

BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL

# Memorandum

LOCKHEED MARTIN

Date: February 9, 1996  
POEF-150-96-0088

Lockheed Martin Utility Services, Inc.

To: [REDACTED] Dan Hopt

From: [REDACTED] Don Buter

Subject: Internal Investigation into Health Physics Management Practices

On Thursday, February 1, 1996, at the direction of [REDACTED] through [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], I and [REDACTED] (reporting to [REDACTED]), initiated an investigation into allegations of improper conduct on the part of [REDACTED]. On Friday, February 2, 1996, we were joined in our inquiries by Lockheed Martin Utility Services (LMUS) [REDACTED].

The allegations were directed specifically at [REDACTED], by [REDACTED] to her [REDACTED]. The allegations concerned inconsistencies in overtime assignment, misrepresentation of training records to outside auditors, time card fraud, improperly changing an employee's dosage record, and corruption in the maintenance of the DOE/LAP Thermal Luminescent Dosimeter (TLD) Database. [REDACTED] had been placed on Crisis Suspension at 1130 hours, on February 1, 1996, by [REDACTED], pending the outcome of the investigation.

The following personnel were interviewed during the course of this investigation:

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL

US Senate Version

Bill  
people  
who  
worked  
in the  
PPD

## BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL

Internal Investigation into Health Physics Management Practices  
Page 2  
February 9, 1996  
POEF-150-96-0088

[REDACTED]

BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL

Internal Investigation into Health Physics Management Practices  
Page 5  
February 9, 1996  
POEF-150-96-0088

Improperly changing an employee's dosage on September 8, 1994.

**Allegation:**

[redacted] stated that, on September 8, 1994, [redacted] had directed her to prepare a correction sheet to change three dosages in the TLD database from 26 shallow/26 deep millirem to 0 shallow/0 deep millirem. The dosages were assigned to [redacted] and [redacted] alleged that [redacted] wanted the exposures changed to zero, because, "It's for a court case. It's easier to explain zero than it is 26 (shallow)/26 (deep)." [redacted] had allegedly gone on to say that he had earlier had a meeting with [redacted] and [redacted] regarding the situation with [redacted] and that the three of them had jointly decided that the change was necessary. *Left W.*

During the late Fall of 1994, [redacted] had occasion to check the database for the altered figures, only to find them returned to their previous readings.

[redacted] Reply of February 7, 1996:

[redacted] stated that he had "no recollection" of being in such a meeting (neither did [redacted]). [redacted] said that he had never changed a dosage due to a court action, and he had never been directed by management to make such a change. He added that he submitted "thousands" of such change requests during a typical year.

After looking at the dosage figures, however, [redacted] said that the figures that had been changed from 26 shallow/26 deep millirem to 0 shallow/0 deep millirem, should have, in his opinion, been zeros. [redacted] said that the reason for this was that the previous 1990 figures, upon which the three subsequent figures had been based, had been contested figures themselves ([redacted] dispute this opinion, stating that there was no justifiable cause for altering the figures).

There was also the fact that these figures had been subsequently changed from zeros back to the previous figures of 26 millirem. [redacted] stated that, having completed a dosage change, the only way that he would have directed the dosages to be changed back to the previous figures would have been if someone had

BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL

## BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL

Internal Investigation into Health Physics Management Practices  
Page 6  
February 9, 1996  
POEF-150-96-0088

complained that the manner in which the changes had been made was not consistent with Health Physics policy.

██████████ Reply of February 9, 1996:

When confronted with the TLD exposure readings prepared on September 7 - 9, 1994, ██████████ stated that although he did not recall the incident, it could have happened. "If I changed these (figures), and it seems that I must've," ██████████ said, it was not an effort to falsify figures. He stated that had the report of September 7, 1994, been given to him, and he had observed the December 31, 1990 figure of 23 shallow/26 deep millirem, he would have directed the shallow figure of 23 millirem to be changed to 26 millirem, and the subsequent figures of 26 shallow/26 deep millirem that had been estimated from the 1990 figures to be reduced to 0 shallow/0 deep millirem.

██████████ went on to say that he would have changed the figures if he had known it involved a court or not, in order to supply correct data. If he had said something like, "It's for a court case. Zero is easier to read," it would have probably been in the context of an off-hand, satirical remark.

██████████ stated that he had no information to show why these figures had been subsequently changed back to the previous numbers. He added that he was unable to see any justification for returning them to their original status, as the original numbers had been in error.

#### Investigators' Conclusions:

It is difficult to understand why such an improper action would have been taken upon the negligible figure of 26 millirem. If true, such an action represents a act of gross impropriety on the part of ██████████. The fact that the figures were subsequently changed back to the previous format further complicates the issue, as it raises the possibility of "cold feet" for the individual responsible for the change.

Although we believe the allegation to be true, we cannot definitively prove it. Our reasons for believing the allegation are as follows, and can be clarified by the following timeline:

BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL

## BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL

Internal Investigation into Health Physics Management Practices  
 Page 7  
 February 9, 1996  
 POEF-150-96-0088

## TIMELINE

January 31, 1994: [REDACTED] launches a complaint regarding promotion opportunities denied her.

July 26, 1994: *Jeff Walburn*  
 [REDACTED] alleges inhalation injury in X-326 Process Building

August 15, 1994: Self-insurance application filed regarding above allegation.

August 17, 1994: LMUS denies claim with "no specific diagnosis."

September 6, 1994: LMUS requests approval for USEC to hire [REDACTED] as external counsel.

September 7, 1994: A printout of [REDACTED] dosage history is prepared for Legal Services. *Jeff Walburn*

September 8, 1994: [REDACTED] allegedly directs [REDACTED] in the presence of [REDACTED] to change four of [REDACTED] historical dosages. *Jeff*

September 9, 1994: A printout of the sheet detailing the above changes is prepared, and inserted into the information prepared for Legal Services two days earlier.

September 16, 1994: *Jeff* [REDACTED] requests his medical occupational information from Health Services.

September 23, 1994: USEC approves the hiring of [REDACTED]

September 29, 1994: LMUS schedules doctor's examination for October 18, 1994 (we believe that this examination was for [REDACTED]) *Jeff*

BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL

Internal Investigation into Health Physics Management Practices  
Page 8  
February 9, 1996  
POEF-150-96-0088

November 3, 1994: The information requested on September 16, 1994, is apparently delivered to [REDACTED] *Jeff*.

November 22, 1994: [REDACTED] give depositions regarding lawsuit

[REDACTED] subsequently discovers the dosage figures, changed on September 8, 1994, have been returned to the previous figures.

March, 1995: The March, 1995 database indicates the original figures to be in place.

May 12, 1995: [REDACTED] contacts [REDACTED] with allegations regarding Health Physics impropriety. The incident involving the dosage change is included in her allegations.

December, 1995: [REDACTED] lawsuit is settled.

- [REDACTED] has stated that he would have been the person to have authorized such a change, and, had he been presented with those figures, he would have authorized the change, in order to present valid dosage figures. Site Legal Officer [REDACTED] advises us, however, that the individual who authorized that alteration of dosage figures due to a legal action could possibly face both criminal and civil sanctions.

- This investigative group was informed that code 10, code 12, and code 15 have distinctive meanings when the changing of dosages is contemplated. Code 10 means that while the "shallow" figure is contested, the "deep" figure is uncontested. Code 12 means that both the "shallow" and "deep" figures are contested. Code 15 means that both the "shallow" and "deep" figures are calculated. When [REDACTED] examined the figures in my office on Wednesday, February 7, 1996, he stated that the figures that had been changed to zeros should have been changed to zeros, due to the fact that the 1990 figure, on which the three subsequent dosage figures had been

BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL



BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL

Internal Investigation into Health Physics Management Practices  
Page 9  
February 9, 1996  
POEF-150-96-0088

based, had itself been contested. Perhaps he realized that on September 7, 1994, and was simply trying to correct the figures closer to reality. If so, it was an unwise move. The change code on the listing of those figures was 10, indicating that while the "shallow" figure was contested, the "deep" figure was uncontested. Based on the definition of the codes, [redacted] would have apparently had no justification to change the "deep" figure of the subsequent three dosages to zero. Interestingly enough, when [redacted] under [redacted] direction, prepared the "TLD Corrections" form, she was told that the figures to be changed to zero were contested, so she entered code 12 beside the 1990 figure. [redacted] later advised this investigative group that he was unaware of the meaning of code 10, as he only used code 12 (both "shallow" and "deep" estimated) and code 15 (both "shallow" and "deep" calculated). The correction of these figures was discussed with [redacted] and [redacted] who both said that the existing figures in the database were official figures, and, regardless of the code, should not have been changed when such a request [redacted] had been made. *by jett*

On September 9, 1994, one day after the alleged incident, a report of [redacted] dosage was prepared. We have photocopies of that report in which the page detailing [redacted] dosage history prior to 1990 is dated at the top of the page as September 7, 1994 (the day before the change was made). The page detailing [redacted] dosage history of 1990 through 1994 is dated September 9, 1994 (the day after the change was made), and has the corrected dosages of the previous day. The remainder of the pages are again dated September 7, 1994. It seems apparent that when the dosage report was prepared on September 7, 1994, someone became concerned about four of the dosages. The next day, September 8, 1994, [redacted] and [redacted] stated that [redacted] directed [redacted] to affect changes to those four figures immediately. [redacted] who was there at the time, has offered to submit to polygraph examination to verify her account of the incident). Once affected, a new page for the 1990 - 1994 dosages was printed on the next day, September 9, 1994.

BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL