

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Augmented Inspection Team Exit Meeting
 with Southern California Edison Company
 DVD 2/4

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: San Juan Capistrano, California

Date: Monday, June 18, 2012

Work Order No.: NRC-1798

Pages 1-46

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.
Court Reporters and Transcribers
1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 234-4433

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

AUGMENTED INSPECTION TEAM EXIT MEETING WITH SOUTHERN

CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

+ + + + +

MONDAY

JUNE 18, 2012

+ + + + +

SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO, CALIFORNIA

DVD 2/4

+ + + + +

The meeting convened in the Community Hall
at the San Juan Capistrano Community Center at 25925
Camino Del Avion, San Juan Capistrano, California, at
6:00 p.m., Richard Daniel, presiding.

NRC STAFF PRESENT:

RICHARD DANIEL, Facilitator

THOMAS BLOUNT

ELMO COLLINS

GEORGE CRAVER

EMMETT MURPHY

JOHN REYNOSO

JOEL RIVERA-ORTIZ

GREGORY WARNICK

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

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

PRESENT: (CONTINUED)

GREGORY WERNER

ALSO PRESENT:

PETER DIETRICH, Southern California Edison Co.

DOUGLAS BAUDER, Southern California Edison Co.

THOMAS PALMISANO, Southern California Edison Co.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(11:20 a.m.)

FACILITATOR DANIEL: (Joins during progress) ready for the question and comment period, what you all have come for. For those of you that may not have been here for the first two-thirds, my name is Rick Daniel. I will be the facilitator here.

And this is the way we are going to try to work this tonight, folks. The job, my job is to try to provide -- be fair and balanced. I'm going to be moving about. I am going to be approaching folks that have questions.

If you have a question, you raise your hand.

I will come to you. Not yet. I will come to you. If you can make your way to the aisle, you can make your comment, ask your question and the appropriate NRC person will address you.

We have our first question. Just a minute. Folks, we will limit questions and comments to two minutes. Okay.

I'll be right with you.

Keep in mind what I said earlier about our focus. It's about the steam tubes on the steam generators. I hope we can stick to that. If we can't, I'll help refocus us. Keep in mind, you always have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the option of filling out the NRC form out there on the
2 table. Okay.

3 So we have our first question. Just a
4 minute. Thank you. Folks, we're going to limit the
5 questions and comments to two minutes, okay? I'll be
6 right with you. Go ahead.

7 Why don't you give us your name, if you like,
8 and go ahead.

9 MR. STONE: I'm Gene Stone from Residents
10 Organized for a Safe Environment. On April 6, I had
11 a personal meeting with Chairman Jaczko, as many of our
12 local coalition did, and he promised us, as much as he
13 could, that this meeting would be open for people to
14 speak because at the last April meeting in San Juan
15 Capistrano, the lights were turned off at 8:30 and we
16 had to leave.

17 Now I understand, and I agree, that the
18 steam generator issue is very important, and we should
19 talk about this issue, and I agree with that for that
20 tonight.

21 I would officially ask Elmo for the next
22 meeting to be a category 3 meeting so that we can actually
23 discuss everything that the public wants to discuss with
24 no limited time on that meeting.

25 (Applause)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. STONE: If Elmo can tell me how to do
2 that legally, publicly, or whatever it takes to get that
3 done with the NRC, I'll leave you my email.

4 So my question is how is it that 39 design
5 changes did not trigger a complete review by the NRC
6 and complete public hearings as is required by law?
7 Has the law been broken by either California Edison,
8 Mitsubishi or the NRC? Thank you.

9 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Thank you, Gene. Greg?

10 MR. WERNER: Well, the 50.59 process is the
11 regulation and by regulation, they were -- they were
12 allowed to do what they did. Now, to say that it wasn't
13 reviewed, portions were reviewed by the NRC. Actually,
14 there were two changes that did require License
15 Amendments that were reviewed by the NRC.

16 The NRC did do reviews of part of the design
17 before the change integers were installed were, as well
18 as the Augmented Inspection Team also looked at the
19 design.

20 As I said earlier, we are continuing our
21 review, and we did identify those two issues for -- I
22 mean the one issue, with the 50.59, associated with the
23 two changes to the code of record that was used, as
24 follow-up plans we have to look at.

25 FACILITATOR DANIELS: Elmo.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. COLLINS: I'd like to add to that, to
2 that response to your question. It's an outstanding
3 question. It's one we have got ourselves. Because of
4 what was in the plant while the plant was operating,
5 we had to be absolutely clear, you know, what happened
6 here, and how did these steam generators get in the plant,
7 what were the NRC's review processes, what are our
8 regulations, to make sure that this went the way that
9 we wanted.

10 And we are still looking at that. We
11 haven't reached our final conclusion. But we had that
12 question, as well. And so we indicated in the
13 presentation -- and this is part of the augmented team
14 inspection procedure -- that we would look for these
15 conditions, look at ourselves, ask ourselves what else
16 do we need to do. And so that's a question we are trying
17 to answer, as well. I think your question is right on
18 the money.

19 With respect to the category 3 meetings,
20 I have got to tell you, we have been knocking our brains
21 out, you know, how to do these meetings as best we could.

22 And on this one, we really, we would have
23 preferred to have gone that route. We just didn't quite,
24 couldn't quite get to it with the information we wanted
25 to present to you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 But that is actually a question for our next
2 meetings or the series of meetings, which one of those
3 would be appropriate. And we want to have those meetings
4 so we can have a better, I think, exchange of information,
5 a better dialogue with you here in California. So,
6 thanks for raising that.

7 MR. STONE: Respectfully, we demand that
8 type of meeting.

9 MR. COLLINS: All right, thank you.

10 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Thank you, gentlemen.
11 I'm going to come to this lady over here. Excuse me.
12 Give us your name.

13 MS. BECKER: Rochelle Becker, Executive
14 Director of the Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility.
15 I have two questions, and I thought I saw Mr. Craver
16 here earlier. Is he here?

17
18 MR. CRAVER: Yes, I am.

19 MS. BECKER: Okay. Hello, Mr. Craver.
20 I have a question for you. Could you just stand up,
21 because I think the whole audience would like to hear
22 the answer.

23 My question is, is there a number, is there
24 an amount of money -- we know that there is no amount
25 of safety before you reopen -- but is there an amount

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of money before you reopen? How much money do you expect
2 your ratepayers to pay before this plant re-operates?

3 Is there a break-off point in which Edison decides this
4 is just too much?

5 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Coming right to you.
6 I'll get back to you.

7 MR. CRAVER: At this point all of our focus
8 has been on trying to understand the technical aspects
9 and what exactly is taking place here, what the mechanism
10 of wear is, what the causes of wear are and how we are
11 going to actually address those.

12 As we get through the final evaluation of
13 what the final fixes are, what those will look like,
14 are those the same fixes for the near term as they are
15 for the long term, then I think we will have a better
16 idea of what those cost components are.

17 But I think it is actually really important
18 for us not to get the financial piece into this at this
19 point, for us to just focus primarily on the safety issues
20 and primarily on what we are going to be able to do to
21 fix it.

22 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Thank you. Hang on,
23 folks. Hang on. We are going to try to keep the
24 questions oriented towards the steam tubes. Is this
25 a question on the steam tubes?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. BECKER: Okay. This is to the NRC.
2 We have just been told that you spent 1300 man-hours
3 or 1500 man-hours, or whatever, for this review.
4 However, you didn't spend this amount of time before
5 you approved it and the State of California invested
6 in these steam generators.

7 Is the federal government going to help in
8 any way with the ratepayer cost of this, or are we
9 supposed to pay for your mistakes, as well as Edison's
10 mistakes? Thank you.

11 (Applause)

12 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Okay.

13 MR. BLOUNT: The agency had -- and you are
14 asking for us -- how are we going to handle our regulatory
15 responsibilities. We have an obligation to review the
16 safety of these facilities and how they are operated.
17 We will do that as we are mandated to do.

18 When situations arise, that's why we have
19 reactive inspections, and so we address those as they
20 come up. I guess I'm not sure how I would address that
21 much beyond that. Please.

22 MR. COLLINS: Thanks, Rochelle. Good to
23 see you hear tonight. It's been a while. I think we
24 have already indicated we need to go back and look.
25 You know, wid we follow the -- did NRC follow our

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 processes, which are implementing our regulations, and
2 was the right implementation of inspection programs that
3 were put in place to look at this very thing.

4 And our accountability, I think, goes to
5 the oversight committees we answer to in Congress
6 ultimately -- and we have some representatives here -
7 that hold us to that, to make sure we follow our
8 processes.

9 I mean, that's all I can do is follow my
10 process from the regional office. And we are doing our
11 best to make that happen. So, if we're not, we want
12 to be the first to fix it.

13 But also, we are going to take a look at
14 these processes and see if they need to be improved
15 because of what's going on here.

16 This is a very difficult, technical issue,
17 and to be quite honest with you, it has not been seen
18 before. That doesn't give anyone any comfort. But we
19 need to be smarter, up-front about these types of changes
20 in nuclear power plants. I'll acknowledge that.

21 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Thank you, Elmo.
22 This gentleman, you have a question. Can you stand up,
23 please.

24 MR. CUMMINGS: My name is Jim Cummings
25 (phonetic), retired Southern California Edison

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 employee, Unit 1. I have a question in regards to why
2 the design was changed on the steam generators from the
3 initial construction to where we fabricated something
4 out of the -- maybe different from what the final
5 engineering report would have had you do. That seems
6 like there's been a major deviation right there as far
7 as the steam generator design.

8 MR. WERNER: Yes, I'll take that question.

9 Of course the steam generators were different than what
10 was originally put in because the original steam
11 generators had to be replaced. So they had issues with
12 the original generators across the industry, and from
13 a lessons learned standpoint, with the numerous changes
14 that have been incorporated in the new generators.

15 FACILITATOR DANIEL: We'll get to you.
16 Steam tube generators.

17 MR. HOLTZMAN: Staying on focus -- Joe
18 Holtzman, Mission Viejo -- my question is one question.

19 I would like to direct it to the NRC, Greg, perhaps
20 you can take it and maybe Mr. Dietrich could take it.

21 Was there a failure mode effect analysis
22 done on these designs before construction was started?

23 (Pause)

24 MR. HOLTZMAN: The silence is deafening.

25 MR. WARNICK: Like Greg said, as part of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the inspection process, we have a procedure that we
2 implement for replacement of steam generators. We
3 reviewed in part the 50.59s associated with the
4 replacement steam generators.

5 We did not review it to the level of detail
6 to determine if the failure mode analysis was done.
7 Beyond that, Edison, if they choose to reply, they can
8 shed some light on that.

9 MR. DIETRICH: Thank you. The steam
10 generators were replaced using an engineering design
11 change package which does look at potential modes of
12 failure of the steam generators and it looks for
13 understood or anticipated modes of failure.

14 Included in our technical specification
15 changes were two License Amendments to change the
16 plugging limits on the new steam generators compared
17 to the old steam generators, to move to a lower percentage
18 of through-wall wear to plug the steam generator tube.

19 So we did look at and analyze the potential
20 for wear affecting our steam generators. That was
21 documented in our engineering change package. A failure
22 modes and effects analysis is traditionally done in our
23 business associated with looking at a new occurring
24 problem.

25 So specifically to answer your question,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 there was not an FMEA, a failure modes effect analysis
2 done per se. We are working through that as part of
3 our solution set and problem-solving situation.

4 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Thank you. I'll get
5 back to you. Okay?

6 PARTICIPANT: (Name inaudible). Why is it
7 that Mitsubishi is not present at this meeting and the
8 same for AREVA and Westinghouse?

9 MR. BLOUNT: In this particular case for
10 this meeting, this meeting, the Augmented Inspection
11 Team results, it was as the NRC providing our response
12 to the licensee on what we have found.

13 Mitsubishi, AREVA, others, are vendors to
14 that licensee. They are not the ones that we look to
15 for responsibility associated with that facility. So
16 if they were here, they would be here in an advisory
17 capacity to the licensee.

18 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Thank you, Tom.
19 Steam tubes.

20 MS. RUSCH: My name is Emily. I am a
21 concerned citizen and the director of the California
22 Public Interest Research Group, a statewide consumer
23 advocacy group, and like Rochelle, I am concerned first
24 and foremost about safety, but I am also concerned about
25 cost to ratepayers who are already paying for the steam

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 generators that are now not operating.

2 And I'm wondering if Southern California
3 Edison can commit to not asking ratepayers to pay for
4 those steam generators again, should they need to be
5 replaced.

6 MR. COLLINS: I'll start. I appreciate
7 your question. We all know this is, on the face of it
8 a costly -- the plant has been shut down, not generating,
9 for a number of months.

10 Just from the NRC's perspective, we are
11 primarily interested in safety. And so I know I can't
12 put myself in your shoes as a California ratepayer, so
13 I really don't understand how you're feeling, but I would
14 ask you to look at us and say we are going to take a
15 look at safety first and see where it goes.

16 And now I'm going to see if you want to -- if
17 Pete might add to that answer for you, since they do
18 think about cost.

19 MR. DIETRICH: Yes, thank you. You know
20 tonight we came out to talk about specifically the
21 augmentation team results and to talk specifically about
22 what our learnings are up to this point.

23 I will share with you the concerns of our
24 stakeholders, the concerns of our customers are very
25 important to us and we are mindful of that as we go

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 forward.

2 All of our discussions regarding costs or
3 cost issues are ahead of us types of discussions. We
4 will have opportunities to continue to discuss that and
5 it will play out very openly in front of the California
6 Public Utility Commission.

7 So, we are committed to providing that
8 visibility to the situation going forward. But I think
9 tonight it's important to talk about the technical
10 situation and how we move forward over the next few
11 months. Thank you.

12 FACILITATOR DANIEL: I'm just going to move
13 over here. I'm coming, folks.

14 MR. COLLINS: I hope some of you have
15 questions. I've got a technical team sitting here in
16 the front row. They're just dying to answer your
17 questions.

18 MR. LUTZ: Okay, Okay. Ray Lutz with
19 Citizens Oversight. Now you mentioned that the
20 unexpected tube-to-tube wear was due to excessive steam
21 velocity. The question is -- and you said your
22 simulation simulated it to be three to four times higher
23 than the other simulation.

24 And my first question is, did you actually
25 measure the velocity of the steam to find out if either

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 of those simulations is any good? Did you measure the
2 velocity in the actual steam generator? Number 1.

3 And number 2, why is the steam at a higher
4 velocity? That is not the root cause. You need to jump
5 back and say why is it going faster? Is it because
6 Southern California Edison modified these steam
7 generators by adding 370 additional tubes and
8 subtracting the certain supports and so fourth? Is that
9 the reason?

10 Is it -- what is the reason? Because you
11 guys came in here saying you came to the cause of this
12 and you gave us no cause. This is not the cause.

13 So I want to know the answer. What is the
14 cause of the excessive steam velocity? If you tell me
15 it is because of something that happened somewhere else,
16 then you have to ask why did that happen?

17 And you're stopping just after one thing
18 -- oh, excessive tube-to-tube wear, that's why the leak
19 started. Why did that happen, excessive steam velocity,
20 why did that happen?

21 So, please go down that trail. And I want
22 to know, did you measure the steam velocity?

23 MR. WERNER: Actually, that question is
24 outstanding. We have to understand and SONGS owes us
25 that answer as far as what specifically in the design

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 change in the steam generator causing the higher than
2 expected velocity, and as they talked about steam void
3 fractions.

4 So they still owe us that. That's been
5 something that we've discussed since we have been on
6 site. I'm sorry. What was the other question?

7 Oh, they do not measure steam flows within
8 the steam generators. There is not that capability.
9 The modeling is done based upon experimental data, as
10 well as empirical data.

11 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Okay. Another
12 question about steam tubes. Yes, ma'am.

13 MS. STONE: Karen Stone from Laguna Hills.

14 I wanted to know just how much radiation was released
15 from 3 having its problem. You are saying it's minimal,
16 but how much was it? We need to know.

17 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Thank you, Karen.

18 MR. WARNICK: Thank you for the question.
19 As I told you before, I was on site. I responded to
20 the event. Full time, when I'm on the site, I wear a
21 radiation badge that measures my radiation. So I'm
22 monitored.

23 We independently verified and quantified
24 how much release there was. The amount was 5.2 E to
25 the minus 5 millirem.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Now, what that means, essentially is it was
2 more than 10,000 times below what you would receive from,
3 say, an x-ray of the arm or what each of us receives
4 daily from naturally occurring background radiation,
5 which is about one millirem. So, it was 10,000 times
6 below that amount.

7 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Okay. Thank you.

8 MR. WARNICK: Essentially, on my radiation
9 badge that I wear every day, that measures my radiation,
10 it was negligible. It wasn't picked up at all.

11 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Thank you. Okay.
12 Question to Gary Headrick.

13 MR. HEADRICK: My name is Gary Headrick,
14 representing San Clemente Green, about 1500 citizens.

15 And I'd like to share a more general observation that
16 will cover the steam generator issue indirectly. But
17 if you would please indulge me while I read.

18 This is an intervention. The people that
19 you are sworn to protect, the ones that you ultimately
20 serve, are speaking up in a strong and forceful way
21 because you are blindly following a path that has become
22 a habitual routine.

23 Unfortunately, it eventually will lead to
24 the destruction of everyone and everything for miles
25 around if allowed to continue indefinitely. We can't

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 simply let this situation continue any longer. We have
2 been extremely lucky so far.

3 The reckless behavior of Edison that has
4 been exhibiting over the years has got to stop. Edison's
5 insatiable appetite for gambling continues to escalate,
6 when losing, it is virtually impossible thanks to the
7 Price-Anderson Act, and winning is practically
8 guaranteed simply by staying in the game.

9 This situation would be an irresistible
10 temptation for even the most timid gambler. Having
11 never lost, the obsession becomes even stronger. Yet
12 the longer one goes on a winning streak, the more likely
13 it is that luck will run out.

14 The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is
15 equally responsible for this situation reaching such
16 an intolerable condition. Your good intentions aiming
17 to make sure that the power we need is delivered in a
18 safe manner has an inherent conflict of interest that
19 can't be avoided.

20 You either have to put safety first or
21 follow your loyalty to the industry from which you came.

22 You have become the enabler in this relationship, a
23 codependent partner torn between what is best for those
24 you work closely with and the public at large.

25 It is with concern for the good of all that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 we must step in as interveners, reminding you that you
2 must act responsibly and remember your original
3 obligations to the people and the environment.

4 FACILITATOR DANIEL: All right, Gary.
5 Hang on a second. Is this going to result in a question
6 about the steam tubes? Another minute.

7 MR. HEADRICK: It's for a lot of people.
8 The plain truth is that we don't need to gamble our
9 families and our possessions in order to get the power
10 we need for the comfortable lifestyles we are accustomed
11 to. The last four months have been living proof of that
12 fact.

13 The cost of continuing to support this aging
14 nuclear power plant is not necessary. All of the
15 consternation over evacuation routes and sheltering in
16 place to escape radiation has vanished with this recent
17 revelation.

18 The only responsible action to take is for
19 Edison to transition to truly sustainable and safe
20 alternatives before the competition gets too far ahead,
21 and for the NRC to recognize that it is time to retire
22 this old racehorse and deal with the extremely toxic
23 waste that has been piling up in the stall for more than
24 30 years now.

25 FACILITATOR DANIEL: All right, Gary. Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Thank you. Thank you.

2 (Applause)

3 FACILITATOR DANIEL: We'll get back to you,
4 Gary. We'll get back to you.

5 MR. WERNER: Yes, I'd like to respond to
6 that. I think it's important to understand that at the
7 NRC safety is first. We do not have a schedule for
8 restart. No decision has been made.

9 And again, the units are not running because
10 currently it is not safe to restart, until they go ahead
11 and do actions to prevent tube degradation due to
12 vibration.

13 The NRC does not rely on luck, nor does the
14 nuclear industry. The steam generators of the reactor
15 itself, the design, actually incorporated looking at
16 a steam generator tube rupture. So that was part of
17 the design that the plant could respond to.

18 As Greg Warnick indicated earlier, they
19 have detection equipment that rapidly detects small
20 leaks. Operators are trained. They go to training,
21 extensive training. They are able to respond to the
22 leak, isolate it, minimizes the leak, as well as multiple
23 ***11:45:21 (inaudible) in place.

24 So again, the plant design, the training
25 and the construction of the plant are specifically

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 designed to combat accidents, including steam generator
2 tube rupture. So there is no luck involved with that.

3 MR. HEADRICK: Can I finish one paragraph?

4 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Gary, Gary, I'll tell
5 you what, as time permits, we will get back to you for
6 the last paragraph. Okay. We're not going to forget
7 you. Okay? I promise. We're going to get back to you.

8 Sir.

9 MR. WEISS: My name is Rick Weiss and I have
10 two questions I think are germane to this issue. They
11 concern the tubes. And I wanted to know a little bit
12 more about the details of the tubes. I understand that
13 they're three-quarter of an inch diameter. I want to
14 know what they are made of, how thick the walls are and
15 how they have been tested to withstand -- we have been
16 talking about vibrations -- how they have been tested
17 to withstand the earthquakes that we have around here.

18 That's a concern for me.

19 And the other question is, in the event that
20 they need to be replaced or something, what happens to
21 them? I mean, where did they go, what plans do you have
22 to dispose of them or store them. Or actually, what
23 are your plans to -- that was a good question about the
24 nuclear waste piling up, for the past 30 years it has
25 been piling up and we have been looking for solutions,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 waiting for solutions. And are there any new solutions
2 that you have for that?

3 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Thank you, Rick.

4 MR. WERNER: I'm going to let Emmett answer
5 the question about the steam generator tubes, right there
6 in front. He's part of the Augmented Inspection Team,
7 30 plus years' experience looking at team generators.
8 Go ahead, Emmett.

9 MR. MURPHY: Okay, I believe one of the
10 questions was what are the tubes made of. They are made
11 out of INCONEL 690, a thermally treated
12 nickel-chromium-iron alloy, very corrosion, stress
13 corrosion, crack resistant, compared to the INCONEL 600
14 tubing used in the original steam generators. I'm sure
15 I'm missing part of your question.

16 FACILITATOR DANIEL: The seismic -- the
17 seismic --

18 MR. MURPHY: The diameter -- the diameter
19 of these tubes is three-quarters inch. The
20 thickness -- the wall thickness is 0.043 inches, 43 mils.
21 The steam generators were designed for seismic
22 conditions to stay within stress limits required by the
23 code, the ASME, or American Society of Mechanical
24 Engineering, section 3, code stress limits.

25 (Off-mic question)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. MURPHY: The tubes? Each of the tubes
2 is welded at the tube ends to the tube sheet and in
3 addition, they are hydraulically expanded for the full
4 thickness of the tube sheet.

5 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Okay. Thank you.

6 MR. WARNICK: I can't answer how far apart
7 each tube is. Maybe you can get that information from
8 Emmett and we can add that additionally.

9 MR. MURPHY: The tube pitch is one-quarter
10 inch. In other words, the closest nominal dimension
11 between the tubes is 0.25 inches.

12 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Thanks, Emmett.

13 MR. WARNICK: Your second question is what
14 do they do with these steam generators when you replace
15 them. That was actually part of our inspection, when
16 they replaced the old steam generators with the new steam
17 generators.

18 The old steam generators are essentially
19 decontaminated best they can. The cleaned portion is
20 cut up and you know Edison, whatever they choose -- I
21 think they sold most of the metal that they had for scrap,
22 that was clean.

23 There is a portion that is radioactive on
24 the primary side in the tubes, and that's shipped to
25 low level waste facilities that are located throughout

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the country.

2 As far as the bigger waste question, as
3 you're probably aware, that's something that is being
4 debated in Congress now. There was a Blue Ribbon
5 Commission that gave a report recently and that's
6 something that's being determined at the energy policy
7 level.

8 MR. MURPHY: Just one brief -- a correction
9 to what I said -- that the minimum gap between the tubes
10 is one-quarter inch. The pitch is one inch, plus
11 diameter equals pitch.

12 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Thank you, Emmett.

13 (Off-mic question)

14 FACILITATOR DANIEL: That was answered by
15 Emmett. All right. Ma'am, do you have a question?

16 PARTICIPANT: Specifically what are the low
17 level -- where is the low level waste being -- places
18 around the country?

19 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Well, you know, that's
20 outside the scope of this meeting. That's something
21 for another meeting. But you can put it on the feedback
22 form and submit it and somebody will try to answer it
23 for you. We are going to focus on the steam generators
24 and the tubes, have questions about the tubes. Utah.

25 MR. WARNICK: Utah.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 PARTICIPANT: Yes. I know that the nuclear
2 regulatory agency has a lot of channel at its disposal.
3 I assume also that there is independence. I would like
4 to know, as there is among really trained professionals,
5 if there is a minority report.

6 I know that that's considered to be a little
7 difficult. The NRC has been under criticism because
8 of the fact that there has been dissent and it's led
9 to people saying well, you're not playing the game right.

10 And we've had a recent hearing before Congress about
11 all of this.

12 We want independent professional opinion,
13 if there is a majority view and if there is a minority
14 view, about the safety of this, because safety is
15 supposedly your number 1 concern and for that safety,
16 you are responsible to us.

17 FACILITATOR DANIEL: All right. Thank
18 you. Your question is, is there a minority report
19 related to the steam tubes?

20 PARTICIPANT: Other than just the line that
21 has been given to us here, as universal opinions.

22 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Okay. Do you
23 understand that question?

24 MR. COLLINS: Yes. First of all, I want
25 to say I couldn't agree with you more in your comment

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 and even to put a finer point on that, when you do have
2 opposing views or differing views, that drives us to
3 even a better conclusion when they're considered
4 evaluated, understood.

5 My definition of objectivity is I
6 understand the opposing view. I might not agree with
7 it, but I need to understand it when I make a decision.

8 That's when I can look at myself and say I'm close to
9 making an objective decision.

10 I've been watching this team work for a
11 number of months now, and I mean, if there is a minority
12 report or non-concurrence, it will be documented in
13 writing and it will available in publicly.

14 But I have got to tell you right now, I am
15 not hearing any. So far the team is fairly well
16 consistent and it converged on what you've heard here
17 tonight. So I think what -- this is really a team view.

18 So --

19 MR. BLOUNT: If I can just add to that
20 discussion slightly. One of the things that we were
21 concerned with is that we would develop a mindset that
22 said we're headed down this path and that was the answer
23 and we'd put blinders on to this particular issue.

24 So we took the opportunity to bring two
25 separate individuals that are outside the agency as

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 experts to look at what it was that it was that this
2 team was putting together, and we handled them as
3 separate and distinct, much like a challenge board, to
4 look at what the team did and what their findings were
5 and how they went about doing their business to make
6 sure that we got the best insight that we could.

7 With that, then, we were -- we did make the
8 determination that the team did do the inspection that
9 we expected of them and we did reach the appropriate
10 identification of issues.

11 FACILITATOR DANIEL: So in answer to this
12 gentleman's question, Tom?

13 MR. BLOUNT: At the end of the day, we will,
14 once the report is crafted, once we have finalized the
15 report, it will be a publicly available document and
16 it will be available on the NRC website.

17 MR. COLLINS: Just to be clear. That's two
18 reports. There's this team's report and then there's
19 this report that was prepared by the other engineers
20 that we brought in to challenge us on our conclusions.

21 So --

22 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Okay. Steam tubes.
23 Steam tubes.

24 MS. STEMKE: My name is Janesa Stemke and
25 I live in Riverside. The last I heard before tonight

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 about the radiation leaks, I heard, "We don't have
2 statistics on that. We need time. We want to take
3 accurate measurements and these things take time."

4 That was the last I heard and that was back
5 in February or something. We need timely and accurate
6 radiation reports, released and made available to the
7 public immediately. And if that cannot be provided,
8 then you did not have the right to operate a nuclear
9 power plant in this vicinity or any vicinity because
10 the public needs to know this information.

11 And is there a radiation monitoring system
12 made available to the public for this purpose and if
13 not, it makes me wonder if the Nuclear Regulatory
14 Commission is actually paid on commission to keep nuclear
15 power plants operating. Thank you.

16 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Thank you.

17 MR. WERNER: Actually, the NRC does get
18 information, an annual effluent report is published.
19 But it is important to note that the utility did measure
20 the amount of radiation, as Greg Warnick said. They
21 have detectors on the secondary side, the steam side,
22 so they picked up the amount of radioactivity and they
23 analyzed that and came up with the release phase. A
24 couple of weeks after we actually had a radiation
25 detection team from the Region 4 office out here. They

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 actually looked at it and looked at the values and
2 confirmed the numbers.

3 MR. COLLINS: Yes, this is Elmo. I'd like
4 to add to that response. Actually I really appreciate
5 the question. Actually, I heard three questions in
6 there.

7 One was what about the specific event on
8 January 31st. I think we've talked about. There are
9 actual measurements and a computation was made.

10 Then I heard about the NRC's annual report
11 that by regulation Edison has to publish. The question
12 with that is that doesn't seem very timely. What good
13 is that? Every year, how is that being done?

14 I do think we're in the process of taking
15 a look at that to see as an agency if there is anything
16 we can do to speed that up. I don't want to speak and
17 say more than I know. But I believe we haven't had that
18 question before, and I appreciate it.

19 The last point is on maybe some radiation
20 detectors off-site. I tell you one of the -- and I have
21 been with the NRC almost 25 years -- one of the hardest
22 things we have to do is -- one of the hardest things
23 I have to do was stand in front of you and tell you that
24 there is little to no radiation being released from San
25 Onofre, because how are you going to believe me? You

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 can't feel it. You can't taste it. You can't touch
2 it. Right? There is no way you can intuitively tell
3 whether or not you can believe what I'm saying. I
4 understand that.

5 And so one answer to that might be -- and
6 I don't know how we would get there -- but to have
7 detectors off-site so that they can be available for
8 you.

9 (Applause)

10 MR. COLLINS: I understand why you want
11 that. The regulations don't require it, but there may
12 be something, you know, a solution there.

13 FACILITATOR DANIEL: All right. Thank
14 you, Elmo.

15 MR. MARLOWE: Rick Marlowe (phonetic), out
16 of Ramona, California. A couple of things. Realtime
17 reporting over the internet, the emissions would be
18 greatly appreciated by, I'm sure, by most of the people
19 in this room.

20 My concerns about the tubes are Mitsubishi
21 has been making these stem generators for quite a long
22 time. They have been putting all kinds of plants across
23 the United States and there may be some design changes,
24 but the basic geometry and flow in and flow out are
25 probably pretty consistent amongst all these generators.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 I can't imagine that their simulations are
2 three to four times off, and if so, how can that be?
3 And if they are that far off, how come we haven't had
4 these problems in other places and why is it showing
5 up now?

6 FACILITATOR DANIEL: All right. Thank
7 you, Rick. Greg?

8 MR. WERNER: Yes. And actually, Mitsubishi
9 has only had two generators that are currently designed
10 and operating in the United States. One is -- well,
11 both the units that are at SONGS and at Fort Calhoun
12 located outside Omaha, Nebraska.

13 Those steam generators are similar
14 designed, but they are much, much smaller. And actually
15 we had the same concern with the wider thermal hydraulic
16 model, underpredicted the flows. And again, that's
17 another area that we were asking what caused -- what
18 was it in their model that caused those thermal hydraulic
19 conditions to be underpredicted.

20 So we have already asked for that also.

21 FACILITATOR DANIEL: No. I told you, we'll
22 try to get back to you. No. No. We will try to get
23 back to you Gary. Just a minute.

24 PARTICIPANT: So you guys want timely
25 information. Go to the internet. We have our own

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 sources. If you would like them, you can come and see
2 me later.

3 Show of hands, how many people here are here
4 because they do not want any nuclear power?

5 We're here on a post mortem. So why are
6 these things not reviewed upon delivery? I was
7 listening to the earlier part of it and there were
8 accelerometers that had been put off and showed that
9 there could be damage to these things.

10 Now, if I was a clerk at Ralph's and I
11 accepted a shipment like that, I would -- it would come
12 out of my paycheck. So why is it not going to come out
13 of your paycheck?

14 How many of these -- oh, you actually
15 answered this question. The models were off by three
16 to four times. The confidence interval there is
17 straight off the normal curve.

18 So, here is one about how long has an
19 investigation of this sort had to have -- how many -- how
20 long has it taken for an investigation of this sort to
21 have come to a conclusion in the past?

22 FACILITATOR DANIEL: All right, Zeke.
23 Thank you. Greg?

24 MR. WERNER: Well, to answer the question
25 about accelerometers, they were actually evaluated by

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 SONGS. We just had a concern as we looked at them to
2 make sure they were properly evaluated.

3 So, they just weren't blown off. They were
4 actually reviewed. We wanted to make sure that we
5 understood, to make sure they were actually evaluated
6 in accordance with their procedures.

7 So, the other thing, again, about the model,
8 again, we feel the same way as far as being
9 underpredicted. I mean, we don't understand it and
10 that's the kind of situation we're in right now.

11 FACILITATOR DANIEL: All right. Who had
12 some question about steam tubes. Stand up please and
13 come on out here.

14 MR. HARRIS: Harris, (phonetic) building
15 contractor, North San Diego County. I have got a
16 question for Greg. These steam tubes, did I hear you
17 right? Because the statistic were flying so fast. 128
18 tubes were tested, pressure tested?

19 MR. WERNER: 129.

20 MR. HARRIS: 129. Eight of them failed?

21 MR. WERNER: Yes.

22 MR. HARRIS: Were they randomly tested
23 throughout the entire amount of tubes?

24 MR. WERNER: No. Actually, if you go back,
25 all approximately 40,000 tubes had inspections completed

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 on them, and then numerous tubes were reinspected beyond
2 what was required.

3 The tubes that were selected for in situ
4 pressure testing were actually based upon the ones that
5 had the extensive tube wear.

6 MR. HARRIS: So there was no random test
7 of the entire 19,450 tubes in Unit 3?

8 MR. WERNER: That is correct, as far as the
9 in situ pressure testing.

10 MR. HARRIS: With a failure rate of 0.06
11 percent, you might have 1,167 bad tubes.

12 MR. WERNER: I'll let Emmett help me out
13 on this also. But the way the tubes are selected, again,
14 we're looking once the 80 current testings have
15 identified those tubes that would be susceptible to
16 failure, they go in and test them, because they don't
17 have information to analytically say they're okay.

18 So the idea is to go in and physically test
19 them to make sure they will or will not hold. And of
20 course, those eight tubes did not hold, and we suspected
21 that a number of tubes would fail. That was not beyond
22 what we did not expect to happen.

23 So, we expected a number of tubes.
24 Actually, I was surprised more didn't fail.

25 PARTICIPANT: But they only tested 148?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Hang on.

2 MR. COLLINS: We need some explanation here.

3 There is a misunderstanding of what we know about the
4 tubes. So, Emmett.

5 MR. MURPHY: Okay. Every time a plant
6 conducts a steam generator inspection, one of the
7 purposes is such to find tubes that are -- that are
8 damaged beyond accepted limits and those tubes are
9 removed from service.

10 The second question a steam generator
11 inspection is intended to address, is whether or not
12 the plant or the utility was successful in maintaining
13 adequate safety margins in all of the tubes during the
14 last cycle of operation since the last inspection.

15 Normally, that assessment is performed
16 through analysis of the inspection or any current test
17 data of each of the tubes. They measure the depth and
18 length of the cracks.

19 They take into account measurement error.

20 They utilize standard equations for predicting girth
21 strength of the tubing as a function of the length and
22 depth of the flaw.

23 And then they, based on all that
24 information, they determine whether or not they have
25 maintained factors of safety against failure consistent

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 with the requirement.

2 These analyses tend to be very conservative
3 because a lot of the input parameters have a lot of
4 uncertainty, and so sometimes you predict through these
5 analyses that tubes don't have sufficient strength.
6 But it is a very conservative analysis.

7 So, in situ pressure tests, then, are a way
8 to then more realistically establish the amount of safety
9 margin or confirm that you have the appropriate safety
10 margin.

11 So based on your earlier analyses done by
12 Southern California, the eddy current inspection data,
13 they identified a significant number of tubes where their
14 analyses indicated they didn't have the appropriate
15 margin.

16 But these were conservative analyses.
17 That's why we did the pressure tests to determine for
18 sure whether or not they had the appropriate margins.

19 The rest of the tubes that were not tested, it was very
20 clear, upon the eddy current inspection data, that they
21 had the appropriate safety margins.

22 So, it's just the ones -- they just test
23 the ones where there was some question as to whether
24 or not they had appropriate the safety margin. Thank
25 you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. WERNER: I'd like to add to that also,
2 even before the steam generators were brought here to
3 site, that each steam generator, at least one time, if
4 not multiple times, was pressurized, the entire steam
5 generator, to 125 percent of design pressure.

6 So every steam generator tube was
7 pressurized to 125 percent of design pressure.

8 (Off-mic question)

9 MR. WERNER: No, the -- again, you go in
10 from the primary side, so we'll go approximately 2000
11 pounds, so add another, you know, 2500 pounds, and add
12 another 500 pounds. So they're all pressurized to 2500
13 pounds, the entire steam generators. It just wasn't
14 the tubes. It was entire structure.

15 MR. COLLINS: I want to make sure we -- this
16 is a very important point that's made by the gentleman,
17 understand, what's been done at the steam generators
18 and what the condition of the tubes are today. I need
19 the team to tell me. I wasn't on the team, so I could
20 have a misunderstanding.

21 One hundred percent of the tubes, almost
22 20,000 of them, had the tube thickness measured, I think,
23 for the full length, right? So we know the thickness
24 and have data on every tube, almost 20,000 on the steam
25 generator, and it was only those that I think Emmett,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 as Emmett described, that had the most wear that received
2 the in situ pressure testing. So, we know what's out
3 there with these tubes.

4 MR. WERNER: It's also important to
5 understand that the tubes will wear during the normal
6 operation. So, as part of the inspection program, they
7 go and look at them to make sure even if they don't have
8 a leak, they inspect so many tubes as required by tech
9 specs. Again, the first outage they inspect 100 percent
10 of all the tubes.

11 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Okay. Steam tubes.

12 MR. TEASLEY: Hi, I'm Russ Teasley, local
13 resident, with the Earth/Ocean Society. My question
14 is did the NRC or any of the investigators involved do
15 specific analysis of the presence or absence of the stay
16 cylinder, the primary stabilization element of the steam
17 generator?

18 MR. WERNER: I'm going to let Joel answer
19 that question. Joel Rivera-Ortiz was on the team. He
20 actually looked at the design changes associated with
21 the --

22 MR. RIVERA: This is Joe Rivera, NRC,
23 Region 2. As part of the AIT, we looked at many of the
24 design changes that were made from the regional to the
25 new steam generators, and we looked at how the stay

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 cylinder was changed from the regional to the new steam
2 generator.

3 We reviewed the design basis of the steam
4 generators and how the regional steam generators rely
5 on the stay cylinder to perform their function, which
6 formed the basis for operating licensing, operating
7 license of the facility.

8 And we determined that the final safety
9 analysis report of the facility did not rely specifically
10 on the stay cylinder for the safety functions of the
11 steam generator.

12 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Thank you, Joel. All
13 right. I've got to go to this lady in the green shirt
14 before her arm falls off. You had a question about steam
15 tubes? Right? Okay.

16 PARTICIPANT: Thank you so much. This
17 event that happened on January 31st, correct? Okay.
18 What would the tubes' strength be on January 30th if
19 we had had a serious seismic challenge to that plant?
20 What would it take?

21 They certainly were damaged the day before,
22 but they only broke on the 31st. Now maybe they were
23 damaged on the 20th or the 21st. What do we know about
24 how strong these were prior to? Aren't we just gambling
25 here? Aren't we just taking our chances? We are not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 a test facility here, a nuclear test facility. We are
2 families. We are a community. And we deserve better.

3 (Applause)

4 MR. WERNER: Thank you. I'd like to answer
5 that question. Of course, the steam generators, the
6 design, take into consideration the seismic. As part
7 of the in situ pressure testing, again, they selected
8 those 129 tubes, as Emmett described.

9 Now, all those tubes were
10 pressurized -- attempted to pressurize up to 5200 psi,
11 which is, again, essentially almost three times higher
12 than normal pressure.

13 So three of the tubes failed around what
14 we call the main steam line pressure, which was -- I
15 think the test was 3300 psi. And those are the tubes
16 that we were concerned with from a safety standpoint,
17 because they failed at the lower pressure and then the
18 other tubes failed almost at or near the 5200 psi. The
19 rest of the tubes maintained the pressure and they had
20 full strength and showed the integrity that they needed.

21 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Okay. Go ahead, Elmo.

22 MR. COLLINS: Let me re-ask that question.
23 Do we think the tube degradation, the as-found
24 conditions of the tubes, had a significant impact on
25 the ability of the steam generators to withstand the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 seismic event? That might have been one of the questions
2 I heard there.

3 FACILITATOR DANIEL: That's right.

4 MR. COLLINS: What -- and did we look at
5 that? Do we have an assessment? And do we think seismic
6 qualification was significantly impacted? I hate to put
7 my team on the spot, but that was the question we got,
8 I think.

9 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Go ahead, Emmett.

10 MR. MURPHY: Well --

11 MR. COLLINS: Okay, we had the team leader.
12 Now we need the expert to speak, so --

13 MR. MURPHY: The pressure tests -- the test
14 procedure calls for considering not only the
15 differential pressures that are at work during normal
16 operation and during the accident conditions, the safety
17 margin, but for the section that you're testing, section
18 of the tube that you're testing, you must adjust the
19 test pressure to the extent that loading from a seismic
20 event or a local rarefaction wave or some other
21 hypothetical event, if that could affect the pressure
22 capability of the tube, that should be reflected in the
23 test pressure that the in situ pressure test was
24 conducted.

25 It was my understanding during discussions

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that I had with personnel during the time that the tests
2 were done that at the sections that they were testing
3 that no -- that the loading conditions for size
4 differential pressure did not impact the failure
5 pressures.

6 MR. WERNER: Thank you, Emmett. That's
7 why I have people like him on the team. A lot smarter
8 than I am.

9 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Well, what does that
10 mean? Okay. Clarification.

11 MR. COLLINS: Let me restate it. Emmett,
12 you check me to make sure that I say this in plain language
13 accurately.

14 (Off-mic question)

15 MR. COLLINS: It would be the ground
16 acceleration for the design basis earthquake at San
17 Onofre, point 6 gs. But I think I heard Emmett say -- I'm
18 looking at him carefully -- is that based on those
19 stresses alone, the tubes would have retained their
20 structure. Is that what you said? No? Emmett is going
21 to clarify.

22 MR. COLLINS: The test pressure, test
23 pressures at which the in situ test was conducted should
24 reflect any seismic that is occurring.

25 I think maybe the point of confusion was,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you know, is how much does seismic affect the failure
2 pressure for the conditions that we had at San Onofre.

3 It affected it -- it affected it in a negligible manner.

4 In other words, it was differential pressure that
5 controlled the structural margins for this situation.

6 (Off-mic question)

7 MR. MURPHY: Whatever magnitude they were
8 required to consider. I don't know that -- that's
9 not -- I don't know the answer to your question.

10 FACILITATOR DANIEL: All right. Thank
11 you, Emmett.

12 MR. COLLINS: I think we all understand
13 that it's not the magnitude. It's the magnitude and
14 how close it is to the plant. So, what the plant has
15 to be built to is what is the maximum ground acceleration
16 at the site, and then it's doubled.

17 Then that acceleration is doubled. And for
18 San Onofre that's 0.67 gs that constitutes the design.

19 That's the ground acceleration at the site that the
20 plant has to withstand.

21 (Off-mic question)

22 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Is that horizontal and
23 vertical?

24 MR. WARNICK: There are components,
25 horizontal and vertical. I don't know the numbers of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 exactly the horizontal and vertical, but yes that is
2 considered.

3 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Okay. We have a
4 gentleman here who has a question about steam generators.

5 MR. STEINMETZ: Thank you. My name is Jeff
6 Steinmetz. I've got concerns concerning some of the
7 changes regarding the generators and steam tubes.
8 Previously, you stated that you did not -- that you only
9 considered two changes to be under the 50.90 rule.

10 This I'm confused by because it's my
11 understanding that you guys removed the stay cylinder.

12 This should have fallen under the 50.90 rule. The
13 changed tube sheet, the thickness of the -- excuse
14 me -- the change tube sheet was changed. This should
15 have fallen under the 50.90 rule. The tube alloy change.

16 This was the only, as I understand it, thing that was
17 clear to the NRC that was changed that SCE notified
18 you guys of.

19 The additional tubes, 370 tubes per
20 generator, this should have fallen under the 50.59 rule.

21 The changed tube supports should have fallen --

22 (Whereupon, at 12:18 p.m., DVD 2 ended)

23

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com