KAS C-131

Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title:

٢٧.

U.S. NRC In re DAVID GEISEN GEISTN

Docket # 1A-05-052

Interview of Allen Hiser

Date Marked for ID: 12/10, 2008 (Tr. p. 1401)

Date Offered in Ev: 12 10 2008 (Tr. p. 1409)

Through Witness/Panel:_ Hiser

Docket Number:

(not provided)

Action: ADMITTED REJECTED WITHDRAWN

Date: 12 10, 2008 (Tr. p. 1409)

Location:

Rockville, Maryland

Date:

Thursday, August 22, 2002

DOCKETED USNRC

September 9, 2009 (8:30am)

OFFICE OF SECRETARY **RULEMAKINGS AND ADJUDICATIONS STAFF**

Work Order No.:

NRC-510

Pages 1-13

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC. Court Reporters and Transcribers 1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.

NRC002-2039

TEMPLATE = SECX-028

NRC002-2039 DS 02

1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	+ + + +
4	OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS
5	INTERVIEW
6	x
7	IN THE MATTER OF:
8	INTERVIEW OF :
ا و	ALLEN HISER :
10	:
11	x
12	Thursday, August 22, 2002
13	
14	Room T-5G2
15	11545 White Flint North
16	Rockville, Maryland
17	
18	The above-entitled interview was conducted
19	at 9:20 a.m.
20	BEFORE:
21	JOE BODENSTEINER,
22	Special Agent
23	
24	•
25	

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1

2.

SPECIAL AGENT BODENSTEINER: On the nozzles, excluding the five or six that may have had interferences, when you are told that they've done an inspection of the other nozzles, do you interpret that as a 360-degree inspection?

MR. HISER: I would have expected at that point in time that we would not have been as detailed as 360 degrees, but I think the intent of the discussion would have been that it would have provided a sufficient coverage to effectively clear the nozzle. They did not say 360 degrees, but at least it would have been sufficient familiarity with what was observed at each nozzle to say there was no leakage there.

As an example, I would have expected, at a minimum, that the observed area would have been what's called the "downhill side" of the nozzle, which is — if the nozzle is cut into a curved part of the head, that would be the part that has the lowest elevation, it's closer to the flange which, it has been observed at other plants, that's where the deposits tend to accumulate from routine analysis. So, at a minimum, that part of the nozzle would have been observed, but there were no — I don't recollect and don't have in my notes — any indication of direct

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1

<u>,</u>

3

<u>4</u> 5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

statements of the amount of coverage of each nozzle, but just that all of them would have been observable, except for the five or six.

SPECIAL AGENT BODENSTEINER: Okay. A reference that was made to the 100-percent inspection. Was that a reference to the 12th review and outage inspection?

MR. HISER: Yes, in the year 2000.

SPECIAL AGENT BODENSTEINER: Was the purpose of the conference call in support of FirstEnergy's request for continued operation beyond December 31, 2001?

MR. HISER: At this point, this is our first interaction with FENOC, and we were -- their initial Bulletin response indicated that they planned to do an inspection at their next outage, which was scheduled, I believe, at that point -- I believe their initial response said April 2002. At that point, we were trying to assess the appropriateness acceptability of that response, and so we were trying to get some background information and just really to initiate a dialogue with them -- we received your response, you answered some of these questions -- and, you know, we were just initiating the dialogue at this point.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1923 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433