACKLETON: On the record.

This is December 30th, 1981. The time is now 10:07 a.m.

This is an interview of Mr. Michael R. Tresler, and Mr. Tresler's position with PG&E is the Diablo Canyon Supervising Piping Coordinator.

He has been with Pacific Gas and Electric Company for 17-½ years.

The purpose of this interview is part of the investigation presently being conducted by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, concerning the facts and happenings surrounding the present reverification program of the seismic design of the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant that is being conducted by PG&E.

In addition to Mr. Tresler, present from the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Region 5, is Mr. Bobby H. Faulkenberry, Chief of Reactor Construction Projects Branch and my name is Owen C. Shackleton, Jr. I am a Senior Investigator assigned to Region 5.

This interview is being conducted in room 3101 of the corporate headquarters of PG&E at 77 Beale Street, San Francisco, California.

Mr. Tresler, prior to going on record, I discussed

1 with you and you were also advised by your corporate
2 legal counsel, that you have the right to have your
3 private legal counsel present during the course of this
4 interview.

5 Do you waive that right?

6 MR. TRESLER: Yes, I do.

7 MR. SHACKLETON: Thank you.

8 I would also ask of you, Mr. Tresler, that
9 you keep the testimony you are about to give to the
10 Commission confidential.

11 Is that understood?

12 MR. TRESLER: That's correct, yes, I understand.

13 MR. SHACKLETON: Thank you. Would you please
14 rise for the oath?

15 Whereupon,

16 MICHAEL R. TRESLER

17 having been first duly sworn, was called as a witness
18 herein and was examined and testified as follows:

19 MR. SHACKLETON: Please be seated.

20 Now, Mr. Faulkenberry will conduct the
21 questioning.

22 MR. FAULKENBERRY: Mr. Tresler, for the
23 record, would you please state your position with
24 Pacific Gas and Electric Company?

25 MR. TRESLER: I am the Diablo Canyon Supervising

1 Piping Coordinator.

2 MR. FAULKENBERRY: Mr. Tresler, did you attend
3 both the October the 9th and November the 3rd meetings
4 that were held between PG&E and the NRC at Bethesda,
5 Maryland?

6 MR. TRESLER: Yes, I did.

7 MR. FAULKENBERRY: Mr. Tresler, it has been
8 determined that four separate draft reports of Dr. Cloud's
9 work were submitted to PG&E.

10 These draft reports were submitted to PG&E
11 on the approximate dates of October 21st, October 26th,
12 November 6th and November 12, 1981.

13 My question is, prior to the November 3rd
14 meeting at Bethesda, were you aware that PG&E had
15 received either the October 21st or October 26th draft
16 reports from Dr. Cloud?

17 MR. TRESLER: I believe I was aware of the
18 receipt by the company of the first draft but as I sit
19 here now, I can't recall if I looked at those drafts
20 before or after the meetings in Bethesda.

21 MR. FAULKENBERRY: Mr. Tresler, to the best
22 of your knowledge then, did you actually see either
23 the October 21st or October 26th draft prior to the
24 November 3rd meeting and if you did see either one,
25 did you review or comment on either draft?

1 MR. TRESLER: Again, I don't recall whether
2 or not I reviewed the draft before or after the meeting
3 that we're talking about.

4 I do know that I reviewed a portion of the
5 first Cloud draft.

6 MR. FAULKENBERRY: Do you know whether that
7 review was conducted prior to the meeting or after the
8 meeting?

9 MR. TRESLER: I don't recall.

10 MR. FAULKENBERRY: Did you make any comments
11 on the particular draft?

12 MR. TRESLER: Yes, I did.

13 MR. FAULKENBERRY: Did you send those comments
14 back to Mr. Rocca or Dr. Cloud through Mr. Rocca?

15 MR. TRESLER: I sent my comments to Mr. Rocca.
16 I don't know that they were forwarded to Dr. Cloud.

17 MR. FAULKENBERRY: Were your comments documented
18 on draft reports -- were they handwritten comments or
19 provided under separate cover?

20 MR. TRESLER: Okay, my comments were both
21 written on a copy of the draft as well as oral comments
22 directly to Mr. Rocca.

23 MR. FAULKENBERRY: Mr. Tresler, while at the
24 November 3rd, 1981 meeting, did you hear the statements
25 made by Mr. Maneatis, Mr. Norton and Dr. Cloud as regarding

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Dr. Cloud's draft reports as identified on pages 215, to 218 of the transcript of the November the 3rd meeting?

MR. TRESLER: Yes, I did.

MR. FAULKENBERRY: While at the meeting on November 3rd and hearing the statements made by Mr. Norton, Mr. Maneatis and Dr. Cloud, in your own mind, at the time you heard these statements, did you consider these statements to be possibly erroneous or misleading to the NRC?

MR. TRESLER: No. I did not.

MR. FAULKENBERRY: Could you explain why you did not consider these statements to be misleading or erroneous based upon the fact that you knew a draft report was within PG&E at the time the meeting was being conducted?

MR. TRESLER: Again, I really don't recall whether or not I had access to the Cloud draft prior to the November 3rd meeting.

I do recall looking at it but again, I don't recall whether it was before or after the meeting and I don't remember being surprised or concerned about the statements made by Maneatis, Cloud or Norton during the meeting.

MR. FAULKENBERRY: Mr. Tresler, a few moments ago, you reviewed the conversations that took place at the November 3rd meeting as identified on pages 215 through 218 of the transcript.

1 Based upon what you just reviewed, if you had
2 been aware of the draft report being provided to PG&E
3 prior to the November 3rd meeting, do you think you
4 would have considered those to be erroneous statements?

5 MR. TRESLER: No, I think those statements
6 probably -- I would consider them to be reasonable statements.

7 I do recall the document that I looked at which
8 was generated by Cloud and forwarded to the company.

9 The part of the report that I looked at was
10 that which pertained to the piping design and construction
11 which I have responsibility for.

12 I looked at that document which we're calling
13 a draft report and maybe that's what it was even called
14 on the head sheet.

15 I didn't see the head sheet.

16 But I looked at it as essentially as findings
17 to date that were being documented by Cloud and I reviewed
18 the document to make sure that we, the company, had provided
19 him with the necessary information in order to address the
20 subjects that he was addressing in that report.

21 The report was generated over a very short--
22 based on a very short period of review of PG&E documentation
23 calculations and so on and I had a concern that it was
24 being done at such a rate that some items might be missed
25 which could allow for conclusions to be drawn which are in

1 error and it was based on that philosophy or attitude that
2 I reviewed that portion of the report directed to piping.

3 MR. FAULKENBERRY: Mr. Tresler, prior to the
4 November 3rd meeting between PG&E and the NRC at Bethesda,
5 there were several meetings held by PG&E representatives
6 as "pre-conference meetings" and these meetings were
7 held, I believe on Saturday October 31st and Sunday,
8 November 1st and Monday, November 2nd.

9 Did you attend any or all of these meetings?

10 MR. TRESLER: I attended all of the meetings
11 intermittently, in and out.

12 MR. FAULKENBERRY: While at these meetings,
13 did you hear any conversations by anyone regarding the
14 draft reports that Dr. Cloud had submitted to PG&E?

15 MR. TRESLER: I don't recall any comments
16 on the draft reports prepared by Cloud.

17 The comments I recall being made were instead
18 directed towards his presentation of the information or
19 practice, presentation, which was to be given November 3rd.

20 MR. FAULKENBERRY: Mr. Tresler, at any time
21 during the November the 3rd meeting at Bethesda, including
22 the period during the lunch break, did you hear any
23 conversations by anyone with regard to the draft reports
24 that Dr. Cloud had submitted to the NRC?

25 MR. TRESLER: You're asking me during the lunch

1 break?

2 MR. FAULKENBERRY: At any time during the meeting
3 that day of November the 3rd, including the lunch breaks?

4 MR. TRESLER: No, I heard comments following
5 the meeting but none prior to conclusion of the meeting.

6 MR. FAULKENBERRY: Could you relate to us
7 the comments that you heard following the meeting as
8 related to the draft reports?

9 MR. TRESLER: Jim Rocca and I discussed
10 the presentation made that day and Jim expressed some
11 concern over the comment that Mr. Norton made indicating
12 that we had not reviewed any draft reports from Cloud
13 or received draft reports from Cloud.

14 Jim seemed to be concerned about that comment
15 because he did recall that we had received such a report
16 or draft.

17 MR. FAULKENBERRY: MR. Tresler, based upon
18 your conversation with Mr. Rocca and your being present
19 at the November 3rd meeting, did you in your own mind
20 consider then that Mr. Norton or Mr. Maneatis may have
21 made some misleading statements to the NRC?

22 MR. TRESLER: I guess I and I told Jim Rocca
23 this when I talked with him. I really didn't consider
24 the statements to be misleading in that again, I considered
25 the work that Cloud was doing at that point in time to be

1 preliminary and anything that he was coming up with that
2 we looked at were findings and I felt it was absolutely
3 necessary that the company participate in some limited
4 degree with Cloud in his review to assure that he had
5 access to the information that he required to perform
6 that review.

7 I feel that way today.

8 MR. FAULKENBERRY: Mr. Tresler, did anytime
9 after conversations with Mr. Rocca, did you relay to
10 any of your management the conversation that you had or
11 the fact that Mr. Rocca had concerns that possibly
12 information provided to the NRC had been misleading?

13 MR. TRESLER: No, I did not discuss that with
14 management other than Mr. Rocca.

15 MR. FAULKENBERRY: Mr. Tresler, do you have
16 any knowledge of whether or not Mr. Rocca relayed his
17 concerns to anyone else within PG&E other than yourself?

18 MR. TRESLER: I believe he did but I can't
19 be certain. I was not involved in the conversations
20 and have no first-hand knowledge of such conversations.

21 MR. FAULKENBERRY: Okay, Mr. Tresler, that's
22 the extent of the questions I have.

23 Owen do you have anything to add?

24 MR. SHACKLETON: Yes, thank you.

25 Mr. Tresler, you state that you recall that you

1 did see one of the drafts and that you did make comments
2 concerning the section that must have addressed the
3 piping at the Diablo plant.

4 Have you seen the final or the interim--it's
5 commonly referred to as the interim report from Dr. Cloud
6 that was issued after the November 3rd meeting?

7 MR. TRESLER: I believe there's been two
8 issued since November 3rd, although I'm not certain
9 because I've only seen one.

10 MR. SHACKLETON: Which report did you see?
11 Do you recall the date of it's issuance?

12 MR. TRESLER: No, I don't.

13 MR. SHACKLETON: Did you have an opportunity
14 to examine this report?

15 MR. TRESLER: Yes.

16 MR. SHACKLETON: Did you read the section
17 that addressed your area of responsibility?

18 MR. TRESLER: Yes.

19 MR. SHACKLETON: Do you recall whether or not
20 any of the comments or recommendations you made to Mr. Rocca
21 either in writing or orally were incorporated in that
22 report?

23 MR. TRESLER: Now again, we're talking about
24 a report that was issued after November 3rd?

25 MR. SHACKLETON: Yes, sir.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. TRESLER: I made no comments on it.

I made no comments on the second or third draft report.

The only comment that I made was on the first draft report or summary of findings, whatever you want to call it.

MR. SHACKLETON: What I am getting to, Mr. Tresler, is the report that was dated, Bobby, November 6th?

MR. FAULKENBERRY: There were two reports after November 3rd. The first after November 3rd was dated November 6th. The second was dated November 12th. The November the 12th report was the one that was actually submitted to the NRC.

MR. SHACKLETON: That's the report I'm talking about, Mr. Tresler. I'm interested in knowing whether or not you were able to decipher whether or not any of the recommendations you made or comments made to Mr. Rocca were incorporated in that report?

MR. TRESLER: Okay, the comment that I made on the draft the draft that I reviewed was that before conclusions be drawn by Cloud, the information was not available in order to review some aspect of the plant or information was not available -- as an example, assignments of work to specific consultants to PG&E, that I be given the opportunity to provide that information that was missing.

As a result of that comment, Cloud's organization

PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 FORM 2084

1 did make a request for information on assignments to
2 a consultant. We made those files available to Cloud's
3 representative auditor and as a result of that, I believe
4 the words in the final report were changed.

5 It was not -- I provided no change in wording
6 but instead distinctly asked for the opportunity to
7 provide documentation on an issue that Cloud was addressing.
8 He came in and reviewed that documentation and as a result,
9 modified the wording of one of the paragraphs in the report.

10 MR. SHACKLETON: Mr. Tresler, can you recall,
11 and I realize I'm putting you on the spot without
12 reference having a document to refer to, but can you
13 be specific as to the subject matter that was changed?
14 The paragraph you just referred to?

15 MR. TRESLER: There was a paragraph which
16 indicated that very little if any evidence existed of
17 assignments of work or correspondence between -- it was
18 either EES or EDS, both of which were piping group
19 consultants.

20 The files -- apparently the files that
21 Cloud had reviewed didn't contain any of this correspondence
22 he was looking for, although other files within our
23 organization did contain that information.

24 I made his organization aware of those files.
25 They came in, found evidence of a substantial amount of

1 correspondence, and as a result, modified the statement
2 to indicate that there was a higher level of correspondence
3 available with those consultants than with Blume.

4 MR. SHACKLETON: For the record, Mr. Tresler,
5 you referred to these companies which are common in
6 the nuclear industry by their letters.

7 Would you please, if you know their full names,
8 give their full names?

9 MR. TRESLER: EES is Earthquake Engineering
10 Services.

11 EDS is Engineering Design Services.

12 MR. SHACKLETON: And the last company you
13 referred to was -- is that URS/Blume & Associates?

14 MR. TRESLER: That's correct.

15 MR. SHACKLETON: Mr. Tresler, in your testimony
16 in addressing what transpired after the meeting or after
17 the lunch hour on November 3rd when you were talking
18 with James Rocca concerning Mr. Rocca's concerns that
19 Bruce Norton, the private counsel for the company
20 had made reference that the company had not yet received
21 the report from Dr. Cloud, do you recall whether or
22 not Mr. Rocca mentioned going and discussing this with
23 Mr. Norton?

24 MR. TRESLER: Just for the record, the
25 conversation I had with Rocca occurred after the meeting on

1 an airplane back to San Francisco.

2 MR. SHACKLETON: Okay, thank you.

3 MR. TRESLER: Secondly, I have no knowledge
4 of Mr. Rocca discussing this with Mr. Norton.

5 In fact, I doubt that he did. I believe
6 we were on separate planes.

7 MR. SHACKLETON: Did he suggest or make
8 comments that he should call or talk to Mr. Norton
9 concerning this matter?

10 MR. TRESLER: He made no such comment to
11 me.

12 MR. SHACKLETON: Fine, I thank you.

13 I have no further questions.

14 Bobby?

15 (Brief pause.)

16 MR. SHACKLETON: Mr. Tresler, we thank you
17 very much for your presence and we'll now go off record.
18 The time is 10:29 a.m.

19 (Whereupon, at 10:29 a.m., the interview of
20 Mr. Michael R. Tresler was concluded.)

21

22

23

24

25

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3 INVESTIGATION OF
4 DIABLO CANYON UNITS 1 & 2
5 INTERVIEW OF
6 MICHAEL R. TRESLER
7
8

9 Pacific Gas & Electric
10 Headquarters Offices
11 Law Department Conference Room
12 77 Beale Street
13 San Francisco, California

14 Wednesday,
15 December 30th, 1981

16 The above-entitled matter came on for further
17 hearing, pursuant to notice at 1:02 p.m.

18 APPEARANCES:

19 On behalf of the NRC Staff:

20 OWEN C. SHACKLETON, Jr., Moderator
21 B. H. FAULKENBERRY
22
23
24
25

ERRATA SHEET

Interview of Michael R. Tressler, December 30, 1981

The following corrections should be made:

- ° Page 503, Line 24 - Insert MR. FAULKENBERRY: at the beginning of the line as the speaker.
- ° Page 505, Line 17 - Change itw to with.

The above corrections were identified by Michael R. Tressler and Bobby H. Faulkenberry.

P R O C E E D I N G S

1:02 p.m.

MR. SHACKLETON: On the record.

This is December 30, 1981. The time is 1:01 p.m.
This is continuation of the interview of Mr. Michael R. Tresler, Diablo Canyon Supervising Pipe Coordinator for PG&E.

Present conducting the interview from the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission is Mr. Bobby H. Faulkenberry and my name is Owen C. Shackleton, Jr., Senior Investigator, both of us from the NRC are from Region 5.

Mr. Tresler, do you understand sir, that you are still under oath?

MR. TRESLER: Yes, I do.

MR. SHACKLETON: And do you also understand sir, that you still have the right to have private counsel present and do you waive that right?

MR. TRESLER: I waive that right.

MR. SHACKLETON: Thank you.

We will continue then, with the questioning, Mr. Faulkenberry.

Whereupon,

MICHAEL R. TRESLER

having been previously duly sworn, was recalled as a witness

1 and was examined and testified as follows:

2 MR. FAULKENBERRY: Mr. Tresler, in your
3 earlier testimony, you indicated that you rode back
4 on the airplane from the November the 3rd meeting with
5 the NRC with Mr. Rocca.

6 You also indicated that during the course of
7 the airplane flight, you had conversations with Mr. Rocca
8 with regard to some of Mr. Norton's statements at the
9 meeting.

10 Could you please explain to us as accurately
11 and in as much detail as possible, the conversation that
12 took place between you and Mr. Rocca?

13 MR. TRESLER: Mr. Rocca indicated to me
14 a concern for the accuracy for statements made by Mr.
15 Bruce Norton.

16 He indicated that he did have knowledge of
17 having received a draft or preliminary report from Cloud
18 which was contrary to the statements made by Mr. Norton
19 in the meeting that day with the NRC.

20 He didn't really elaborate on it other than
21 to say he felt that those statements were misleading.

22 Misleading is an interpretation on my part.
23 I don't recall whether he used that specific word.

24 During the course of that conversation, did
25 Mr. Rocca in anyway say that he was going to or he felt like

1 he should make he should make his upper management aware
2 of possible misinformation?

3 MR. TRESLER: I don't believe he indicated a
4 feeling that he should or shouldn't, either way to me,
5 during the flight.

6 MR. FAULKENBERRY: Mr. Tresler, I will show
7 you a statement made by Mr. Norton.

8 It is contained on pages 216 and 217 of the
9 November the 3rd meeting transcript.

10 I would ask you to read it and I would
11 like to ask you a few questions regarding that statement.

12 It starts on the bottom of page 216 and
13 continues on page 217.

14 (Pause)

15 MR. TRESLER: Okay, I have read the statement.

16 (Pause)

17 MR. SHACKLETON: Do you want to go off the
18 record, Bobby for this period of time?

19 Off the record.

20 (Discussion off the record.)

21 MR. SHACKLETON: On the record.

22 MR. FAULKENBERRY: Mr. Tresler, with regard
23 to the statement by Mr. Norton as contained on page 216 and
24 217 and -- I will read from the statement made by Mr.
25 Norton and I quote, "Any suggestions you have if you want

1 the report before we see it, fine. I frankly resent the
2 implication that Dr. Cloud is not an independent reviewer
3 because he is.

4 "As Mr. Maneatis just reported to you, we heard
5 this presentation to you yesterday. In fact, we heard it
6 Sunday for the first time. I assure you that's the case
7 and we came back last night or we came back yesterday and
8 you heard it this morning.

9 "The report itself hasn't been prepared. If you
10 want a copy of it before we get it, fine. Or simultaneously."

11 Mr. Tresler, do you recall Mr. Rocca discussing
12 with you his concerns with regard to Mr. Norton's statement
13 or offer that he made to the NRC that the NRC could have
14 Dr. Cloud's reports simultaneously or prior to their
15 receipt by PG&E?

16 MR. TRESLER: I don't think Jim discussed that
17 with me.

18 I think Jim's only concern was that he had
19 knowledge of the document that he considered to be a
20 preliminary report and he felt that Mr. Norton's statements
21 were not consistent with the fact that we did have that
22 report.

23 He gave no indication of concern to me about
24 the commitment that we made to the NRC to provide reports
25 simultaneous with our receipt or any of that sort of thing.