

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

PUBLIC MEETING
BETWEEN U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION O350 PANEL
AND FIRST ENERGY NUCLEAR OPERATING COMPANY
OAK HARBOR, OHIO

Meeting held on Wednesday, September 10, 2003, at
2:00 p.m. at the Oak Harbor High School, Oak Harbor, Ohio,
taken by me, Marie B. Fresch, Registered Merit Reporter,
and Notary Public in and for the State of Ohio.

PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

- John "Jack" Grobe,
Senior Manager, Region III Office
& Chairman, MC 0350 Panel
- William Ruland, Senior Manager NRR
& Vice Chairman, MC 0350 Panel
- David Passehl,
Project Engineer Davis-Besse
- Christopher Scott Thomas,
Senior Resident Inspector
U.S. NRC Office - Davis-Besse
- Jon Hopkins,
NRR Project Manager - Davis-Besse
- Monica Salter-Williams,
NRC Resident Inspector - Davis Besse

FIRST ENERGY NUCLEAR OPERATING COMPANY

- Lew Myers, FENOC Chief Operating Officer
- James J. Powers, III
Director - Nuclear Engineering
- Mark Bezilla, Vice President/Plant Manager
- Steve Loehlein,
Manager - Nuclear Quality Assessment
- Rick Dame - Reliability Unit Supervisor

1 MR. PASSEHL: Welcome to
2 FirstEnergy and members of the public for accommodating our
3 meeting today. This is a public meeting between the NRC
4 Davis-Besse Oversight Panel and FirstEnergy Nuclear
5 Operating Company.

6 My name is David Passehl. I'm a Project Engineer
7 and Assistant to the Branch Chief Christine Lipa.
8 Christine is unable to join us today, so I will be
9 discussing the agenda today.

10 Next slide, please.

11 The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the NRC
12 Oversight Panel activities, focusing on those activities
13 since our last public meeting, and to allow FirstEnergy to
14 present the status of activities in their Restart Plan.

15 Next slide, please.

16 Today's agenda will cover an introduction and
17 opening remarks, a brief summary of the August 12th public
18 meetings. We'll be discussing significant NRC activities
19 since the August 12th public meeting. We'll hear the
20 Licensee's presentation on the status of their Return to
21 Service Plan. We will adjourn the NRC meeting with
22 FirstEnergy, have a short break, and then hear comments and
23 answer questions and finally we'll adjourn the meeting.

24 First, before we get started, I would like to make
25 some introductions. Jack Grobe to my left is the Senior

1 Manager in the Region III Office in Lisle, Illinois, and
2 he's the Chairman of the Davis-Besse Oversight Panel.

3 Bill Ruland to his left is the Senior Manager and is
4 the Vice Chairman of the Oversight Panel. Bill's position
5 is Director, Project Directorate 3 in the Division of
6 Licensing Project Management at our headquarters office.

7 Jon Hopkins to Bill's left is the Project Manager
8 for the Davis-Besse facility. He works in our headquarters
9 office.

10 Scott Thomas to my right is the Senior Resident
11 Inspector at Davis-Besse.

12 Jack Rutkowski who is not here is another Resident
13 Inspector; and we just hired a third Resident Inspector,
14 Monica Salter-Williams.

15 MR. GROBE: Why don't I
16 introduce Monica.

17 Would you stand up? There you are. Don't sit down
18 yet.

19 Monica has just joined us this week. She's moved
20 her family here to the area, which is outstanding. Monica
21 comes to us from our Region 1 Office. She's got a
22 Bachelor's degree in Chemistry and Master's degree in
23 Nuclear Engineering from Penn State University, and worked
24 at the Three Mile Island Plant for a couple of years prior
25 to joining the Regulatory Commission.

1 She joined as an Intern Engineer in Region 1 Office
2 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and received her inspector
3 training in that office, and just recently was qualified as
4 a fully qualified inspector, which is quite a significant
5 accomplishment.

6 And we're very glad to have Monica and her husband
7 and her five year old son here with us. Take a good luck
8 at Monica. You're not going to see her very often, because
9 usually what you'll see is her going by in a motorcycle.
10 And, that will probably be at a fairly high rate of speed.

11 So, Monica has joined us and she's going to be the
12 third member of the Davis-Besse team that will be at the
13 plant every day inspecting the facility.

14 That's unusual to have three Resident Inspectors.
15 Most of the nuclear power plants in the United States have
16 two, but because of the challenges faced by the Licensee,
17 the increased oversight that the NRC is providing, Monica
18 has been assigned as the third Resident at Davis-Besse.

19 So, welcome, Monica.

20 MR. PASSEHL: Thanks, Jack.

21 Also, Nancy Keller is the Davis-Besse Resident
22 Office Assistant and she's in the lobby, making sure
23 everybody gets slides and that.

24 Also, Jan Strasma, who is our Region III Public
25 Affairs Officer, he's here.

1 And, we were expecting our State and Government
2 Affairs Officer to come here. He was delayed however, and
3 he had with him the monthly newsletter. So, when he gets
4 here, we can distribute copies of the monthly newsletter.

5 Also, I wanted to say, in the monthly newsletter,
6 there was, there may be an error. The next 0350 Public
7 Meeting for Davis-Besse will be at Camp Perry on
8 October 7.

9 I think that's all the NRC.

10 Lew, could you introduce FirstEnergy, please.

11 MR. MYERS: Sure.

12 At the end of the table is Rick Dame. Rick is from
13 our Perry plant. He spoke at our last meeting. Rick is
14 the Restart Test Manager. As you know, we're in the mode
15 of heating up our plant. We'll talk about that today and
16 taking it up for the 7-day Pressure/Temperature Test.

17 Rick's job was to prepare that test which we have
18 approved today; and then to step back and work directly for
19 me and Gary Leidich in an assessment role, and we're going
20 to monitor our process and proceed through this new
21 performance area during the 7-day cycle. So, Rick today
22 will be discussing that.

23 Jim Powers is the Director of Engineering. He is
24 sitting next to me on my left.

25 Mark Bezilla will talk about the plan and status

1 today.

2 And then, Steve Loehlein, at the end of the table,
3 is Manager of Quality Assurance and he'll discuss those
4 areas.

5 MR. PASSEHL: Thank you, Lew.

6 At this time, I would like to ask for introductions
7 of public officials or representatives of public officials.

8 MR. WITT: Jere Witt, County
9 Administrator.

10 MR. PASSEHL: Anyone else
11 besides Jere?

12 Okay. Thank you.

13 As I said, this meeting is open to public
14 observation. Please note that this is a meeting between
15 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and FirstEnergy. At the
16 conclusion of the business portion of the meeting, but
17 before the meeting is adjourned, the NRC staff will be
18 available to receive comments from members of the public
19 and answer questions.

20 The newsletter, when it gets here, will provide
21 some background information and discuss the current plan of
22 NRC activities and it's a good resource to learn about what
23 activities have been ongoing in the last month.

24 On the back page of the newsletter there is some
25 reference information on how to contact us if you have

1 questions or concerns, and we've included the email address
2 and phone number for our Public Affairs Officers, and there
3 also is a web page address where individuals can read and
4 have access to numerous public documents about
5 Davis-Besse.

6 In the foyer, we also have a Public Meeting Feedback
7 Form, which we use to solicit comments and on aspects of
8 the meeting that we can improve on.

9 We're having the meeting transcribed today by Marie
10 Fresch to maintain a record of this meeting. The
11 transcription will be available on our web page in about 3
12 to 4 weeks. And, please keep in mind, it is important that
13 speakers use the microphones to ensure that Marie and the
14 audience can hear.

15 Next, I would like to briefly describe the August
16 12th public meeting, which was our last public meeting,
17 during which we provided a status update on our Restart
18 Checklist and Inspection Activities.

19 In today's presentation, we plan to provide an
20 update on the Checklist and also on our recently completed
21 and ongoing NRC activities.

22 FirstEnergy provided an update on efforts toward
23 restart. They discussed the High Pressure Injection Pumps,
24 Debris Issue, and the new Electrical Distribution System
25 Software called ETAP.

1 They discussed the Plant's Readiness for Mode 3
2 Pressure and Temperature Test, which is about 2155 pounds
3 per square inch and 530 degrees. They also discussed what
4 this test is expected to accomplish.

5 They also provided a status on results from Safety
6 Culture Assessments and their readiness for entry into Mode
7 3. Lastly, they discussed observations and assessments by
8 the site's Quality Assurance Organization.

9 The transcripts from that meeting are available on
10 our website.

11 Next slide, please.

12 Since the August 12 meeting, we closed Restart
13 Checklist Item 2c1, which entailed the Emergency Core
14 Cooling System and Containment Spray System Sump. The
15 Davis-Besse Oversight Panel approved this checklist item
16 for closure on September 2nd. We inspected the new sump
17 and our, the results of that inspection can be found in our
18 Inspection Report 03-06, 2003-06.

19 The only remaining item from that inspection was to
20 complete a review of the technical adequacy of certain
21 calculations, which we identified as a concern in that
22 Inspection Report. We've completed that review and
23 determined that FirstEnergy addressed our concerns.

24 Closure of that item will be discussed in the NRC
25 Inspection Report 03-17, which is due to be out in the next

1 couple weeks.

2 We also closed Restart Checklist Item 6g, which was
3 a License Amendment Request by FirstEnergy to relocate
4 their high pressure and low pressure injection flow balance
5 testing from a Technical Specifications to the updated
6 Safety Analysis Report.

7 We are also in the process of updating our
8 Confirmatory Action Letter to address two items. The first
9 item concerned quarantine of material from the reactor
10 pressure vessel head and control rod drive mechanism nozzle
11 penetrations that were necessary to address the root cause
12 of the head degradation.

13 NRC has received nozzle specimens and those have
14 been sent to a laboratory at Northwest and they have been
15 inventoried and the reactor vessel head has been shipped to
16 a low level waste repository.

17 Also -- next slide, please.

18 MR. GROBE: Dave, before you
19 go on. There is one other item that's been accomplished
20 since the last meeting that was accomplished since these
21 slides were prepared, that has to do with a license
22 amendment that was issued last Friday.

23 FirstEnergy requested a license amendment to conduct
24 the Mode 3 Normal Operating Pressure and Temperature Test,
25 with the existing high pressure injection pumps prior to

1 the modification to address the concern that was identified
2 regarding some internal components in the pump. That
3 license amendment was approved and issued Friday.

4 From the NRC's perspective, all of the checklist
5 items that need to be addressed prior to Licensee
6 commencing this test have been accomplished.

7 MR. PASSEHL: Okay. I wanted to
8 discuss some continuing NRC activities. First, being the
9 System Health Reviews and Design Issues. This is an
10 inspection that we conducted that evaluated the safety
11 function of various systems and topical issues, such as
12 high energy line breaks, equipment qualification, seismic
13 flooding and ~~Intensive-10CFR50~~ Appendix R, which deals with
14 fire protection.

15 This inspection was conducted by several inspectors
16 and we held an Exit Meeting with FirstEnergy to discuss
17 their results. The report should be available in a few
18 weeks.

19 We also performed an inspection of the site's
20 Corrective Action Process to ensure that this process is
21 being effectively implemented and appropriate corrective
22 actions are being taken to prevent recurrence of problems.

23 This inspection included a review of Restart
24 Corrective Action items to determine if items required to
25 be accomplished prior to startup of the plant had been

1 correctly characterized and actions had been completed in
2 accordance with the Licensee and NRC requirements.

3 We also held an Exit Meeting with the Utility
4 yesterday and discussed the results of the inspection, and
5 that report should be available in a few weeks.

6 We continue to perform an inspection of the site
7 Safety Culture and Safety Conscious Work Environment area,
8 where we're evaluating the Licensee's process and tools for
9 monitoring improvement in Safety Culture and Safety
10 Conscious Work Environment and the effectiveness of the
11 Employee Concerns Program.

12 That inspection, as I mentioned, is in progress.
13 And on April 7th of this year, we issued a press release
14 that has biographical information on the members of the
15 team.

16 Also, we continue to perform inspections by our
17 Resident Inspectors. As we introduce the three, they are
18 stationed permanently at the site and they inspect a broad
19 range of activities covering in the areas of Operations,
20 Maintenance and Testing. The Resident Inspectors issue an
21 inspection report every six to seven weeks.

22 MR. GROBE: Let me just
23 comment on the first two inspections that Dave identified;
24 that is, the System Health Inspection and Corrective Action
25 Team Inspection. Those two inspections are very important

1 activities. They were conducted by quite a number of staff
2 over a long period of time.

3 The Corrective Action Inspection began in March and
4 the System Health Inspection began earlier this year. The
5 number of inspectors, for example, on the Corrective Action
6 Team Inspection, is that inspection has involved ten
7 inspectors with well over two hundred years of experience
8 in nuclear power operation.

9 The results that were presented during the Exit
10 Meeting yesterday by those inspection teams are preliminary
11 results. Those need to be reviewed by regional management
12 and then presented to the panel by the teams. And the
13 panel will evaluate the results of those inspections and
14 make a final determination on whether they are sufficient
15 to address the checklist items.

16 Consequently, it's not appropriate at this point in
17 time to discuss the preliminary results of those
18 inspections; however, we are planning and expect a specific
19 meeting to discuss the results of those inspections,
20 because those two areas are very important to the closure
21 of the Restart Checklist.

22 Sometime in the near future we'll be identifying a
23 public meeting time and place to discuss the results of
24 those inspections.

25 Thanks, Dave.

1 MR. PASSEHL: Okay, next slide,
2 please.

3 Okay, I wanted to cover some upcoming activities
4 that the NRC is undertaking.

5 We are preparing to conduct an inspection of the
6 lower reactor vessel head area. This inspection will
7 review procedures and related ASME code requirements
8 relative to the leak test of the Reactor Coolant System.
9 The NRC will also observe conduct of the tests and verify
10 proper implementation of procedures. There is a fuller
11 description of this in the monthly newsletter.

12 The NRC is planning to conduct a meeting to discuss
13 the Licensee's Assessment of Safety Culture, once the
14 Licensee has fully integrated their independent and
15 internal assessments. The meeting is currently scheduled
16 to be held in the Region III Office on October 1st.

17 The NRC is preparing to conduct an assessment of the
18 Licensee's efforts to address Restart Checklist item 3i,
19 which is the process for ensuring completeness and accuracy
20 of required records and submittals to the NRC. The results
21 of this inspection will enable the NRC to gain confidence
22 in the quality of the Licensee's submittals, such that the
23 NRC can have reasonable assurance in the completeness and
24 accuracy of the Licensee basis and other important
25 communications to the NRC.

1 The NRC is also performing follow-up reviews of
2 potentially risk significant issues regarding the
3 Containment Emergency Sump and the High Pressure Injection
4 Pumps. In the NRC Inspection Report 03-15, we discuss a
5 finding associated with ineffective Corrective Actions
6 related to unacceptable Containment coatings, fibrous
7 material, and other debris. This resulted in the inability
8 of the Emergency Core Cooling System Sump to perform its
9 safety function under certain postulated accident scenarios
10 due to clogging of the sump screen.

11 We are also following up a finding that was
12 discussed in Licensee Event Report 2003-02 associated with
13 their high pressure injection pumps being incapable of
14 maintaining suction from the Containment Emergency Sump via
15 the Low Pressure Injection Pumps during high pressure
16 recirculation. As I mentioned, that is discussed in the
17 OER LER. Oh, also is discussed in Report 03-15 as well,
18 2003-15.

19 And also, the last thing I wanted to mention, is the
20 NRC is preparing to conduct a Restart Assessment Team
21 Inspection when the Utility nears the point where it will
22 seek NRC authorization for restart. The inspection will
23 review the readiness of the plant and the plant staff to
24 resume plant operations safely and in compliance with NRC
25 requirements. The inspection findings will be considered

1 by the NRC Oversight Panel in making its recommendation to
2 the Regional Administrator on possible restart.

3 MR. GROBE: Thanks, Dave.

4 Just a couple more observations. We don't like to
5 conduct meetings outside of this local area, because we
6 know that there is a large amount of interest in the local
7 population regarding the activities going on at
8 Davis-Besse. Occasionally, we found it necessary to
9 conduct the meeting either in our headquarters office in
10 Rockville or the Region III Office in Chicago.

11 The upcoming Safety Culture Meeting will be
12 conducted in Chicago because of the need to have additional
13 staff management at that meeting. Instead of bringing them
14 all out to here, we need to conduct the meeting, it's more
15 effective to conduct the meeting in Chicago. As we've done
16 in the past, we will have both audio and video
17 teleconferencing of that meeting.

18 So, if you're here in the local area and you're
19 interested in that meeting, you can participate both by
20 listening to the meeting via telephones, free 1-800 number;
21 and also participate in the question and answer period
22 after the conclusion of the business portion of the meeting
23 through the telephone lines.

24 In addition to that, the meeting will be available
25 to the public in our headquarters office in Rockville

1 through video teleconferencing. We felt it was important
2 to make those opportunities since we're taking this meeting
3 out of the local community here.

4 The other thing I wanted to mention, and Dave was
5 too humble to mention this. He is leading the Restart
6 Assessment Team Inspection; and that will be a team of
7 operation experts and engineering experts that will do the
8 final evaluation of the readiness of the Davis-Besse Plant
9 to move from a shutdown mode of operations to a restart
10 operations, mode of operations.

11 And that inspection is not currently scheduled,
12 because we don't know when restart might be, but we just
13 put it on the slide here to make you aware that that's an
14 upcoming inspection.

15 It will be a fairly large team inspection. They
16 will be observing plant operations around the clock for
17 several days to gather a sense of the readiness of the
18 plant to return to an operational configuration.

19 Thanks, Dave.

20 MR. PASSEHL: Thank you. And
21 that completes our portion of the presentation. So, with
22 that, I would like to turn it over to FirstEnergy.

23 MR. MYERS: Thank you.

24 There are a couple people in the audience. We have,
25 from our corporate organization, we have Mary O'Reilly with

1 us today. Mary is our corporate legal group.

2 And, Fred von Ahn, the VP of Quality Assurance, is
3 also in the audience.

4 And Bob Schrauder is here, and he's supervising the
5 HPI Project, so that's on the schedule today. So, you know
6 Bob is here too, if there is any questions in that area.

7 If you're ready to get started, our Desired Outcome
8 today, we have an agenda where I thought I would take a few
9 moments and discuss the, the loss of transmission that we
10 experienced since the last meeting. That ought to be
11 interesting. And the response of Davis-Besse and our other
12 plants during that time.

13 Mark Bezilla will discuss the plant status today.

14 Jim Powers will talk about some of the technical
15 issues that are still ongoing and they're coming to
16 closure.

17 And then Operational Readiness Assessment Plan,
18 Rick Dame will discuss that. And as we said, that is
19 underway as we speak.

20 Then Steve Loehlein will finally give a prospective
21 from the Quality Assurance Program; and then I will come
22 back and summarize.

23 Our Desired Outcomes today -- next slide. The plant
24 systems are being inspected and tested for restart. We've
25 already completed the Containment Pressure Test, which is

1 part of our Restart Test Plan. Containment Pressure Test
2 was done very successfully and the leakage rate was
3 probably one of the lowest we've seen in the history of the
4 plant.

5 We've also completed 250 pound pressure test of our
6 nuclear reactor, when we pressurized the reactor up to 250
7 pounds run on reactor coolant pump. At this time, plant
8 systems are being inspected and the ~~net~~ next plateau is 2155
9 pound pressure test, which is our normal pressure. And
10 we'll heat the reactor up to about 532 degrees and maintain
11 it there for about 7 days. And, we'll discuss that more in
12 our presentation today.

13 Once again, we want to discuss our technical issues
14 that we've addressed at the plant; and most, if not all of
15 the technical issues are coming to closure. There's still
16 a couple of outstanding things, like the API HPI pump that we
17 have to go install and Bob is working hard on that on the
18 test that we have going on.

19 Then we have the ongoing assessments that we will be
20 performing during this Pressure Temperature Test, along
21 with some other tests that we have to monitor our people,
22 our plant, and our processes, and ensure that nuclear
23 safety is maintained and we operate the plant event-free.

24 We think that sets us up to develop a rapport that
25 we will provide to our Restart Oversight Panel, Gary

1 Leidich, and myself; and then if, with corrective actions
2 after that, we would be ready to turn to the NRC to ask for
3 restart.

4 With that, we're prepare to get started. If you
5 would like, I'll start out talking about the plant response
6 on the loss of grid.

7 Shortly after 4 p.m. on August 14th, the electric
8 power at our switchyard was lost. We had the opportunity
9 to implement our emergency plan procedures as part of that
10 process, and this type drill meant physically implement the
11 procedures.

12 Our overall conclusions were that our equipment at
13 the plant performed as designed. In fact, it performed
14 very well. The Davis-Besse plant was in Mode 5. The fuel
15 was in the reactor, with the reactor head installed during
16 that time.

17 The decay heat train ~~too~~ two was in service providing
18 core coolant. At the time, we issued both emergency
19 diesels start, started as desired; load to your bus, and
20 ran throughout the time of the event. All of our systems
21 at our plant performed as designed. And, once again, we
22 were pleased with the overall performance of our system.

23 The initial response to the event was in accordance
24 with our Emergency Preparedness Program. We have that in
25 place and that we drill all the time. We classified the

1 event as an unusual event, as at 1621. Our offsite
2 notifications were made in a timely manner.

3 The Emergency Response Organizations consisting of
4 what we call our Technical Support Center was manned, our
5 Operator Support Center was manned, and the Emergency
6 Control Center was manned. We went beyond the requirements
7 to man those centers and those centers were manned to
8 provide station support.

9 The Perry Station was also operating at that time at
10 a hundred percent power, and trip power tripped when power was lost, and
11 performed similar.

12 Our Beaver Valley Plant was operating, had to reduce
13 power for a short length of time, and then, then returned
14 to a hundred percent power until after the event was over
15 with.

16 At 1621, I think, on the 15th, we decided, we
17 declared the event over with. We returned -- the diesel
18 performed its action well. We returned, once we decided
19 both plants were stable and the grid was stable; that's
20 what we were watching voltage preparations variations of the grid for
21 a couple days before we returned to our normal power, per
22 power source was the grid; and we did that at 1621 on
23 8-15.

24 With that, that's all I have.

25 MR. GROBE: I have one

1 question for you, Lew.

2 MR. MYERS: Sure.

3 MR. GROBE: There is a lot of
4 effort to, there is a lot of effort right now focused on
5 trying to understand what caused an unprecedented power
6 outage in the northeast and southern part of Canada. What
7 are your plans on evaluating the information that's gained
8 and learned from the evaluation of the cause of this event,
9 and incorporating that into the probabilities of loss of
10 outside power included in your Probabilistic Risk
11 Assessment for the plant?

12 MR. MYERS: You know, Jack,
13 that's, as part of our ETAP program, we have to look at
14 grid stability and look at the probabilities of loss of
15 power like this. We won't know anything until all the
16 facts are gathered, what caused this loss of power, and
17 where the actions of companies, our company as well as
18 other companies, will be taken. And once we look at all
19 that, we'll go back and redetermine where our stability
20 factors of our grid are at the time.

21 And so, we'll look at the, the actions that our
22 company would take, because it was a combination of many
23 events that caused this situation.

24 MR. GROBE: Okay, thank you.

25 MR. BEZILLA: Thank you. Our

1 next slide, please.

2 My Desired Outcome for today is to demonstrate to
3 you that our preparations for this Normal Operating
4 Pressure Test is thorough, well planned, and
5 comprehensive.

6 Next slide, please.

7 (mike problem)

8 MR. BEZILLA: Okay, I'll start
9 over. My Desired Outcome for today is to demonstrate to
10 you that our preparations for this Normal Operating
11 Pressure Test is thorough, well planned, and
12 comprehensive.

13 Next slide, please.

14 The plant is currently in Mode 5. Reactor Coolant
15 System is around 110 degrees and we're heating it up and
16 we're about two hundred pounds per square inch in the
17 Reactor Coolant System.

18 We're in the progression through the remaining
19 activities required to be completed for entry into Mode 4;
20 and Mode 4 is Reactor Coolant System greater than 200
21 degrees; and we anticipate making that mode change late
22 tonight or early tomorrow.

23 What we have in front of us is final venting of the
24 Reactor Coolant System, making sure all our testing and
25 paperwork is in place. One final check, to make sure we're

1 in accordance with our tech specs and license amendment
2 requests; and then we'll start the first two reactor
3 coolant pumps and start heating up and pressurizing the
4 Reactor Coolant System.

5 Next slide, please.

6 During the Normal Operating Pressure Test, our focus
7 will be on the following:

8 Nuclear Safety, our ability to ensure that the
9 reactor core remains covered and cool.

10 Our People, their attitudes and behaviors.

11 Our Plant, how well the systems, structures and
12 components perform.

13 And our Processes, how they enable our, how they
14 enable and guide our people in their performance of their
15 tasks and assignments.

16 Next slide, please.

17 Our expectations of our people during this Normal
18 Operating Pressure Test are as follows:

19 First, that Nuclear Safety is first and foremost in
20 their thoughts and that they ensure issues receive the
21 attention warranted by their significance.

22 That they be prepared. For example, they preview
23 each task and assignment. They verify that they have the
24 tools and materials needed to do their tasks. They conduct
25 preevolution briefs. They know what success looks like.

1 And that they can recognize issues and problems. And that
2 they know what to do if faced with adversity.

3 Another expectation of our people is that they
4 communicate. For example, that they use three-way
5 communication to ensure that they have been understood or
6 that they understand. That they report any issues
7 immediately to their supervisor; and if it's a plant
8 equipment issue, immediately to the control room. That
9 they provide complete and accurate information. And
10 finally, that they be accountable. For example, they
11 self-check their work. They peer check others work. They
12 make sure that each tasking job is completed. The
13 paperwork is completed. They exhibit a questioning
14 attitude. They identify mistakes and errors and use our
15 Corrective Action Process. That they're reliable and that
16 they own the outcome of their efforts.

17 Next slide, please.

18 This next slide just depicts, I'll say, the
19 Management Team. I'll say a piece of the Management Team,
20 but a focused piece of the Management Team that will be in
21 place for this Normal Operating Pressure Test.

22 As you see, Lew will be filling the Site
23 Vice-President role. I'll be Director of Operations. Mike
24 Roder is Manager of Operations. And we have a Normal
25 Operating Pressure Test Team, and I'll get to that in a

1 minute on the next slide.

2 We have Jim Powers, Engineering Organization,
3 providing support as needed through the evolution. And,
4 then we have Mike Stevens, our Director of Maintenance; and
5 Greg Dunn, our Manager of Work Control. Greg's working day
6 shift; Mike's working night shift; and we have our Outage
7 Control Center manned up to be able to support Mike and his
8 team if there are any anomalies or issues that are
9 encountered on the heatup and pressurization, the stable
10 period, and then the cooldown and depressurization of the
11 plant.

12 Off to the left here, you'll see that we have Rick
13 Dame, as we talked about Independent Assessor, and Steve
14 Loehlein, Manager of Quality Assurance and his team. What
15 these individuals will be doing will be taking a look at
16 the, us, our people, and our behaviors, and I'll say
17 attitudes and approach to solving problems, as well as our
18 processes and how well those processes enable our people to
19 work through solutions and issues. And both Rick and Steve
20 will talk a little bit later in the presentation about what
21 they're going to be doing during this Normal Operating
22 Pressure Test.

23 Next slide, please.

24 Okay, this is a little finer look at the Normal
25 Operating Pressure Test Team. Again, we have our Manager

1 of Operations, Mike Roder, in charge of the plant.

2 We have Test Directors on day shift and night shift
3 and those are the conductors, the orchestrators of the
4 evolution.

5 We have a couple of assistants. Those guys will
6 back up, spell the Test Directors, as well as take care of
7 all the Post Maintenance Tests that we're going to be doing
8 during this Normal Operating Pressure Test.

9 You can see we have three specific teams. First
10 team is Boric Acid Inspection, part of our Restart Test
11 Plan, has us go back at 2155 pounds, which is normal
12 pressure in the system and they'll inspect over a thousand
13 pieces, parts, if you will; checking flanges, checking
14 bolted connections, checking valves, and other type
15 equipment.

16 We got teams set up. Again, we have day shift,
17 night shift. We have a number of inspectors that have been
18 trained and are ready to perform the tasks. They've
19 reviewed what components and things they need to look at.

20 What we plan on doing is when we get to 2155 pounds,
21 we'll have them go out and take an initial look; and in
22 about three days into the stabilization period, we'll have
23 them go back out and I'll say do the four score inspections
24 of the system. Okay.

25 Again, those guys, we have a couple of the system

1 managers, again, to spell them and provide additional
2 management focus for those teams.

3 Middle group here, Reactor Coolant System
4 Sensitivity Leakage. We have again Test Managers and Test
5 Support Groups, which consist of chemistry personnel and
6 radiological protection personnel.

7 What we will do during this test period is a couple
8 different things. First off, we'll do a long-duration
9 Reactor Coolant System Leak Rate Test. And part of that
10 test puts in known leakage. Then we run our program and
11 see if that program can identify the known leakage and how
12 accurate it can get to measure that quantity of Reactor
13 Coolant System leakage.

14 And then, the additional activity we'll perform
15 during this test is we've installed a new reactor coolant
16 leakage monitor device known as a FLUS Monitor. And that
17 item is, the detector is physically located underneath the
18 vessel, and then the monitoring equipment is located in the
19 basement of the building over underneath one of the
20 stairwells.

21 What we'll do is put in some, we'll increase the
22 humidity at the detector and then we'll be able to analyze
23 to see how sensitive that monitor is and how low humidity
24 change it can detect underneath the vessel. It will give
25 us an indication of potential leakage in the vicinity of

1 the bottom part of the reactor vessel.

2 Lastly, as part of our team, we realize there is
3 going to be some opportunities and challenges on the way
4 up. We're going to have some valves that leak. We may
5 have some flanges that leak. There may be some other
6 equipment issues that arise as we heat up and pressurize
7 the system and as we're stable and then as we cool down and
8 depressurize.

9 What we've done is set up some immediate response
10 teams. We've got engineering support, we have maintenance
11 support, we have radiologic protection support. So, if
12 there are any immediate issues, at these individuals
13 disposal are teams that are prepared to go out and assess
14 those problems, use our Problem-Solving Decision-Making
15 Process, if required, and then hopefully be able to
16 remediate and address whatever those issues may be.

17 So, that's our Normal Operating Pressure Testing.
18 And most of those functions are in place. The remainder
19 will be in place today and/or tomorrow.

20 Okay, next slide.

21 MR. RULAND: Mark, could you
22 clarify for me, when you say you're establishing a known
23 leakage rate, how you actually do that?

24 MR. BEZILLA: We'll establish a
25 Reactor Coolant System sample and we'll be able to monitor

1 that and be able to determine what that sample flow rate is
2 and go ahead and run our program and it will be able to, it
3 will say half a gallon a minute or a tenth of a gallon per
4 minute and it will compare that to the known leak rate that
5 we established. So, it will be through the samples is how
6 we'll establish that.

7 MR. RULAND: Okay, great.

8 MR. BEZILLA: Okay. Another
9 question?

10 MR. RULAND: Well, I wanted to
11 make sure --

12 MR. BEZILLA: I'm not going to
13 go --

14 MR. RULAND: I just wanted to
15 make sure you were. Good. Thank you.

16 MR. BEZILLA: Normal Operating
17 Pressure Test; already talked a little about the conditions
18 right at, around 532 degrees, which is normal, normal
19 no-load temperature. And then the Reactor Coolant System
20 pressure around 2155 pounds per square inch.

21 And, as I said, we initially get up at 2155. We'll
22 perform a walkdown. And there is over a thousand
23 components and pieces and parts that we'll go look at to
24 make sure we know the status of those components. If there
25 is any issues, we'll address those at the time.

1 And, then, about three days into it, we'll go ahead
2 and repeat those inspections and that will give us a little
3 bit of soak time on the plant and we'll be able to identify
4 if there is any minor ~~web page~~ weepage or anything like that from
5 those specific components that we're looking at. Okay.

6 Then, also, during this 7-day test, we'll be able to
7 perform Post Maintenance and Modification Testing. We've
8 done as much testing as we can do in the current state, but
9 we need pressure and temperature to be able to complete
10 some of those inspections and tests.

11 All right, last thing, is during this timeframe, it
12 will give us a chance to see how we respond in more of a
13 normal mode of operation. And if the plant behaves and
14 doesn't provide some of those opportunities as we're
15 heating up, as we're stabling, as we're cooling down, Rick
16 and Steve's groups will run some exercises on us and see
17 how we perform. They'll talk a little more about that
18 shortly.

19 Next slide, please.

20 So, what's this Normal Operating Pressure Test going
21 to do for us? I believe it's going to help demonstrate
22 confidence in our plant systems and equipment. In
23 preparation for this test, we've done a lot of work. I'll
24 get to that. I have a slide that just rolls that up. I'll
25 get to that.

1 We've done a lot of work. And from a safety
2 equipment standpoint, to enter Mode 4, we have to have
3 proven to ourselves that all that equipment will function
4 if needed, and so we're in the final stages of completing
5 that testing, as I said, completing the paperwork, so we
6 can appropriately raise temperature above 200 degrees and
7 enter Mode 4.

8 So, we'll have check down on Safety Features
9 Actuation System, which is a lot of the safety equipment
10 designed to protect the fuel if we have an accident or some
11 condition where it would require it to work.

12 Our Reactor Protection System, which essentially
13 monitors the number of parameters within the plant and will
14 cause automatic shutdowns of the reactor. In this Normal
15 Operating Pressure Test, we won't be using the fuel in the
16 reactor. We'll have lots of shutdown margin, if you will,
17 but nonetheless, we want to make sure that system is ready
18 to go. And pieces of it are required in Mode 4 and Mode 3,
19 some of it is not required until Mode 1 and 2, but we'll
20 have it thoroughly checked out.

21 Then, also, our Feedwater Line Rupture Control
22 System -- Steam and Feedwater Line Control Rupture System;
23 this helps mitigate any kind of steam ~~like~~ leak on the secondary
24 plant to again ensure that the fuel remains covered and
25 cool.

1 So, we'll check those all out and have done the
2 required testing. So, we'll have good confidence in those
3 systems prior to changing modes.

4 From our Primary Systems standpoint, Lew talked
5 about in his opening remarks having conducted the 250
6 pound -- the 250 pound test on the Reactor Coolant System.
7 That gave us some confidence that our systems will be okay,
8 but this, I will say, is the dress rehearsal for actual
9 restart. It will bring the plant up to normal pressure and
10 close to normal temperature and that will give us a much
11 better feel of the equipment and the things we worked on,
12 if we have any additional component problems or equipment
13 problems.

14 I've already talked about validating our Integrated
15 Leakage, Reactor Coolant System Leakage capabilities, as
16 well as the FLUS monitoring. And, from a secondary systems
17 standpoint, we have put steam on the main turbine seals,
18 we've drawn vacuum, we've exercised a number of those
19 components, but it's been awhile since we had the main
20 steam pipe hot and we've had that system pressurized. And
21 by doing this Normal Operating Pressure Test, we'll be able
22 to check out a lot of the fluid systems on the secondary
23 plant and look for any component deficiencies or
24 deficiencies that we might have in the secondary plant
25 also.

1 Okay, next slide.

2 Some of the inspections that we'll be doing on the
3 primary side, once we get up, actually we're going to watch
4 it as we come up, but when we get up to full pressure and
5 near normal temperature, we'll be checking out Reactor
6 Vessel flange and the O-rings and between the O-rings on
7 that connection.

8 Reactor Head Control Rod Drive Mechanism, checking
9 the nozzle penetrations. We've installed view ports on the
10 head, so we can get a pretty good look at those nozzle
11 penetrations even when the reactor is up and hot. Of
12 course, not with nuclear reaction going on, but we can get
13 a view during this one.

14 And also the flanges associated with those Control
15 Rod Drive Mechanisms, we think we've solved leakage
16 problems there, but this will be a good opportunity to
17 check for us also.

18 The Bonnet Nozzles, Reactor Incore Monitoring
19 Instrumentation. We have a couple cameras set up
20 underneath there, so if we have any significant leakage,
21 we'll be able to see that through the insulation. And I
22 believe, when we're hot, we're going to take a couple peaks
23 under the insulation, but we'll do a thorough check when
24 we're done with that, we'll pull the insulation and look
25 closely at all those penetrations.

1 We'll take a look at our Steam Generator, our
2 Pressurizer manways and hand-holes. Those can be subject
3 to leakage at times. We want to make sure we have good
4 torques on those.

5 Reactor Coolant Pump covers and seals. Those are
6 always areas you want to be careful of. So, we'll check
7 those out. We have a pretty robust plan for Reactor
8 Coolant pumps; you put the lid on, there is a gasket there,
9 and between those seals, leak monitoring capability. We
10 have a pretty aggressive plan to go check those and watch
11 to see if there is any leakage on the way up. If there is
12 leakage while we heat it up, then there's leakage on the
13 way down.

14 Sometimes you can get some leakage on the way up or
15 on the way down on those joints, because the metal expands
16 and contracts. Typically, if you have any minor leakage on
17 the way up or on the way down, when you get up at full
18 pressure, near temperature, you don't have any more
19 leakage.

20 So, we have a pretty aggressive plan to go check
21 that out, specifically on the two pumps that we just worked
22 on taken apart and on the two pumps that we haven't taken
23 apart.

24 Then our Reactor Coolant System -- or Pressurizer
25 Heaters, there is flange joints there we will be checking,

1 and Pressurizer safety and relief valves. Again, we'll
2 check those connections, and then we'll also check for any
3 true leakage we might have on those components, because
4 that's something we want to take care of prior to restart
5 if there was any leakage there.

6 And, numerous, like I said, there is a thousand plus
7 things we're going to be looking at; Reactor Coolant System
8 valves, packing associated with those valves, and again,
9 bolted connections and flanges.

10 Okay, so, those are just some of the checks we'll be
11 performing.

12 Okay, next slide, please.

13 This is just a pictorial of the plant. In the
14 Auxiliary Building, that houses a lot of the safety systems
15 that I talked about earlier, and we've done a number of
16 modifications, a lot of work on those, and we're in the
17 final testing of those components to make sure they're
18 ready to support mode change and its Normal Operating
19 Pressure Test.

20 We've been inside Containment. I'll talk a little
21 bit about some of the things we've done in Containment.
22 We've been pouring over that, making sure it's as clean as
23 it can be. And it's probably in the best shape it's been
24 in, in 25 years. So, we think we've done a good job there,
25 not only from a housekeeping standpoint, but also from a

1 radiological standpoint.

2 And with the exceptions of a few areas, we can
3 probably walk in there in street clothes today. I know
4 that the desire, once we get through with this, once we
5 finish up, whatever work might be needed to be done, that
6 we would like to go in there in street clothes.

7 Lastly on the turbine side, that's the power
8 generation side. Again, we'll get a good chance to check
9 it out and see what its health looks like. It's been
10 pretty much out for the last 16 to 18 months, so we'll get
11 a chance to check that out.

12 Cooling Tower is in service and you might see a
13 little coolant there, not a whole lot when we check, but
14 there might be a little bit there.

15 So, that's a little pictorial on the plant.

16 Okay. Next slide, please.

17 Accomplishments. Some of this is a repeat from
18 previous meetings, but I think it's worthwhile going
19 through this. Some of these we had to do. Some of these
20 we've chosen to do to improve our margin of safety at the
21 Davis-Besse plant.

22 We replaced the Reactor Pressure Vessel Head.

23 We improved the Containment Emergency Sump. We
24 probably have the, we probably have the most robust sump in
25 the PWR industry right now. We're pretty proud of that.

1 We modified our High Pressure Injection Pump
2 Recirculation Line. There are some scenarios, some
3 accident scenarios, where we would have to align the high
4 pressure injection pumps off the low pressure injection
5 pumps while they're taking suction from the Containment
6 Sump. And we've put in a modification now to allow those
7 pumps to have good minimum flow protection while they're in
8 that mode. And, although, we don't expect to need that,
9 it's there if you would need it.

10 We painted the Containment Dome. We believe we have
11 the dome in good shape from a coating standpoint.

12 As I said, we've installed the FLUS Online Leak
13 Monitoring System.

14 We've replaced Containment Air Coolers and a lot of
15 the duct work and registers associated with that system.

16 We've enhanced the Decay Heat Valve Enclosure.
17 There is a couple of valves that are low in the Containment
18 Building that we need to ensure stay dry if there's an
19 accident for some period of time. And we've essentially
20 built a new enclosure around those components. And we just
21 completed the final, final testing prior to Mode 4, and the
22 leak rate was probably the best we've ever seen on that
23 enclosure, so we feel good and confident about that
24 modification.

25 We cleaned the Reactor Vessel. That was with fuel

1 out. And I believe back in the April timeframe, just as we
2 were getting ready to put the fuel in, we noticed a couple,
3 what looked like paint chips, and stuff. Went back,
4 revacuumed, cleaned that all out prior to putting fuel in.
5 So, we feel good about that.

6 We confirmed the Fuel Integrity. We sift sip all the
7 fuel that's up on the fuel pins to see if there is any
8 leakage on those assemblies and on the pins. We believe we
9 have good fuel cladding integrity, and we also are pretty
10 careful when we're putting those assemblies in to make sure
11 we didn't have any grid strap which are there to help
12 support the fuel pins, make sure those things behaved and
13 we didn't grab any of those or tear any of those when we
14 put the fuel back. So, we feel pretty good about our fuel
15 integrity.

16 Again, we will not be using nuclear fuel and heat
17 for this first Normal Operating Test, but the fuel is in
18 the vessel, and it's, it's there.

19 MR. THOMAS: Mark, before you
20 move on. You've had some challenges with the --
21 (mike squealed) -- with the microphone. No, with the fuel
22 integrity over several cycles, past cycles. What's been
23 done differently going forward to, to maybe prevent that in
24 the future?

25 MR. BEZILLA: Okay. Lew said he

1 would like to answer that, Scott.

2 MR. THOMAS: Or to prevent
3 similar challenges going forward.

4 MR. MYERS: We inspected all
5 the fuel; fuel assembly by fuel assembly. We checked all
6 the grid straps and we reconstituted with some stainless
7 steel rods some of the, some of the fuel that's in position
8 where you have, I call it jet impingement, vibration
9 inducement. So, we reconstituted that through the fuel
10 assemblies that area.

11 So, going forward from a Framatone standpoint, we've
12 made all the, who supplies our fuel, we made all the
13 improvements that they suggested.

14 MR. THOMAS: Okay.

15 MR. BEZILLA: You okay with
16 that, Scott?

17 MR. THOMAS: Okay.

18 MR. BEZILLA: Okay. Boric Acid,
19 we've scoured the plant inside Containment, outside
20 Containment. We did the 50 pound and 250 pound test, so we
21 feel pretty good heading into this Normal Operating Test as
22 far as knowing what our baseline is and being able to
23 detect any leaks, leakages at this point.

24 And then, finally, I've already talked a little
25 about Containment Building, but we've cleaned the

1 Containment Building and I've had my Ops guys and RP guys
2 and Services guys essentially in there nonstop for the last
3 couple weeks just making sure they've looked at every nook
4 and cranny and got just about everything out of there that
5 shouldn't be in there. So, we're feeling pretty good about
6 the Containment condition as far as this first Normal
7 Operating Test.

8 Next slide, please.

9 Dave had talked about the, getting the specimens
10 that were required out of the old Davis-Besse head. This
11 is just a picture of it on the train. As Dave said, we
12 shipped that off to Envirocare in Utah and it will be
13 disposed of properly.

14 Next slide.

15 This is just a, a roll up of the actions completed.
16 So, since the spring of 2002, these are the things that
17 we've done.

18 We've done approximately a hundred modifications to
19 the plant. Again, some of which we needed to do, some of
20 which we've chosen to do to improve safety margin of the
21 plant, the reliability of equipment.

22 We processed through about 7700 work orders.

23 We've written over 14,000 Condition Reports, issues,
24 problems, questions. We've completed about 23,000
25 Corrective Actions in response to those questions, issues,

1 and problems.

2 We've performed over 15,000 surveillances. About
3 5,000 of those are shift routine types, so there has been
4 about 10,000 other surveillances that we performed on our
5 equipment and systems.

6 And we've made, we've performed about 2200
7 Preventative Maintenance Tasks to help ensure the
8 reliability of our equipment.

9 And we processed about 2700 Procedure Changes trying
10 to make that tool as good as it can be for our people to
11 enable them to be successful in their tasks and
12 evolutions.

13 So, what's the point? The point is we've done a
14 lot of stuff. We think we've improved the reliability of
15 the plant. We think we've improved and we've gained the
16 safety margin of the plant. And I believe we set the stage
17 for a successful Normal Operating Pressure Test here in the
18 next couple of days. Okay.

19 Next slide, please.

20 So, what follows this Normal Operating Pressure
21 Test? Well, we'll complete the test. And as Lew said,
22 that's a 7-day evolution. The whole thing should take,
23 say, 9 to 11 days, 9 to 10 days to complete heatup,
24 pressurization, stabilization, testing, and the cooldown
25 depressurization.

1 And when we're done with that test, we'll return to
2 Mode 5, that's less than 200 degrees; and react, check on
3 margin, and we'll assess the results.

4 We know we have to remove and modify our high
5 pressure injection pumps. Jim will give you a little
6 update of where we're at there.

7 Rick and Steve as well as our own assessments will
8 determine how our people and how our processes performed.

9 And I suspect they're going to be things, actions we need
10 to do there. As much as I would expect us to be flawless,
11 I know that's not going to be the case and we will have
12 improvements to make. So, we will address the people,
13 plant, and process issues.

14 We're already in the transition from the Return to
15 Service Plan Practices to Normal Operating Practices.
16 Prior to restart, we'll need to be there fully engaged
17 doing our normal practices.

18 And then lastly, when we got our hands around all
19 that, we will be asking for permission to restart the
20 Davis-Besse facility.

21 That's all I have. Any questions for me?

22 MR. PASSEHL: Yeah, just a
23 question from me. How do you plan to capture people,
24 plant, and process issues identified and evaluate those?

25 MR. BEZILLA: Dave, that's a

1 good question. We have assessment monitoring processes,
2 observations that we use. And then if we find any
3 deficiencies there, in almost all cases we'll write a
4 Condition Report and that gets us into our Corrective
5 Action Process. What that allows us to do is deal with
6 that specific issue.

7 And then one of the things that we haven't done a
8 lot of during this time frame is trending. And by putting
9 that stuff in our Corrective Action Process, that will
10 enable us to look at low level items and see if there is
11 anything we need to roll up where we need to take action
12 where we don't have an issue or event.

13 That's one of the areas I think you may hear Rick or
14 Steve talk about as training. We know we need to
15 reinvigorate that. We're in the process of doing that.

16 But to answer your question, we'll put those into
17 our Corrective Action Process and deal with them
18 appropriately.

19 Other questions?

20 MR. GROBE: I have one or two
21 things. First off, regarding the Decay Heat Valve
22 Enclosure, I know that you had a number of challenges
23 verifying the integrity of leak tightness of that
24 enclosure. Could you describe what was the final cause of
25 the leakage that you were seeing and how you resolved that?

1 MR. BEZILLA: It will be my
2 pleasure, Jack. I have become up close and personal with
3 this thing. Okay.

4 What we essentially had was a pit. All right. In a
5 pit, okay. What we did was, we turned it into a tank. So,
6 we made a stainless steel enclosure inside this head. We
7 had about, oh, shoot, miles, we had miles of weld that we
8 had to perform on this enclosure to build this enclosure.

9 Those earlier attempts at solving the leakage
10 problems, we had to go back and do some touch-up on those
11 welds. You do that much welding, you have some veracity
12 there. So, we went back and touched up those welds.

13 Then our final challenge was there was penetrations
14 that go into this enclosure, the actual piping
15 penetrations. And the way we solved that issue was we made
16 a boot, put a flange on the tank and made a boot; had that
17 boot come up outside the enclosure; welded that tank,
18 welded that boot to the tank; and then we put about 18
19 inches of fire retardant, foam-type material on that; and
20 then finally a protective cover over that whole enclosure.

21 And we finally went and had the test here a couple
22 days ago. Like I said, we had the best results ever. We
23 just kept after it. Made sure we had the welds all solid
24 and good, and fixed this penetration issue. Like I say,
25 probably the best results I've seen.

1 MR. GROBE: Thanks, Mark. I did
2 have some questions regarding Containment Air Coolers, but
3 I peeked ahead and saw that Jim is going to be talking a
4 little about those, so I'll hold those questions for you.

5 MR. BEZILLA: Understand the
6 Containment Air Cooler questions you'll do after Jim's
7 presentation. Okay. Very good.

8 MR. RULAND: Mark, could you
9 tell me a little bit more about the cameras that will be
10 under the insulation?

11 MR. BEZILLA: Bill, they're not
12 under the insulation, they're down underneath the vessel.
13 To get to our vessel, there is a ladder, you go down a
14 ladder, go down some steps alongside the heat cores.
15 When you get underneath there, you look up at about
16 9; 8, 9, 10 feet, okay, 8, 9, 10 feet, you have insulation
17 package. The cameras will be pointed at those, at the
18 insulation package. So, we'll be able to look at that.

19 They're not, I don't believe they're inside the
20 insulation. If I remember, they're looking at the
21 insulation package. Okay?

22 MR. RULAND: Are those cameras
23 going to be live outside Containment, do you know?

24 MR. BEZILLA: What we'll do is
25 we'll, because we don't have like dedicated penetration

1 through the Containment for those, we'll have them all set
2 up, we'll have the cable run out to a low, low heat area.
3 In this case, I was going to say low doze, but in this
4 case, it's just a cooler area. I believe we're setting it
5 up right inside the personnel air lock. So, we can go in,
6 it will go inside Containment and we'll be able to view it
7 from right there by the personnel air lock.

8 MR. RULAND: Okay.

9 MR. BEZILLA: Any other
10 questions?

11 MR. PASSEHL: I thought you were
12 going to be a doing a bare metal inspection. Maybe I was
13 mistaken.

14 MR. BEZILLA: Dave, like I said,
15 I think we're going to take the heat. When we're hot, the
16 thing is 532 degrees.

17 MR. PASSEHL: Right.

18 MR. BEZILLA: To pull the
19 insulation off, it's pretty intense. I think we're going
20 to take a peek.

21 Then, we know we have as found. We have pictures of
22 the penetrations. We have, I'll say, as-left prior to this
23 Normal Operating Pressure Test. When we're done, we'll
24 pull the insulation off and we can get hands-on, check that
25 out. So, we will do bare metal, but it's after the 7-day

1 hold test. Okay?

2 MR. PASSEHL: Thank you.

3 MR. BEZILLA: With that, I turn

4 it over to Jim.

5 MR. POWERS: Okay. Thank you,

6 Mark.

7 This afternoon I would like to demonstrate that the
8 technical issues are coming to close here at the plant. As
9 you know, we've described a number of the challenges that
10 we've had and substantially improving that into safety
11 margin at Davis-Besse. And we've made good progress.

12 As I think you can see from our closure curves over
13 on the wall for the Corrective Action Program, we've worked
14 through a lot of issues, and are largely crediting our
15 Return to Service Plan we put in place last year.

16 We completed inspections. And can I have the next
17 slide, please?

18 Completed inspections, identified and documented our
19 issues in depth through our Corrective Action Program. As
20 Mark alluded, we've answered over 14,000 Condition Reports
21 in the course of this outage.

22 So, we have tackled many issues. At this point
23 those issues are clearly understood and are bounded. Three
24 of the major issues that remain are High Pressure Injection
25 Pumps, the Electrical Distribution System, and Containment

1 Air Coolers. And I'll talk about each one of those.

2 First one I would like to go over is the High

3 Pressure Injection Pumps. Qualification testing is now in

4 progress at our laboratory in Alabama. As you know, we've

5 done quite a bit of industry leading research on our High

6 Pressure Injection Pumps and performance of Containment

7 Emergency Sumps and the debris definition in Containment in

8 post-accident environment. So, we're quite proud of that.

9 And much of the initial work that had been done to

10 set up the progress we've made today is now set in place so

11 that we're in the formal qualification stage of that. That

12 means putting the actual parts that will constitute the

13 final design into a proof test, which will be a 21-day

14 test, and we're starting that test now, and it's ongoing.

15 We finalized our debris characterization. Of

16 course, one of the big questions was just what kind of

17 debris are we talking about; fibers from insulation, grit,

18 pieces of, flakes of coating, paint that's in Containment,

19 for example. Characterized all that and provided a basis

20 for what the pumps would see for this 21-day test in that

21 post-accident condition environment.

22 And we had a very comprehensive Design Review

23 Meeting in Alexandria, Virginia, on August 28, 29, attended

24 by not only our engineers, but contract specialist

25 engineers, third party consultant reviewers for us to

1 assure the design is appropriate, our Engineering
2 Assessment Board representatives, as well as the NRC in
3 attendance to review it. So, a very comprehensive review
4 was held of our final design plans.

5 We succeeded in getting the hydrostatic bearing
6 design from Pump Guinard in France, who originated the
7 hydrostatic bearing. And the French, as we mentioned in
8 past meetings, part of their pumps and bearings for debris,
9 potential debris and pumpage.

10 So, we took their design and adapted it and improved
11 it for the Davis-Besse application. And the improvements
12 being, the addition of screens that we've talked about in
13 the water supply that goes to those bearings, as well as
14 what we refer to as the escape groove in the bearing to
15 allow any small debris that gets in there to escape.

16 That's been working very well in our testing
17 environment, and we're pleased with the evolution of this
18 design.

19 One of the other things we learned in our testing
20 program is that we wanted the hardface, the fine clearance
21 parts, that's wearings, bearing surfaces, for example.
22 We've done that. We've worked those parts and they are
23 available.

24 We're waiting for results of our qualification
25 testing prior to doing final machining, particularly on the

1 hydrostatic bearing. So, that is awaiting the test results,
2 but we're positioned to make those modifications to the
3 pumps within the window after our Normal Operating Pressure
4 Tests and that supports the schedule as we have it laid
5 out. So, we're looking good from that perspective.

6 Then the last bullet talks about that, the
7 modification schedule. So, we've reinstalled the original
8 pumps to support the Normal Operating Pressure Test.
9 They've done what we refer to as a surveillance test
10 completed on those to demonstrate that they work
11 appropriately at the plant; achieved the approval by the
12 Nuclear Regulatory Commission on the license amendment
13 request to support our testing.

14 Once we complete our Normal Operating Pressure Test,
15 we'll remove the pumps, modify them, reinstall them, and
16 proof test them, again surveillance test them to
17 demonstrate they work properly installed at Davis-Besse.

18 So, that issue is coming to closure. We'll have
19 substantial margin to the understanding of these pumps and
20 the Emergency Containment Sump, plus help the environment
21 for the industry.

22 MR. HOPKINS: Jim, have you
23 decided on a final design, strainer design?

24 MR. POWERS: Yes, we selected a
25 final design for the strainer. It's a 50 mil strainer

1 size, which we have seen perform well relative to the
2 debris mix and in the long term; and we're observing that
3 and testing that.

4 MR. HOPKINS: Is it any sort of
5 special design of, the volcano design or anything like
6 that?

7 MR. POWERS: It's a flat
8 perforated plate design. We haven't hardfaced it because
9 we found that pumping this amount of grit and debris
10 through the pump and entering through the holes, that there
11 was some wear, so we went to a hardened material design on
12 that; otherwise, it's a flat perforated plate.

13 MR. HOPKINS: Okay, thank you.

14 MR. GROBE: Jim, I couldn't
15 understand you; was that 1-5 mill or 5-0?

16 MR. POWERS: 5-0.

17 MR. GROBE: Good. Thank you.

18 MR. MYERS: Do you have any
19 other questions? We have an expert in the audience.

20 MR. POWERS: Our expert.

21 MR. GROBE: Were you ready to
22 go on?

23 MR. POWERS: Yes.

24 MR. GROBE: Before you do
25 that, I just want to make a couple observations.

1 We had engineers down in Alabama observing some of
2 the testing of these pumps and also we had an engineer and
3 an engineering manager from our Nuclear Reactor Regulation
4 Office in Rockville visit MPR and Associates, the
5 engineering firm that's doing this work; and so far we
6 haven't identified any questions. So, that's good news.

7 MR. POWERS: Um-hmm.

8 MR. RULAND: Jim, so, I know
9 you said you were doing the 21-day proof test, I think is
10 your word. So, based on when it started, is it 21 days
11 from today or?

12 MR. POWERS: Essentially, yes,
13 Bill, 21 days from today. What we'll do is modify that
14 test, and determine the results. We're also going to go
15 through our Normal Operating Pressure Test at the plant,
16 determine the results of that. Determine what type of work
17 we need to do, maintenance work, after the Normal Operating
18 Pressure Test to finalize the outage. We can make a
19 decision either waiting through the 21 days for the final
20 determination of bearing design or take a, make a decision
21 earlier in time.

22 We believe once we've operated for a substantial
23 amount of time, bearing design will be proven and complete
24 out the 21 days qualification, we can decide later.

25 Okay. With that I'll move into our Electrical

1 Distribution System. We've certainly talked about this
2 over the past several meetings as well. This was a
3 conversion that we've done in the analytical software that
4 predicts how the electricity is distributed through the
5 plant to all the safety-related and nonsafety-related
6 systems and shows the voltage is adequate.

7 We've completed the ETAP analysis, that's the
8 electrical analysis program, for the first Mode 4. Then,
9 as well as defining Corrective Actions that will be
10 required to restart the plant. And those are well
11 understood and relatively straightforward.

12 For example, we have actuators on several of our
13 dampers for H-Vac systems at the plant. That voltage for
14 those actuators needs to be improved, and we are looking at
15 changing the power supply cables to those actuators by
16 pulling a larger size cable through the conduit to the
17 actuator.

18 Very straightforward modification has been scoped
19 out, proceeding down that track now. And I would say that
20 characterizes the handful of things that we need to do
21 after the Normal Operating Pressure Test to fully restore
22 the electrical system, and improve its margin.

23 Another big step forward, we believe, in the margin
24 of safety at the plant is the much improved understanding
25 of design basis of the Electrical Distribution System and

1 correcting the problems that have been in that system over
2 the years, what we have referred to as latent issues,
3 bringing it up to industry standards.

4 So, following the Normal Operating Pressure Test,
5 we'll make those modifications that we've identified, and
6 provide resolution, final resolution prior to restart of
7 the plant.

8 The changes that we've made to support this initial
9 entry into Mode 4 and Mode 3, I'm sure we have substantial
10 margin available in the system pending making those final
11 modifications; and that is, like, we increase voltage
12 settings on some of the transformers. We are also ensuring
13 that all of the main transformers, power supply feeds are
14 available, so we have plenty of equipment, plenty of margin
15 going into the testing sequence.

16 MR. GROBE: Jim, could you
17 briefly describe the modifications that are necessary for
18 the second Mode 4 and 3, and also whether or not you've
19 identified a license amendment request that would need to
20 be evaluated?

21 MR. POWERS: We do not believe
22 any license amendment will be required. In previous
23 meetings, since we were looking at various options of
24 approach to resolve our issues with the system, there were
25 some of those that could have involved license amendment.

1 The one that we selected does not. Maintains the,
2 all flexibilities that we have in the system as originally
3 licensed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. And the
4 modifications were required to essentially restore the
5 capability involving the components, essentially, the
6 existing overall configuration.

7 But the modifications consist of things like pulling
8 a larger cable to hydro actuators for H-VAC dampers.
9 There's also three fans in ventilation system, looks like
10 we'll be pulling cable to those as well. And there were
11 several other areas where we needed to complete more
12 detailed analysis and manufacture input to us to fully
13 understand the needs of our equipment. And that's being
14 completed. So, they're not very complex modifications.

15 MR. GROBE: What's the status
16 of the design change documentation for those modifications?

17 MR. POWERS: That is getting
18 started at this point, Jack. We've done, one of our
19 engineering, architect engineer has done a review of the
20 scope of that and laid it out for us and we're proceeding
21 forward at this point.

22 We've been focused pretty intensely on our
23 electrical system entering into Mode 4 and make sure our
24 work is complete there. Now, we're turning our attention
25 on this follow-up for finding resolution.

1 I'll move on to the Containment Air Coolers. This
2 is, this is also a major piece of work that we did at the
3 plant restoring our Containment Air Coolers. We've talked
4 about that item at past meetings, essentially rebuilt
5 them.

6 What happened though during the loss of offsite
7 power event on August 14th, we had what appears to be a
8 water pressure surge in the service water supply to those
9 Containment Air Coolers. And the reason for that, what
10 happened is when the power is lost to the site from the
11 grid, of course, the equipment stops, all the motors stop,
12 and that includes the service water pumps which were
13 pumping water through the, to the CACs and through the CACs
14 that were in service.

15 So, when that pump motor stops, pressure drops off
16 in the very high spots of the system, voids can be created.
17 So, when the pumps restart, what happens is the emergency
18 diesel generators start the sequence on low start repower,
19 the service water pumps restart, and water rushes back
20 through the system and refills.

21 When that happened during the loss of offsite power,
22 one of our Containment Air Coolers, number one, indicated
23 some deformation of flexible metal bellows that we have as
24 part of the piping system connected to the Containment Air
25 Cooler; and those bellows were there as part of the pipe

1 stress analysis and support design criteria to assure that
2 the nozzle loadings on those Containment Air Coolers were
3 appropriate.

4 Now, what we did is, after observing the
5 misalignment and expansion of the piping bellows assembly,
6 especially deformation of them, we issued a Significant
7 Condition Adverse to Quality and assembled an Investigation
8 Team.

9 This is a pretty broadly based Investigation Team.
10 We have an Engineering Root Cause Mentor, as well as
11 representatives from the engineering company that designed
12 the piping system for CAC, and the bellows manufacturer
13 provided us a representative who was on site for virtually
14 two weeks full time helping us assess this. Water analysts
15 were evaluating the, the pressure surge in the piping
16 system by running computer programs. And we had pipe
17 stress analysts from the Design Engineering Section, system
18 engineers from our plant, Engineering Section, on the team
19 as well. So, it was pretty broadly based composite team
20 evaluating it.

21 What we determined looking into it, was that because
22 of the nature of the outage that we were in, maintenance
23 ongoing, Number One Containment Air Cooler was bound out of
24 service while he were completing work on an air-operated
25 valve, part of our air-operated valve project, improvement

1 project, associated with that Containment Air Cooler. And
2 that was on one train of the Service Water System.

3 The other train we had the operable, operating
4 Containment Air Cooler in it, there was water flowing
5 through it.

6 When the pumps restarted, the pump that pressurized
7 the train with the Containment Air Cooler from the one
8 that's isolated, resulted in the pressure surge because of
9 the closed valve in that train, with the maintenance
10 alignment there.

11 When there is a closed valve and water pressure
12 would reflect off, it can essentially double the pressures
13 in a system. And similar at home, if you close a water
14 faucet too fast, you hear a bang. That's the type of event
15 that we're talking about.

16 And so, the other operating Containment Air Cooler
17 unit sustained that loss of offsite power event very well.
18 We had some questions as we examined the details of the
19 bellows installation and looked at exactly what we had
20 there for configuration; and we had some, we have some
21 issues with that, that we feel we want to correct prior to
22 return to service, after this, following this pressure test
23 pending.

24 But CACs number 2 and 3 that were in the operating
25 mode sustained the event rather well. In fact, all the,

1 all the piping system, pressure integrity was maintained.

2 Also, the team determined that we had designed this
3 system for a water flow, pressure surges. The NRC had
4 previously issued an Information Notice, 9606 is the number
5 of it, that talks about post-accident conditions in these
6 Containment Air Coolers that could lead to steam voids
7 inside of that because of very hot conditions in
8 Containment in the early stages of an accident. And then
9 when the water flow is reinitiated, what happens with the
10 steam.

11 So, we designed for those loads and, but the loading
12 from the loop, what we found was, the loading from the loop
13 was very similar to those loads, but when you have a
14 Containment Air Cooler isolated, no flow going through it,
15 and with a set of conditions in the service water system,
16 set of conditions we had with relatively high pressure in
17 the system, we could have a much larger load.

18 So, the Containment Air Coolers were normally
19 operable in Modes 1, 2, and 3. We're in Mode 5. And, we
20 learned quite a bit from this, in terms of how we're going
21 to lay out our CACs that are in standby, how the system is
22 designed to perform when it's in operation, one CAC in each
23 group.

24 We determined thus far from our examination that the
25 analysis that was done for Information Notice 9606,

1 pressures do apparently bound the loss of offsite power
2 condition pressures in the inoperable loops. And that was
3 good news. But, if you have an isolated CAC, has those
4 conditions, those pressures can be twice, twice what have
5 been analyzed.

6 MR. GROBE: Jim, you
7 mentioned that there were other conditions that were in the
8 Service Water System that might have been exacerbated the
9 situation, can you go into that in a little more detail?

10 MR. POWERS: Yes, normally, a
11 system like a Service Water System is, has flow rates that
12 are based on temperatures of the season, heat loads in the
13 plant, it provides normal heat exchangers. So, whether --
14 depending on the season with the lake temperature, how cold
15 is your cooling water; depending on the operation of the
16 plant, how much heat are you trying to remove from your
17 systems; depends on how much flow is going.

18 And on the day that the incident occurred, there was
19 not much heat going to the plant, of course, because we've
20 been offline shutdown for a year and a half.

21 So, the pressure with the alignment of the heat
22 exchange system was relatively high. It was over, a little
23 over a hundred PSI. Normally, normal operation, we would
24 expect it to be more around the range of 70 PSI. In fact,
25 that's what the original analyses were based on.

1 So, we learned from this, that there was an
2 additional amount of pressure, about 30 PSI, that needed to
3 add to the analysis to get a full bounding assessment of
4 potential pressures.

5 MR. GROBE: This is really an
6 interesting issue. I'm not sure if you've gotten far
7 enough along in your event investigation team work to
8 completely answer this question.

9 What would prevent these kinds of situations from
10 occurring during normal operation? Are you permitted to
11 take one CAC out of service during normal operation?

12 MR. POWERS: Yes, during normal
13 operation, we have three CAC units, and you're required to
14 have two. We are required to have two in service, and
15 that's one on each train.

16 So, during normal operation, you have flow paths
17 open on each train. That's very important those flow paths
18 are open. So, when the pumps restart, the flow can proceed
19 through the CACs and pressure waves are relatively low.

20 So, the bottom line is, in Modes 1, 2 and 3 when the
21 CACs are required to be operable, they've aligned them such
22 that the pressure waves are not so high.

23 MR. GROBE: But do your
24 technical specifications permit you to go down to one CAC
25 for a period of time?

1 MR. POWERS: Yeah, Mark has
2 said, for a limited amount of time, 72 hours.

3 MR. GROBE: Are there any
4 operating restrictions that prevent pressure from getting
5 higher in the Service Water System?

6 MR. POWERS: What we're doing
7 is, basically we're providing analysis, we're revising our
8 calculations, Jack, to be sure we encompass that
9 condition.

10 And I should go on and add, we've done the
11 assessment for the short term, and taken actions for the
12 entry into Mode 4, done a full structural assessment of
13 bellows and piping system, very detailed walkdown, finite
14 element analysis of the bellows in their as-found
15 conditions for CACs 2 and 3.

16 Also, had an independent third party bellows expert,
17 if you will, somebody who's participated in the Expansion
18 Joint Manufacturers Association Standards Boards, take a
19 look at the situation for us from a third party perspective
20 and be sure we have good margin for entry to Mode 4. And
21 we do, providing operability evaluation of that effect.

22 But the long term actions will be taken. We'll add
23 further margin in the system as well, not only revising the
24 calculations to encompass this; system pressure could be
25 higher, we are also looking at things like providing tie

1 rods on the bellows to further provide structural margin
2 there.

3 So, there is a number of things we're looking at
4 right now to improve the margins.

5 ~~MR. GROBE~~ [Unknown]: Even the one we
6 had out of service, that took the 2X water hammer when it
7 was out of service. It still has margin left even after
8 the water hammer. It's the form, bellows deform, there is
9 still margin there, and structurally sound.

10 MR. THOMAS: Sir, are you
11 saying that you could put CAC 1 back in service and call it
12 operable in its present condition? Is that what you just
13 said?

14 MR. POWERS: Yeah, we possibly
15 could be able to do that, based on the analysis that we've
16 done today, Scott. (mike adjustment)

17 What I said is, based on the analysis we've done
18 today, that could be possible. We've examined it, because
19 we want as much margin as possible in the plant as we
20 proceed to Mode 4. And so, examined, was there a
21 possibility, what was the actual condition of the CAC
22 number one bellows.

23 And the stress analyst will tell you from a plastic
24 deformation standpoint with a straining criteria on the
25 material, has the capability of a 30 percent strain. We

1 believe that CAC number 1, there is about a 10 percent
2 strain has occurred, based on that two times water surge we
3 were talking about. CACs 2 and 3 were at about 5 percent.

4 So, there is still margin available. And these
5 bellows, for those of you, perhaps a good description of
6 them would be like a radiator hose made out of metal. So,
7 they are kind of like an accordion.

8 So, what we're evaluating here is something that's
9 designed to move and looking at whether it's in its design
10 specifications and what we refer to as ASME Code, which is
11 the piping pressure code, design code requirements that we
12 are licensed under.

13 MR. MYERS: We don't have an
14 intention to declare it operable, but we do have an
15 intention to declare it functional, so we have additional
16 margin, so we're trying to get as much margin as we can.

17 So, I asked them to go back and analyze those valves
18 also, and they indicated to me there is margin there.

19 MR. THOMAS: So, let me
20 understand. You're saying that CAC 1 will be available for
21 service during the Mode 4 test?

22 MR. MYERS: Yeah.

23 MR. POWERS: We're evaluating.

24 MR. THOMAS: Okay.

25 MR. POWERS: Scott, that's

1 based on preliminary calculations that have been done up to
2 about noon time today. That's preliminary results of
3 stress analysis calculations. So, there is further work to
4 do. There is also the air-operated valve associated with
5 that CAC also has work remaining on it, but I think Lew had
6 a good point here in terms of would it be available to us
7 should we want to utilize it as a backup.

8 MR. THOMAS: Where is that
9 evaluation documented?

10 MR. POWERS: It's currently in
11 preparation. As I said, preliminary calculations. So, we
12 will head down the track of operability evaluation with
13 that to formalize it, if all the analysis supports that.

14 MR. GROBE: Does your design
15 basis earthquake analysis include a loss of offsite power?

16 MR. POWERS: I believe so,
17 Jack, but I would want to reserve and go back to be sure.

18 MR. GROBE: I believe it does
19 too. So, in the stress analyses that you did, did you for
20 these bounding calculations, did you include design basis
21 earthquake concurrently with the offsite power and pressure
22 surge?

23 MR. POWERS: I believe we
24 included the combinations that would be appropriate for the
25 license basis, Jack. I have to go back, I want to go back

1 to verify that to the level of detail I don't have today,
2 but I believe so.

3 MR. GROBE: Okay, as far as
4 the long term actions that are being finalized, you haven't
5 finally determined what actions you need to take; is that
6 correct?

7 MR. POWERS: That's right.

8 MR. GROBE: As far as design
9 activities, those have to be determined yet?

10 MR. POWERS: That's right. We
11 have a design team looking at that now, at options, at
12 materials availability, which is valves, and that type of
13 equipment; and looking at what the, the most appropriate
14 way to go about it is.

15 MR. GROBE: Okay.

16 Any questions?

17 MR. THOMAS: Is your intention
18 to put the leak valves back on the CACs?

19 MR. POWERS: Right now, yes.
20 We're looking at that. That's been a question we've had,
21 Scott.

22 The CACs in the past years at the plant, there was a
23 question about thermal, what's referred to, again, pressure
24 design code is thermal overprotective pressure protection.

25 If you close valves on a vessel filled with water and it

1 heats up, pressure will, like a pressure cooker, which has
2 a relief valve.

3 There has been various special systems that they've
4 done in the past that had resulted in the removal of small
5 relief valves from these Containment Air Coolers, and with
6 actions being taken to assure that they would not
7 overpressurize. We're reevaluating that now, and heading
8 down the track of putting some of those reliefs back in.

9 MR. MYERS: Yes.

10 MR. POWERS: Yes.

11 MR. THOMAS: Prior to startup?

12 Is this a prior to startup action?

13 MR. POWERS: Currently, that's
14 what we're talking.

15 MR. THOMAS: Okay.

16 MR. RULAND: Jim, I would like
17 to bring you back to the, the HPI pumps. If you remember,
18 we had some discussion about whether --
19 (mike problem)

20 We have been having some discussion in the past
21 about having a public meeting with the HPI pumps. Sounds
22 like now, like, you know, you want to start possibly
23 planning a public meeting to kind of flush out, not only
24 for our benefit but the public, exactly where you're at;
25 and given that your design is not complete, and sounds like

1 your debris is finalized, it appears that this might be,
2 you should go forward and start planning meetings. So,
3 we'll be having further discussions on that matter.

4 MR. POWERS: That would be
5 good.

6 MR. GROBE: That meeting will
7 most likely occur in our headquarters office.

8 MR. POWERS: Okay.

9 Okay, if there is no more questions on the closure
10 of technical issues, I would like to turn it over to Rick
11 Dame, who will talk about our Operational Readiness
12 Assessment Program.

13 MR. PASSEHL: Jim, before we
14 move on, we covered about half of the agenda. Let's take a
15 ten minute break until 20 minutes to 4, and rejoin. I
16 notice Rolland Lickus, our State Government Officer is
17 here, so he must have brought those monthly reports with
18 him. So, go ahead and pick one up if you like.

19 Thank you.

20 (Off the record.)

21 MR. PASSEHL: Okay, we're ready
22 to get started. Go ahead, Rick.

23 MR. DAME: Thank you.

24 My name is Rick Dame and I would like to talk a
25 little about the two roles I was brought up to the

1 Davis-Besse facility to help out with. I'm from the Perry
2 Nuclear Power Plant and the first role that I talked about
3 last month was assistance with planning the Integrated
4 Restart Test Plan.

5 Now, my background at the Perry Plant was a former
6 Senior Reactor Operator and I had put together the shutdown
7 and startup sequences for the Perry Plant for a couple of
8 ~~refilling~~ refueling outages. So, I brought that knowledge to the
9 Davis-Besse Station and it helped them put together a very
10 comprehensive plan called the Integrated Restart Test
11 Plan. Now, this plan is a detailed evolution all the way
12 from initial Mode 4 to a hundred percent power.

13 We talked earlier about the 7-day Normal Operating
14 Pressure Test. That's a big segment of this particular
15 test sequence. And this plan covers the structure,
16 expectations, assignments, and detailed schedule,
17 contingencies that will be put in place to support the safe
18 and event-free startup of the Davis-Besse plant.

19 And this particular document for the sake of the
20 panel will be included as part of our revision to the
21 Implementation Action Plan, which was Checklist Item 5.d.i.
22 So, we'll be revising that. This is sort of up and beyond
23 what you already have seen in that plan. Again, it's an
24 extremely detailed and comprehensive test plan.

25 One additional note, we talked about some of the

1 work that's been done at this facility; all
2 post-maintenance testing captured in this particular
3 document, as designated down to the owner by night shift to
4 day shift depending on the disciplines, and those have been
5 published and have been distributed to the organization and
6 folks are walking down those activities, so they're well
7 prepared to handle those tests when they come up.

8 So, that was the first role that I was brought out,
9 and, as Lew mentioned, this was approved earlier today.
10 So, this plan is in place.

11 Now, I get an opportunity to move to the second
12 role, which is a little bit different and I would say maybe
13 a little more challenging. That's to take a look at
14 Operational Readiness in the Davis-Besse Nuclear Facility.
15 So, I'm here to talk about the Operational Readiness
16 Assessment Plan.

17 Next slide.

18 The desired outcome of this assessment is to
19 demonstrate the readiness of the people and processes to
20 safely and reliably operate the plant.

21 We have heard through the different presentations
22 over the months the amount of time and effort that has gone
23 into improving processes, trying to change attitudes,
24 trying to improve culture of the station with regards to
25 nuclear safety. So, what this Operational Readiness Plan

1 is going to do is more or less take a step back and see how
2 effective we have been at those particular measures.

3 Next slide, please.

4 There is a couple ways you can do assessments; you
5 can test people; you can put forth surveys; you can
6 interview people, but probably the most effective way of
7 assessing the behavior of an organization is through
8 observations. So, that's the method that we're going to be
9 utilizing for the Operational Readiness Assessment Plan.

10 So, we're going to conduct observations and
11 assessments during the 7-day Normal Operating Pressure
12 Test. This is a very, very unique opportunity, because
13 it's a complex task. It's going to involve a lot of
14 operation evolutions, a lot of post maintenance testing,
15 potentially a lot of decision-making if emergent issues
16 come up. So, this is going to be a very, very unique forum
17 to assess the organization.

18 We're going to perform potentially some exercises,
19 depending on the amount of activities that are going on at
20 the facility. I'll talk about these a little bit later,
21 but we've put some together to take a look at standards and
22 processes to ensure appropriate, safe and reliable
23 operation. Again, we'll talk about this a little bit
24 later.

25 One thing before we move from this slide, I'm here

1 talking about the assessment plan. It's not just myself
2 doing an assessment. You'll see that we have a very, very
3 comprehensive team that's going to be brought in to assess
4 the organization on various levels. I think you'll find it
5 a very unique structure and it's going to be very, very
6 beneficial to the Davis-Besse station.

7 Next slide.

8 The Assessment Criteria. Any time that you're doing
9 an assessment, you're going to want to evaluate against
10 standards. The Davis-Besse station has a couple of
11 standards they use internally specific to the operation of
12 the power plant. One, is they have a Conduct of Excellence
13 handbook.

14 What this is, is a handbook that's been passed out
15 to the entire Operations Organization. It's issued by the
16 Operations Manager, and it more or less communicates his
17 expectations with regard to the operation of the facility.
18 That also works hand in hand with the procedure called
19 Conduct of Operations.

20 Besides those two criteria, again looking back at
21 some of my past experiences, I was a host peer at the Perry
22 Nuclear Power Station for a World Association of Nuclear
23 Operator Assessment. The World Association of Nuclear
24 Operators utilized performance objectives and criteria.
25 They're very similar to another organization that's

1 domestic to the U.S., the Institute of Nuclear Power
2 Operations.

3 So, next slide, please.

4 Let's talk a little about the World Association of
5 Nuclear Operators Performance Criteria. This group is a
6 worldwide group. They look at nuclear operation,
7 domestically, and across the world. What they've done is
8 they've assembled a set of consistent standards of
9 excellence to determine station strengths and weaknesses.

10 For this particular assessment, we're going to
11 select a couple portions of this. It's really a
12 comprehensive book of different criteria, but we're going
13 to focus on "Operational Effectiveness" and "Operations."

14 Now, for those not familiar with the criteria, what
15 the particular criteria might look like under
16 Organizational Effectiveness is there is a number of
17 different things that would be looked at. One type of
18 example would be, how much the management staff challenges
19 each other when they look at different situations.

20 For example, if Dave were to come up to me with a
21 Condition Report, which is one of the ways we document
22 issues; it gets issued; it ends up the next morning getting
23 evaluated by the management team. How much interaction is
24 there and challenging, healthy challenging amongst the team
25 to assure that an effective decision is made. So, this is

1 some of the types of things we'll look at.

2 We'll look at also how operators take a look at
3 equipment. Do they recognize normal trends? What they do
4 when they see abnormal trends? Is it documented? How
5 effective is it documented? What measures are taken?
6 Again, testing a questioning attitude, a lot of the thought
7 processes with regards to nuclear safety culture and
8 operation of station.

9 Next slide, please.

10 MR. GROBE: Rick, I have a
11 question before you go on.

12 MR. DAME: Yes?

13 MR. GROBE: Are the weight of
14 performance indicators or performance criteria, are those
15 publicly available?

16 MR. DAME: I believe they
17 are. I'd have to verify that. The criteria we're using
18 are the 1999 version, and I could get back to you with more
19 information on that, Jack. I do know that the INPO, the
20 new evaluation criteria, there is a lot of similarities
21 with respect to the WANO criteria.

22 MR. GROBE: Okay, thank you.

23 MR. DAME: Let's talk about
24 the Integrated Assessment Team. I mentioned that I'm
25 certainly not working alone with regards to this

1 assessment. In fact, I'm very, very fortunate to have a
2 very, very talented staff that's going to be assisting me
3 with this assessment.

4 Really, you probably need to look at this Integrated
5 Assessment on three levels. One, there is going to be a
6 line assessment. Myself will be the leader of that
7 particular assessment, and what we'll be looking at is
8 different evolutions within the plant. Again, looking for
9 conduct of Ops, if the behaviors in the field match the
10 expectation of station management.

11 So, I'll be looking at that from one level. Let's
12 call that the Internal FirstEnergy Nuclear Assessment,
13 because in addition to myself, there will be support from
14 our corporate office, folks from the Perry station, their
15 Senior Reactor Operator Level, also from the Beaver Valley
16 station. So, again, those are all FirstEnergy power
17 stations, nuclear power stations, that will be working on
18 that portion of the assessment.

19 We're fortunate enough to have a number of external
20 operational assessors coming in. Most of these individuals
21 are talented, visionary, change agent Senior Nuclear
22 Executives that have helped turnarounds at other stations
23 or improve station performance. This group will be taking
24 a look at mostly the organizational effectiveness. They're
25 going to lend their talents not only in observations, but

1 going to look for that talented group of people to provide
2 recommendations.

3 For example, if they were in charge of facilities,
4 things they would be thinking of doing to improve
5 performance in certain areas. Again, it's a great
6 opportunity. We have a whole week to more or less pick the
7 brains of some of the industry's best with regards to
8 running nuclear power stations. So, that will be the
9 second group of assessors.

10 Lastly, I don't want to steal any thunder from Steve
11 Loehlein, but we have Quality Assessment going on during
12 the entire Normal Operating Pressure Tests. And I'll let
13 Steve talk about that quite a bit more, but it's really the
14 third level of assessment. Teams will be working in
15 conjunction with each other to assess station performance,
16 operational readiness during the 7-day Normal Operating
17 Pressure Test.

18 We'll talk about the products here a little later.
19 Again, if you look at the diagram, again, the middle
20 portion is that line assessment that I talked about, some
21 of the interaction with plant management, plant staff.

22 Okay, you see down at the bottom part the External
23 Operation Assessment tying in along with the Quality
24 Assessment. We'll talk about some of the products and
25 deliverables that will be coming out of this particular

1 assessment.

2 Next slide, please.

3 Okay. As I mentioned, the 7-day Test provides a
4 very, very unique gathering opportunity, as I put it on
5 this slide. We'll be looking mostly at evolutions that are
6 already in place and scheduled and activities tied directly
7 with performance of Normal Operating Tests.

8 We talked about some of the processes and
9 improvements. We'll be looking at a lot of things with
10 regard to inspections, the way we're doing business there;
11 again, some of the problem-solving of emerging issues.
12 These are new processes that have been enhanced to help
13 support the restart at the Davis-Besse facility.

14 Second bullet, we talk about organizational response
15 to actual emergent issues. We're very proud of the
16 document that we've sort of built upon industry experience;
17 both problem-solving and decision-making procedure. When
18 emergent issues come up, the management team can declare
19 the use of this particular document; really, anyone can, to
20 help systematically and rigorously work through issues to
21 find the best solution and most effective solution. So,
22 we'll be taking a look at how the station is utilizing that
23 instruction.

24 Last, but not least, organizational response to
25 emergent issue exercises. You heard Mark Bezilla talk

1 about earlier a lot of the different things we've worked on
2 in the plant. We do expect some minor emergencies to come
3 up. It's sort of the nature of starting up a power plant
4 that's got thousand and thousands of components; however,
5 if we're pleasantly surprised with day 3, 4, 5, 6 of this
6 test, everything is running completely smooth and we
7 haven't seen certain types of organizational response to
8 issues, we'll have some exercises we can utilize and we'll
9 talk about those on the next slide.

10 "Emergent Issues" Exercises. Again, these are more
11 or less contingencies that we expect to see in a number of
12 different observation opportunities that we'll take
13 advantage of, but we do have some we put in place. I'll
14 describe some of these in a little bit of detail as we walk
15 through the things that we potentially look at.

16 The one thing, having been a Senior Reactor Operator
17 at a nuclear power facility, I have utmost respect for the
18 control room crews, especially in the middle of a complex
19 evolution, to minimize distractions; and every measure will
20 be taken to ensure that there will be no distractions to
21 the control room crew, more or less moving them away from
22 that sole mission or primary mission of safe event-free
23 operation.

24 So, you might ask what kind of exercise would that
25 be? Again, we would like to look at the cognitive thought

1 process of how people take a look at issues, look at their
2 significance, and how they may react to them, again, in the
3 spirit of nuclear safety culture.

4 Interestingly, we talked about 14,000 odd Condition
5 Reports this year. Some of those may have looked innocuous
6 on the surface, but once it got dug into proved to be
7 pretty significant. We might just go back in that whole
8 database, so to speak, and maybe utilize one of those to
9 improve, see if some of the lessons learned applied from
10 some of those Condition Reports have been retained and how
11 they react to them. That might be one way to look at
12 things.

13 There is other ones where we might bring up a
14 Condition Report, and again, we bring it up, again,
15 assessing the determinations made by the shift manager.
16 There might be absolutely nothing wrong with this Condition
17 Report, but we'll see if maybe they overreact or
18 underreact.

19 Again, we want to take a look at the response and
20 maybe the thinking aspect of the shift manager, but then,
21 more importantly, we would like to see what happens once he
22 does look out for help, because again, we're moving towards
23 an operating facility. That's the mission of the entire
24 station to support operations when issues come up.

25 Okay. So, we want to see how apt those shift

1 managers are to ask the organization for help. We don't
2 want a shift manager particularly trying to solve all the
3 issues they can. We have a whole lot of people around.
4 They're very talented to support that operation staff.
5 Again, it's got to be about operations leadership when you
6 start talking about an operating facility. We need to make
7 sure that organizational support is used accordingly.

8 Some of the types of cognizant-type exercises, maybe
9 some of the things we would take a look at, mentioned
10 Condition Reports, one aspect of those are Operability
11 Determinations. What those are, is let's say, Bill were to
12 find an issue out in the plant, writes a Condition Report,
13 and it happens to be on a piece of equipment. That piece
14 of equipment, probably very important to the operational
15 staff; he'll take a look at it. One of first questions
16 he'll ask himself; am I operable or not.

17 Okay. So, we may put some of those exercises in to
18 exercise that thinking again. Not stuff that's obvious,
19 stuff that requires some thinking to put together, ask some
20 questions, I would like this looked into a little more.

21 Priority 200 Work Order. What those are, is an
22 organizational response to a work issue or a problem that
23 needs to be addressed on a 24/7 or around-the-clock basis.
24 Really, we'll be looking at the organizational response,
25 not necessarily what the control room is doing as they are

1 asking for that help. Okay.

2 Procedure changes. I know one of the things Lew
3 Myers is always talking about is procedure changes. Let's
4 take a look at some of our processes there, things we can
5 do to get better. Again, it's an aspect of operating a
6 power plant that is important.

7 Immediate investigation and off-hour equipment
8 challenges. Things to take a look at. Again, when you
9 look at off-hour challenges, something happens at 3 in the
10 morning; I know at my station more often than not, I'll get
11 a phone call, "Hey, Rick, what do you think about this?"
12 So, we'll see if those kind of things are happening here
13 with regard to decision-making and response to issues,
14 again, weighing significance of issues.

15 Next slide, please.

16 MR. GROBE: Excuse me,
17 Rick. I just had one quick question. You may have said
18 this and I just didn't understand it. What exactly is a
19 Priority 200 Work Order?

20 MR. DAME: The priorities at
21 the station with regard to work orders, there is basically
22 a tiered approach. Priority 100 is absolutely emergent.
23 It would be something you have to do to protect the health
24 and public safety by an issue. What that means, you would
25 go out and basically fix it and some of the paperwork

1 sometimes would follow; for example, work order.

2 Priority 200 is something that needs to be responded
3 to in a round-the-clock type of action. Might be something
4 that puts you into, for example, a 7-day limiting condition
5 of operation for tech specs. Okay. So, there is a, a
6 desire to recover that piece of equipment and bring it back
7 to its operational function to support operation of the
8 facility.

9 A Priority 300 would be something that would be
10 addressed ideally within a 21-day period of time.

11 And Priority 400 would be following your normal work
12 schedule, which would be 12-week rolling average.

13 So, again, it's just a prioritization system.

14 MR. GROBE: Okay.

15 MR. MYERS: A tech spec
16 change would be expected.

17 MR. PASSEHL: Rick, I have a
18 question too. Your second bullet there says, "Exercises
19 will be designed to have minimal impact on Control Room
20 Crews." Yet, you have listed an example of exercise being,
21 say, immediate investigation. I don't quite understand how
22 those two match.

23 MR. DAME: Okay, unique
24 investigation is actually done by the line organization
25 outside the control room. So, what that would be is, for

1 example, one of the Condition Reports or certain criteria
2 might be you want or need investigation done and that's
3 usually a 24-hour response by Engineering Organization to an
4 issue.

5 Again, one thing about these exercises, I talk about
6 the utmost ~~expect~~ respect for the control room crew, none of these
7 will be put into play without the consent of the entire
8 Integrated Assessment Team. So, that would include not
9 only the line staff, but the external staff.

10 So, again, I think we'll have plenty of opportunity
11 to take a look at these, a sort of contingent if we're
12 pleasantly surprised and the plant is operating flat out
13 perfect throughout 7-day test. So, again, that was a
14 desire to put together some exercises.

15 MR. MYERS: You know, running
16 drills on shift is nothing new. We have fire drills,
17 safety drills, we've been exercising for years on shift.
18 So, you have to be cautious about it. We're sitting there,
19 once we get the plant stabilized, run the NOP, just sitting
20 there; this is pretty routine, so being able to run some of
21 these things.

22 What we have to do also, is simply being shut down,
23 we have this whole support core around, working around all
24 day and night, because then you have the team calls the
25 facility man. We have to run these drills in a manner

1 where, or the exercises, so that we evaluate how it would
2 be done if that support crew wasn't there. Because that's
3 the next step when we ask to go restart the plant, right?
4 You won't have that support, your support team there 24
5 hours a day, 7 days a week.

6 So, you know, do we have the right duty calls? Do
7 we have the right procedures? One of the things that we
8 use at our other plants is, in the middle of the night, we
9 would call key members, we have a duty list. We get the
10 team out there and utilize the organization to help the
11 shift supervisor solve his problem. We all work 24/7 when
12 you call on us.

13 How does this team respond? I haven't seen that,
14 you know, so we need to look at that.

15 MR. THOMAS: Lew, I agree that
16 testing is done on shift, but I would, I guess, question if
17 it's normally done during an infrequently performed test
18 evolution, which the NOP Test would be. And I guess our
19 concern would be that, and likewise yours, I'm sure, that
20 it didn't impact the control room's focus on the test
21 itself. So, that's, I guess, what's driving our interest
22 in this.

23 MR. MYERS: We considered,
24 you know, the infrequently performed test and the evolution
25 we're using for this. What that does is add additional

1 layers of management to monitor stuff like that.

2 MR. THOMAS: I understand.

3 MR. MYERS: You know, bringing

4 the plant up, and heating it up and getting all the pumps

5 running and everything, and testing your equipment once we

6 get there is pretty tough, and cooling back down. Once we,

7 for 7 days just sitting there, there will be several days

8 there where it's pretty, pretty, just not much going on, so

9 that's the time period we're looking at.

10 MR. THOMAS: All right.

11 MR. DAME: Again, Scott, I

12 want to reemphasize, these are sort of contingent plans and

13 activities and not all of them will be initiated. We want

14 to again look at organizational effectiveness too. If an

15 issue is happening, it's in Engineering, if it's in their

16 house; are they addressing it with a matter of priority it

17 measures, deserves, and bringing responses and solutions to

18 Operations versus maybe Operations always calling out.

19 Again, we're trying to look how these organizations

20 work together for operational readiness. We'll be very,

21 very cautious. Again, it will be a group decision before

22 we head out.

23 MR. MYERS: At our other two

24 stations, we have clerical support on shift to help out

25 with procedure changes. So, I don't see that right now.

1 So, how would it work here in the middle of the night?

2 We need to understand.

3 MR. THOMAS: Okay.

4 MR. DAME: Okay, the last
5 slide that I would like to talk to, is how we're going to
6 document these assessments. This is a question that came
7 up at the last 350 public meeting. And, there is actually
8 a couple different vehicles that we can use to document the
9 assessments.

10 My particular team, Internal Assessment Team, is
11 going to use the FirstEnergy Nuclear Focus Self-Assessment
12 Report document. A Report Number 2003-21, so, this will
13 capture all the different operation from the Internal
14 Assessment Team.

15 We also have a computerized data base which we can
16 put observations on, and, again, we're going to sort of
17 leave it up to the teams once we have our initial
18 coordination meeting. It's going to happen probably
19 tomorrow or the day after with regards to the vehicle we
20 would like to use to document these observations.

21 The External Assessment Team as part of this plan.
22 Again, this plan covers all three of these reports that
23 we'll see here as deliverable documentation. They'll be
24 supplying a report within 10 days to the President of
25 FirstEnergy Nuclear.

1 That same 10-day due date, okay, is also applied to
2 the Internal Assessment Team, as well as the Quality
3 Assessment Team; and that's all part of this report here.
4 So, again, I don't want to steal any of, steal any of
5 Quality Assurance's discussion which is coming up next
6 here, so they'll talk quite a bit about the assessment
7 report, what they'll be looking at.

8 All these reports are going to be included in the
9 final Integrated Restart Report. So, again, one of the
10 Checklist items, I believe it's 5c, talks about Operational
11 Readiness for Restart, a lot of these observations and
12 assessments will be documentation, support documentation
13 for them for the final Integrated Restart Report.

14 With that, I open the floor to questions.

15 MR. GROBE: Just one
16 additional question or comment actually. If we could put
17 slide 33 back up, three slides back, I appreciate it.

18 Thank you. I just wanted to make a couple
19 observations about this plan. Engineers love drawings like
20 these, love to have that up there.

21 The Quality Assurance Assessment is something that's
22 required by NRC, and we're going to hear Steve's plans for
23 what kind of assessments he's going to do. I think this
24 overall plan is very well conceived. It will provide a
25 very solid insight augmenting Quality Assurance for putting

1 people in at the experience, all quality people in at the
2 working level, looking from the inside at what's going on;
3 and if there isn't enough going on, you have this plan for
4 exercise, which is something I haven't seen before. It
5 will be interesting to see how it works.

6 In addition to that, you have this External
7 Assessment with experts across the industry. I think this
8 is a very solid plan and it will give you a lot of insight,
9 and I look forward to our next meeting, hearing the results
10 of what you learned.

11 MR. MYERS: I think, is Russ
12 Carney here now?

13 MR. DAME: Yeah, Russ Carney
14 the Operations Manager of the Perry station will be
15 participating in this.

16 MR. MYERS: Is he here?

17 MR. DAME: He was here
18 earlier.

19 Again, we're going to be getting the best and the
20 brightest of the Operations Departments across First
21 Nuclear to help out. Again, we'll be making observations,
22 at the same time making recommendations, things that can be
23 done to improve organizational effectiveness and
24 Operations.

25 MR. MYERS: Okay. Steve.

1 MR. LOEHLEIN: Thank you.

2 While the rest of the organization has just finished
3 up discussing all the progress they've made, all their
4 plans for finishing preparations for plant restart; the QA,
5 we have sort of a different role, it's our job to continue
6 to assess their activities and assure that they continue to
7 make improvement in areas where it's needed.

8 So, the focus of my discussion today will be really in
9 three areas; first will be the Corrective Action Program,
10 then I'll talk to you about some of the observations we've
11 made recently in the last several weeks, and then at the
12 end I want to discuss these activities that we have planned
13 during the Normal Operating Pressure Test that has been
14 mentioned earlier today.

15 So, this first slide here is an update on the
16 Corrective Action Review that we spoke about in several
17 previous meetings. I'll kind of remind everyone about what
18 some of this data is.

19 The Quality Organization some months back led an
20 investigation review of the Corrective Actions associated
21 with quite a number of Condition Reports. We looked at it
22 from the standpoint of Corrective Actions generated out of
23 it. There were 5,402 completed Corrective Actions that we
24 looked at, at the time, which include all of the 0350
25 Checklist related Corrective Actions.

1 That review team some weeks back concluded in '92 92
2 percent of those cases, there was an acceptable connection
3 between the Corrective Actions that were taken and the
4 records and documents that led back clearly to the
5 condition described in the initial Condition Report.

6 In about 8 percent of the cases, the team concluded
7 was inconclusive or unacceptable and they generated 37
8 Condition Reports as a result of; and those 37 Condition
9 Reports documented 422 sort of discreet occurrences of
10 issues they had questioned.

11 Since last month's tally, now as of the other day,
12 it is, 221 of those 422 issues have been investigated. And
13 the fallout of it is, 185 is proved to be documentation
14 errors or inadequacies, which means that in those cases an
15 appropriate action was taken in response to the condition,
16 but the documentation that led from the initiation to the
17 ultimate action that was taken needs to be improved.

18 There were 36 cases found so far, missed items or
19 procedure errors. Of those 36, found to be dominated by
20 two specific types of errors. We found 8 cases in which
21 there were issues closed, assuming they would make a change
22 to the Preventative Maintenance Task that would cover an
23 ongoing action. So, in many cases that did not happen.

24 There were also about 15 cases so far, that issues
25 that were expected to be in the Checklist for the walkdowns

1 to be done for the Mode 3 Pressure Test, QA found in these
2 15 cases, they were not on the checklist.

3 Sort of the conclusion of this thus far, is if you
4 look at these cases, none of these has been a significant
5 condition adverse to quality. They represent in a certain
6 percentage of the cases only a small percentage of the
7 cases some more minor items were missed, and they are being
8 addressed.

9 Any questions on this review?

10 Next slide, please.

11 Because of the importance of the Corrective Action
12 Program, I thought I would update you, Jack, and the rest
13 of the team on some of the things we've been doing. I'm
14 sure that your Residents know that we've been following the
15 Corrective Action Program pretty closely. We do that every
16 quarter as part of our Continuous Assessment Process. So,
17 we get data on a regular basis. And, I want to share with
18 you those things we are emphasizing to the organization in
19 terms of requiring attention by management.

20 First, the, since last month we talked about
21 transition and how the organization would be going into
22 some of its more normal practices, back to their daily 8:00
23 Management Review Board Meetings with Condition Reports, so
24 forth; given us a chance to observe the categorization
25 process.

1 And, conclusions we have at this point is that the
2 categorization process appears to be working properly to
3 the procedure, but we believe that challenges by the
4 organization of each other in that categorization has been,
5 is being held up primarily by three or four key managers
6 who are making the challenges, and that interchange needs
7 to be more of the managers in a more active way. That's
8 one of the things we provided to management as some
9 insight.

10 Also seen some cases, they're not using all of the
11 available barriers in reviewing these conditions.
12 Sometimes a Condition Report analyst isn't used or a
13 supervisor has been delegated to approve a Condition Report
14 that normally would be a manager's signature. And while
15 that's all okay, we have seen when we look at those
16 examples, that more frequently that those additional
17 barriers or management barriers are not used, we see that
18 the quality of the evaluation tends to droop. So, we've
19 been providing that insight as well.

20 Probably the overall most important thing that needs
21 to happen, I think it's been mentioned here before, is this
22 reinstatement of the trending effort. The whole Corrective
23 Action Program as its devised right now is based on the
24 concept that lower level issues will be treated and managed
25 as low level without requiring a great deal of intervention

1 by management at high levels, not every issue is treated as
2 an earth-shaking type of issue.

3 That's a good practice when you have a complex
4 machine, like one of these units, and you have a lot of
5 minor tasks, if you will, on the process, but what comes
6 key with that, is that when you use trending to show, to
7 tell yourself where are we seeing peak types of
8 occurrences, and where does it then represent some more
9 important challenge, something that may have a more
10 important cause behind it, needs to be investigated.

11 The current status is that the performance
12 improvement is reinstating, reinstating a trending
13 process and their data, as I understand it from them, was
14 collected up to the end of August, and the first report to
15 the management of various departments on their part of the
16 process will be out in September. So, this is being
17 instituted, but we can not have QA pass any judgment on the
18 quality as yet, because there hasn't been an outcome from
19 that process yet.

20 It is critical that this, for the future health of
21 this Corrective Action Program, that that be effectively
22 implemented; and that's something we're going to continue
23 to monitor.

24 Questions?

25 MR. MYERS: One of the

1 differences we found when we first came was that our other
2 two plants, went through all the corrective CRs, every
3 morning, and here you --
4 (mike problem)

5 MR. MYERS: The differences,
6 we had the same Corrective Action Process being implemented
7 here and at our other two plants. Our other two plants, we
8 review them. Every night, we would write Condition
9 Reports. And, the next day, we, as a management team would
10 review those and properly classify them.

11 At this plant, we have been shoving it down to a
12 subcommittee, those are being done managers -- by managers,
13 so we lost that ownership. So, we raised that back into
14 the management area. And, we need to continue to focus. I
15 think we're classifying right, but I think he's right, we
16 see three or four people challenging every one. We should
17 go over all those CRs at the managers meeting.

18 MR. GROBE: Just one
19 observation. We're going to be talking about this a lot
20 more on October 1st when you talk about your status of your
21 Safety Culture improvements and your long term vision for
22 that. I've peeked ahead at some of the slides, you're
23 going to be talking about some of these issues also.

24 I understand that you're going to have some monthly
25 performance indicators that are going to give you insight

1 into the cultural performance of your organization, and
2 we'll talk more about those on October 1st.

3 But I also view the trending program as very
4 important. Trending programs I've seen implemented at
5 various nuclear stations over the years have varying
6 amounts of value added, but an effective training program
7 can be a very good precursor indicator for evaluating
8 Safety Culture attributes, whether they're procedural
9 adherence issues or quality of technical documents or
10 personal performance issues, things of that nature.

11 Prior to reinstating the trending program, we did
12 have some good feedback that were trends, coming from the
13 nature of trends, but they were coming from individuals,
14 not a structured trending program. The one that comes to
15 my mind right now, is that the Engineering Administration
16 Supervisor was seeing a trend of administrative errors in
17 documentation packages that were coming to him or her. I
18 don't remember the individual. And said, I've seen enough
19 of this and I want you guys to get to the bottom of it, and
20 wrote a CR on that trend.

21 That's the kind of thing that is really critically
22 important, as I said, and provides a precursor to more
23 significant issues.

24 So, he deserves or she deserves a pat on the back
25 for identifying that trend, but you need to have a

1 structured program to continually evaluate what your
2 Condition Reports are saying to you and whether there are
3 any trends.

4 MR. MYERS: That's really
5 interesting. We write about, on the average, we wrote
6 about 15,000 Condition Reports. What, several thousand
7 Condition Reports a year received at the station.

8 My belief, my personal belief, you know, I hate
9 condition reporting systems. It's not part of the
10 precondition reporting. I've been to a lot of plants where
11 I find them, the subsystem. We pretty well eliminated
12 that. We have one Corrective Action Program, and our
13 procedures go through there, our engineering questions go
14 through that program and properly classify stuff.

15 We also -- so then that gives us the ability to
16 amend stuff and look at it, and really from a management
17 team understand it.

18 A good example; one of our other plants, say that;
19 we found a Corrective Action in the training program we
20 didn't know about. Found we had like three or four
21 thousand Corrective Actions we needed to take over there,
22 that our management team at the plant didn't know about.
23 So, we had to fix that.

24 So, if you know who is writing the information, the
25 right information or data, not trending is not too good.

1 So, you got to make sure that's the case.

2 Additionally, not only can we do that, one of the
3 things we typically did at our other plants, process called
4 Collective Significance Reviews, I've mentioned here
5 before. Once a quarter or two, we had at our other plants,
6 our licensing group take a look at all of our corrected CRs
7 and Corrective Actions that's in our database.

8 We also go back and look at other stuff, like INPO
9 reports that we receive, NRC LERs that we are writing,
10 industry experience that we're finding; and we try to put
11 that all together as a senior leadership to figure out, do
12 we have an overall site problem with procedure adherence,
13 seek the limits of mechanical maintenance group or
14 something.

15 So, what that helps us do is every year develop
16 focus areas where we want to go with the plant, I would use
17 the words, you use the words Safety Culture awhile ago. I
18 don't think that if you find a negative trend that's
19 necessarily procedure adherence, means you have a
20 materially bad safety culture, but if you start eliminating
21 all these barriers, you wind up with a bad safety culture.
22 Remember the slide I showed last time? So, as we watch the
23 barriers, you see negative trends on the barriers and we
24 act on the trends, so you don't have failures in any of
25 them.

1 So, the Collective Significance Process sort of does
2 that. So, we have those two processes.

3 Once again, I've been over here at this plant for
4 about a year and a half now and I've not seen how we really
5 do business. I know the way we do business here is often
6 the way it looks on surface to our other two stations, but
7 when you go dig down, it's quite a difference.

8 So, we have a sense of that, make sure that we have
9 consistency. As Chief Operating Officer, my job is real
10 simple, make sure we have good standard implemented and we
11 implement them at all three of our sites. That's exactly
12 what I intend to do.

13 MR. LOEHLEIN: Okay. This next
14 slide. This one covers some of the things we are doing
15 more at the present time.

16 First of all, the ongoing oversight of qualification
17 testing. That speaks to the high pressure injection pump
18 related testing going on at the laboratories in Alabama.
19 One of my assessors from the engineering side has been
20 there several times in the past. He is there this week. I
21 will be going there myself tomorrow morning to spend a day
22 looking at how that is progressing.

23 Some of the other focus areas, I've listed the key
24 ones, kind of areas that we're looking at to provide you
25 with some of the things we've identified through the

1 organization.

2 One would be, we've talked about Containment Air
3 Coolers today, the valves that we're dealing with on
4 Containment Air Cooler Number 1.

5 There was a case that response to the loss of
6 offsite power, that QA thought pretty well performed by the
7 station, but we felt the identification of this particular
8 problem should have been more timely, took longer to
9 identify than it should have.

10 The area of procedure compliance I know is one of
11 significant interest to the NRC, as well as to us. In our
12 second quarter assessment of the organization, we found
13 some data, there might be something to the issue of
14 procedure compliance, I would say, but now we're starting
15 to get some data and issues we find that may start to point
16 to what some of the causes might be for the problems that
17 we've had in the area. All, what constitutes work to
18 procedure as opposed to working to the skills that you've
19 been trained to do.

20 Just as an example, we had this week seen a Senior
21 Reactor Operator from Beaver Valley who is on rotational
22 assignment to Quality Assessment at Beaver, came up this
23 week to spend a few days with us, observing testing
24 activities and so forth.

25 And he observed some of the service water testing

1 that was going on in his summary assessment. The
2 observation was that the operators performed very well. He
3 felt when he compared it to what was done at his station;
4 that the procedures lack quite a bit of guidance in some
5 areas and the operators were more reliant on their own
6 historical knowledge than they would have been at his
7 station.

8 And we've seen some other cases in which the
9 operation staff or the maintenance staff is operating under
10 the assumption that they, this is within their task
11 capability.

12 So, we think now we're starting to put together some
13 insights that will help us investigate further where there
14 may be some improvements. There may be not just in
15 performance, but maybe in understanding better what you
16 need a procedure for and what you don't. And that all goes
17 back to training and so forth.

18 So, we want you to know we are starting to get some
19 data along those lines, Jack, you asked me about that some
20 time back.

21 I think -- there are a number of other activities I
22 could talk about, unless you have questions, I'd probably
23 prefer to move on to the Normal Operating Pressure Test
24 activities that we have planned.

25 Sort of as a way of context, we have a nice little

1 map, you pointed out on the slide 33, Jack. It shows how
2 we're all working, how we have these roles associated with
3 Normal Operating Pressure Test.

4 Some of the things that QA is going to be looking at
5 there, as it relates specifically to that part, is we're
6 going to be looking at, here's some of the specific
7 things. Verifying four hours after reaching normal
8 operating pressure that there is a Mode 3 walkdown to
9 ensure technical leakage is accomplished. That's one of
10 the things that's required by the process. We'll be
11 looking at that.

12 We're going to be observing the Reactor Coolant
13 System Inspection Team. We'll be accompanying those teams
14 in the Containment on those walkdowns.

15 We'll be observing the work order, procedure
16 process, corrective action activities of the two 7-person
17 maintenance teams that will respond to whatever they're
18 given.

19 We'll be verifying the proper institution of the RCS
20 leakage procedure, and a number of other things. That's
21 specific to the actual Mode 4 activities.

22 Throughout these evolutions though, we are observing
23 a control room manned control, and a number of other
24 activities that involve coordination with the control room
25 and personnel out in the field.

1 Part of the context I would like to give to this is
2 that we're not in QA just doing support of or oversight of
3 this Normal Operating Pressure Test. The whole Restart
4 Test Plan has been under development for ~~some time~~ some time, and QA
5 has done oversight of the development of that plan. We
6 have provided insights into that.

7 And we are engaged in assessments throughout this
8 Continuous Assessment Process, that includes running up to
9 Mode 4 and 3 and coming back down to Mode 5, and along with
10 that, lots of support activity, Just-In-Time Training. And
11 anybody that's familiar with our Continuous Assessment
12 Process knows other support things that we look at.

13 Probably what I would like to share with you, all
14 this is going to go on in the next few weeks, we'll share
15 this same importance with the line organization in the last
16 few days. We're particularly interested, not just in the
17 process and how the equipment performs, but in three key
18 areas that relate all the way back to what the organization
19 needs to learn on the reactor head event. The Operations
20 leadership that we displayed, the proper demand and control
21 and guarding of the safety of the plant; the safety
22 culture, which we'll be able to observe well through how
23 promptly issues are identified and whether they're
24 prioritized and resolved appropriately and what condition
25 they are. And we'll be looking at procedure compliance,

1 which was another key ingredient. So, those are kind of
2 the big picture things that we'll be looking for on top of
3 the others.

4 I would say, finally, the one thing that we get to
5 do that maybe others don't get to do as easily, we'll be
6 observing line organizations oversight for how well they do
7 oversight. So, that will be interesting for us.

8 Any questions?

9 MR. GROBE: Nope. Thank
10 you.

11 MR. MYERS: I would like to
12 take a couple moments and try to talk about some of the
13 changes we take into the improvements to Anchor the
14 Long-Term Permanent Improvements that we have at FENOC.

15 Next slide.

16 Since the last time we met, there has been many
17 changes made within FENOC to sustain safety focus and
18 improve performance at our nuclear stations. At our
19 corporate level, Gary Leidich has now been named President
20 of FENOC. And I think that happened since our last
21 meeting.

22 We have Staff Improvement Executive, gentleman by
23 the name of Joe Hagan, that reports on the 22nd of
24 September, and Senior Vice President of Engineering and
25 Support to replace Gary.

1 Joe comes to us from the Exelon Corporation. So,
2 you may know Joe. At that company, he was Senior
3 Vice-President, Nuclear Operations-PECO. I knew Joe as the
4 Site VP with Entergy, where he was the Site VP of the Grand
5 Gulf Nuclear Plant. So, we're really pleased to have Joe
6 come to us, and in this position.

7 And once again, the other thing that he runs, since
8 shutdown has gone on besides improved our executives,
9 also in charge of our Quality Oversight Group as Vice
10 President. He not only reports to the President of FENOC,
11 he reports to our Board of Directors also, our new
12 Committee Board.

13 At the plant level, we've installed an experience
14 Senior Leadership Team since the shutdown, and we'll be
15 announcing a new member in the near future. Randy Fast,
16 the previous Plant Manager, Jack, I think you know this,
17 is being moved to the corporate position to ensure the
18 organizational effectiveness for all of our plants.

19 The Safety Culture issues and Organizational
20 Effectiveness, it's got to the point now that we want to
21 take Lessons Learned from here and focus on all of our
22 plants. And, Randy will be primarily responsible for
23 consistency and looking at our Safety Cultures and Safety
24 Conscious Work Environment, as well as our training
25 programs at our facilities. There is a lot of ground to be

1 made at our facilities, you know, consistent training
2 program, consistent with all three facilities. So, Randy
3 will be focusing in that area.

4 The plant senior leadership team now, which is the
5 directors and vice president at Davis-Besse Plant is
6 looking, has over 150 years of nuclear experience. It's a
7 pretty good senior leadership.

8 Nonetheless, there's 13 managers at the plant now,
9 and they form a management team. That's been a significant
10 strength since the outage. And that team has over 260
11 years of nuclear experience.

12 Another 15 managers, 18 managers as directors that
13 we have in place now, over 15 of those people have either
14 Senior Reactor Operators or Senior Reactor Operator
15 certification. I think one of the major things that you
16 look at, at the decline of this plant, was that we had done
17 a good job in the past of developing the top line of
18 managers, gain SRO and SRO certification, and that went
19 from an SRO pipeline down to a certification, and over time
20 to nothing at all, you know, so we think we've regained
21 that level of operation of experience that we need at the
22 station. And we'll really be focusing on the SRO pipeline
23 in the future.

24 From improvements to improve safety margin, many
25 improvements have been made that have added safety margin

1 to the Davis-Besse plant. We talked about several of those
2 today. A couple come to mind. We think the Containment
3 Sump that we've installed sets a new industry standard.
4 That's the most robust PWR sump I've seen. We brought some
5 of our experience over from our Perry Plant to develop
6 that. So we think, that's another example of how the fleet
7 approach is serving us well.

8 The new reactor safety seal that we installed will
9 greatly improve, reduce the dose I think we receive each
10 outage, and also our exposure of the reactor vessel. The
11 leakage that we saw, when we inspected it, now corrected.
12 So, we think that is a good improvement to our plant.

13 The FLUS Monitoring System is the first of a kind to
14 be installed in the United States. You know, people say
15 what they want; when you go out and inspect RCS every
16 outage and do all whatever you want to do, but there is
17 nothing there, that we got the only system that I know of
18 that's live time one hundred percent of the time that will
19 tell you if you develop a leak. So, that's, that's going
20 to be a very unique piece of equipment.

21 I'm really excited about testing it during this
22 7-day test. Probably one of the ones I'm watching the
23 most.

24 The Electrical Transit and Analysis Program we
25 installed, we talked about earlier, called ETAP, allows us,

1 it really is an interesting piece of software. With Jim, I
2 characterize it, as most plants use, when this plant was
3 built, used software, when the plant was built, it didn't
4 have software, but it went to a type of software that
5 allowed us to look at electrical distribution as a whole.

6 Our electrical distribution system has always been
7 robust, but with the new software we're able to run
8 transients; you ask about our switchover, we can make any
9 kind of assumption you want to make. We can make breakers
10 out, equipment out, different pieces out, and run different
11 transients to see what the voltage does and the currents do
12 down, down the component level. It actually takes into
13 consideration the wiring and connectors.

14 So, we think this piece of software that was
15 installed at our plant is not only helping us analyze our
16 electrical distribution better, but it's also causing us to
17 make some modifications to our system. Jim talked about
18 several, that there is some more that we'll be making after
19 the outage. We're going to look at some of the electrical
20 the MCC motor control centers that we have daisy chain at
21 our plant. So, we'll be making improvements there.

22 So, from a modification standpoint, there has been
23 unique things done at our plant we think that will make
24 this plant an industry lead when it's all said and done.

25 From a FENOC standpoint, we've also changed our

1 vision at our plant, in all our plants, to try to focus on
2 safety more. And we also developed new matrix that we
3 think will be an industry lead. Our vision used to be
4 operational excellence. That was pretty good, but it
5 really didn't send some of the messages we think we want to
6 send. So, we've changed our vision to all our plants to be
7 people with a strong safety focus, delivering top fleet
8 operative performance.

9 The new matrix now monitors Safety Culture. I think
10 that you go look at our, our corporate performance
11 indicators and matrix, I don't know of anyone else that's
12 going to have a routine matrix monitoring Safety Culture
13 and Assessment Program where every couple years they assess
14 Safety Culture of the plant. We built that into our
15 program now. I certainly believe that will make us unique
16 to the industry.

17 We've taken several actions. I think they're long
18 term improvements to the Personnel Performance. Next
19 slide.

20 From a training standpoint, we've trained everyone
21 on Lessons Learned. And I've talked about that before,
22 won't go through everything here.

23 We've got new training for the managers and
24 supervisor that focus on supervisors focusing now on
25 nuclear safety and professionalism, nuclear

1 professionalism.

2 There is improvement in our evaluation process. We
3 now have two new areas that we evaluate on, the managers
4 and supervisor under, but what I think is more interesting
5 and really not here, I want to talk about is, Jack, I think
6 you attended our ROP meeting, and observed that for part of
7 this week. We're getting ready to roll out a new tool
8 called Root Learning Map that will be used as what I would
9 call an alignment tool for each and every one of our
10 employees.

11 You know, I find this tool quite, one of the more
12 exciting things that I've seen. They did a demonstration
13 where the, myself, and the, and the senior leadership team
14 on Saturday, and they used this product, with a cola
15 company project. And we were so interested in, the senior
16 leadership team before it was over with, we were ready to
17 go up to the nuclear power and get a cola. So, it was --
18 maybe we need to do that.

19 But anyway, we thought that was, that's really a
20 good product, and we're excited about using it in our
21 plant. So, we've worked with this company for several
22 weeks now on the senior level and manager level to develop
23 this product. It's important that each employee
24 understands the unique responsibilities that we have as a
25 company, for we have to the nuclear industry, and most

1 importantly, the responsibilities that we have to the
2 public.

3 You know, this tool is designed to make sure that
4 there is clear alignment in those areas. We will provide
5 this alignment training to each and every employee at our
6 plant before startup.

7 Next area. One of our major Building Blocks was
8 the Program Building Blocks, was to ensure that our
9 programs have good ownership, meet industry standards, and
10 give us assurance of good implementation.

11 We made progress with our Corrective Action Program,
12 but we're just getting started. We have a long ways to go
13 there. That was evident yesterday.

14 We've already contracted with an independent
15 contractor, independent review of our design calculations
16 program with Sargent & Lundy starting next week. So, that
17 would continue to improve the quality of our products. You
18 know, when I got through with the, even before that, there
19 is a couple of areas that comes to mind. Engineering
20 calculations are one of them. Make sure that's a good
21 product. So, we're going after that already.

22 We've already started a project to upgrade our
23 engineering design basis, with a new tool called ATLAS. I
24 had it available today. I was hoping to get some time when
25 you guys were at the plant to demonstrate that tool, but we

1 ran out of time today and got away, so maybe the next time
2 you're there, we'll be able to give you a demonstration of
3 that product.

4 It is a computerized product that allows, that I can
5 even use, to go in, and you give me an accident, I'll tell
6 you the systems with that product that you have to depend
7 on, the components that you have to depend on, and then it
8 allows me to go to curator and pick up the design basis for
9 each and every component.

10 So, very quickly, you have access to design
11 information at our station. So, I think this is a
12 tremendous tool that we implemented at our Perry Plant. We
13 already have the products in place to implement it here.

14 Next slide.

15 We also made great improvements I think in our
16 Oversight Process, our Management Observation Program.

17 Mark talked earlier, one of the main tools we used
18 in the 7-day Test is the Management Observation Program,
19 besides the Corrective Action Program. Each and every
20 activity, we already have a detailed schedules of managers
21 to be on shift to observe activities using our Management
22 Observation Program.

23 New performance indicators are visible at each and
24 every department. You walk around the site, even on the
25 walls, what we think, that we expect each and every

1 employee in that department to understand. So, we've got
2 these new performance indicators in place.

3 The Safety Culture Assessment, we think is not only
4 a good improvement, we think our process is probably, and
5 it's our opinion, the best in the industry. And we've
6 looked at all of them.

7 The Engineering Assessment Board was put in place to
8 ensure quality of our engineering mods. And there's
9 probably some other areas we can use that in.

10 Then augmented independence and capability of our
11 Quality Assurance Group, I think has given us great
12 dividends. I look back at some of the Quality Assurance
13 reports that are written at our Davis-Besse station; and
14 read the reports, I find them quite good. I just can't
15 come up with the same conclusions that the Quality
16 Assurance group did. So, we think this independence will
17 help us to be self-critical.

18 And then improvements in the Nuclear Review Board of
19 our company and borrowed oversight has really been
20 strengthened.

21 That's all I have in that area. Any questions?

22 MR. GROBE: Just an
23 observation. I think that's a good bit of information to
24 wet your whistle on, on what we're going to be covering
25 October 1st.

1 MR. MYERS: Right.

2 MR. GROBE: Because that's the
3 foundation of what you've done.

4 MR. MYERS: Right.

5 MR. GROBE: Did you have some
6 closing remarks you wanted to make?

7 MR. MYERS: Yes, I did.

8 MR. GROBE: Okay.

9 MR. MYERS: You know, in
10 summary, I started out today discussing loss of offsite
11 power. All of our technical support centers were manned at
12 all three of our plants. We supplied the resources to each
13 other. At Beaver Valley we had food delivered to the Perry
14 Plant. So, those technical support centers were all
15 communications, demonstrating the effectiveness of our
16 fleet approach that we now have, that our three plants are
17 not being, not being operated in isolation anymore.

18 Once again, we're confident enough that once we were
19 confident in the stability of our grid, we determined
20 together at our Perry Plant and our Davis-Besse plant, and
21 went back to offsite power at 1940 on August the 15th.

22 What I'm most pleased with, is throughout that
23 transit, when I'm talking to, talking to Canada and in
24 talking to Bill Pearce, I think our team consistently
25 focused on nuclear safety throughout. Every conversation

1 we had was focused on nuclear safety.

2 Employees responded both in a timely and effective
3 manner, which is a good sign, the response to our
4 facility. And finally, our equipment, our equipment
5 consists of redundant trains. That means we have two
6 redundant trains that are one hundred percent capable of
7 handling an event, and they all operated well.

8 You know, nuclear guys really like redundant
9 trains. And they like that redundancy. One of the things
10 I've seen up here with Mark is, he's the only person I ever
11 seen bring two laser beams with him for presentation.

12 MR. GROBE: Do they both have
13 batteries?

14 MR. MYERS: Yeah.

15 We now, we're now I think at a major milestone at
16 our plant. We've entered our Restart Test Plan. We've
17 tested our Containment. Demonstrated the leak tightness of
18 that area to the public. We performed the 50 pound, 250
19 pound test, and fixed the problems that we found in that
20 test.

21 We're now, we're now at 210 pounds, with a bubble in
22 the pressurizer in our reactor. And we've already ran the
23 2-1 and 2-2 reactor coolant pumps. We ran all four since
24 we've been here, all four reactor coolant pumps today, and
25 I think we're raw testing now as we sit here, testing our

1 main control rods.

2 That's really important. We put the new head on the
3 reactor, but we have not stroked the control rods to make
4 sure they move properly with this new head since we've been
5 shut down. So, stroking these control rods is really
6 important to us. So, that's an exciting milestone there.

7 MR. THOMAS: Lew, could you
8 just for clarity sake, could you be a little more specific
9 with the control rod testing, what's going on, just what
10 exactly you're doing?

11 MR. MYERS: Oh. The control
12 rods are operated from the reactor head, the control
13 mechanism on the reactor head. What we're doing is, we're
14 proving the rods will move freely without interference,
15 and that the new reactor head is properly aligned to the
16 control rods in the reactor core. So, ensuring those rods
17 will move freely in our reactor core is very important.

18 We're doing that today cold. So, taking like one
19 bank of rods at a time and moving them, making sure they
20 move freely. Does that answer your question?

21 MR. GROBE: I appreciate
22 Scott's question. I think it's important to note that in
23 the current operational condition they're in, there is two
24 ways to control reactivity; one is with the control rods
25 and the other is with boric acid that you add to the

1 reactor coolant.

2 In the shutdown condition you're in, you can
3 actually pull all of the control rods out of reactor and
4 the boric acid that's in the coolant will still maintain
5 the reactor to properly shut down.

6 So, people get sometimes a little "hinky" when you
7 start talking about pulling control rods, but in this
8 configuration, control rod testing is --

9 MR. MYERS: We're simply
10 doing rod testing.

11 MR. GROBE: -- a completely
12 safe activity.

13 MR. MYERS: And with that,
14 once again, our Boron upgrade at 2300 would be in rods,
15 which is quite shut down, so we were simply doing rods.

16 We ran all four of our reactor coolant pumps once
17 again, and beginning to increase reactor pressure the next
18 day up to 2155 pounds of temperature, about 532 degrees, by
19 the operation of reactor coolant pumps.

20 I guess that's sort of hard to understand too, but
21 generally as you start the reactor coolant pumps, and
22 reactor coolant pumps are large machines that circulate
23 about a hundred thousand gallons each of reactor coolant
24 through the core. When you run the reactor coolant pump,
25 you have about 16 megawatts thermal of heat, and so it's

1 easy to heat up the reactor just by running the pumps.

2 So, we'll be running all four reactor coolant
3 pumps with a bubble in the pressurizers, normal way with a
4 steam bubble, normal way we operate, to increase
5 temperature up to 532 degrees and the pressure up to 2155
6 pounds, which is our normal conditions.

7 So, we're doing that today. We're doing that to
8 show the integrity of our Reactor Coolant System and our
9 systems. And that is an exciting time.

10 Most of our technical issues, as Jim said, are
11 complete. We still have a couple out in front of us. We
12 have some electrical changes we want to make and high
13 pressure injection pumps that we're working on, and we have
14 the parts and solution for that. And so we're excited
15 about that.

16 We're performing the 7-day Test using the Lessons
17 Learned from other extended outages. I mean, you look --
18 Jack, you've been through some of these. We expect to find
19 and fix any equipment problems with the issues resulting
20 from the extended outage, many of them during this test.
21 So, we would expect that our power ~~extension~~ ascension program when
22 we do restart the plant will be smooth. And we would not
23 find some of the problems I think some of the plants had
24 that were in extended outages. So, I'm excited about this
25 7-day test and the technical issues getting behind us.

1 We'll assess our people during this, during this
2 7-day process, our plant and how it operates; and then
3 finally, our processes. And once we're satisfied that
4 we've -- and we don't expect this to be clean. We expect
5 to find more problems and go fix them. And once we assess
6 everything, and made the Corrective Actions, we'll write a
7 report with those Corrective Actions and present that
8 report as part of our Restart Test Plan to the, to the
9 Restart Oversight Panel.

10 Shortly after that, we would expect to, with their
11 approval and with Gary Leidich's approval to come forth to
12 the regulatory agency and tell you that we're ready to
13 restart our plant and ask your permission to do that.

14 So, this is a very exciting time and a major
15 milestone for us. As we sit here today, Mark and I keep
16 getting beeps, pages about the status of the equipment as
17 it's changing before us.

18 So, a very good opportunity for us, and we look
19 forward to it. We think this is a major milestone in our
20 plant. That's all we have. Thank you.

21 MR. GROBE: Okay, very good.

22 Thank you. Any final questions?

23 I just want to make a couple of observations. One
24 of the current buzz words in business management vernacular
25 is having an organization built to last. Clearly, the

1 meeting that we're going to have on October 1st, and the
2 focus of that meeting is going to be not only what you've
3 done to-date to prepare for restart within the context of
4 Organizational Effectiveness and Human Performance, but
5 also what your structured plans are to ensure that that
6 continues on and how that would be monitored in the
7 future.

8 The panel is charged not only in evaluating the
9 activities that you conduct during a shutdown in making
10 recommendations to Jim Caldwell and Jim Dyer and Bill
11 Travers on whether or not we think the plant is ready to
12 restart at an appropriate time, but also to express the
13 view as to why it has confidence that this plant can start
14 safely and operate in the future safely.

15 So, the meeting on October 1st is a very important
16 meeting and it will provide additional insight beyond
17 Management/Human Performance Inspection Team activities
18 into that aspect of the activity, Return to Service
19 Activity, that is ensuring that the organization is built
20 to last.

21 If you get to the point in time where you restart
22 the plant, not only restarted safely, but it will continue
23 to operate safely in the future.

24 So, that's an important meeting. And we mentioned a
25 couple other meetings that we're anticipating in the next

1 several weeks. One would be discussion of the results of
2 the Corrective Action Team Inspection, and the System
3 Health Inspection. That will be likely in Region III.

4 In addition, we're expecting in the next several
5 weeks to have a meeting on the high pressure injection pump
6 redesign and testing activities, and that will be in
7 Rockville.

8 Then, I think we have a public meeting, our next
9 monthly meeting, if I look at my monthly newsletter, which
10 you can all pick up now in the foyer. But our next public
11 meeting is October 7th at 2:00 and again at 7:00; not in
12 the Oak Harbor High School as indicated in the newsletter,
13 but at the Camp Perry, at the Camp Perry facility which we
14 have been in before.

15 So, with that, I think the business portion of this
16 meeting is adjourned, and we'll reconvene in about five
17 minutes to discuss the, any questions and receive any
18 comments that members of the public have.

19 I think it should be clearly noted on the record
20 that this meeting adjourned the business portion at 1
21 minute to 5, and that is a record. I appreciate that.

22 Thank you.

23 (Off the record.)

24 MR. GROBE: What I would
25 like to do is first, if there is any representative of the

1 local level -- excuse me, local elected official here that
2 has a question or comment, I would like to give them a
3 chance to ask it, or if they have a statement, I would like
4 to give them an opportunity.

5 I don't see anyone. I'll just open it up for
6 general, general questions or comments.

7 MR. RIDZON: Paul Ridzon,
8 McDonald Investments.

9 On your website today, you indicated that you plan
10 to issue a final report on the NOP Test about 30 days after
11 conclusion of the test. Will this be the first feedback
12 you give, or will there be a preliminary report? And,
13 secondly, is issuance of this report a precursor to
14 restart?

15 MR. GROBE: I think you can
16 interpret every one of our inspection reports as something
17 that is before restart, but I don't believe it's proper to
18 interpret the completion of the NOP Test as moments away
19 from restart. I believe that FirstEnergy has publicly said
20 that they anticipate restart during the fourth quarter of
21 this year. The NOP test is an opportunity to discover
22 problems, and to demonstrate that the facility is in a
23 leak-tight condition.

24 As Lew Meyers indicated earlier, and Mark Bezilla
25 also said this, they anticipate finding some problems. It

1 is not unusual in this kind of situation to find minor
2 leaks on valve packings and bolted connections and things
3 of that nature, which takes some time to complete. And
4 they also went over a number of activities that need to be
5 completed prior to restart, including the three that Jim
6 Powers highlighted today; high pressure injection pumps,
7 the Electrical Distribution System and the Containment Air
8 Coolers.

9 So, there is some work that was not necessary to
10 complete prior to the Mode 4, Mode 3 pressure test that is
11 necessary to complete prior to Mode 2, and those activities
12 will be ongoing.

13 With respect to public dialogue on the NOP Test
14 results, I anticipate that will be a significant agenda
15 item on our next public meeting, which I think I said was
16 October 7th. So, that will pre, that will occur before the
17 inspection report is issued on our inspection of the test,
18 so I anticipate significant dialogue at that time.

19 MR. RIDZON: Thank you.

20 MS. RICK: Hi, I'm Shelly

21 Rick with Ohio Citizens Action; with me is Carrie Kree. We
22 are bringing 984 letters today that are written by people
23 across Northern Ohio to Jim Caldwell urging that the
24 Davis-Besse plant be kept closed.

25 These people are not convinced that the technical

1 fixes that are being made to the plant are sufficient to
2 warrant returning it to service. So we're asking not only
3 that you deliver the letters to Mr. Caldwell, but also that
4 you weigh very carefully the points that are made by the
5 residents of Northern Ohio.

6 MR. GROBE: I appreciate --
7 you could leave the box down there, we'll pick it up. You
8 don't need to bring it up here. I appreciate receiving
9 these letters.

10 We have a new item in the last few months in our, in
11 our monthly update, our newsletter, which is called, I
12 think it's called Mail Bag or Mail Call. It's called Mail
13 Call. And we've received over five thousand letters from
14 folks as far west I believe as Oklahoma and as far east as
15 New York State, many letters from people who reside in the
16 State of Ohio.

17 And, I believe all of those letters have been read.
18 I've read a significant number of them. Jim has read a
19 significant number of them also. And we're in the process
20 of responding to every one of those letters, and we'll also
21 read these letters and respond to them.

22 I wish these people would have the opportunity to
23 come to one of these meetings or spend more time reviewing
24 material that's publicly available on the website, as many
25 of the questions they address are already available

1 publicly, but we appreciate getting the letters. We'll
2 respond to every one of them. And thank you for bringing
3 them to our attention.

4 Is there anyone else that has a question?

5 Yes, sir?

6 MR. KHAR: My name is Ashar Khar,
7 with Foresight Investments.

8 MR. PASSEHL: Would you please spell
9 it?

10 MR. KHAR: I just want to ask,
11 there is no way for us on site to get any kind of report
12 during the test period, you know, the 7 days and all that,
13 just after that, which would indicate whether there was
14 some, something unusual that happened or not, or did not
15 happen. I mean, I know you guys will be monitoring it on a
16 daily basis. So, there is no way that you'll get any kind
17 of news relating to whether everything went, within the
18 normal sphere of stuff, or something abnormal happened,
19 earlier than, I guess, the October meeting or the report.

20 Can we expect in some part of your public relations
21 side, if there is something unusual it might come out with
22 something earlier than that?

23 MR. GROBE: There is, I think
24 I understood your question. There is a punch line from a
25 very old joke; no news is good news. But, if anything

1 significant arises during the course of this test, there
2 are reporting requirements that are in place that the NRC
3 has, that significant issues would need to be, very
4 significant issues would need to be promptly reported and
5 less significant issues would have a longer time frame on
6 reporting to us.

7 But, I believe that there will be information
8 available if there is a significant problem. So, I don't
9 think you need to worry about that. And I just want to
10 emphasize, that I anticipate that the results of that test
11 will be discussed in detail at our next public meeting.
12 And, this is not a short test. I believe it's going to be
13 ten or twelve or fourteen days if everything goes well,
14 before the test is completed. And that's well towards the
15 next meeting. So, I think that will be a good opportunity
16 to conduct the test, evaluate the results, and I think
17 FirstEnergy will be prepared to discuss it at that
18 meeting.

19 MR. KHAR: So, if I can just
20 paraphrase it --

21 MR. GROBE: Could you speak
22 up, sir?

23 MR. KHAR: Yeah. You said it
24 will take about ten to fourteen days, starting say, today's
25 is the 10th, the 24th of September, if everything works by

1 schedule, we would hope to have the test completed. So, if
2 we don't hear anything from the NRC, as you indicated,
3 during that time frame until we come in October, it
4 identifies nothing of any substance happened which
5 required, you know, you to report a major occurrence to
6 headquarters or anything like that.

7 MR. GROBE: I would certainly
8 encourage you to contact FirstEnergy. I believe if, that
9 they would be more than willing to discuss the progress
10 they're making at any time. So, contact FirstEnergy.

11 MR. KHAR: Okay. Thank you.

12 MR. BROOK: Hi, I'm Shawn
13 Brook with HSBC Securities. I just had two quick
14 questions, to actually amplify what my other two financial
15 industry colleagues asked. First was, is there some, were
16 the test to be somehow halted, the important three day
17 period, when there is specifically high temperature and
18 pressure, would there have to be some issue of public
19 safety that would cause the test to be somehow interrupted?

20 MR. GROBE: I missed the very
21 last words, the test would be somehow what, sir?

22 MR. BROOK: Well, the test,
23 there's something wrong going to happen, supposed to last
24 between nine and eleven days; there is apparently from the
25 discussions today, a three-day period where there is very

1 high pressure and very high temperature. If the test were
2 to be halted for any specific reason, would it have to be
3 for public safety or for one of these potential problems
4 that have been identified?

5 MR. GROBE: That's a very good
6 question. I appreciate the question. Let me make a little
7 bit of a clarifying statement and then answer your
8 question.

9 There is going to be a period of time that it takes
10 to raise the Reactor Coolant System temperature and
11 pressure up to the normal operating pressure, and normal no
12 load temperature. Then the, that pressure and temperature
13 will be held for 7-days. And then after the 7-days, the
14 plant will be cooled back down to Mode 5.

15 During that period of time, this is a, from a public
16 health and safety standpoint, this is a very low risk
17 evolution. And, it's for that reason that the Restart
18 Panel concluded that there were only four of our checklist
19 items that were necessary to close prior to this first Mode
20 4, and the rest of the checklist items are required to be
21 addressed prior to restart of the plant.

22 Those four checklist items were making sure the
23 Containment sump was properly, the modification to the
24 Containment sump was properly modified and properly
25 designed and installed; that the Containment Integrated

1 Leak Rate Test was effectively conducted; that the Reactor
2 Coolant System Leakage Monitoring Program, that the company
3 has made significant improvements and provisions, was in
4 place and adequate; and that the Boric Acid Corrosion
5 Management Program that's been upgraded during the shutdown
6 has been properly implemented and is adequate.

7 So, those four checklist items have been inspected
8 and closed up. And as far as the agency is concerned, the,
9 no further activities need to be accomplished by us prior
10 to restart.

11 Again, the reason for that, there is very little
12 risk. There is essentially no decay heat in the fuel, and
13 so once the reactor coolant pumps, there is no heat
14 source. So, if there is any significant problem with the
15 Reactor Coolant System, it's very easy to immediately
16 ameliorate that problem.

17 If there is a significant problem, obviously, the
18 test would be suspended, and I don't anticipate that.
19 Certainly, FirstEnergy is going to have a lot of people
20 paying close attention to that as is the NRC.

21 I anticipate that there will be a series of work
22 items that come out of this test, as the results are
23 evaluated, and those would be worked off. But I believe,
24 as far as work that's currently known, the critical path
25 work is the work that we heard Jim Powers discuss today,

1 and that's the high pressure injection pumps, the
2 Electrical Distribution System and the Containment Air
3 Coolers.

4 MR. BROOK: It's only the
5 responsibility of FirstEnergy to report --

6 MR. GROBE: Get a little
7 closer to the microphone.

8 MR. BROOK: I'm sorry. It's
9 only the responsibility of FirstEnergy to make those
10 reports to inform people that we have those problems, or?

11 MR. GROBE: Well, it's the
12 responsibility of FirstEnergy to document problems in their
13 Condition Reporting System as part of their Corrective
14 Action Program. The NRC has regulations for certain more
15 significant Condition Reports that they're required to be
16 reported to the NRC.

17 At a normally operating plant, there is likely to be
18 several thousand Condition Reports every year and just a
19 few would be required to be reported, just to give you some
20 context to the level of significance of the things that
21 need to be reported as drastically, the routine day-to-day
22 kind of issues that are dealt with.

23 Any work items that come out of this would be
24 handled through the Work Management System at FirstEnergy.
25 So, it's their responsibility to identify issues, document

1 them in the Corrective Action Program, fix them through
2 their Work Management Process.

3 And we'll have people inspecting this program. We
4 have the three Resident Inspectors, as well as an
5 Operations expert from the regional office and Senior
6 Metallurgist from the regional office who will be on the
7 site.

8 MR. BROOK: Thank you. One
9 last question, if I might. You mentioned something, or
10 someone on the panel mentioned there is going to be a
11 Restart Inspection Team assembled in anticipation of
12 FirstEnergy coming to you to request a restart. My point
13 is, has that team already been assembled and what do you
14 think the advance notice would be, like, are we talking a
15 week, two weeks or a month before the, the team actually
16 receives a request from FirstEnergy to restart the plant?
17 I'm trying to get an idea of the timeline.

18 MR. GROBE: There is a lot of
19 interest today in schedules and timeframes. The schedule
20 for the restart, what we call the Restart Assessment Team
21 Inspection, affectionately referred to as the RATI. That
22 schedule is not driven by anything FirstEnergy asks for.
23 That inspection will be conducted when we believe that
24 they're sufficiently far along in having a routine
25 operating organization that we can get a good assessment,

1 independent assessment.

2 The team has not been assembled, because depending
3 on when the inspection occurs, the team will have different
4 membership, because all these people are not sitting around
5 in Chicago waiting for something to do; they all have
6 different work activities. So, we'll put together a group
7 of appropriate experts at the time that it's time to
8 conduct that inspection.

9 There is no close relationship necessarily to the
10 Restart Assessment Team Inspection and the restart meeting
11 that Lew Myers referred to; or the restart decision, other
12 than the fact that the inspection needs to be completed
13 prior to the panel considering a restart recommendation.
14 It should not be inferred when that inspection starts,
15 we're one week away from restart or anything of that
16 nature. That's not the way it works.

17 MR. BROOK: Thank you.

18 MR. GROBE: Any additional
19 questions?

20 Okay, very good. Thank you very much. We'll
21 reconvene at 7:00.

22 (Off the record.)

23 - - -

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE

2 I, Marie B. Fresch, Registered Merit Reporter and
3 Notary Public in and for the State of Ohio, duly
4 commissioned and qualified therein, do hereby certify that
5 the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the
6 proceedings as taken by me and that I was present during
7 all of said proceedings.

8 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and
9 affixed my seal of office at Norwalk, Ohio, on this
10 21st day of September, 2003.

11

12

13

14

Marie B. Fresch, RMR

15

NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF OHIO
My Commission Expires 10-9-03.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25