

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION REGION IV 1600 E LAMAR BLVD ARLINGTON, TX 76011-4511

July 3, 2014

EA 14-008

Jeremy Browning, Site Vice President Arkansas Nuclear One Entergy Operations, Inc. 1448 SR 333 Russellville, AR 72802-0967

SUBJECT: SUPPLEMENT TO THE ARKANSAS NUCLEAR ONE UNIT 1 DROPPED STATOR REGULATORY CONFERENCE MEETING SUMMARY

Dear Mr. Browning:

On May 1, 2014, members of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff met with representatives of the Arkansas Nuclear One facility to discuss the apparent violation affecting both units related to the drop of the Unit 1 main generator stator as documented in NRC Inspection Report 05000313/2013012 and 05000368/2013012 (ML14083A409), issued on March 24, 2014. The focus of the regulatory conference was a discussion on the safety significance of the finding. The discussion included Unit 1 mitigating actions focusing on the use of temporary power to recover the electrical buses and Unit 2 procedural electrical power recovery actions.

In a meeting summary (ML14128A512) issued on May 9, 2014, it was noted that the regulatory conference was transcribed and that a copy of the transcription would be made available and placed into the NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS). A copy of this transcript is provided as an enclosure to this letter.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.390 of the NRC's "Rules of Practice," a copy of this letter and its enclosures will be available electronically for public inspection in the NRC's Public Document

Sincerely,

/RA Cale Young for Greg Werner/

Gregory E. Werner, Chief Project Branch E Division of Reactor Projects

Docket Nos.: 50-313, 50-368 License Nos.: DPR-51, NPF-6

Enclosure: ANO Unit 1 Stator Drop Regulatory Conference Transcript Sincerely,

/RA Cale Young for Greg Werner/

Gregory E. Werner, Chief Project Branch E Division of Reactor Projects

Docket Nos.: 50-313, 50-368 License Nos.: DPR-51, NPF-6

Enclosure: ANO Unit 1 Stator Drop Regulatory Conference Transcript

DISTRIBUTION:

See next page

ADAMS ACCESSION NUMBER: ML14184B252

SUNSI Rev	iew	ADAMS	I Publicly	Available	🗵 Non-Se	nsitive	
By:		🗵 Yes 🛛 No	□ Non-Pub	icly Available	Sensitiv	е	
OFFICE	RIV/DRP	RIV/DRP					
NAME	CYoung/dll	GWerner					
SIGNATURE	/RA/	/RA CYoung					
		for/					
DATE	7/3/14	7/3/14					

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Letter to Jeremy Browning from Gregory E. Werner dated July 3, 2014

SUBJECT: SUPPLEMENT TO THE ARKANSAS NUCLEAR ONE UNIT 1 DROPPED STATOR REGULATORY CONFERENCE MEETING SUMMARY

DISTRIBUTION:

Regional Administrator (Marc.Dapas@nrc.gov) Deputy Regional Administrator (Kriss.Kennedv@nrc.gov) Acting DRP Director (Troy.Pruett@nrc.gov) Acting DRP Deputy Director (Michael.Hay@nrc.gov) DRS Director (Anton.Vegel@nrc.gov) DRS Deputy Director (Jeff.Clark@nrc.gov) Senior Resident Inspector (Brian.Tindell@nrc.gov) Resident Inspector (Matt.Young@nrc.gov) Resident Inspector (Abin.Fairbanks@nrc.gov) Branch Chief, DRP/E (Greg.Werner@nrc.gov) Senior Project Engineer, DRP/E (Cale.Young@nrc.gov) Project Engineer, DRP/E (Jim.Melfi@nrc.gov) ANO Administrative Assistant (Gloria.Hatfield@nrc.gov) Public Affairs Officer (Victor.Dricks@nrc.gov) Public Affairs Officer (Lara.Uselding@nrc.gov) Project Manager (Peter.Bamford@nrc.gov) Branch Chief, DRS/TSB (Geoff.Miller@nrc.gov) ACES (R4Enforcement.Resource@nrc.gov) RITS Coordinator (Marisa.Herrera@nrc.gov) Regional Counsel (Karla.Fuller@nrc.gov) Technical Support Assistant (Loretta, Williams@nrc.gov) Congressional Affairs Officer (Jenny.Weil@nrc.gov) RIV/ETA: OEDO (Yen-Ju.Chen@nrc.gov) **ROPreports**

Cause No: (None)

Nuclear Regulatory Conference with Entergy Operations, Inc.

Transcript of Proceedings

May 1, 2014



Job No. 18996

307 W. 7th Street, Suite 1350 Fort Worth, Texas 76102

817-336-3042 * depos@merittexas.com

Job No. 18996 Nuclear Regulatory Conference with Entergy Operations, Inc.

Transcript of Proceedings May 1, 2014

May 1, 2014
Page 3
Page 3 IN ATTENDANCE CONT'D Jeremy Browning - Site Vice President ANO Joseph Kowaleski - Senior Vice President, Entergy David McKenney - Supervising Engineering John Hathcoat - Assistant Operations Manager, ANO Gary Sullins - Assistant Operations Manager, ANO Richard Harris - Manager, Emergency Planning Dale James - Director, Regulatory and Performance Improvement Department, ANO John McCann - Vice President, Regulatory Assurance, Entergy Bryan Ford - Senior Manager, Fleet Regulatory Assurance, Entergy Stephanie Pyle - Manager, Regulatory Assurance, ANO Stephanie Pyle - Manager, Regulatory Assurance, ANO
25
Page 4
1 INDEX 2 3 Page No. 4 Appearances

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

	Page 5	Page 7
1	PROCEEDINGS	¹ Feedback forms are also available on the
2	OPERATOR SYLVIA: Good afternoon	² side table, and they will also be available online with
3	everyone. Welcome and thank you for standing by. At	³ the public meeting notice for this meeting. We would
4	this time participant lines are in listen only mode.	⁴ appreciate and request that you fill out the feedback
5	Following today's presentation we will have an	5 forms.
6	opportunity for question and answer session. At that	6 So quickly, if you look at the screen,
7	time please press star-one on your phone to ask a	⁷ the agenda, we're going to do an introduction of
8	question. Now I'll turn the call over to our host,	⁸ participants and I would just like to have the main
9	Mr. Greg Werner. You may begin.	⁹ table introduce theirselves. We'll do some NRC opening
10	MR. WERNER: Thank you Sylvia. Good	¹⁰ remarks, summary of the violation, additional NRC
11	afternoon, I'm Gregory Werner with the Nuclear	¹¹ opening remarks by Marc Dapas, Regional Administrator,
12	Regulatory Commission. I'm the Branch Chief,	¹² the licensee Entergy presentation, we'll have some
13	responsibility for Arkansas Nuclear One and Waterford	¹³ question and answers during that time from the NRC.
14	Nuclear Power Plants.	¹⁴ Once y'all's presentation is done, the
15	Welcome to the regulatory conference	¹⁵ NRC will leave the room, we'll caucus and determine if
16	between the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and Entergy	¹⁶ we have any other additional questions or need
17	Operations. Today we'll be discussing the event that	¹⁷ additional information, we'll come back in at that time.
18	occurred on March 31st of last year involving a drop	¹⁸ We'll ask those questions. Marc Dapas will then do a
19	Unit 1 stator at the Arkansas Nuclear One facility.	¹⁹ closing remarks, we'll adjourn the conference, and then
20	The event resulted in identification of	²⁰ we'll take questions and comments from members of the
21	two preliminarily greater than green findings associated	²¹ public.
22	the with violations of 10CFR, Part 50, Appendix B,	²² So just so start out with introductions,
23	Criterion V for Instructions, Procedures, and Drawings,	²³ again, as I said, I'm Gregory Werner, Branch Chief.
24	associated with the failure to insure that the overhead	²⁴ MR. KENNEDY: I'm Kriss Kennedy, Director
25	temporary hoisting assembly was designed and tested in	²⁵ of Division of Reactor Projects, NRC Region IV.
	Page 6	Page 8
1		
1 2	accordance with approved standards.	¹ MR. DAPAS: I'm Marc Dapas, Regional
	accordance with approved standards. A couple of administrative items; first,	 MR. DAPAS: I'm Marc Dapas, Regional Administrator of NRC Region IV office.
2	accordance with approved standards.	 MR. DAPAS: I'm Marc Dapas, Regional Administrator of NRC Region IV office.
2 3	accordance with approved standards. A couple of administrative items; first, the closest restrooms are located out the door to your	 MR. DAPAS: I'm Marc Dapas, Regional Administrator of NRC Region IV office. MR. CLARK: I'm Jeff Clark. I'm the
2 3 4	accordance with approved standards. A couple of administrative items; first, the closest restrooms are located out the door to your left past the guard station. In the event of an	 MR. DAPAS: I'm Marc Dapas, Regional Administrator of NRC Region IV office. MR. CLARK: I'm Jeff Clark. I'm the Acting Director for Division of Reactor Safety, Region
2 3 4 5	accordance with approved standards. A couple of administrative items; first, the closest restrooms are located out the door to your left past the guard station. In the event of an emergency, listen to the announcement over the intercom, if an evacuation of the building is necessary the nearest exists are out the front. Go out the doors to	 MR. DAPAS: I'm Marc Dapas, Regional Administrator of NRC Region IV office. MR. CLARK: I'm Jeff Clark. I'm the Acting Director for Division of Reactor Safety, Region IV.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	accordance with approved standards. A couple of administrative items; first, the closest restrooms are located out the door to your left past the guard station. In the event of an emergency, listen to the announcement over the intercom, if an evacuation of the building is necessary the nearest exists are out the front. Go out the doors to your left, or you can go out the doors to your right to	 MR. DAPAS: I'm Marc Dapas, Regional Administrator of NRC Region IV office. MR. CLARK: I'm Jeff Clark. I'm the Acting Director for Division of Reactor Safety, Region IV. MR. CIRCLE: I'm Jeff Circle, a Team Leader of the Division of Risk Assessment NRR headquarters.
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	accordance with approved standards. A couple of administrative items; first, the closest restrooms are located out the door to your left past the guard station. In the event of an emergency, listen to the announcement over the intercom, if an evacuation of the building is necessary the nearest exists are out the front. Go out the doors to your left, or you can go out the doors to your right to the side of the building, and then our assembly area	 MR. DAPAS: I'm Marc Dapas, Regional Administrator of NRC Region IV office. MR. CLARK: I'm Jeff Clark. I'm the Acting Director for Division of Reactor Safety, Region IV. MR. CIRCLE: I'm Jeff Circle, a Team Leader of the Division of Risk Assessment NRR headquarters. MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman, I'm a Risk
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	accordance with approved standards. A couple of administrative items; first, the closest restrooms are located out the door to your left past the guard station. In the event of an emergency, listen to the announcement over the intercom, if an evacuation of the building is necessary the nearest exists are out the front. Go out the doors to your left, or you can go out the doors to your right to the side of the building, and then our assembly area would be to the north towards the roads, we will proceed	 MR. DAPAS: I'm Marc Dapas, Regional Administrator of NRC Region IV office. MR. CLARK: I'm Jeff Clark. I'm the Acting Director for Division of Reactor Safety, Region IV. MR. CIRCLE: I'm Jeff Circle, a Team Leader of the Division of Risk Assessment NRR headquarters. MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman, I'm a Risk Analyst with NRR Risk Assessment and headquarters.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	accordance with approved standards. A couple of administrative items; first, the closest restrooms are located out the door to your left past the guard station. In the event of an emergency, listen to the announcement over the intercom, if an evacuation of the building is necessary the nearest exists are out the front. Go out the doors to your left, or you can go out the doors to your right to the side of the building, and then our assembly area would be to the north towards the roads, we will proceed out in that direction.	 MR. DAPAS: I'm Marc Dapas, Regional Administrator of NRC Region IV office. MR. CLARK: I'm Jeff Clark. I'm the Acting Director for Division of Reactor Safety, Region IV. MR. CIRCLE: I'm Jeff Circle, a Team Leader of the Division of Risk Assessment NRR headquarters. MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman, I'm a Risk Analyst with NRR Risk Assessment and headquarters. MR. LOVELESS: I'm David Loveless, I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	accordance with approved standards. A couple of administrative items; first, the closest restrooms are located out the door to your left past the guard station. In the event of an emergency, listen to the announcement over the intercom, if an evacuation of the building is necessary the nearest exists are out the front. Go out the doors to your left, or you can go out the doors to your right to the side of the building, and then our assembly area would be to the north towards the roads, we will proceed out in that direction. The agenda is what's up on the screen.	 MR. DAPAS: I'm Marc Dapas, Regional Administrator of NRC Region IV office. MR. CLARK: I'm Jeff Clark. I'm the Acting Director for Division of Reactor Safety, Region IV. MR. CIRCLE: I'm Jeff Circle, a Team Leader of the Division of Risk Assessment NRR headquarters. MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman, I'm a Risk Analyst with NRR Risk Assessment and headquarters. MR. LOVELESS: I'm David Loveless, I'm the Senior Reactor Analyst for Region IV.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	accordance with approved standards. A couple of administrative items; first, the closest restrooms are located out the door to your left past the guard station. In the event of an emergency, listen to the announcement over the intercom, if an evacuation of the building is necessary the nearest exists are out the front. Go out the doors to your left, or you can go out the doors to your right to the side of the building, and then our assembly area would be to the north towards the roads, we will proceed out in that direction. The agenda is what's up on the screen. We also have an agenda that was printed and distributed.	1 MR. DAPAS: I'm Marc Dapas, Regional 2 Administrator of NRC Region IV office. 3 MR. CLARK: I'm Jeff Clark. I'm the 4 Acting Director for Division of Reactor Safety, Region 5 IV. 6 MR. CIRCLE: I'm Jeff Circle, a Team 7 Leader of the Division of Risk Assessment NRR 8 headquarters. 9 MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman, I'm a Risk 10 Analyst with NRR Risk Assessment and headquarters. 11 MR. LOVELESS: I'm David Loveless, I'm 12 the Senior Reactor Analyst for Region IV. 13 MR. WILLOUGHBY: I'm Leonard Willoughby,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	accordance with approved standards. A couple of administrative items; first, the closest restrooms are located out the door to your left past the guard station. In the event of an emergency, listen to the announcement over the intercom, if an evacuation of the building is necessary the nearest exists are out the front. Go out the doors to your left, or you can go out the doors to your right to the side of the building, and then our assembly area would be to the north towards the roads, we will proceed out in that direction. The agenda is what's up on the screen. We also have an agenda that was printed and distributed. If you'd like to get one, it's located over there on the	1 MR. DAPAS: I'm Marc Dapas, Regional 2 Administrator of NRC Region IV office. 3 MR. CLARK: I'm Jeff Clark. I'm the 4 Acting Director for Division of Reactor Safety, Region 5 IV. 6 MR. CIRCLE: I'm Jeff Circle, a Team 7 Leader of the Division of Risk Assessment NRR 8 headquarters. 9 MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman, I'm a Risk 10 Analyst with NRR Risk Assessment and headquarters. 11 MR. LOVELESS: I'm David Loveless, I'm 12 the Senior Reactor Analyst for Region IV. 13 MR. WILLOUGHBY: I'm Leonard Willoughby, 14 Senior Reactor Inspector, Region IV.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	accordance with approved standards. A couple of administrative items; first, the closest restrooms are located out the door to your left past the guard station. In the event of an emergency, listen to the announcement over the intercom, if an evacuation of the building is necessary the nearest exists are out the front. Go out the doors to your left, or you can go out the doors to your right to the side of the building, and then our assembly area would be to the north towards the roads, we will proceed out in that direction. The agenda is what's up on the screen. We also have an agenda that was printed and distributed. If you'd like to get one, it's located over there on the side counter, so feel free to get up and get an agenda.	1 MR. DAPAS: I'm Marc Dapas, Regional 2 Administrator of NRC Region IV office. 3 MR. CLARK: I'm Jeff Clark. I'm the 4 Acting Director for Division of Reactor Safety, Region 5 IV. 6 MR. CIRCLE: I'm Jeff Circle, a Team 7 Leader of the Division of Risk Assessment NRR 8 headquarters. 9 MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman, I'm a Risk 10 Analyst with NRR Risk Assessment and headquarters. 11 MR. LOVELESS: I'm David Loveless, I'm 12 the Senior Reactor Analyst for Region IV. 13 MR. WILLOUGHBY: I'm Leonard Willoughby, 14 Senior Reactor Inspector, Region IV. 15 MR. WERNER: Thank you. Entergy?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	accordance with approved standards. A couple of administrative items; first, the closest restrooms are located out the door to your left past the guard station. In the event of an emergency, listen to the announcement over the intercom, if an evacuation of the building is necessary the nearest exists are out the front. Go out the doors to your left, or you can go out the doors to your right to the side of the building, and then our assembly area would be to the north towards the roads, we will proceed out in that direction. The agenda is what's up on the screen. We also have an agenda that was printed and distributed. If you'd like to get one, it's located over there on the side counter, so feel free to get up and get an agenda. This conference is being transcribed and will be	1 MR. DAPAS: I'm Marc Dapas, Regional 2 Administrator of NRC Region IV office. 3 MR. CLARK: I'm Jeff Clark. I'm the 4 Acting Director for Division of Reactor Safety, Region 5 IV. 6 MR. CIRCLE: I'm Jeff Circle, a Team 7 Leader of the Division of Risk Assessment NRR 8 headquarters. 9 MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman, I'm a Risk 10 Analyst with NRR Risk Assessment and headquarters. 11 MR. LOVELESS: I'm David Loveless, I'm 12 the Senior Reactor Analyst for Region IV. 13 MR. WILLOUGHBY: I'm Leonard Willoughby, 14 Senior Reactor Inspector, Region IV. 15 MR. WERNER: Thank you. Entergy? 16 MR. BROWNING: Jeremy Browning, Site Vice
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	accordance with approved standards. A couple of administrative items; first, the closest restrooms are located out the door to your left past the guard station. In the event of an emergency, listen to the announcement over the intercom, if an evacuation of the building is necessary the nearest exists are out the front. Go out the doors to your left, or you can go out the doors to your right to the side of the building, and then our assembly area would be to the north towards the roads, we will proceed out in that direction. The agenda is what's up on the screen. We also have an agenda that was printed and distributed. If you'd like to get one, it's located over there on the side counter, so feel free to get up and get an agenda. This conference is being transcribed and will be available publicly online.	1 MR. DAPAS: I'm Marc Dapas, Regional 2 Administrator of NRC Region IV office. 3 MR. CLARK: I'm Jeff Clark. I'm the 4 Acting Director for Division of Reactor Safety, Region 5 IV. 6 MR. CIRCLE: I'm Jeff Circle, a Team 7 Leader of the Division of Risk Assessment NRR 8 headquarters. 9 MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman, I'm a Risk 10 Analyst with NRR Risk Assessment and headquarters. 11 MR. LOVELESS: I'm David Loveless, I'm 12 the Senior Reactor Analyst for Region IV. 13 MR. WILLOUGHBY: I'm Leonard Willoughby, 14 Senior Reactor Inspector, Region IV. 15 MR. WERNER: Thank you. Entergy? 16 MR. BROWNING: Jeremy Browning, Site Vice 17 President, Arkansas Nuclear One.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	accordance with approved standards. A couple of administrative items; first, the closest restrooms are located out the door to your left past the guard station. In the event of an emergency, listen to the announcement over the intercom, if an evacuation of the building is necessary the nearest exists are out the front. Go out the doors to your left, or you can go out the doors to your right to the side of the building, and then our assembly area would be to the north towards the roads, we will proceed out in that direction. The agenda is what's up on the screen. We also have an agenda that was printed and distributed. If you'd like to get one, it's located over there on the side counter, so feel free to get up and get an agenda. This conference is being transcribed and will be available publicly online. As a reminder, when we speak, if we will	1MR. DAPAS: I'm Marc Dapas, Regional2Administrator of NRC Region IV office.3MR. CLARK: I'm Jeff Clark. I'm the4Acting Director for Division of Reactor Safety, Region5IV.6MR. CIRCLE: I'm Jeff Circle, a Team7Leader of the Division of Risk Assessment NRR8headquarters.9MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman, I'm a Risk10Analyst with NRR Risk Assessment and headquarters.11MR. LOVELESS: I'm David Loveless, I'm12the Senior Reactor Analyst for Region IV.13MR. WILLOUGHBY: I'm Leonard Willoughby,14Senior Reactor Inspector, Region IV.15MR. BROWNING: Jeremy Browning, Site Vice17President, Arkansas Nuclear One.18MR. KOWALESKI: Joe Kowaleski, Chief
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	accordance with approved standards. A couple of administrative items; first, the closest restrooms are located out the door to your left past the guard station. In the event of an emergency, listen to the announcement over the intercom, if an evacuation of the building is necessary the nearest exists are out the front. Go out the doors to your left, or you can go out the doors to your right to the side of the building, and then our assembly area would be to the north towards the roads, we will proceed out in that direction. The agenda is what's up on the screen. We also have an agenda that was printed and distributed. If you'd like to get one, it's located over there on the side counter, so feel free to get up and get an agenda. This conference is being transcribed and will be available publicly online. As a reminder, when we speak, if we will introduce ourselves so the transcription lady can go	1MR. DAPAS: I'm Marc Dapas, Regional2Administrator of NRC Region IV office.3MR. CLARK: I'm Jeff Clark. I'm the4Acting Director for Division of Reactor Safety, Region5IV.6MR. CIRCLE: I'm Jeff Circle, a Team7Leader of the Division of Risk Assessment NRR8headquarters.9MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman, I'm a Risk10Analyst with NRR Risk Assessment and headquarters.11MR. LOVELESS: I'm David Loveless, I'm12the Senior Reactor Analyst for Region IV.13MR. WILLOUGHBY: I'm Leonard Willoughby,14Senior Reactor Inspector, Region IV.15MR. BROWNING: Jeremy Browning, Site Vice17President, Arkansas Nuclear One.18MR. KOWALESKI: Joe Kowaleski, Chief19Operating Officer for the southern plants.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	accordance with approved standards. A couple of administrative items; first, the closest restrooms are located out the door to your left past the guard station. In the event of an emergency, listen to the announcement over the intercom, if an evacuation of the building is necessary the nearest exists are out the front. Go out the doors to your left, or you can go out the doors to your right to the side of the building, and then our assembly area would be to the north towards the roads, we will proceed out in that direction. The agenda is what's up on the screen. We also have an agenda that was printed and distributed. If you'd like to get one, it's located over there on the side counter, so feel free to get up and get an agenda. This conference is being transcribed and will be available publicly online. As a reminder, when we speak, if we will introduce ourselves so the transcription lady can go ahead and get our names on the record. As a reminder to	1MR. DAPAS: I'm Marc Dapas, Regional2Administrator of NRC Region IV office.3MR. CLARK: I'm Jeff Clark. I'm the4Acting Director for Division of Reactor Safety, Region5IV.6MR. CIRCLE: I'm Jeff Circle, a Team7Leader of the Division of Risk Assessment NRR8headquarters.9MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman, I'm a Risk10Analyst with NRR Risk Assessment and headquarters.11MR. LOVELESS: I'm David Loveless, I'm12the Senior Reactor Analyst for Region IV.13MR. WILLOUGHBY: I'm Leonard Willoughby,14Senior Reactor Inspector, Region IV.15MR. BROWNING: Jeremy Browning, Site Vice17President, Arkansas Nuclear One.18MR. KOWALESKI: Joe Kowaleski, Chief19Operating Officer for the southern plants.20MR. MCKENNEY: My name's David McKenney
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	accordance with approved standards. A couple of administrative items; first, the closest restrooms are located out the door to your left past the guard station. In the event of an emergency, listen to the announcement over the intercom, if an evacuation of the building is necessary the nearest exists are out the front. Go out the doors to your left, or you can go out the doors to your right to the side of the building, and then our assembly area would be to the north towards the roads, we will proceed out in that direction. The agenda is what's up on the screen. We also have an agenda that was printed and distributed. If you'd like to get one, it's located over there on the side counter, so feel free to get up and get an agenda. This conference is being transcribed and will be available publicly online. As a reminder, when we speak, if we will introduce ourselves so the transcription lady can go	1 MR. DAPAS: I'm Marc Dapas, Regional 2 Administrator of NRC Region IV office. 3 MR. CLARK: I'm Jeff Clark. I'm the 4 Acting Director for Division of Reactor Safety, Region 5 IV. 6 MR. CIRCLE: I'm Jeff Circle, a Team 7 Leader of the Division of Risk Assessment NRR 8 headquarters. 9 MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman, I'm a Risk 10 Analyst with NRR Risk Assessment and headquarters. 11 MR. LOVELESS: I'm David Loveless, I'm 12 the Senior Reactor Analyst for Region IV. 13 MR. WILLOUGHBY: I'm Leonard Willoughby, 14 Senior Reactor Inspector, Region IV. 15 MR. WERNER: Thank you. Entergy? 16 MR. KOWALESKI: Joe Kowaleski, Chief 19 Operating Officer for the southern plants. 20 MR. MCKENNEY: My name's David McKenney 21 and I'm Engineering Supervisor at ANO.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	accordance with approved standards. A couple of administrative items; first, the closest restrooms are located out the door to your left past the guard station. In the event of an emergency, listen to the announcement over the intercom, if an evacuation of the building is necessary the nearest exists are out the front. Go out the doors to your left, or you can go out the doors to your right to the side of the building, and then our assembly area would be to the north towards the roads, we will proceed out in that direction. The agenda is what's up on the screen. We also have an agenda that was printed and distributed. If you'd like to get one, it's located over there on the side counter, so feel free to get up and get an agenda. This conference is being transcribed and will be available publicly online. As a reminder, when we speak, if we will introduce ourselves so the transcription lady can go ahead and get our names on the record. As a reminder to both NRC and Entergy personnel, if you wish to make a	1 MR. DAPAS: I'm Marc Dapas, Regional 2 Administrator of NRC Region IV office. 3 MR. CLARK: I'm Jeff Clark. I'm the 4 Acting Director for Division of Reactor Safety, Region 5 IV. 6 MR. CIRCLE: I'm Jeff Circle, a Team 7 Leader of the Division of Risk Assessment NRR 8 headquarters. 9 MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman, I'm a Risk 10 Analyst with NRR Risk Assessment and headquarters. 11 MR. LOVELESS: I'm David Loveless, I'm 12 the Senior Reactor Analyst for Region IV. 13 MR. WILLOUGHBY: I'm Leonard Willoughby, 14 Senior Reactor Inspector, Region IV. 15 MR. WERNER: Thank you. Entergy? 16 MR. BROWNING: Jeremy Browning, Site Vice 17 President, Arkansas Nuclear One. 18 MR. KOWALESKI: Joe Kowaleski, Chief 19 Operating Officer for the southern plants. 20 MR. MCKENNEY: My name's David McKenney 21 and I'm Engineering Supervisor at ANO.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	accordance with approved standards. A couple of administrative items; first, the closest restrooms are located out the door to your left past the guard station. In the event of an emergency, listen to the announcement over the intercom, if an evacuation of the building is necessary the nearest exists are out the front. Go out the doors to your left, or you can go out the doors to your right to the side of the building, and then our assembly area would be to the north towards the roads, we will proceed out in that direction. The agenda is what's up on the screen. We also have an agenda that was printed and distributed. If you'd like to get one, it's located over there on the side counter, so feel free to get up and get an agenda. This conference is being transcribed and will be available publicly online. As a reminder, when we speak, if we will introduce ourselves so the transcription lady can go ahead and get our names on the record. As a reminder to both NRC and Entergy personnel, if you wish to make a comment or question, please move to the microphone or	1 MR. DAPAS: I'm Marc Dapas, Regional 2 Administrator of NRC Region IV office. 3 MR. CLARK: I'm Jeff Clark. I'm the 4 Acting Director for Division of Reactor Safety, Region 5 IV. 6 MR. CIRCLE: I'm Jeff Circle, a Team 7 Leader of the Division of Risk Assessment NRR 8 headquarters. 9 MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman, I'm a Risk 10 Analyst with NRR Risk Assessment and headquarters. 11 MR. LOVELESS: I'm David Loveless, I'm 12 the Senior Reactor Analyst for Region IV. 13 MR. WILLOUGHBY: I'm Leonard Willoughby, 14 Senior Reactor Inspector, Region IV. 15 MR. WERNER: Thank you. Entergy? 16 MR. KOWALESKI: Joe Kowaleski, Chief 19 Operating Officer for the southern plants. 20 MR. MCKENNEY: My name's David McKenney 21 and I'm Engineering Supervisor at ANO. 22 MR. SULLINS: I'm Gary Sullins, I'm the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	accordance with approved standards. A couple of administrative items; first, the closest restrooms are located out the door to your left past the guard station. In the event of an emergency, listen to the announcement over the intercom, if an evacuation of the building is necessary the nearest exists are out the front. Go out the doors to your left, or you can go out the doors to your right to the side of the building, and then our assembly area would be to the north towards the roads, we will proceed out in that direction. The agenda is what's up on the screen. We also have an agenda that was printed and distributed. If you'd like to get one, it's located over there on the side counter, so feel free to get up and get an agenda. This conference is being transcribed and will be available publicly online. As a reminder, when we speak, if we will introduce ourselves so the transcription lady can go ahead and get our names on the record. As a reminder to both NRC and Entergy personnel, if you wish to make a comment or question, please move to the microphone or move the microphone in front of you or go to the podium	1 MR. DAPAS: I'm Marc Dapas, Regional 2 Administrator of NRC Region IV office. 3 MR. CLARK: I'm Jeff Clark. I'm the 4 Acting Director for Division of Reactor Safety, Region 5 IV. 6 MR. CIRCLE: I'm Jeff Circle, a Team 7 Leader of the Division of Risk Assessment NRR 8 headquarters. 9 MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman, I'm a Risk 10 Analyst with NRR Risk Assessment and headquarters. 11 MR. LOVELESS: I'm David Loveless, I'm 12 the Senior Reactor Analyst for Region IV. 13 MR. WILLOUGHBY: I'm Leonard Willoughby, 14 Senior Reactor Inspector, Region IV. 15 MR. WERNER: Thank you. Entergy? 16 MR. KOWALESKI: Joe Kowaleski, Chief 19 Operating Officer for the southern plants. 20 MR. MCKENNEY: My name's David McKenney 21 and I'm Engineering Supervisor at ANO. 22 MR. SULLINS: I'm Gary Sullins, I'm the 23 Manager of Shift Operations for ANO Unit 1.

Job No. 18996 Nuclear Regulatory Conference with Entergy Operations, Inc.

	Page 9		Page 11
1	MR. HARRIS: Richard Harris, Emergency	1	identified 10 unresolved items. Subsequently, a
2	Planning Manager, Arkansas Nuclear One.	2	follow-up team was conducted July 15th through February
3	MR. JAMES: I'm Dale James, Director of	3	10th, 2014, to review those unresolved items. During
4	Regulatory and Performance Improvement, Arkansas Nuclear	4	the inspection the inspectors identified two findings of
5	One.	5	potentially greater than Green significance that were a
6	MR. WERNER: Thank you. Again this is	6	violation of regulatory requirements.
7	Gregory Werner. I'm going to have some opening remarks.	7	The NRC assessed the risk significance of
8	In accordance with the NRC's regulatory	8	this event and preliminarily determined that there was a
9	process after potentially risk significant findings	9	high safety significance, or the color Red, for Unit 1;
10	identified and characterized by the significance	10	a substantial safety significance, or Yellow color, for
11	determination processes as greater than Green, we offer	11	Unit 2. The NRC uses colors to classify the risk
12	licensees an opportunity for a regulatory conference.	12	significance of each event. Green finding; green,
13	In this case, Entergy has requested that	13	white, yellow, red. With Green being the least risk
14	a conference be held to discuss the issues and their	14	significance and Red being the most risk significance.
15	significance. This conference is open to the public for	15	Following the inspection on site, the NRC
16	observation. Members of both the public both those	16	preliminarily determined that the finding constituted
17	ins attendance here and via the phone bridge should be	17	apparent violation of 10CFR, Part 50, Appendix Bravo,
18	aware that this is a meeting between the Nuclear	18	Criterion V, Instructions, Procedures, and Drawings.
19	Regulatory Commission and Entergy.	19	The violation was determined to be a failure of the
20	During the meeting comments and questions	20	licensees to insure that the overhead temporary hoisting
21	will not be taken from members of the public. Following	21	assembly was adequately designed and tested.
22	the conference, the NRC staff will be available to	22	Specifically, licensee failed to identify deficiencies
23	answer questions and receive comments from members of	23	in the vendor calculation titled Heavy Lift Gantry
24	the public concerning matters discussed at this	24	Calculation, and the incorrectly sized component in the
25	conference.	25	north tower structure of the temporary hoisting
	Dage 10		

Page 10

1	On March 31st 2013, during the movement	1
2	of the Unit 1 stator, the overhead temporary hoisting	2
3	assembly transporting the stator collapsed, causing the	3
4	525-ton stator to fall on and extensively damage	4
5	portions of the Unit 1 turbine deck and subsequently	5
6	fall over 30 feet into the train bay.	6
7	The stator drop resulted in a Unit 1 loss	7
8	of offsite power for approximately 6 days and a Unit 2	8
9	reactor trip. The drop stator ruptured a common fire	9
10	main header in the train bay which caused flooding in	10
11	Unit 1 and water damage to the electrical switchgear for	11
12	unit 2, a small explosion resulting in a loss of offsite	12
13	power to one vital bus.	13
14	As a result, one of the Unit 2 emergency	14
15	diesel generators started and restored power to the	15
16	associated safety-related vital bus. In response to	16
17	the small explosion inside the Unit 2 electrical	17
18	cabinet, the operators declared a notification of an	18
19	unusual event.	19
20	On April 5th 2013, an augmented	20
21	inspection team was chartered to assess the facts and	21
22	circumstances surrounding the temporary hoisting	22
23	assembly collapse.	23
24	The augmented inspection team completed	24
25	the fact-finding inspection on May 9th 2013, and	25

Page 12

1	assembly.
2	In addition, ANO personnel failed to
3	perform a load test of the temporary hoisting assembly.
4	These preliminary results along with an
5	option for regulatory conference were communicated to
6	you during an exit onsite that was conducted on
7	February 10th, 2014, and is documented in NRC Inspection
8	Report 2013 12, dated March 24, 2014.
9	This regulatory conference is the last
10	step of the inspection process before the NRC makes its
11	final determination on the significance of the
12	inspection findings.
13	This event led to a unique situation
14	where the NRC identified one performance deficiency and
15	one violation alleging different risk significance
16	determination for each unit. The differences in the
17	risk significance related to a couple of factors;
18	different operational modes, Unit 1 was shut down with
19	reactor head off, fuel in the vessel, ready to be
20	refueled as compared to Unit 2 there was 100 percent
21	power. The other differences are they are completely
22	different reactor designs. One is a Babcock & Wilcox
23	the other one is a combustion engineering design. They
24	have different systems and components that impact the
25	risk significance of the findings.

	Page 13		Page 15
1	The purpose of this conference today is	1	evaluation.
2	to allow you to provide your position in part or all	2	Following the event and prior to
3	with the facts and assumptions used by the NRC to make	3	subsequent return to power, NRC inspectors observed
4	our preliminary significance determination, and to allow	4	repair activities including the removal of the drop
5	you to present new information that may assist us in	5	stator, observed the subsequent Unit 1 replacement
6	arriving at the most appropriate final significance	6	stator lift, reviewed the corrective actions associated
7	determination.	7	with repairing the damaged Unit 1 turbine structure, the
8	We also appreciate your views as to	8	fire main system, and both the Unit 1 and Unit 2
9	whether there's any information that may be relevant to	9	electrical systems, review the modifications and
10	the application of the significance determination in	10	procedures related to heavy load lifts and we also
11	this case, including your position on the content and	11	observe training of your staff that they received on the
12	accuracy of the inspection report findings.	12	advised requirements for heavy load lifting
13	In particular, as discussed in the cover	13	Now, I'd like to turn it over to Marc for
14	letter of the augmented inspection team follow-up	14	his opening remarks.
15	report, please discuss actions that could be taken to	15	MR. DAPAS: Thank you, Greg. This is
16	mitigate the severity of this event and what range of	16	Marc Depas, Regional Administrator. The stator drop was
17	credit should be applied and the basis for that.	17	certainly an unprecedented event that was significant
18	If you have any additional information	18	from both the reactor and personnel safety standpoint.
19	that is under development and is not currently available	19	So it's in that context and is particularly important
20	to be presented at this conference, please inform us of	20	that at the conclusion of this conference we at least
21	the nature and the date when the NRC would expect to	21	have a shared understanding of the facts and assumptions
22	receive that information. The NRC must receive that	22	regarding our preliminary significance determination,
23	information in a timely manner so that we can review it	23	and that we also have afforded you the full opportunity
24	and they can assess wit that information.	24	to communicate any new information to ensure that our
25	Please note that the primary purpose of	25	final risk determination is as accurate as it can be.
	Page 14		Page 16

16

	Page 14		Page 16
1	this meeting is to discuss issues related, again, to the	1	We communicated in the letter that I
2	safety significance of the findings, which informs the	2	signed that Greg referenced, the follow-up augmented
3	outcome of the apparent violation. It is important to	3	inspection team report dated March 24, we did clearly
4	note that the decision to conduct this conference does	4	communicate the basis for our preliminary risk
5	not mean that the NRC has determined that a violation	5	assessment. And as Greg indicated, there are different
6	has occurred. The violation related to these findings	6	designs between Unit 1 and Unit 2, and that results in
7	being discussed today will be assessed in accordance	7	different systems and components that impact the risk
8	with the commissions enforcement policy.	8	significance.
9	As a reminder, any statements, views, or	9	So in my view further underscores the
10	expressions of opinions made by NRC employees of this	10	importance to ensure that we have the opportunity to
11	conference do not represent final agency determinations	11	fully engage and the shared understanding of the facts
12	or beliefs relative to the matter before us today.	12	and assumptions. We ultimately may disagree with how
13	Following this conference, the regional	13	much significance should be accorded to the different
14	and NRC headquarter staff will reach significance	14	factors, but it's important that we have a shared
15	determination and enforcement decision. Our goal is to	15	understanding, at least, from, you know, the premise
16	issue the final significance determination letter by	16	that we're operating from.
17	June 10th of this year.	17	We acknowledge the corrective actions
18	Just to kind of give you a little	18	that were performed to ensure the plant was properly
19	background on our inspection activities, we determined	19	repaired and safe for restart. But I also wanted to
20	that ANO personnel conducted extensive reviews of the	20	note, as I mentioned in the cover letter to the subject
21	event and the root cause evaluation and implemented	21	inspection report that I just referenced, we had offered
22	appropriate corrective actions that served the	22	the conclusion that your staff did not address Entergy's
23	subsequent lift of the drop stator and the Unit 1	23	oversight of the contractors involved with the stator
24	replacement rotor of the stator were performed safely	24	lift and we independently determined that you the
25	considering the lessons learned from the root cause	25	licensee did not ensure adequate supervisory and

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

	Page 17		Page 19
1	management oversight of the contractors and other	1	expanding further into possibly crediting some actions
2	supplemental personnel involved with the stator lift and	2	that we believe could have mitigated the risk. We also
3	that this contributed to the event.	3	wanted to point out that following the event, the
4	So I'd like to, as part of the conference	4	operators at the station took appropriate actions to
5	today, hear your thoughts regarding the actions you've	5	place the plants in stable configurations, also
6	taken to provide for oversight of contractors, how you	6	minimizing the risk to the health and safety of the
7	evaluate that in going forward, what actions you've	7	public.
8	taken to ensure that in going forward approach you have	8	We would also like to note that our
9	adequately addressed that performance deficiency that	9	safety-related equipment performed as designed, further
10	was apparent from our independent review.	10	reducing the risk to the health and safety of the
11	That concludes my opening remarks. I	11	public.
12	look toward to the discussion, and at this point, I'll	12	If we could, if we could move onto the
13	turn it over to you, Mr. Kowaleski, to provide any	13	agenda. As Joe spoke earlier, we're going to break the
14	opening remarks you may have	14	presentation down into two separate areas, initially,
15	Thank you.	15	that's focusing on Unit 1 initially, and then we'll move
16	MR. KOWALESKI: Yeah, Jeremy Browning is	16	onto the discussion on Unit 2.
17	going to do the opening remarks. And our presentation	17	We've strategically put a break right
18	is going to address all the points that you made. It is	18	after the Unit 1 discussion, and again we'll take a
19	constructive to first look at the Unit 1 risk	19	break whenever it's appropriate, but we thought that
20	significance and the Unit 2 risk significance, and	20	would be a clean point to possibly allow ourselves to
21	discuss the evolutions.	21	if there's additional follow-up questions because it is
22	MR. BROWNING: All right. This is Jeremy	22	a different set of the parameters that we will move into
23	Browning, Site Vice President Arkansas Nuclear One, I do	23	when we talk about Unit 2. So we thought that might be
24	appreciate the opportunity, thank you for your time, to	24	a good breaking point.
25	share additional insights and information that we	25	The agenda, we're going to kind of paint
	share additional insights and information that we		The agenda, were going to kind of paint
	Page 18		Page 20
1	believe will help us achieve that objective of	1	the backdrop of the plant's immediate response, you
2	determining the most accurate assessment of risk that	2	know, what happened immediately just so we have a clear
3	occurred following that event.	3	picture. It will be a very brief discussion, but I
4	As we were preparing for this, I wanted	4	think it's important for us to understand what actually
5	to make sure it's crystal clear that in no way, shape,	5	happened, the configuration of the plant, and the
6	or form are we intending to challenge the significance	6	actions that we actually took following the event.
7	of the consequences of that event. We are simply trying	7	Following that, we will discuss a couple
8	to establish the most accurate picture of the nuclear	8	of areas on Unit 2, recovery of 4160 volt power and
9	safety risk following that event.	9	inventory makeup, and some success paths that we were
10	We take this commitment very seriously.	10	developing as contingencies in the event the power
11	The seriousness of this event, the people that are	11	continued to degrade, that being our offsite power which
12	sitting on the Entergy panel were present on the day of	12	was always available to us and our safety buses that
13	the event, myself included. The most impactful piece of	13	were always available to us. The conduit between the
14	that is obviously the loss of one young man's life and	14	two has discussed earlier, had been severed.
16		1 1 5	

16 recoveries. How do we connect the available offsite lasting impact on me personally, and the station, 17 personally we take it very seriously. power to the available safety, and we did have some 18 additional contingencies that we were working on. And as a result, we will share with you 19 the corrective actions that we took that were derived After the break, we'll shift to Unit 2. out of a very thorough and rigorous causal analysis 20 The discussion on Unit 2 is a little bit different in 21 that the recovery actions that we'll be talking about on which we broadened to extent of cause and condition. So 22 Unit 2 would be procedurally driven. The equipment was 23 We do appreciate the insights you available, we really aren't developing operator or 24 station-performed activities to implement those. provided to us in the augmented inspection team report 25 and your risk analysis. We use that as a basis for our

15

This is just simply walking you through

So, really, that's the focus of our

5 (Pages 17 to 20)

the injury of several other employees. That will have a

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we will share that.

	Page 21	Page 23
1	the available resources that we had and our analysis as	¹ thank you.
2	in some cases, there may not have been the appropriate	² MR. KOWALESKI: Good afternoon. This is
3	credit applied to those areas. And then we will, at the	³ Joe Kowaleski. Just add one other item to that as we're
4	end of presentation, talk about the site actions, the	⁴ talking about the actual installation of the power
5	common cause, including fleet actions that were taken	⁵ supply from the offsite startup one transformer to the
6	and, obviously, closing comments.	⁶ safety buses. That was actually installed and available
7	So if we can move on to the Unit 1	7 for service in 4.4 days. Gary is going to discuss the
8	section. Already painted a little bit of an overview,	⁸ time to full recovery is 4.8 days, so in the actual
9	this is what you're about to listen to. We're going to	⁹ event we have we had offsite power established prior to
10	focus on the NRC event tree. When we're talking about	¹⁰ and within the timeframe of core recovery.
11	4160 volt AC power recovery, there's actually four	¹¹ MR. SULLINS: Good afternoon, I'm Gary
12	sections if this.	¹² Sullins, Manager Shift Operations on ANO Unit 1. I
13	The first section of it is what we	¹³ supervise the shift managers for Unit 1 and then the
14	actually did to recover power. Just so you understand	¹⁴ senior license holder to that unit. I also serve in the
15	what we it took to actually connect that available	¹⁵ role of TFC manager in our emergency response
16	offsite power source to the onsite power source.	¹⁶ organization. In that role I report directly to the
17	Then we're going to discuss three success	¹⁷ emergency plan manager and coordinate development of
18	paths that were being developed as contingencies in the	¹⁸ repair and recovery actions in the TFC working with our
19	event that we lost offsite power, or we lost one of our	¹⁹ operations, maintenance, and engineering coordinators.
20	diesels, what would we do then? That's part of the way	²⁰ On the day of the stator drop event, I
21	we do business. We're thinking about what could happen	²¹ provided oversight for control room activities
22	next.	²² throughout the day, and in the days and weeks following,
23	So those recovery actions were already	²³ I served in the role of supporting the engineering and
24	under development in that we would possibly lose one of	²⁴ how to support organizations in defining strategies for
25	our emergency diesels and what would it take to get that	25 our recovery.
	Page 22	Page 24
1		
1 2	offsite power connected to our buses.	1 MR. MCKENNEY: My name is David McKenney
	offsite power connected to our buses. And the 4th item that we will talk about	 MR. MCKENNEY: My name is David McKenney and I'm the right now I'm currently the Engineering
2	offsite power connected to our buses. And the 4th item that we will talk about is inventory. Making sure that we had available	 MR. MCKENNEY: My name is David McKenney and I'm the right now I'm currently the Engineering Fix It Now Supervisor at ENTARK (unclear) 1. I've got
2 3	offsite power connected to our buses. And the 4th item that we will talk about is inventory. Making sure that we had available inventory for our spent fuel pool which was flooded up,	 MR. MCKENNEY: My name is David McKenney and I'm the right now I'm currently the Engineering Fix It Now Supervisor at ENTARK (unclear) 1. I've got going on 27 a little more than 27 years experience,
2 3 4	offsite power connected to our buses. And the 4th item that we will talk about is inventory. Making sure that we had available inventory for our spent fuel pool which was flooded up, had over 300,000 gallons of water on top of the fuel	 MR. MCKENNEY: My name is David McKenney and I'm the right now I'm currently the Engineering Fix It Now Supervisor at ENTARK (unclear) 1. I've got going on 27 a little more than 27 years experience, all of it in engineering, and before that 6 years of
2 3 4 5	offsite power connected to our buses. And the 4th item that we will talk about is inventory. Making sure that we had available inventory for our spent fuel pool which was flooded up, had over 300,000 gallons of water on top of the fuel active fuel, but we did recognize the need to establish	 MR. MCKENNEY: My name is David McKenney and I'm the right now I'm currently the Engineering Fix It Now Supervisor at ENTARK (unclear) 1. I've got going on 27 a little more than 27 years experience, all of it in engineering, and before that 6 years of
2 3 4 5 6	offsite power connected to our buses. And the 4th item that we will talk about is inventory. Making sure that we had available inventory for our spent fuel pool which was flooded up, had over 300,000 gallons of water on top of the fuel	 MR. MCKENNEY: My name is David McKenney and I'm the right now I'm currently the Engineering Fix It Now Supervisor at ENTARK (unclear) 1. I've got going on 27 a little more than 27 years experience, all of it in engineering, and before that 6 years of construction experience. I was the engineering
2 3 4 5 6 7	offsite power connected to our buses. And the 4th item that we will talk about is inventory. Making sure that we had available inventory for our spent fuel pool which was flooded up, had over 300,000 gallons of water on top of the fuel active fuel, but we did recognize the need to establish inventory control.	 MR. MCKENNEY: My name is David McKenney and I'm the right now I'm currently the Engineering Fix It Now Supervisor at ENTARK (unclear) 1. I've got going on 27 a little more than 27 years experience, all of it in engineering, and before that 6 years of construction experience. I was the engineering coordinator and the TSE the evening after the event.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	offsite power connected to our buses. And the 4th item that we will talk about is inventory. Making sure that we had available inventory for our spent fuel pool which was flooded up, had over 300,000 gallons of water on top of the fuel active fuel, but we did recognize the need to establish inventory control. As we go on through the Unit 1	 MR. MCKENNEY: My name is David McKenney and I'm the right now I'm currently the Engineering Fix It Now Supervisor at ENTARK (unclear) 1. I've got going on 27 a little more than 27 years experience, all of it in engineering, and before that 6 years of construction experience. I was the engineering coordinator and the TSE the evening after the event. We'll talk about what the engineering activities were
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	offsite power connected to our buses. And the 4th item that we will talk about is inventory. Making sure that we had available inventory for our spent fuel pool which was flooded up, had over 300,000 gallons of water on top of the fuel active fuel, but we did recognize the need to establish inventory control. As we go on through the Unit 1 discussion, we recognize that crediting those, there is	 MR. MCKENNEY: My name is David McKenney and I'm the right now I'm currently the Engineering Fix It Now Supervisor at ENTARK (unclear) 1. I've got going on 27 a little more than 27 years experience, all of it in engineering, and before that 6 years of construction experience. I was the engineering coordinator and the TSE the evening after the event. We'll talk about what the engineering activities were going on associated with that. The engineering fix it now team is one of our normal businesses is to provide temporary power
2 3 5 7 8 9 10	offsite power connected to our buses. And the 4th item that we will talk about is inventory. Making sure that we had available inventory for our spent fuel pool which was flooded up, had over 300,000 gallons of water on top of the fuel active fuel, but we did recognize the need to establish inventory control. As we go on through the Unit 1 discussion, we recognize that crediting those, there is no approved process to credit actions that we were	 MR. MCKENNEY: My name is David McKenney and I'm the right now I'm currently the Engineering Fix It Now Supervisor at ENTARK (unclear) 1. I've got going on 27 a little more than 27 years experience, all of it in engineering, and before that 6 years of construction experience. I was the engineering coordinator and the TSE the evening after the event. We'll talk about what the engineering activities were going on associated with that. The engineering fix it now team is one of our normal businesses is to provide temporary power during outages and for other like bus outages and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	offsite power connected to our buses. And the 4th item that we will talk about is inventory. Making sure that we had available inventory for our spent fuel pool which was flooded up, had over 300,000 gallons of water on top of the fuel active fuel, but we did recognize the need to establish inventory control. As we go on through the Unit 1 discussion, we recognize that crediting those, there is no approved process to credit actions that we were proposing. So what we did is we used known tools that are already out there for assessing risk, and we tried to say how can we apply those known tools to the	 MR. MCKENNEY: My name is David McKenney and I'm the right now I'm currently the Engineering Fix It Now Supervisor at ENTARK (unclear) 1. I've got going on 27 a little more than 27 years experience, all of it in engineering, and before that 6 years of construction experience. I was the engineering coordinator and the TSE the evening after the event. We'll talk about what the engineering activities were going on associated with that. The engineering fix it now team is one of our normal businesses is to provide temporary power during outages and for other like bus outages and some of those kind of things. So we're very familiar
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	offsite power connected to our buses. And the 4th item that we will talk about is inventory. Making sure that we had available inventory for our spent fuel pool which was flooded up, had over 300,000 gallons of water on top of the fuel active fuel, but we did recognize the need to establish inventory control. As we go on through the Unit 1 discussion, we recognize that crediting those, there is no approved process to credit actions that we were proposing. So what we did is we used known tools that are already out there for assessing risk, and we tried to say how can we apply those known tools to the methodologies that we would be implementing to give	 MR. MCKENNEY: My name is David McKenney and I'm the right now I'm currently the Engineering Fix It Now Supervisor at ENTARK (unclear) 1. I've got going on 27 a little more than 27 years experience, all of it in engineering, and before that 6 years of construction experience. I was the engineering coordinator and the TSE the evening after the event. We'll talk about what the engineering activities were going on associated with that. The engineering fix it now team is one of our normal businesses is to provide temporary power during outages and for other like bus outages and some of those kind of things. So we're very familiar with the ability to get power to where we need it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	offsite power connected to our buses. And the 4th item that we will talk about is inventory. Making sure that we had available inventory for our spent fuel pool which was flooded up, had over 300,000 gallons of water on top of the fuel active fuel, but we did recognize the need to establish inventory control. As we go on through the Unit 1 discussion, we recognize that crediting those, there is no approved process to credit actions that we were proposing. So what we did is we used known tools that are already out there for assessing risk, and we tried to say how can we apply those known tools to the methodologies that we would be implementing to give credit to action and come up with a method for crediting	1MR. MCKENNEY: My name is David McKenney2and I'm the right now I'm currently the Engineering3Fix It Now Supervisor at ENTARK (unclear) 1. I've got4going on 27 a little more than 27 years experience,5all of it in engineering, and before that 6 years of6construction experience. I was the engineering7coordinator and the TSE the evening after the event.8We'll talk about what the engineering activities were9going on associated with that.10The engineering fix it now team is one of11our normal businesses is to provide temporary power12during outages and for other like bus outages and13some of those kind of things. So we're very familiar14with the ability to get power to where we need it.15MR. SULLINS: To remind you of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	offsite power connected to our buses. And the 4th item that we will talk about is inventory. Making sure that we had available inventory for our spent fuel pool which was flooded up, had over 300,000 gallons of water on top of the fuel active fuel, but we did recognize the need to establish inventory control. As we go on through the Unit 1 discussion, we recognize that crediting those, there is no approved process to credit actions that we were proposing. So what we did is we used known tools that are already out there for assessing risk, and we tried to say how can we apply those known tools to the methodologies that we would be implementing to give credit to action and come up with a method for crediting those.	 MR. MCKENNEY: My name is David McKenney and I'm the right now I'm currently the Engineering Fix It Now Supervisor at ENTARK (unclear) 1. I've got going on 27 a little more than 27 years experience, all of it in engineering, and before that 6 years of construction experience. I was the engineering coordinator and the TSE the evening after the event. We'll talk about what the engineering activities were going on associated with that. The engineering fix it now team is one of our normal businesses is to provide temporary power during outages and for other like bus outages and some of those kind of things. So we're very familiar with the ability to get power to where we need it. MR. SULLINS: To remind you of the structure of our presentation, the success paths for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	offsite power connected to our buses. And the 4th item that we will talk about is inventory. Making sure that we had available inventory for our spent fuel pool which was flooded up, had over 300,000 gallons of water on top of the fuel active fuel, but we did recognize the need to establish inventory control. As we go on through the Unit 1 discussion, we recognize that crediting those, there is no approved process to credit actions that we were proposing. So what we did is we used known tools that are already out there for assessing risk, and we tried to say how can we apply those known tools to the methodologies that we would be implementing to give credit to action and come up with a method for crediting those. I think that is all I had on the	1MR. MCKENNEY: My name is David McKenney2and I'm the right now I'm currently the Engineering3Fix It Now Supervisor at ENTARK (unclear) 1. I've got4going on 27 a little more than 27 years experience,5all of it in engineering, and before that 6 years of6construction experience. I was the engineering7coordinator and the TSE the evening after the event.8We'll talk about what the engineering activities were9going on associated with that.10The engineering fix it now team is one of11our normal businesses is to provide temporary power12during outages and for other like bus outages and13some of those kind of things. So we're very familiar14with the ability to get power to where we need it.15MR. SULLINS: To remind you of the16structure of our presentation, the success paths for174160 volt power recovery are built upon what we actually
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	offsite power connected to our buses. And the 4th item that we will talk about is inventory. Making sure that we had available inventory for our spent fuel pool which was flooded up, had over 300,000 gallons of water on top of the fuel active fuel, but we did recognize the need to establish inventory control. As we go on through the Unit 1 discussion, we recognize that crediting those, there is no approved process to credit actions that we were proposing. So what we did is we used known tools that are already out there for assessing risk, and we tried to say how can we apply those known tools to the methodologies that we would be implementing to give credit to action and come up with a method for crediting those. I think that is all I had on the overview, so I think we're ready to actually move into	1MR. MCKENNEY: My name is David McKenney2and I'm the right now I'm currently the Engineering3Fix It Now Supervisor at ENTARK (unclear) 1. I've got4going on 27 a little more than 27 years experience,5all of it in engineering, and before that 6 years of6construction experience. I was the engineering7coordinator and the TSE the evening after the event.8We'll talk about what the engineering activities were9going on associated with that.10The engineering fix it now team is one of11our normal businesses is to provide temporary power12during outages and for other like bus outages and13some of those kind of things. So we're very familiar14with the ability to get power to where we need it.15MR. SULLINS: To remind you of the16structure of our presentation, the success paths for174160 volt power recovery are built upon what we actually18did to substantiate their viability and also recognize
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	offsite power connected to our buses. And the 4th item that we will talk about is inventory. Making sure that we had available inventory for our spent fuel pool which was flooded up, had over 300,000 gallons of water on top of the fuel active fuel, but we did recognize the need to establish inventory control. As we go on through the Unit 1 discussion, we recognize that crediting those, there is no approved process to credit actions that we were proposing. So what we did is we used known tools that are already out there for assessing risk, and we tried to say how can we apply those known tools to the methodologies that we would be implementing to give credit to action and come up with a method for crediting those. I think that is all I had on the overview, so I think we're ready to actually move into the Unit 1 discussion.	1MR. MCKENNEY: My name is David McKenney2and I'm the right now I'm currently the Engineering3Fix It Now Supervisor at ENTARK (unclear) 1. I've got4going on 27 a little more than 27 years experience,5all of it in engineering, and before that 6 years of6construction experience. I was the engineering7coordinator and the TSE the evening after the event.8We'll talk about what the engineering activities were9going on associated with that.10The engineering fix it now team is one of11our normal businesses is to provide temporary power12during outages and for other like bus outages and13some of those kind of things. So we're very familiar14with the ability to get power to where we need it.15MR. SULLINS: To remind you of the16structure of our presentation, the success paths for174160 volt power recovery are built upon what we actually18did to substantiate their viability and also recognize19that those success paths were in our contingency plans
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	offsite power connected to our buses. And the 4th item that we will talk about is inventory. Making sure that we had available inventory for our spent fuel pool which was flooded up, had over 300,000 gallons of water on top of the fuel active fuel, but we did recognize the need to establish inventory control. As we go on through the Unit 1 discussion, we recognize that crediting those, there is no approved process to credit actions that we were proposing. So what we did is we used known tools that are already out there for assessing risk, and we tried to say how can we apply those known tools to the methodologies that we would be implementing to give credit to action and come up with a method for crediting those. I think that is all I had on the overview, so I think we're ready to actually move into the Unit 1 discussion. MR. SULLINS: Mr. Browning, this is Gary	1MR. MCKENNEY: My name is David McKenney2and I'm the right now I'm currently the Engineering3Fix It Now Supervisor at ENTARK (unclear) 1. I've got4going on 27 a little more than 27 years experience,5all of it in engineering, and before that 6 years of6construction experience. I was the engineering7coordinator and the TSE the evening after the event.8We'll talk about what the engineering activities were9going on associated with that.10The engineering fix it now team is one of11our normal businesses is to provide temporary power12during outages and for other like bus outages and13some of those kind of things. So we're very familiar14with the ability to get power to where we need it.15MR. SULLINS: To remind you of the16structure of our presentation, the success paths for174160 volt power recovery are built upon what we actually18did to substantiate their viability and also recognize19that those success paths were in our contingency plans20in the event that power degraded.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	offsite power connected to our buses. And the 4th item that we will talk about is inventory. Making sure that we had available inventory for our spent fuel pool which was flooded up, had over 300,000 gallons of water on top of the fuel active fuel, but we did recognize the need to establish inventory control. As we go on through the Unit 1 discussion, we recognize that crediting those, there is no approved process to credit actions that we were proposing. So what we did is we used known tools that are already out there for assessing risk, and we tried to say how can we apply those known tools to the methodologies that we would be implementing to give credit to action and come up with a method for crediting those. I think that is all I had on the overview, so I think we're ready to actually move into the Unit 1 discussion. MR. SULLINS: Mr. Browning, this is Gary Sullins, you spoke to the spent fuel pool, I think you	1MR. MCKENNEY: My name is David McKenney2and I'm the right now I'm currently the Engineering3Fix It Now Supervisor at ENTARK (unclear) 1. I've got4going on 27 a little more than 27 years experience,5all of it in engineering, and before that 6 years of6construction experience. I was the engineering7coordinator and the TSE the evening after the event.8We'll talk about what the engineering activities were9going on associated with that.10The engineering fix it now team is one of11our normal businesses is to provide temporary power12during outages and for other like bus outages and13some of those kind of things. So we're very familiar14with the ability to get power to where we need it.15MR. SULLINS: To remind you of the16structure of our presentation, the success paths for174160 volt power recovery are built upon what we actually18did to substantiate their viability and also recognize19that those success paths were in our contingency plans20in the event that power degraded.21So what we'll start with, initial
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	offsite power connected to our buses. And the 4th item that we will talk about is inventory. Making sure that we had available inventory for our spent fuel pool which was flooded up, had over 300,000 gallons of water on top of the fuel active fuel, but we did recognize the need to establish inventory control. As we go on through the Unit 1 discussion, we recognize that crediting those, there is no approved process to credit actions that we were proposing. So what we did is we used known tools that are already out there for assessing risk, and we tried to say how can we apply those known tools to the methodologies that we would be implementing to give credit to action and come up with a method for crediting those. I think that is all I had on the overview, so I think we're ready to actually move into the Unit 1 discussion. MR. SULLINS: Mr. Browning, this is Gary Sullins, you spoke to the spent fuel pool, I think you meant the fuel transfer.	1MR. MCKENNEY: My name is David McKenney2and I'm the right now I'm currently the Engineering3Fix It Now Supervisor at ENTARK (unclear) 1. I've got4going on 27 a little more than 27 years experience,5all of it in engineering, and before that 6 years of6construction experience. I was the engineering7coordinator and the TSE the evening after the event.8We'll talk about what the engineering activities were9going on associated with that.10The engineering fix it now team is one of11our normal businesses is to provide temporary power12during outages and for other like bus outages and13some of those kind of things. So we're very familiar14with the ability to get power to where we need it.15MR. SULLINS: To remind you of the16structure of our presentation, the success paths for174160 volt power recovery are built upon what we actually18did to substantiate their viability and also recognize19that those success paths were in our contingency plans20in the event that power degraded.21So what we'll start with, initial22conditions that applied both on the day of the event
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	offsite power connected to our buses. And the 4th item that we will talk about is inventory. Making sure that we had available inventory for our spent fuel pool which was flooded up, had over 300,000 gallons of water on top of the fuel active fuel, but we did recognize the need to establish inventory control. As we go on through the Unit 1 discussion, we recognize that crediting those, there is no approved process to credit actions that we were proposing. So what we did is we used known tools that are already out there for assessing risk, and we tried to say how can we apply those known tools to the methodologies that we would be implementing to give credit to action and come up with a method for crediting those. I think that is all I had on the overview, so I think we're ready to actually move into the Unit 1 discussion. MR. SULLINS: Mr. Browning, this is Gary Sullins, you spoke to the spent fuel pool, I think you meant the fuel transfer. MR. BROWNING: Both. In our succession	1MR. MCKENNEY: My name is David McKenney2and I'm the right now I'm currently the Engineering3Fix It Now Supervisor at ENTARK (unclear) 1. I've got4going on 27 a little more than 27 years experience,5all of it in engineering, and before that 6 years of6construction experience. I was the engineering7coordinator and the TSE the evening after the event.8We'll talk about what the engineering activities were9going on associated with that.10The engineering fix it now team is one of11our normal businesses is to provide temporary power12during outages and for other like bus outages and13some of those kind of things. So we're very familiar14with the ability to get power to where we need it.15MR. SULLINS: To remind you of the16structure of our presentation, the success paths for174160 volt power recovery are built upon what we actually18did to substantiate their viability and also recognize19that those success paths were in our contingency plans20in the event that power degraded.21So what we'll start with, initial22conditions that applied both on the day of the event23with the plant responding as it did, and these initial
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	offsite power connected to our buses. And the 4th item that we will talk about is inventory. Making sure that we had available inventory for our spent fuel pool which was flooded up, had over 300,000 gallons of water on top of the fuel active fuel, but we did recognize the need to establish inventory control. As we go on through the Unit 1 discussion, we recognize that crediting those, there is no approved process to credit actions that we were proposing. So what we did is we used known tools that are already out there for assessing risk, and we tried to say how can we apply those known tools to the methodologies that we would be implementing to give credit to action and come up with a method for crediting those. I think that is all I had on the overview, so I think we're ready to actually move into the Unit 1 discussion. MR. SULLINS: Mr. Browning, this is Gary Sullins, you spoke to the spent fuel pool, I think you meant the fuel transfer.	1MR. MCKENNEY: My name is David McKenney2and I'm the right now I'm currently the Engineering3Fix It Now Supervisor at ENTARK (unclear) 1. I've got4going on 27 a little more than 27 years experience,5all of it in engineering, and before that 6 years of6construction experience. I was the engineering7coordinator and the TSE the evening after the event.8We'll talk about what the engineering activities were9going on associated with that.10The engineering fix it now team is one of11our normal businesses is to provide temporary power12during outages and for other like bus outages and13some of those kind of things. So we're very familiar14with the ability to get power to where we need it.15MR. SULLINS: To remind you of the16structure of our presentation, the success paths for174160 volt power recovery are built upon what we actually18did to substantiate their viability and also recognize19that those success paths were in our contingency plans20in the event that power degraded.21So what we'll start with, initial22conditions that applied both on the day of the event

	Page 25		Page 27
1	emergency diesel generators.	1	non-vital sources to our vital switchgear. Those being
2	We were on day 7 of our refuelling outage	2	our startup one and startup two transformers and the
3	with our fuel transfer canal flooded. That provided for	3	alternate AC diesel generator. Our vital switchgear
4	us a time to boil of 12 hours and a time to core	4	were unaffected and operated properly once re-powered
5	uncovery of 115 hours or 4.8 days	5	from the emergency diesel generators.
6	MR. MITMAN: If I could ask a question of	6	Also note is that we had available to us
7	clarification on that? This is Jeff Mitman from	7	480-volt power within our power block from local
8	headquarters. The 12 hours and the 115 hours are a	8	distribution, we commonly refer to it as the London
9	little bit longer than what I'd seen previously. Two	9	Line. On the day of the stator drop event, that power
10	questions; first is, could you supply the basis for	10	source was used for non-vital equipment. This supports
11	those times? And the second question is, those are the	11	the spent fuel pool cooling function and in days that
12	times that we currently understand were the conditions	12	followed, this power source was used to recover load
13	that they were in. Also of extreme importance is what	13	centers for our 480-volt distribution system. And
14	the operators thought they had at the time of the event.	14	you'll see later in our presentation how this available
15	And so could you speak to how much time they thought	15	power provides options for us to respond.
16	they had when the event happened?	16	On the day of the event we chose to staff
17	MR. SULLINS: Yes I can, Jeff. We can	17	our emergency response organization, and for the
18	provide followup calculations from our insurance staff	18	dominant cut set and the risk assessment we would
19	for the times presented. I don't have with me, readily,	19	likewise be in an alert condition and have available to
20	the times that we we calculate daily an estimate, a	20	us that support structure provided by our ERO.
21	bounding estimate for time to boil and time to core	21	We were in day seven of a fueling outage
22	uncovery, and those times were short and I'll have to	22	and that provided for us substantial support of human
23	get back with you for the exact times that were posted	23	resources. We had 295 craft available, 45 electricians,
24	in the control room and available previously.	24	this is around the clock support, approximately 40
25	MR. BROWNING: Gary, are the estimates	25	engineering personnel, and 60 operations personnel. And
	Page 26		Page 28
-	Page 26		Page 28
1	that are done are any of those recoverable, are they	1	those are the operations personnel available to support
2	that are done are any of those recoverable, are they documented?	2	those are the operations personnel available to support Unit 1. It does not include those that were involved in
2 3	that are done are any of those recoverable, are they documented? MR. SULLINS: Yes they are.	2 3	those are the operations personnel available to support Unit 1. It does not include those that were involved in Unit 2.
2 3 4	that are done are any of those recoverable, are they documented? MR. SULLINS: Yes they are. MR. BROWNING: So we can provide the	2 3 4	those are the operations personnel available to support Unit 1. It does not include those that were involved in Unit 2. To ground our discussion, we've reviewed
2 3 4 5	that are done are any of those recoverable, are they documented? MR. SULLINS: Yes they are. MR. BROWNING: So we can provide the from that day with the estimate?	2 3 4 5	those are the operations personnel available to support Unit 1. It does not include those that were involved in Unit 2. To ground our discussion, we've reviewed your risk assessment and have focussed on key nodes in
2 3 4 5 6	that are done are any of those recoverable, are they documented? MR. SULLINS: Yes they are. MR. BROWNING: So we can provide the from that day with the estimate? MR. SULLINS: Yes we can.	2 3 4 5 6	those are the operations personnel available to support Unit 1. It does not include those that were involved in Unit 2. To ground our discussion, we've reviewed your risk assessment and have focussed on key nodes in sequence 19 which is called out in your report, which
2 3 4 5 6 7	that are done are any of those recoverable, are they documented? MR. SULLINS: Yes they are. MR. BROWNING: So we can provide the from that day with the estimate? MR. SULLINS: Yes we can. MR. DAPAS: Just an over arching	2 3 4 5 6 7	those are the operations personnel available to support Unit 1. It does not include those that were involved in Unit 2. To ground our discussion, we've reviewed your risk assessment and have focussed on key nodes in sequence 19 which is called out in your report, which involves the loss of both emergency diesel generators
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that are done are any of those recoverable, are they documented? MR. SULLINS: Yes they are. MR. BROWNING: So we can provide the from that day with the estimate? MR. SULLINS: Yes we can. MR. DAPAS: Just an over arching question. Our preliminary risk determination we had a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	those are the operations personnel available to support Unit 1. It does not include those that were involved in Unit 2. To ground our discussion, we've reviewed your risk assessment and have focussed on key nodes in sequence 19 which is called out in your report, which involves the loss of both emergency diesel generators and then other sequences where loss of one emergency
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	that are done are any of those recoverable, are they documented? MR. SULLINS: Yes they are. MR. BROWNING: So we can provide the from that day with the estimate? MR. SULLINS: Yes we can. MR. DAPAS: Just an over arching question. Our preliminary risk determination we had a different subsequent regarding time to boil and time to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	those are the operations personnel available to support Unit 1. It does not include those that were involved in Unit 2. To ground our discussion, we've reviewed your risk assessment and have focussed on key nodes in sequence 19 which is called out in your report, which involves the loss of both emergency diesel generators and then other sequences where loss of one emergency diesel generator can influence the probability of core
2 3 5 7 8 9 10	that are done are any of those recoverable, are they documented? MR. SULLINS: Yes they are. MR. BROWNING: So we can provide the from that day with the estimate? MR. SULLINS: Yes we can. MR. DAPAS: Just an over arching question. Our preliminary risk determination we had a different subsequent regarding time to boil and time to core uncovery.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	those are the operations personnel available to support Unit 1. It does not include those that were involved in Unit 2. To ground our discussion, we've reviewed your risk assessment and have focussed on key nodes in sequence 19 which is called out in your report, which involves the loss of both emergency diesel generators and then other sequences where loss of one emergency diesel generator can influence the probability of core damage.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	that are done are any of those recoverable, are they documented? MR. SULLINS: Yes they are. MR. BROWNING: So we can provide the from that day with the estimate? MR. SULLINS: Yes we can. MR. DAPAS: Just an over arching question. Our preliminary risk determination we had a different subsequent regarding time to boil and time to core uncovery. MR. MITMAN: The initial assessment's a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	those are the operations personnel available to support Unit 1. It does not include those that were involved in Unit 2. To ground our discussion, we've reviewed your risk assessment and have focussed on key nodes in sequence 19 which is called out in your report, which involves the loss of both emergency diesel generators and then other sequences where loss of one emergency diesel generator can influence the probability of core damage. We'll be talking about, as Mr. Browning
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	that are done are any of those recoverable, are they documented? MR. SULLINS: Yes they are. MR. BROWNING: So we can provide the from that day with the estimate? MR. SULLINS: Yes we can. MR. DAPAS: Just an over arching question. Our preliminary risk determination we had a different subsequent regarding time to boil and time to core uncovery. MR. MITMAN: The initial assessment's a little bit shorter than those times, but not to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	those are the operations personnel available to support Unit 1. It does not include those that were involved in Unit 2. To ground our discussion, we've reviewed your risk assessment and have focussed on key nodes in sequence 19 which is called out in your report, which involves the loss of both emergency diesel generators and then other sequences where loss of one emergency diesel generator can influence the probability of core damage. We'll be talking about, as Mr. Browning mentioned, recovery paths that were available to us for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that are done are any of those recoverable, are they documented? MR. SULLINS: Yes they are. MR. BROWNING: So we can provide the from that day with the estimate? MR. SULLINS: Yes we can. MR. DAPAS: Just an over arching question. Our preliminary risk determination we had a different subsequent regarding time to boil and time to core uncovery. MR. MITMAN: The initial assessment's a little bit shorter than those times, but not to the point to the human reliability analysis isn't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	those are the operations personnel available to support Unit 1. It does not include those that were involved in Unit 2. To ground our discussion, we've reviewed your risk assessment and have focussed on key nodes in sequence 19 which is called out in your report, which involves the loss of both emergency diesel generators and then other sequences where loss of one emergency diesel generator can influence the probability of core damage. We'll be talking about, as Mr. Browning mentioned, recovery paths that were available to us for 4160-volt power as well as inventory control recovery.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that are done are any of those recoverable, are they documented? MR. SULLINS: Yes they are. MR. BROWNING: So we can provide the from that day with the estimate? MR. SULLINS: Yes we can. MR. DAPAS: Just an over arching question. Our preliminary risk determination we had a different subsequent regarding time to boil and time to core uncovery. MR. MITMAN: The initial assessment's a little bit shorter than those times, but not to the point to the human reliability analysis isn't sensitive enough to distinguish between what they have,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	those are the operations personnel available to support Unit 1. It does not include those that were involved in Unit 2. To ground our discussion, we've reviewed your risk assessment and have focussed on key nodes in sequence 19 which is called out in your report, which involves the loss of both emergency diesel generators and then other sequences where loss of one emergency diesel generator can influence the probability of core damage. We'll be talking about, as Mr. Browning mentioned, recovery paths that were available to us for 4160-volt power as well as inventory control recovery. Our objective, just to summarize, is to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that are done are any of those recoverable, are they documented? MR. SULLINS: Yes they are. MR. BROWNING: So we can provide the from that day with the estimate? MR. SULLINS: Yes we can. MR. DAPAS: Just an over arching question. Our preliminary risk determination we had a different subsequent regarding time to boil and time to core uncovery. MR. MITMAN: The initial assessment's a little bit shorter than those times, but not to the point to the human reliability analysis isn't sensitive enough to distinguish between what they have, what's currently being estimated and what we used. So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	those are the operations personnel available to support Unit 1. It does not include those that were involved in Unit 2. To ground our discussion, we've reviewed your risk assessment and have focussed on key nodes in sequence 19 which is called out in your report, which involves the loss of both emergency diesel generators and then other sequences where loss of one emergency diesel generator can influence the probability of core damage. We'll be talking about, as Mr. Browning mentioned, recovery paths that were available to us for 4160-volt power as well as inventory control recovery. Our objective, just to summarize, is to provide a technical basis for success paths for that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that are done are any of those recoverable, are they documented? MR. SULLINS: Yes they are. MR. BROWNING: So we can provide the from that day with the estimate? MR. SULLINS: Yes we can. MR. DAPAS: Just an over arching question. Our preliminary risk determination we had a different subsequent regarding time to boil and time to core uncovery. MR. MITMAN: The initial assessment's a little bit shorter than those times, but not to the point to the human reliability analysis isn't sensitive enough to distinguish between what they have, what's currently being estimated and what we used. So it's not going to shift the results, but I'm not sure	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	those are the operations personnel available to support Unit 1. It does not include those that were involved in Unit 2. To ground our discussion, we've reviewed your risk assessment and have focussed on key nodes in sequence 19 which is called out in your report, which involves the loss of both emergency diesel generators and then other sequences where loss of one emergency diesel generator can influence the probability of core damage. We'll be talking about, as Mr. Browning mentioned, recovery paths that were available to us for 4160-volt power as well as inventory control recovery. Our objective, just to summarize, is to provide a technical basis for success paths for that dominant cut set where both diesel generators or one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that are done are any of those recoverable, are they documented? MR. SULLINS: Yes they are. MR. BROWNING: So we can provide the from that day with the estimate? MR. SULLINS: Yes we can. MR. DAPAS: Just an over arching question. Our preliminary risk determination we had a different subsequent regarding time to boil and time to core uncovery. MR. MITMAN: The initial assessment's a little bit shorter than those times, but not to the point to the human reliability analysis isn't sensitive enough to distinguish between what they have, what's currently being estimated and what we used. So it's not going to shift the results, but I'm not sure where the numbers are coming from and I'd like to get a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	those are the operations personnel available to support Unit 1. It does not include those that were involved in Unit 2. To ground our discussion, we've reviewed your risk assessment and have focussed on key nodes in sequence 19 which is called out in your report, which involves the loss of both emergency diesel generators and then other sequences where loss of one emergency diesel generator can influence the probability of core damage. We'll be talking about, as Mr. Browning mentioned, recovery paths that were available to us for 4160-volt power as well as inventory control recovery. Our objective, just to summarize, is to provide a technical basis for success paths for that dominant cut set where both diesel generators or one diesel generator is lost. Three of these involve
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that are done are any of those recoverable, are they documented? MR. SULLINS: Yes they are. MR. BROWNING: So we can provide the from that day with the estimate? MR. SULLINS: Yes we can. MR. DAPAS: Just an over arching question. Our preliminary risk determination we had a different subsequent regarding time to boil and time to core uncovery. MR. MITMAN: The initial assessment's a little bit shorter than those times, but not to the point to the human reliability analysis isn't sensitive enough to distinguish between what they have, what's currently being estimated and what we used. So it's not going to shift the results, but I'm not sure where the numbers are coming from and I'd like to get a look at those.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	those are the operations personnel available to support Unit 1. It does not include those that were involved in Unit 2. To ground our discussion, we've reviewed your risk assessment and have focussed on key nodes in sequence 19 which is called out in your report, which involves the loss of both emergency diesel generators and then other sequences where loss of one emergency diesel generator can influence the probability of core damage. We'll be talking about, as Mr. Browning mentioned, recovery paths that were available to us for 4160-volt power as well as inventory control recovery. Our objective, just to summarize, is to provide a technical basis for success paths for that dominant cut set where both diesel generators or one diesel generator is lost. Three of these involve recovering 4160-volt AC power and the three success
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that are done are any of those recoverable, are they documented? MR. SULLINS: Yes they are. MR. BROWNING: So we can provide the from that day with the estimate? MR. SULLINS: Yes we can. MR. DAPAS: Just an over arching question. Our preliminary risk determination we had a different subsequent regarding time to boil and time to core uncovery. MR. MITMAN: The initial assessment's a little bit shorter than those times, but not to the point to the human reliability analysis isn't sensitive enough to distinguish between what they have, what's currently being estimated and what we used. So it's not going to shift the results, but I'm not sure where the numbers are coming from and I'd like to get a look at those. And likewise, what the operators thought	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	those are the operations personnel available to support Unit 1. It does not include those that were involved in Unit 2. To ground our discussion, we've reviewed your risk assessment and have focussed on key nodes in sequence 19 which is called out in your report, which involves the loss of both emergency diesel generators and then other sequences where loss of one emergency diesel generator can influence the probability of core damage. We'll be talking about, as Mr. Browning mentioned, recovery paths that were available to us for 4160-volt power as well as inventory control recovery. Our objective, just to summarize, is to provide a technical basis for success paths for that dominant cut set where both diesel generators or one diesel generator is lost. Three of these involve recovering 4160-volt AC power and the three success paths were those contingency plans that were developed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that are done are any of those recoverable, are they documented? MR. SULLINS: Yes they are. MR. BROWNING: So we can provide the from that day with the estimate? MR. SULLINS: Yes we can. MR. SULLINS: Yes we can. MR. DAPAS: Just an over arching question. Our preliminary risk determination we had a different subsequent regarding time to boil and time to core uncovery. MR. MITMAN: The initial assessment's a little bit shorter than those times, but not to the point to the human reliability analysis isn't sensitive enough to distinguish between what they have, what's currently being estimated and what we used. So it's not going to shift the results, but I'm not sure where the numbers are coming from and I'd like to get a look at those. And likewise, what the operators thought is probably more important then what the times actually	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	those are the operations personnel available to support Unit 1. It does not include those that were involved in Unit 2. To ground our discussion, we've reviewed your risk assessment and have focussed on key nodes in sequence 19 which is called out in your report, which involves the loss of both emergency diesel generators and then other sequences where loss of one emergency diesel generator can influence the probability of core damage. We'll be talking about, as Mr. Browning mentioned, recovery paths that were available to us for 4160-volt power as well as inventory control recovery. Our objective, just to summarize, is to provide a technical basis for success paths for that dominant cut set where both diesel generators or one diesel generator is lost. Three of these involve recovering 4160-volt AC power and the three success
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that are done are any of those recoverable, are they documented? MR. SULLINS: Yes they are. MR. BROWNING: So we can provide the from that day with the estimate? MR. SULLINS: Yes we can. MR. DAPAS: Just an over arching question. Our preliminary risk determination we had a different subsequent regarding time to boil and time to core uncovery. MR. MITMAN: The initial assessment's a little bit shorter than those times, but not to the point to the human reliability analysis isn't sensitive enough to distinguish between what they have, what's currently being estimated and what we used. So it's not going to shift the results, but I'm not sure where the numbers are coming from and I'd like to get a look at those. And likewise, what the operators thought is probably more important then what the times actually were because that's what everybody is going to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	those are the operations personnel available to support Unit 1. It does not include those that were involved in Unit 2. To ground our discussion, we've reviewed your risk assessment and have focussed on key nodes in sequence 19 which is called out in your report, which involves the loss of both emergency diesel generators and then other sequences where loss of one emergency diesel generator can influence the probability of core damage. We'll be talking about, as Mr. Browning mentioned, recovery paths that were available to us for 4160-volt power as well as inventory control recovery. Our objective, just to summarize, is to provide a technical basis for success paths for that dominant cut set where both diesel generators or one diesel generator is lost. Three of these involve recovering 4160-volt AC power and the three success paths were those contingency plans that were developed in response to the event. We also will talk about a 4th success
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that are done are any of those recoverable, are they documented? MR. SULLINS: Yes they are. MR. BROWNING: So we can provide the from that day with the estimate? MR. SULLINS: Yes we can. MR. SULLINS: Yes we can. MR. DAPAS: Just an over arching question. Our preliminary risk determination we had a different subsequent regarding time to boil and time to core uncovery. MR. MITMAN: The initial assessment's a little bit shorter than those times, but not to the point to the human reliability analysis isn't sensitive enough to distinguish between what they have, what's currently being estimated and what we used. So it's not going to shift the results, but I'm not sure where the numbers are coming from and I'd like to get a look at those. And likewise, what the operators thought is probably more important then what the times actually	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	those are the operations personnel available to support Unit 1. It does not include those that were involved in Unit 2. To ground our discussion, we've reviewed your risk assessment and have focussed on key nodes in sequence 19 which is called out in your report, which involves the loss of both emergency diesel generators and then other sequences where loss of one emergency diesel generator can influence the probability of core damage. We'll be talking about, as Mr. Browning mentioned, recovery paths that were available to us for 4160-volt power as well as inventory control recovery. Our objective, just to summarize, is to provide a technical basis for success paths for that dominant cut set where both diesel generators or one diesel generator is lost. Three of these involve recovering 4160-volt AC power and the three success paths were those contingency plans that were developed in response to the event.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that are done are any of those recoverable, are they documented? MR. SULLINS: Yes they are. MR. BROWNING: So we can provide the from that day with the estimate? MR. SULLINS: Yes we can. MR. DAPAS: Just an over arching question. Our preliminary risk determination we had a different subsequent regarding time to boil and time to core uncovery. MR. MITMAN: The initial assessment's a little bit shorter than those times, but not to the point to the human reliability analysis isn't sensitive enough to distinguish between what they have, what's currently being estimated and what we used. So it's not going to shift the results, but I'm not sure where the numbers are coming from and I'd like to get a look at those. And likewise, what the operators thought is probably more important then what the times actually were because that's what everybody is going to be working towards is what they think is the amount of time	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	those are the operations personnel available to support Unit 1. It does not include those that were involved in Unit 2. To ground our discussion, we've reviewed your risk assessment and have focussed on key nodes in sequence 19 which is called out in your report, which involves the loss of both emergency diesel generators and then other sequences where loss of one emergency diesel generator can influence the probability of core damage. We'll be talking about, as Mr. Browning mentioned, recovery paths that were available to us for 4160-volt power as well as inventory control recovery. Our objective, just to summarize, is to provide a technical basis for success paths for that dominant cut set where both diesel generators or one diesel generator is lost. Three of these involve recovering 4160-volt AC power and the three success paths were those contingency plans that were developed in response to the event. We also will talk about a 4th success path involving use of 480-volt power to provide force
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that are done are any of those recoverable, are they documented? MR. SULLINS: Yes they are. MR. BROWNING: So we can provide the from that day with the estimate? MR. SULLINS: Yes we can. MR. DAPAS: Just an over arching question. Our preliminary risk determination we had a different subsequent regarding time to boil and time to core uncovery. MR. MITMAN: The initial assessment's a little bit shorter than those times, but not to the point to the human reliability analysis isn't sensitive enough to distinguish between what they have, what's currently being estimated and what we used. So it's not going to shift the results, but I'm not sure where the numbers are coming from and I'd like to get a look at those. Mnd likewise, what the operators thought is probably more important then what the times actually were because that's what everybody is going to be working towards is what they think is the amount of time that they have, not how much time they actually have.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	those are the operations personnel available to support Unit 1. It does not include those that were involved in Unit 2. To ground our discussion, we've reviewed your risk assessment and have focussed on key nodes in sequence 19 which is called out in your report, which involves the loss of both emergency diesel generators and then other sequences where loss of one emergency diesel generator can influence the probability of core damage. We'll be talking about, as Mr. Browning mentioned, recovery paths that were available to us for 4160-volt power as well as inventory control recovery. Our objective, just to summarize, is to provide a technical basis for success paths for that dominant cut set where both diesel generators or one diesel generator is lost. Three of these involve recovering 4160-volt AC power and the three success paths were those contingency plans that were developed in response to the event. We also will talk about a 4th success path involving use of 480-volt power to provide force flow makeup to the reactor coolant system.

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

	Page 29		Page 31
1	4160-volt success paths were on the board and being	¹ here and we're going to run a c	apable to there and all
2	evaluated in scope in response to this event as	² the relaying and the metering the	-
3	contingencies in the event that something happened. So	³ to do that would be on the table	
4	in terms of determining what we could do, these were	⁴ where is the source of power at	nd where do I need it?
5	already on the table.	5 MR. CIRCLE: Was t	the equipment staged?
6	MR. DAPAS: I think that's an important	6 MR. BROWNING: Y	Yes, sir. We will discuss
7	distinction there. It's not that these alternative	7 that as far as we were going to	do some circ water pump
8	success paths could have been pursued, you are	⁸ cables and some other work on	some site where we had the
9	communicating to us that they actually were being	⁹ craft there, the resources there,	the materials there
10	pursued or at least you were going through the thought	.0 for similar work with similar co	omponents, we just
11	process and what would be involved to establish power	¹ changed where those compone	
12	via those alternate routes. Is that correct?	² MR. KOWALESKI:	This is Joe Kowaleski,
13	MR. KOWALESKI: Yeah, that's correct. So	³ just to be clear, so all the mater	
14	given the picture, we've got two diesel generators, a	4 these options were on site? Th	
15	very stable condition, and so evaluating how to restore	⁵ this job, but they were immedia	•
16	offsite power, the way we chose to do it, from start up		That includes the human
17	one to the safety buses was done in a way to provide	resource and the skills and the	training to implement
18	flexibility for the ultimate recovery. Lay down areas,	⁸ them.	
19	travel paths so it was well away from what we needed for	.9 MR. CIRCLE: But n	
20	construction activities. And it provided operational	MR. BROWNING: 1	
21	flexibility for future testing and activities to restore	developed at that time. They w	vere developed in order to
22	the electrical part.	²² implement. ²³ MR DAPAS: I think	
23	So it's more complex then these options.	MIX. DAI AS. TUIIIIN	
24 25	These options were on the board, being evaluated by the	appropriate that you were plain	ning to go through and
25	TSC as contingencies in the event that we had a problem	explain to	
	Page 30		Page 32
1	with the diesel or some kind of a problem with	¹ MR. BROWNING	: Yes, sir.
2	with the diesel or some kind of a problem with completing the offsite source that we ultimately did.	² MR. DAPAS: I u	Yes, sir. nderstand your question.
2 3	with the diesel or some kind of a problem with completing the offsite source that we ultimately did. MR. BROWNING: And hopefully through our	 ² MR. DAPAS: I un ³ I think it's a valid question. 	: Yes, sir. nderstand your question. I think we'll you
2 3 4	with the diesel or some kind of a problem with completing the offsite source that we ultimately did. MR. BROWNING: And hopefully through our presentation we're going to demonstrate to you that the	 ² MR. DAPAS: I un ³ I think it's a valid question. ⁴ were going to give us the op 	: Yes, sir. nderstand your question. I think we'll you portunity to engage, right?
2 3 4 5	with the diesel or some kind of a problem with completing the offsite source that we ultimately did. MR. BROWNING: And hopefully through our presentation we're going to demonstrate to you that the scope of what we actually did was very similar to the	 MR. DAPAS: I un MR. DAPAS: I un I think it's a valid question. were going to give us the op MR. BROWNING 	 Yes, sir. inderstand your question. I think we'll you portunity to engage, right? Yes, sir, if we don't hit
2 3 4 5 6	with the diesel or some kind of a problem with completing the offsite source that we ultimately did. MR. BROWNING: And hopefully through our presentation we're going to demonstrate to you that the scope of what we actually did was very similar to the scope that was in these contingency plans, so the	 MR. DAPAS: I un MR. DAPAS: I un I think it's a valid question. were going to give us the op MR. BROWNING your expectations when we find 	 Yes, sir. inderstand your question. I think we'll you portunity to engage, right? Yes, sir, if we don't hit
2 3 4 5 6 7	with the diesel or some kind of a problem with completing the offsite source that we ultimately did. MR. BROWNING: And hopefully through our presentation we're going to demonstrate to you that the scope of what we actually did was very similar to the scope that was in these contingency plans, so the materials, the resources, and the people that we would	 MR. DAPAS: I un MR. DAPAS: I un I think it's a valid question. were going to give us the op MR. BROWNING your expectations when we for question. 	 Yes, sir. inderstand your question. I think we'll you portunity to engage, right? Yes, sir, if we don't hit lip past the slide, ask a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	with the diesel or some kind of a problem with completing the offsite source that we ultimately did. MR. BROWNING: And hopefully through our presentation we're going to demonstrate to you that the scope of what we actually did was very similar to the scope that was in these contingency plans, so the materials, the resources, and the people that we would have needed to do this activity, we could have shifted	 MR. DAPAS: I un MR. DAPAS: I un I think it's a valid question. were going to give us the op MR. BROWNING your expectations when we f question. MR. CIRCLE: We 	 Yes, sir. inderstand your question. I think we'll you portunity to engage, right? Yes, sir, if we don't hit lip past the slide, ask a ell, we're not wallflowers.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	with the diesel or some kind of a problem with completing the offsite source that we ultimately did. MR. BROWNING: And hopefully through our presentation we're going to demonstrate to you that the scope of what we actually did was very similar to the scope that was in these contingency plans, so the materials, the resources, and the people that we would have needed to do this activity, we could have shifted the plan from what we were actually doing, which was	 MR. DAPAS: I un MR. DAPAS: I un I think it's a valid question. were going to give us the opp MR. BROWNING your expectations when we f question. MR. CIRCLE: WA MR. SULLINS: T 	 Yes, sir. inderstand your question. I think we'll you portunity to engage, right? Yes, sir, if we don't hit lip past the slide, ask a ell, we're not wallflowers. Thank you for the question.
2 3 5 7 8 9 10	with the diesel or some kind of a problem with completing the offsite source that we ultimately did. MR. BROWNING: And hopefully through our presentation we're going to demonstrate to you that the scope of what we actually did was very similar to the scope that was in these contingency plans, so the materials, the resources, and the people that we would have needed to do this activity, we could have shifted the plan from what we were actually doing, which was based on actual planning not the ones proposed in risk	 MR. DAPAS: I un MR. DAPAS: I un I think it's a valid question. were going to give us the opport of the second sec	 Yes, sir. inderstand your question. I think we'll you portunity to engage, right? Yes, sir, if we don't hit lip past the slide, ask a ell, we're not wallflowers. Thank you for the question. and for postulated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	with the diesel or some kind of a problem with completing the offsite source that we ultimately did. MR. BROWNING: And hopefully through our presentation we're going to demonstrate to you that the scope of what we actually did was very similar to the scope that was in these contingency plans, so the materials, the resources, and the people that we would have needed to do this activity, we could have shifted the plan from what we were actually doing, which was based on actual planning not the ones proposed in risk analysis, but they are so similar in nature that that	 MR. DAPAS: I un MR. DAPAS: I un I think it's a valid question. were going to give us the opport of give us the opport	 Yes, sir. inderstand your question. I think we'll you portunity to engage, right? Yes, sir, if we don't hit lip past the slide, ask a ell, we're not wallflowers. Thank you for the question. and for postulated ities would be dictated by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	with the diesel or some kind of a problem with completing the offsite source that we ultimately did. MR. BROWNING: And hopefully through our presentation we're going to demonstrate to you that the scope of what we actually did was very similar to the scope that was in these contingency plans, so the materials, the resources, and the people that we would have needed to do this activity, we could have shifted the plan from what we were actually doing, which was based on actual planning not the ones proposed in risk analysis, but they are so similar in nature that that change in course could have happened pretty quickly.	 MR. DAPAS: I un MR. DAPAS: I un I think it's a valid question. were going to give us the op MR. BROWNING your expectations when we f question. MR. CIRCLE: Way MR. SULLINS: T Both for our actual response equipment failures, our prior the circumstances. And what 	 Yes, sir. inderstand your question. I think we'll you portunity to engage, right? Yes, sir, if we don't hit lip past the slide, ask a ell, we're not wallflowers. Thank you for the question. and for postulated ities would be dictated by twe mean by that is we're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	with the diesel or some kind of a problem with completing the offsite source that we ultimately did. MR. BROWNING: And hopefully through our presentation we're going to demonstrate to you that the scope of what we actually did was very similar to the scope that was in these contingency plans, so the materials, the resources, and the people that we would have needed to do this activity, we could have shifted the plan from what we were actually doing, which was based on actual planning not the ones proposed in risk analysis, but they are so similar in nature that that change in course could have happened pretty quickly. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle from	 MR. DAPAS: I un MR. DAPAS: I un I think it's a valid question. were going to give us the op MR. BROWNING your expectations when we f question. MR. CIRCLE: WA MR. SULLINS: T Both for our actual response equipment failures, our prior the circumstances. And what looking at our defense in dep 	 Yes, sir. inderstand your question. I think we'll you portunity to engage, right? Yes, sir, if we don't hit lip past the slide, ask a ell, we're not wallflowers. 'hank you for the question. and for postulated ities would be dictated by it we mean by that is we're oth for our five key safety
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	with the diesel or some kind of a problem with completing the offsite source that we ultimately did. MR. BROWNING: And hopefully through our presentation we're going to demonstrate to you that the scope of what we actually did was very similar to the scope that was in these contingency plans, so the materials, the resources, and the people that we would have needed to do this activity, we could have shifted the plan from what we were actually doing, which was based on actual planning not the ones proposed in risk analysis, but they are so similar in nature that that change in course could have happened pretty quickly. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle from headquarters. Did these contingencies exist in any way,	 MR. DAPAS: I un MR. DAPAS: I un I think it's a valid question. were going to give us the opp MR. BROWNING your expectations when we f question. MR. CIRCLE: Wa MR. SULLINS: T Both for our actual response equipment failures, our prior the circumstances. And wha looking at our defense in dep functions. What's our status 	 Yes, sir. inderstand your question. I think we'll you portunity to engage, right? Yes, sir, if we don't hit lip past the slide, ask a ell, we're not wallflowers. Thank you for the question. and for postulated ities would be dictated by it we mean by that is we're of the or ur five key safety of the plant? If the TSC
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	with the diesel or some kind of a problem with completing the offsite source that we ultimately did. MR. BROWNING: And hopefully through our presentation we're going to demonstrate to you that the scope of what we actually did was very similar to the scope that was in these contingency plans, so the materials, the resources, and the people that we would have needed to do this activity, we could have shifted the plan from what we were actually doing, which was based on actual planning not the ones proposed in risk analysis, but they are so similar in nature that that change in course could have happened pretty quickly. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle from headquarters. Did these contingencies exist in any way, shape, or form prior to the stator drop as standard	 MR. DAPAS: I un MR. DAPAS: I un I think it's a valid question. were going to give us the opposition of the second second	 Yes, sir. inderstand your question. I think we'll you portunity to engage, right? Yes, sir, if we don't hit lip past the slide, ask a ell, we're not wallflowers. Thank you for the question. and for postulated ities would be dictated by it we mean by that is we're oth for our five key safety of the plant? If the TSC y and in the event of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	with the diesel or some kind of a problem with completing the offsite source that we ultimately did. MR. BROWNING: And hopefully through our presentation we're going to demonstrate to you that the scope of what we actually did was very similar to the scope that was in these contingency plans, so the materials, the resources, and the people that we would have needed to do this activity, we could have shifted the plan from what we were actually doing, which was based on actual planning not the ones proposed in risk analysis, but they are so similar in nature that that change in course could have happened pretty quickly. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle from headquarters. Did these contingencies exist in any way, shape, or form prior to the stator drop as standard contingencies that you normally take? That would	 MR. DAPAS: I un MR. DAPAS: I un I think it's a valid question. were going to give us the opport of gives and the second seco	 Yes, sir. inderstand your question. I think we'll you portunity to engage, right? Yes, sir, if we don't hit lip past the slide, ask a ell, we're not wallflowers. 'hank you for the question. and for postulated ities would be dictated by twe mean by that is we're of the plant? If the TSC y and in the event of sessing those and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	with the diesel or some kind of a problem with completing the offsite source that we ultimately did. MR. BROWNING: And hopefully through our presentation we're going to demonstrate to you that the scope of what we actually did was very similar to the scope that was in these contingency plans, so the materials, the resources, and the people that we would have needed to do this activity, we could have shifted the plan from what we were actually doing, which was based on actual planning not the ones proposed in risk analysis, but they are so similar in nature that that change in course could have happened pretty quickly. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle from headquarters. Did these contingencies exist in any way, shape, or form prior to the stator drop as standard contingencies that you normally take? That would require, you know, putting equipment in the warehouse,	 MR. DAPAS: I un MR. DAPAS: I un I think it's a valid question. were going to give us the opport of gives and the second seco	 Yes, sir. nderstand your question. I think we'll you portunity to engage, right? Yes, sir, if we don't hit lip past the slide, ask a ell, we're not wallflowers. Thank you for the question. and for postulated ities would be dictated by twe mean by that is we're of the plant? If the TSC y and in the event of sessing those and ne day of the event the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	with the diesel or some kind of a problem with completing the offsite source that we ultimately did. MR. BROWNING: And hopefully through our presentation we're going to demonstrate to you that the scope of what we actually did was very similar to the scope that was in these contingency plans, so the materials, the resources, and the people that we would have needed to do this activity, we could have shifted the plan from what we were actually doing, which was based on actual planning not the ones proposed in risk analysis, but they are so similar in nature that that change in course could have happened pretty quickly. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle from headquarters. Did these contingencies exist in any way, shape, or form prior to the stator drop as standard contingencies that you normally take? That would	 MR. DAPAS: I un MR. DAPAS: I un I think it's a valid question. were going to give us the op MR. BROWNING your expectations when we f question. MR. CIRCLE: With the second seco	 Yes, sir. nderstand your question. I think we'll you portunity to engage, right? Yes, sir, if we don't hit lip past the slide, ask a ell, we're not wallflowers. Thank you for the question. and for postulated ities would be dictated by tt we mean by that is we're poth for our five key safety of the plant? If the TSC y and in the event of sessing those and ne day of the event the and we had two trains of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	with the diesel or some kind of a problem with completing the offsite source that we ultimately did. MR. BROWNING: And hopefully through our presentation we're going to demonstrate to you that the scope of what we actually did was very similar to the scope that was in these contingency plans, so the materials, the resources, and the people that we would have needed to do this activity, we could have shifted the plan from what we were actually doing, which was based on actual planning not the ones proposed in risk analysis, but they are so similar in nature that that change in course could have happened pretty quickly. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle from headquarters. Did these contingencies exist in any way, shape, or form prior to the stator drop as standard contingencies that you normally take? That would require, you know, putting equipment in the warehouse, getting it prepared, procedures or anything like that?	 MR. DAPAS: I un MR. DAPAS: I un I think it's a valid question. were going to give us the op MR. BROWNING your expectations when we f question. MR. CIRCLE: With the second seco	 Yes, sir. nderstand your question. I think we'll you portunity to engage, right? Yes, sir, if we don't hit lip past the slide, ask a ell, we're not wallflowers. Thank you for the question. and for postulated ities would be dictated by tt we mean by that is we're poth for our five key safety of the plant? If the TSC y and in the event of sessing those and ne day of the event the and we had two trains of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	with the diesel or some kind of a problem with completing the offsite source that we ultimately did. MR. BROWNING: And hopefully through our presentation we're going to demonstrate to you that the scope of what we actually did was very similar to the scope that was in these contingency plans, so the materials, the resources, and the people that we would have needed to do this activity, we could have shifted the plan from what we were actually doing, which was based on actual planning not the ones proposed in risk analysis, but they are so similar in nature that that change in course could have happened pretty quickly. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle from headquarters. Did these contingencies exist in any way, shape, or form prior to the stator drop as standard contingencies that you normally take? That would require, you know, putting equipment in the warehouse, getting it prepared, procedures or anything like that? MR. BROWNING: The actual specific	 MR. DAPAS: I un MR. DAPAS: I un I think it's a valid question. were going to give us the opp MR. BROWNING your expectations when we f question. MR. CIRCLE: WA MR. SULLINS: T Both for our actual response equipment failures, our prior the circumstances. And what looking at our defense in dep functions. What's our status is activated as it was that day blackout condition, we're ass establishing priorities. On the plant was stabilized quickly decay heat removal on this stabilized 	 Yes, sir. inderstand your question. I think we'll you portunity to engage, right? Yes, sir, if we don't hit lip past the slide, ask a ell, we're not wallflowers. Thank you for the question. and for postulated ities would be dictated by it we mean by that is we're of the plant? If the TSC y and in the event of sessing those and ne day of the event the and we had two trains of upport equipment in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	with the diesel or some kind of a problem with completing the offsite source that we ultimately did. MR. BROWNING: And hopefully through our presentation we're going to demonstrate to you that the scope of what we actually did was very similar to the scope that was in these contingency plans, so the materials, the resources, and the people that we would have needed to do this activity, we could have shifted the plan from what we were actually doing, which was based on actual planning not the ones proposed in risk analysis, but they are so similar in nature that that change in course could have happened pretty quickly. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle from headquarters. Did these contingencies exist in any way, shape, or form prior to the stator drop as standard contingencies that you normally take? That would require, you know, putting equipment in the warehouse, getting it prepared, procedures or anything like that? MR. BROWNING: The actual specific contingency that we're talking about today would not	 MR. DAPAS: I un MR. DAPAS: I un I think it's a valid question. were going to give us the opposition of the second system of the second system	 Yes, sir. nderstand your question. I think we'll you portunity to engage, right? Yes, sir, if we don't hit lip past the slide, ask a ell, we're not wallflowers. Thank you for the question. and for postulated ities would be dictated by twe mean by that is we're oth for our five key safety of the plant? If the TSC y and in the event of sessing those and ne day of the event the and we had two trains of upport equipment in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	with the diesel or some kind of a problem with completing the offsite source that we ultimately did. MR. BROWNING: And hopefully through our presentation we're going to demonstrate to you that the scope of what we actually did was very similar to the scope that was in these contingency plans, so the materials, the resources, and the people that we would have needed to do this activity, we could have shifted the plan from what we were actually doing, which was based on actual planning not the ones proposed in risk analysis, but they are so similar in nature that that change in course could have happened pretty quickly. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle from headquarters. Did these contingencies exist in any way, shape, or form prior to the stator drop as standard contingencies that you normally take? That would require, you know, putting equipment in the warehouse, getting it prepared, procedures or anything like that? MR. BROWNING: The actual specific contingency that we're talking about today would not have been fully developed; however, the processes that we would have used for temporary power for a normal refueling, we do these kind of things to prepare	 MR. DAPAS: I un MR. DAPAS: I un I think it's a valid question. were going to give us the opposition of the provided states o	 Yes, sir. nderstand your question. I think we'll you portunity to engage, right? Yes, sir, if we don't hit lip past the slide, ask a ell, we're not wallflowers. Thank you for the question. and for postulated ities would be dictated by the mean by that is we're on the for our five key safety of the plant? If the TSC y and in the event of sessing those and he day of the event the and we had two trains of upport equipment in a with those key he electric power, al, protecting the spent fuel
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	with the diesel or some kind of a problem with completing the offsite source that we ultimately did. MR. BROWNING: And hopefully through our presentation we're going to demonstrate to you that the scope of what we actually did was very similar to the scope that was in these contingency plans, so the materials, the resources, and the people that we would have needed to do this activity, we could have shifted the plan from what we were actually doing, which was based on actual planning not the ones proposed in risk analysis, but they are so similar in nature that that change in course could have happened pretty quickly. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle from headquarters. Did these contingencies exist in any way, shape, or form prior to the stator drop as standard contingencies that you normally take? That would require, you know, putting equipment in the warehouse, getting it prepared, procedures or anything like that? MR. BROWNING: The actual specific contingency that we're talking about today would not have been fully developed; however, the processes that we would have used for temporary power for a normal	MR. DAPAS: I un MR. SULLINS: I MR. CIRCLE: WM MR. SULLINS: T Both for our actual response equipment failures, our prior the circumstances. And wha looking at our defense in dep functions. What's our status is activated as it was that day blackout condition, we're ass establishing priorities. On th plant was stabilized quickly decay heat removal on this s operation.	 Yes, sir. inderstand your question. I think we'll you portunity to engage, right? Yes, sir, if we don't hit lip past the slide, ask a ell, we're not wallflowers. Thank you for the question. and for postulated ities would be dictated by twe mean by that is we're poth for our five key safety of the plant? If the TSC y and in the event of sessing those and ne day of the event the and we had two trains of upport equipment in a with those key he electric power, al, protecting the spent fuel itions that existed in our

	Page 33		Page 35
1	personnel with changing plant conditions, electrical	1	We don't have to protect that diesel anymore and that
2	safety, structural safety were very important to us.	2	breaker would have been closed by the operators just as
3	And as Mr. Kowaleski had mentioned, we	3	Gary's stating it. The subsequent days we've discovered
4	were factoring in given that we were stable with two	4	nothing that would have changed our approach and that
5	trains in operation, we're looking at taking a longer	5	breaker would have powered that bus up without
6	term view of risk and how we recover and what we	6	challenge.
7	ultimately chose to do with our recovery of offsite	7	MR. SULLINS: The process I was
8	power.	8	involved in that decision. That process that applies is
9	On the day of the event we recovered	9	our temporary modification process, and I had
10	promptly our decay heat removal function, our spent fuel	10	discussions with the lead for the recovery team, our
11	pool cooling. In the week that followed, we reliably	11	design engineering manager, about whether we met the
12	operated emergency diesel generators with no challenges,	12	criteria for an emergency team mod and actually placing
13	and beyond that, we reliably operated our two trains of	13	it into service, and my position was that we did not.
14	decay heat removal.	14	So we waited for the formal approval to be completed to
15	As we've already discussed, we chose	15	place it into service.
16	we developed and chose a recovery path for 4160-volt	16	MR. BROWNING: Again going back to the
17	power. In light of the stable conditions and the time	17	other again, this is Jeremy Browning, Site Vice
18	margin that was available for us with the condition,	18	President ANO we would have met the criteria for
19	too, of our shut down operations protection plan flooded	19	emergency temp mod had one of those diesel generators
20	up to implement an optimum electrical recovery.	20	failed in some way because the safety function would not
21	That recovery that was implemented was	21	have been met and that would allowed that process to
22 23	made available to my staff and operations in 4.4 days.	22 23	continue forward.
23	And to be clear on what we mean by available, it was	23	MR. CIRCLE: Right. And this is Jeff
25	tested energized up to the last breaker on which no	25	Circle. The thing is that if the diesel had failed, one
15	modifications were made and operating instructions and	25	of the reasons why it failed is the fault with the
	Page 34		Page 36
1	briefings have been provided to our operators in the	1	switchgear. So it wouldn't have been a 4.4-day
2	briefings have been provided to our operators in the form of night orders. So in the event that we needed to	2	switchgear. So it wouldn't have been a 4.4-day recovery, it would have been a little bit longer.
2 3	briefings have been provided to our operators in the form of night orders. So in the event that we needed to use this source on a emergency basis, it was available	2 3	switchgear. So it wouldn't have been a 4.4-day recovery, it would have been a little bit longer. Because you would have to have measured the switchgear
2 3 4	briefings have been provided to our operators in the form of night orders. So in the event that we needed to use this source on a emergency basis, it was available to us at that time	2 3 4	switchgear. So it wouldn't have been a 4.4-day recovery, it would have been a little bit longer. Because you would have to have measured the switchgear to ensure that the fault, the condition had cleared.
2 3 4 5	briefings have been provided to our operators in the form of night orders. So in the event that we needed to use this source on a emergency basis, it was available to us at that time MR. MITMAN: Could you speak to why you	2 3 4 5	switchgear. So it wouldn't have been a 4.4-day recovery, it would have been a little bit longer. Because you would have to have measured the switchgear to ensure that the fault, the condition had cleared. MR. KOWALESKI: I would clarify that
2 3 4 5 6	briefings have been provided to our operators in the form of night orders. So in the event that we needed to use this source on a emergency basis, it was available to us at that time MR. MITMAN: Could you speak to why you waited, what the thinking was behind waiting another day	2 3 4 5 6	switchgear. So it wouldn't have been a 4.4-day recovery, it would have been a little bit longer. Because you would have to have measured the switchgear to ensure that the fault, the condition had cleared. MR. KOWALESKI: I would clarify that slightly. The timeframe for the 4.8 days available to,
2 3 4 5 6 7	briefings have been provided to our operators in the form of night orders. So in the event that we needed to use this source on a emergency basis, it was available to us at that time MR. MITMAN: Could you speak to why you waited, what the thinking was behind waiting another day and a half, approximately, before you re-energized	2 3 4 5 6 7	switchgear. So it wouldn't have been a 4.4-day recovery, it would have been a little bit longer. Because you would have to have measured the switchgear to ensure that the fault, the condition had cleared. MR. KOWALESKI: I would clarify that slightly. The timeframe for the 4.8 days available to, quote, uncover the start at the point that you lost both
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	briefings have been provided to our operators in the form of night orders. So in the event that we needed to use this source on a emergency basis, it was available to us at that time MR. MITMAN: Could you speak to why you waited, what the thinking was behind waiting another day and a half, approximately, before you re-energized MR. KOWALESKI: refer to the process	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	switchgear. So it wouldn't have been a 4.4-day recovery, it would have been a little bit longer. Because you would have to have measured the switchgear to ensure that the fault, the condition had cleared. MR. KOWALESKI: I would clarify that slightly. The timeframe for the 4.8 days available to, quote, uncover the start at the point that you lost both diesels, not on the day that stator, but that point in
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	briefings have been provided to our operators in the form of night orders. So in the event that we needed to use this source on a emergency basis, it was available to us at that time MR. MITMAN: Could you speak to why you waited, what the thinking was behind waiting another day and a half, approximately, before you re-energized MR. KOWALESKI: refer to the process diagram.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	switchgear. So it wouldn't have been a 4.4-day recovery, it would have been a little bit longer. Because you would have to have measured the switchgear to ensure that the fault, the condition had cleared. MR. KOWALESKI: I would clarify that slightly. The timeframe for the 4.8 days available to, quote, uncover the start at the point that you lost both diesels, not on the day that stator, but that point in time that both diesels failed, you would have had 4.8
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	briefings have been provided to our operators in the form of night orders. So in the event that we needed to use this source on a emergency basis, it was available to us at that time MR. MITMAN: Could you speak to why you waited, what the thinking was behind waiting another day and a half, approximately, before you re-energized MR. KOWALESKI: refer to the process diagram. MR. SULLINS: I'll answer briefly. It	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	switchgear. So it wouldn't have been a 4.4-day recovery, it would have been a little bit longer. Because you would have to have measured the switchgear to ensure that the fault, the condition had cleared. MR. KOWALESKI: I would clarify that slightly. The timeframe for the 4.8 days available to, quote, uncover the start at the point that you lost both diesels, not on the day that stator, but that point in time that both diesels failed, you would have had 4.8 days to put that in service.
2 3 5 7 8 9 10	briefings have been provided to our operators in the form of night orders. So in the event that we needed to use this source on a emergency basis, it was available to us at that time MR. MITMAN: Could you speak to why you waited, what the thinking was behind waiting another day and a half, approximately, before you re-energized MR. KOWALESKI: refer to the process diagram. MR. SULLINS: I'll answer briefly. It was to complete the review process to formally approve	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	switchgear. So it wouldn't have been a 4.4-day recovery, it would have been a little bit longer. Because you would have to have measured the switchgear to ensure that the fault, the condition had cleared. MR. KOWALESKI: I would clarify that slightly. The timeframe for the 4.8 days available to, quote, uncover the start at the point that you lost both diesels, not on the day that stator, but that point in time that both diesels failed, you would have had 4.8 days to put that in service. MR. CIRCLE: Right, but you would still
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	briefings have been provided to our operators in the form of night orders. So in the event that we needed to use this source on a emergency basis, it was available to us at that time MR. MITMAN: Could you speak to why you waited, what the thinking was behind waiting another day and a half, approximately, before you re-energized MR. KOWALESKI: refer to the process diagram. MR. SULLINS: I'll answer briefly. It was to complete the review process to formally approve the temporary modifications design reviews.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	switchgear. So it wouldn't have been a 4.4-day recovery, it would have been a little bit longer. Because you would have to have measured the switchgear to ensure that the fault, the condition had cleared. MR. KOWALESKI: I would clarify that slightly. The timeframe for the 4.8 days available to, quote, uncover the start at the point that you lost both diesels, not on the day that stator, but that point in time that both diesels failed, you would have had 4.8 days to put that in service. MR. CIRCLE: Right, but you would still have a lot longer time then you had on that particular
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	briefings have been provided to our operators in the form of night orders. So in the event that we needed to use this source on a emergency basis, it was available to us at that time MR. MITMAN: Could you speak to why you waited, what the thinking was behind waiting another day and a half, approximately, before you re-energized MR. KOWALESKI: refer to the process diagram. MR. SULLINS: I'll answer briefly. It was to complete the review process to formally approve the temporary modifications design reviews. MR. MITMAN: Did you have to do any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	switchgear. So it wouldn't have been a 4.4-day recovery, it would have been a little bit longer. Because you would have to have measured the switchgear to ensure that the fault, the condition had cleared. MR. KOWALESKI: I would clarify that slightly. The timeframe for the 4.8 days available to, quote, uncover the start at the point that you lost both diesels, not on the day that stator, but that point in time that both diesels failed, you would have had 4.8 days to put that in service. MR. CIRCLE: Right, but you would still have a lot longer time then you had on that particular event. So that event, the diesels were running, so you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	briefings have been provided to our operators in the form of night orders. So in the event that we needed to use this source on a emergency basis, it was available to us at that time MR. MITMAN: Could you speak to why you waited, what the thinking was behind waiting another day and a half, approximately, before you re-energized MR. KOWALESKI: refer to the process diagram. MR. SULLINS: I'll answer briefly. It was to complete the review process to formally approve the temporary modifications design reviews. MR. MITMAN: Did you have to do any further testing on the buses to see that they were okay	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	switchgear. So it wouldn't have been a 4.4-day recovery, it would have been a little bit longer. Because you would have to have measured the switchgear to ensure that the fault, the condition had cleared. MR. KOWALESKI: I would clarify that slightly. The timeframe for the 4.8 days available to, quote, uncover the start at the point that you lost both diesels, not on the day that stator, but that point in time that both diesels failed, you would have had 4.8 days to put that in service. MR. CIRCLE: Right, but you would still have a lot longer time then you had on that particular event. So that event, the diesels were running, so you had the temp mod right up to the last breaker. What
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	briefings have been provided to our operators in the form of night orders. So in the event that we needed to use this source on a emergency basis, it was available to us at that time MR. MITMAN: Could you speak to why you waited, what the thinking was behind waiting another day and a half, approximately, before you re-energized MR. KOWALESKI: refer to the process diagram. MR. SULLINS: I'll answer briefly. It was to complete the review process to formally approve the temporary modifications design reviews. MR. MITMAN: Did you have to do any further testing on the buses to see that they were okay to take the power?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	switchgear. So it wouldn't have been a 4.4-day recovery, it would have been a little bit longer. Because you would have to have measured the switchgear to ensure that the fault, the condition had cleared. MR. KOWALESKI: I would clarify that slightly. The timeframe for the 4.8 days available to, quote, uncover the start at the point that you lost both diesels, not on the day that stator, but that point in time that both diesels failed, you would have had 4.8 days to put that in service. MR. CIRCLE: Right, but you would still have a lot longer time then you had on that particular event. So that event, the diesels were running, so you had the temp mod right up to the last breaker. What we're talking about we're skipping ahead a little bit
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	briefings have been provided to our operators in the form of night orders. So in the event that we needed to use this source on a emergency basis, it was available to us at that time MR. MITMAN: Could you speak to why you waited, what the thinking was behind waiting another day and a half, approximately, before you re-energized MR. KOWALESKI: refer to the process diagram. MR. SULLINS: I'll answer briefly. It was to complete the review process to formally approve the temporary modifications design reviews. MR. MITMAN: Did you have to do any further testing on the buses to see that they were okay to take the power? MR. SULLINS: No sir, we did not.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	switchgear. So it wouldn't have been a 4.4-day recovery, it would have been a little bit longer. Because you would have to have measured the switchgear to ensure that the fault, the condition had cleared. MR. KOWALESKI: I would clarify that slightly. The timeframe for the 4.8 days available to, quote, uncover the start at the point that you lost both diesels, not on the day that stator, but that point in time that both diesels failed, you would have had 4.8 days to put that in service. MR. CIRCLE: Right, but you would still have a lot longer time then you had on that particular event. So that event, the diesels were running, so you had the temp mod right up to the last breaker. What
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	briefings have been provided to our operators in the form of night orders. So in the event that we needed to use this source on a emergency basis, it was available to us at that time MR. MITMAN: Could you speak to why you waited, what the thinking was behind waiting another day and a half, approximately, before you re-energized MR. KOWALESKI: refer to the process diagram. MR. SULLINS: I'll answer briefly. It was to complete the review process to formally approve the temporary modifications design reviews. MR. MITMAN: Did you have to do any further testing on the buses to see that they were okay to take the power? MR. SULLINS: No sir, we did not. MR. BROWNING: If you look back at the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	switchgear. So it wouldn't have been a 4.4-day recovery, it would have been a little bit longer. Because you would have to have measured the switchgear to ensure that the fault, the condition had cleared. MR. KOWALESKI: I would clarify that slightly. The timeframe for the 4.8 days available to, quote, uncover the start at the point that you lost both diesels, not on the day that stator, but that point in time that both diesels failed, you would have had 4.8 days to put that in service. MR. CIRCLE: Right, but you would still have a lot longer time then you had on that particular event. So that event, the diesels were running, so you had the temp mod right up to the last breaker. What we're talking about we're skipping ahead a little bit because this is part of the risk analysis, that you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	briefings have been provided to our operators in the form of night orders. So in the event that we needed to use this source on a emergency basis, it was available to us at that time MR. MITMAN: Could you speak to why you waited, what the thinking was behind waiting another day and a half, approximately, before you re-energized MR. KOWALESKI: refer to the process diagram. MR. SULLINS: I'll answer briefly. It was to complete the review process to formally approve the temporary modifications design reviews. MR. MITMAN: Did you have to do any further testing on the buses to see that they were okay to take the power? MR. SULLINS: No sir, we did not.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	switchgear. So it wouldn't have been a 4.4-day recovery, it would have been a little bit longer. Because you would have to have measured the switchgear to ensure that the fault, the condition had cleared. MR. KOWALESKI: I would clarify that slightly. The timeframe for the 4.8 days available to, quote, uncover the start at the point that you lost both diesels, not on the day that stator, but that point in time that both diesels failed, you would have had 4.8 days to put that in service. MR. CIRCLE: Right, but you would still have a lot longer time then you had on that particular event. So that event, the diesels were running, so you had the temp mod right up to the last breaker. What we're talking about we're skipping ahead a little bit because this is part of the risk analysis, that you failed two diesels, you're in the station blackout
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	briefings have been provided to our operators in the form of night orders. So in the event that we needed to use this source on a emergency basis, it was available to us at that time MR. MITMAN: Could you speak to why you waited, what the thinking was behind waiting another day and a half, approximately, before you re-energized MR. KOWALESKI: refer to the process diagram. MR. SULLINS: I'll answer briefly. It was to complete the review process to formally approve the temporary modifications design reviews. MR. MITMAN: Did you have to do any further testing on the buses to see that they were okay to take the power? MR. SULLINS: No sir, we did not. MR. BROWNING: If you look back at the slide that talked about priorities. We were making	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	switchgear. So it wouldn't have been a 4.4-day recovery, it would have been a little bit longer. Because you would have to have measured the switchgear to ensure that the fault, the condition had cleared. MR. KOWALESKI: I would clarify that slightly. The timeframe for the 4.8 days available to, quote, uncover the start at the point that you lost both diesels, not on the day that stator, but that point in time that both diesels failed, you would have had 4.8 days to put that in service. MR. CIRCLE: Right, but you would still have a lot longer time then you had on that particular event. So that event, the diesels were running, so you had the temp mod right up to the last breaker. What we're talking about we're skipping ahead a little bit because this is part of the risk analysis, that you failed two diesels, you're in the station blackout condition and now the only power that you have is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	briefings have been provided to our operators in the form of night orders. So in the event that we needed to use this source on a emergency basis, it was available to us at that time MR. MITMAN: Could you speak to why you waited, what the thinking was behind waiting another day and a half, approximately, before you re-energized MR. KOWALESKI: refer to the process diagram. MR. SULLINS: I'll answer briefly. It was to complete the review process to formally approve the temporary modifications design reviews. MR. MITMAN: Did you have to do any further testing on the buses to see that they were okay to take the power? MR. SULLINS: No sir, we did not. MR. BROWNING: If you look back at the slide that talked about priorities. We were making decisions based on actual plant conditions. One of our priorities is we were not going to challenge one of those emergency diesel generators. We were not going to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	switchgear. So it wouldn't have been a 4.4-day recovery, it would have been a little bit longer. Because you would have to have measured the switchgear to ensure that the fault, the condition had cleared. MR. KOWALESKI: I would clarify that slightly. The timeframe for the 4.8 days available to, quote, uncover the start at the point that you lost both diesels, not on the day that stator, but that point in time that both diesels failed, you would have had 4.8 days to put that in service. MR. CIRCLE: Right, but you would still have a lot longer time then you had on that particular event. So that event, the diesels were running, so you had the temp mod right up to the last breaker. What we're talking about we're skipping ahead a little bit because this is part of the risk analysis, that you failed two diesels, you're in the station blackout condition and now the only power that you have is through the temp mod, but you don't know what caused the diesel's to fail. So there would be some additional work
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	briefings have been provided to our operators in the form of night orders. So in the event that we needed to use this source on a emergency basis, it was available to us at that time MR. MITMAN: Could you speak to why you waited, what the thinking was behind waiting another day and a half, approximately, before you re-energized MR. KOWALESKI: refer to the process diagram. MR. SULLINS: I'll answer briefly. It was to complete the review process to formally approve the temporary modifications design reviews. MR. MITMAN: Did you have to do any further testing on the buses to see that they were okay to take the power? MR. SULLINS: I'll on sir, we did not. MR. BROWNING: If you look back at the slide that talked about priorities. We were making decisions based on actual plant conditions. One of our priorities is we were not going to challenge one of those emergency diesel generators. We were not going to challenge a bus.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	switchgear. So it wouldn't have been a 4.4-day recovery, it would have been a little bit longer. Because you would have to have measured the switchgear to ensure that the fault, the condition had cleared. MR. KOWALESKI: I would clarify that slightly. The timeframe for the 4.8 days available to, quote, uncover the start at the point that you lost both diesels, not on the day that stator, but that point in time that both diesels failed, you would have had 4.8 days to put that in service. MR. CIRCLE: Right, but you would still have a lot longer time then you had on that particular event. So that event, the diesels were running, so you had the temp mod right up to the last breaker. What we're talking about we're skipping ahead a little bit because this is part of the risk analysis, that you failed two diesels, you're in the station blackout condition and now the only power that you have is through the temp mod, but you don't know what caused the diesel's to fail. So there would be some additional work that you would have to do prior to restoring power.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	briefings have been provided to our operators in the form of night orders. So in the event that we needed to use this source on a emergency basis, it was available to us at that time MR. MITMAN: Could you speak to why you waited, what the thinking was behind waiting another day and a half, approximately, before you re-energized MR. KOWALESKI: refer to the process diagram. MR. SULLINS: I'll answer briefly. It was to complete the review process to formally approve the temporary modifications design reviews. MR. MITMAN: Did you have to do any further testing on the buses to see that they were okay to take the power? MR. SULLINS: No sir, we did not. MR. BROWNING: If you look back at the slide that talked about priorities. We were making decisions based on actual plant conditions. One of our priorities is we were not going to challenge one of those emergency diesel generators. We were not going to challenge a bus. A different mindset would have come into	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	switchgear. So it wouldn't have been a 4.4-day recovery, it would have been a little bit longer. Because you would have to have measured the switchgear to ensure that the fault, the condition had cleared. MR. KOWALESKI: I would clarify that slightly. The timeframe for the 4.8 days available to, quote, uncover the start at the point that you lost both diesels, not on the day that stator, but that point in time that both diesels failed, you would have had 4.8 days to put that in service. MR. CIRCLE: Right, but you would still have a lot longer time then you had on that particular event. So that event, the diesels were running, so you had the temp mod right up to the last breaker. What we're talking about we're skipping ahead a little bit because this is part of the risk analysis, that you failed two diesels, you're in the station blackout condition and now the only power that you have is through the temp mod, but you don't know what caused the diesel's to fail. So there would be some additional work that you would have to do prior to restoring power. That's all that's why we're asking that question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	briefings have been provided to our operators in the form of night orders. So in the event that we needed to use this source on a emergency basis, it was available to us at that time MR. MITMAN: Could you speak to why you waited, what the thinking was behind waiting another day and a half, approximately, before you re-energized MR. KOWALESKI: refer to the process diagram. MR. SULLINS: I'll answer briefly. It was to complete the review process to formally approve the temporary modifications design reviews. MR. MITMAN: Did you have to do any further testing on the buses to see that they were okay to take the power? MR. SULLINS: I'll on sir, we did not. MR. BROWNING: If you look back at the slide that talked about priorities. We were making decisions based on actual plant conditions. One of our priorities is we were not going to challenge one of those emergency diesel generators. We were not going to challenge a bus.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	switchgear. So it wouldn't have been a 4.4-day recovery, it would have been a little bit longer. Because you would have to have measured the switchgear to ensure that the fault, the condition had cleared. MR. KOWALESKI: I would clarify that slightly. The timeframe for the 4.8 days available to, quote, uncover the start at the point that you lost both diesels, not on the day that stator, but that point in time that both diesels failed, you would have had 4.8 days to put that in service. MR. CIRCLE: Right, but you would still have a lot longer time then you had on that particular event. So that event, the diesels were running, so you had the temp mod right up to the last breaker. What we're talking about we're skipping ahead a little bit because this is part of the risk analysis, that you failed two diesels, you're in the station blackout condition and now the only power that you have is through the temp mod, but you don't know what caused the diesel's to fail. So there would be some additional work that you would have to do prior to restoring power.

Merit Court Reporters LLC

depos@merittexas.com

9 (Pages 33 to 36)

	Page 37		Page 39
1	reconstruct, if you will, what conditions would have	1	the non-vital on Unit 1 or the vital on Unit 1, the
2	existed had you needed to exercise these alternative	2	non-vital on Unit 2 and the vital on Unit 2. So it has
3	recovery paths here, since a lot are looking at those as	3	lots of capabilities to go to different places.
4	being available here to address the risk significance,	4	And, of course, we have the emergency
5	that we describes following an assumption of the failure	5	diesel generators that feed the safety buses. So the
6	of the diesel.	6	way the normal power comes into the plant, is it comes
7	So in my view that's why it's important	7	in from one of the Start transformers to the non-vital.
8	on timelines here, we need to be careful here when we're	8	You can see this line right here shows the difference
9	saying on saying an extensive period of time, you know,	9	between the non-vital above this line and vital below
10	those are all subjective terms. Just try and refine,	10	this line. And so, anyway, there's and then from
11	you know, what is the actual time estimate if there	11	there it goes from
12	needed to be an understanding of the root cause the	12	(Noise from the bridge phone line)
13	cause for the diesel failure here, does that impact the	13	MR. WERNER: This is Greg Werner,
14	bus and would you have to do some degree of testing,	14	somebody with the NRC doesn't have their phone muted.
15	right, before you connected your alternative power	15	Could you please mute your phone? Thank you.
16	source to the affected bus.	16	MR. MCKENNEY: I think we got it. All
17	Understanding that, just what would be a	17	right, so this is the non-vital, which we call A1 and A2
18	realistic estimate of that time?	18	and then from there it feeds through to vitals. This is
19	MR. BROWNING: And hopefully, through our	19	the red train, and the green train, 4160, and then it
20 21	presentations we've discussed the contingencies, we will	20 21	cascades down through the 480-volt systems to provide
22	show the margin that we would have had in the event that	21	the power.
23	we would have lost one of those diesels and decided to	23	So this is the situation we were in
24	implement one of our contingencies, as opposed to what we actually did.	24	before the event and the lines that are colored red is
25	The only real discussion around actual is	25	the lines that were energized. Any questions on that? Okay.
	The only real discussion around actual is		Окау.
	Page 38		Page 40
1	Page 38 to paint the picture of scope and what it took to do it	1	Page 40 So what this figure is designed to show
1 2		1 2	
2 3	to paint the picture of scope and what it took to do it and compare that to what we would have done in the event that we had a failure. And, again, if we get to the	2 3	So what this figure is designed to show you is what was actually damaged by the stator drop. And that's inside this shaded box here. The little
2 3 4	to paint the picture of scope and what it took to do it and compare that to what we would have done in the event that we had a failure. And, again, if we get to the point where we're talking about the timelines and we	2 3 4	So what this figure is designed to show you is what was actually damaged by the stator drop. And that's inside this shaded box here. The little figure on the thing doesn't have shaded, but it has a
2 3 4 5	to paint the picture of scope and what it took to do it and compare that to what we would have done in the event that we had a failure. And, again, if we get to the point where we're talking about the timelines and we haven't met your expectations, we will clearly provide	2 3 4 5	So what this figure is designed to show you is what was actually damaged by the stator drop. And that's inside this shaded box here. The little figure on the thing doesn't have shaded, but it has a red dotted line around it. And what you can see is, is
2 3 4 5 6	to paint the picture of scope and what it took to do it and compare that to what we would have done in the event that we had a failure. And, again, if we get to the point where we're talking about the timelines and we haven't met your expectations, we will clearly provide the information that we need to meet those expectations.	2 3 4 5 6	So what this figure is designed to show you is what was actually damaged by the stator drop. And that's inside this shaded box here. The little figure on the thing doesn't have shaded, but it has a red dotted line around it. And what you can see is, is when the stator fell, it made unavailable the non-vital
2 3 4 5 6 7	to paint the picture of scope and what it took to do it and compare that to what we would have done in the event that we had a failure. And, again, if we get to the point where we're talking about the timelines and we haven't met your expectations, we will clearly provide the information that we need to meet those expectations. MR. SULLINS: Regarding the question on	2 3 4 5 6 7	So what this figure is designed to show you is what was actually damaged by the stator drop. And that's inside this shaded box here. The little figure on the thing doesn't have shaded, but it has a red dotted line around it. And what you can see is, is when the stator fell, it made unavailable the non-vital link between offsite and the vital. So what we're faced
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	to paint the picture of scope and what it took to do it and compare that to what we would have done in the event that we had a failure. And, again, if we get to the point where we're talking about the timelines and we haven't met your expectations, we will clearly provide the information that we need to meet those expectations. MR. SULLINS: Regarding the question on assessing the condition of the bus, we would well confer	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So what this figure is designed to show you is what was actually damaged by the stator drop. And that's inside this shaded box here. The little figure on the thing doesn't have shaded, but it has a red dotted line around it. And what you can see is, is when the stator fell, it made unavailable the non-vital link between offsite and the vital. So what we're faced with was how to get power from the top, above the box,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to paint the picture of scope and what it took to do it and compare that to what we would have done in the event that we had a failure. And, again, if we get to the point where we're talking about the timelines and we haven't met your expectations, we will clearly provide the information that we need to meet those expectations. MR. SULLINS: Regarding the question on assessing the condition of the bus, we would well confer the dialog on the indications available to the operator	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So what this figure is designed to show you is what was actually damaged by the stator drop. And that's inside this shaded box here. The little figure on the thing doesn't have shaded, but it has a red dotted line around it. And what you can see is, is when the stator fell, it made unavailable the non-vital link between offsite and the vital. So what we're faced with was how to get power from the top, above the box, down to the bottom, to get power back if the diesels
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	to paint the picture of scope and what it took to do it and compare that to what we would have done in the event that we had a failure. And, again, if we get to the point where we're talking about the timelines and we haven't met your expectations, we will clearly provide the information that we need to meet those expectations. MR. SULLINS: Regarding the question on assessing the condition of the bus, we would well confer the dialog on the indications available to the operator and how we would access that if that's useful.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	So what this figure is designed to show you is what was actually damaged by the stator drop. And that's inside this shaded box here. The little figure on the thing doesn't have shaded, but it has a red dotted line around it. And what you can see is, is when the stator fell, it made unavailable the non-vital link between offsite and the vital. So what we're faced with was how to get power from the top, above the box, down to the bottom, to get power back if the diesels were to fail.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	to paint the picture of scope and what it took to do it and compare that to what we would have done in the event that we had a failure. And, again, if we get to the point where we're talking about the timelines and we haven't met your expectations, we will clearly provide the information that we need to meet those expectations. MR. SULLINS: Regarding the question on assessing the condition of the bus, we would well confer the dialog on the indications available to the operator and how we would access that if that's useful. Okay. The next phase of our section is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So what this figure is designed to show you is what was actually damaged by the stator drop. And that's inside this shaded box here. The little figure on the thing doesn't have shaded, but it has a red dotted line around it. And what you can see is, is when the stator fell, it made unavailable the non-vital link between offsite and the vital. So what we're faced with was how to get power from the top, above the box, down to the bottom, to get power back if the diesels were to fail. MR. MITMAN: At the time of the event did
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	to paint the picture of scope and what it took to do it and compare that to what we would have done in the event that we had a failure. And, again, if we get to the point where we're talking about the timelines and we haven't met your expectations, we will clearly provide the information that we need to meet those expectations. MR. SULLINS: Regarding the question on assessing the condition of the bus, we would well confer the dialog on the indications available to the operator and how we would access that if that's useful. Okay. The next phase of our section is David McKenney will describe what we actually did to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	So what this figure is designed to show you is what was actually damaged by the stator drop. And that's inside this shaded box here. The little figure on the thing doesn't have shaded, but it has a red dotted line around it. And what you can see is, is when the stator fell, it made unavailable the non-vital link between offsite and the vital. So what we're faced with was how to get power from the top, above the box, down to the bottom, to get power back if the diesels were to fail. MR. MITMAN: At the time of the event did you know the status of 2A9 and whether the 2A9 bus was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to paint the picture of scope and what it took to do it and compare that to what we would have done in the event that we had a failure. And, again, if we get to the point where we're talking about the timelines and we haven't met your expectations, we will clearly provide the information that we need to meet those expectations. MR. SULLINS: Regarding the question on assessing the condition of the bus, we would well confer the dialog on the indications available to the operator and how we would access that if that's useful. Okay. The next phase of our section is David McKenney will describe what we actually did to recover power from Startup No. One.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So what this figure is designed to show you is what was actually damaged by the stator drop. And that's inside this shaded box here. The little figure on the thing doesn't have shaded, but it has a red dotted line around it. And what you can see is, is when the stator fell, it made unavailable the non-vital link between offsite and the vital. So what we're faced with was how to get power from the top, above the box, down to the bottom, to get power back if the diesels were to fail. MR. MITMAN: At the time of the event did you know the status of 2A9 and whether the 2A9 bus was functional or not?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to paint the picture of scope and what it took to do it and compare that to what we would have done in the event that we had a failure. And, again, if we get to the point where we're talking about the timelines and we haven't met your expectations, we will clearly provide the information that we need to meet those expectations. MR. SULLINS: Regarding the question on assessing the condition of the bus, we would well confer the dialog on the indications available to the operator and how we would access that if that's useful. Okay. The next phase of our section is David McKenney will describe what we actually did to recover power from Startup No. One. MR. MCKENNEY: First thing I wanted to do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So what this figure is designed to show you is what was actually damaged by the stator drop. And that's inside this shaded box here. The little figure on the thing doesn't have shaded, but it has a red dotted line around it. And what you can see is, is when the stator fell, it made unavailable the non-vital link between offsite and the vital. So what we're faced with was how to get power from the top, above the box, down to the bottom, to get power back if the diesels were to fail. MR. MITMAN: At the time of the event did you know the status of 2A9 and whether the 2A9 bus was functional or not? MR. MCKENNEY: There was no indication to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to paint the picture of scope and what it took to do it and compare that to what we would have done in the event that we had a failure. And, again, if we get to the point where we're talking about the timelines and we haven't met your expectations, we will clearly provide the information that we need to meet those expectations. MR. SULLINS: Regarding the question on assessing the condition of the bus, we would well confer the dialog on the indications available to the operator and how we would access that if that's useful. Okay. The next phase of our section is David McKenney will describe what we actually did to recover power from Startup No. One.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So what this figure is designed to show you is what was actually damaged by the stator drop. And that's inside this shaded box here. The little figure on the thing doesn't have shaded, but it has a red dotted line around it. And what you can see is, is when the stator fell, it made unavailable the non-vital link between offsite and the vital. So what we're faced with was how to get power from the top, above the box, down to the bottom, to get power back if the diesels were to fail. MR. MITMAN: At the time of the event did you know the status of 2A9 and whether the 2A9 bus was functional or not?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to paint the picture of scope and what it took to do it and compare that to what we would have done in the event that we had a failure. And, again, if we get to the point where we're talking about the timelines and we haven't met your expectations, we will clearly provide the information that we need to meet those expectations. MR. SULLINS: Regarding the question on assessing the condition of the bus, we would well confer the dialog on the indications available to the operator and how we would access that if that's useful. Okay. The next phase of our section is David McKenney will describe what we actually did to recover power from Startup No. One. MR. MCKENNEY: First thing I wanted to do was kind of go through our electrical distribution	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So what this figure is designed to show you is what was actually damaged by the stator drop. And that's inside this shaded box here. The little figure on the thing doesn't have shaded, but it has a red dotted line around it. And what you can see is, is when the stator fell, it made unavailable the non-vital link between offsite and the vital. So what we're faced with was how to get power from the top, above the box, down to the bottom, to get power back if the diesels were to fail. MR. MITMAN: At the time of the event did you know the status of 2A9 and whether the 2A9 bus was functional or not? MR. MCKENNEY: There was no indication to the operators it was nonfunctional. We so the damage
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to paint the picture of scope and what it took to do it and compare that to what we would have done in the event that we had a failure. And, again, if we get to the point where we're talking about the timelines and we haven't met your expectations, we will clearly provide the information that we need to meet those expectations. MR. SULLINS: Regarding the question on assessing the condition of the bus, we would well confer the dialog on the indications available to the operator and how we would access that if that's useful. Okay. The next phase of our section is David McKenney will describe what we actually did to recover power from Startup No. One. MR. MCKENNEY: First thing I wanted to do was kind of go through our electrical distribution system. So everybody has a baseline knowledge on this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So what this figure is designed to show you is what was actually damaged by the stator drop. And that's inside this shaded box here. The little figure on the thing doesn't have shaded, but it has a red dotted line around it. And what you can see is, is when the stator fell, it made unavailable the non-vital link between offsite and the vital. So what we're faced with was how to get power from the top, above the box, down to the bottom, to get power back if the diesels were to fail. MR. MITMAN: At the time of the event did you know the status of 2A9 and whether the 2A9 bus was functional or not? MR. MCKENNEY: There was no indication to the operators it was nonfunctional. We so the damage to the 2A9 bus is actually in the back where the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	to paint the picture of scope and what it took to do it and compare that to what we would have done in the event that we had a failure. And, again, if we get to the point where we're talking about the timelines and we haven't met your expectations, we will clearly provide the information that we need to meet those expectations. MR. SULLINS: Regarding the question on assessing the condition of the bus, we would well confer the dialog on the indications available to the operator and how we would access that if that's useful. Okay. The next phase of our section is David McKenney will describe what we actually did to recover power from Startup No. One. MR. MCKENNEY: First thing I wanted to do was kind of go through our electrical distribution system. So everybody has a baseline knowledge on this before we start talking about options that we take. So I'm going to point to the screen up here, so if you follow along with me, it will help us with that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So what this figure is designed to show you is what was actually damaged by the stator drop. And that's inside this shaded box here. The little figure on the thing doesn't have shaded, but it has a red dotted line around it. And what you can see is, is when the stator fell, it made unavailable the non-vital link between offsite and the vital. So what we're faced with was how to get power from the top, above the box, down to the bottom, to get power back if the diesels were to fail. MR. MITMAN: At the time of the event did you know the status of 2A9 and whether the 2A9 bus was functional or not? MR. MCKENNEY: There was no indication to the operators it was nonfunctional. We so the damage to the 2A9 bus is actually in the back where the termination points to Unit 1. So the bus MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman again. Let me rephrase it a different way. Did the operators think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	to paint the picture of scope and what it took to do it and compare that to what we would have done in the event that we had a failure. And, again, if we get to the point where we're talking about the timelines and we haven't met your expectations, we will clearly provide the information that we need to meet those expectations. MR. SULLINS: Regarding the question on assessing the condition of the bus, we would well confer the dialog on the indications available to the operator and how we would access that if that's useful. Okay. The next phase of our section is David McKenney will describe what we actually did to recover power from Startup No. One. MR. MCKENNEY: First thing I wanted to do was kind of go through our electrical distribution system. So everybody has a baseline knowledge on this before we start talking about options that we take. So I'm going to point to the screen up here, so if you follow along with me, it will help us with that. We have, there's basically five sources	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So what this figure is designed to show you is what was actually damaged by the stator drop. And that's inside this shaded box here. The little figure on the thing doesn't have shaded, but it has a red dotted line around it. And what you can see is, is when the stator fell, it made unavailable the non-vital link between offsite and the vital. So what we're faced with was how to get power from the top, above the box, down to the bottom, to get power back if the diesels were to fail. MR. MITMAN: At the time of the event did you know the status of 2A9 and whether the 2A9 bus was functional or not? MR. MCKENNEY: There was no indication to the operators it was nonfunctional. We so the damage to the 2A9 bus is actually in the back where the termination points to Unit 1. So the bus MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman again. Let me rephrase it a different way. Did the operators think that they could use 2A9 immediately after the stator
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	to paint the picture of scope and what it took to do it and compare that to what we would have done in the event that we had a failure. And, again, if we get to the point where we're talking about the timelines and we haven't met your expectations, we will clearly provide the information that we need to meet those expectations. MR. SULLINS: Regarding the question on assessing the condition of the bus, we would well confer the dialog on the indications available to the operator and how we would access that if that's useful. Okay. The next phase of our section is David McKenney will describe what we actually did to recover power from Startup No. One. MR. MCKENNEY: First thing I wanted to do was kind of go through our electrical distribution system. So everybody has a baseline knowledge on this before we start talking about options that we take. So I'm going to point to the screen up here, so if you follow along with me, it will help us with that. We have, there's basically five sources of power to our vital AC. There's a Startup 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So what this figure is designed to show you is what was actually damaged by the stator drop. And that's inside this shaded box here. The little figure on the thing doesn't have shaded, but it has a red dotted line around it. And what you can see is, is when the stator fell, it made unavailable the non-vital link between offsite and the vital. So what we're faced with was how to get power from the top, above the box, down to the bottom, to get power back if the diesels were to fail. MR. MITMAN: At the time of the event did you know the status of 2A9 and whether the 2A9 bus was functional or not? MR. MCKENNEY: There was no indication to the operators it was nonfunctional. We so the damage to the 2A9 bus is actually in the back where the termination points to Unit 1. So the bus MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman again. Let me rephrase it a different way. Did the operators think that they could use 2A9 immediately after the stator drop?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to paint the picture of scope and what it took to do it and compare that to what we would have done in the event that we had a failure. And, again, if we get to the point where we're talking about the timelines and we haven't met your expectations, we will clearly provide the information that we need to meet those expectations. MR. SULLINS: Regarding the question on assessing the condition of the bus, we would well confer the dialog on the indications available to the operator and how we would access that if that's useful. Okay. The next phase of our section is David McKenney will describe what we actually did to recover power from Startup No. One. MR. MCKENNEY: First thing I wanted to do was kind of go through our electrical distribution system. So everybody has a baseline knowledge on this before we start talking about options that we take. So I'm going to point to the screen up here, so if you follow along with me, it will help us with that. We have, there's basically five sources of power to our vital AC. There's a Startup 1 transformer, which is fed from offsite. There's a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So what this figure is designed to show you is what was actually damaged by the stator drop. And that's inside this shaded box here. The little figure on the thing doesn't have shaded, but it has a red dotted line around it. And what you can see is, is when the stator fell, it made unavailable the non-vital link between offsite and the vital. So what we're faced with was how to get power from the top, above the box, down to the bottom, to get power back if the diesels were to fail. MR. MITMAN: At the time of the event did you know the status of 2A9 and whether the 2A9 bus was functional or not? MR. MCKENNEY: There was no indication to the operators it was nonfunctional. We so the damage to the 2A9 bus is actually in the back where the termination points to Unit 1. So the bus MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman again. Let me rephrase it a different way. Did the operators think that they could use 2A9 immediately after the stator drop? MR. HATHCOAT: This is John Hathcoat, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to paint the picture of scope and what it took to do it and compare that to what we would have done in the event that we had a failure. And, again, if we get to the point where we're talking about the timelines and we haven't met your expectations, we will clearly provide the information that we need to meet those expectations. MR. SULLINS: Regarding the question on assessing the condition of the bus, we would well confer the dialog on the indications available to the operator and how we would access that if that's useful. Okay. The next phase of our section is David McKenney will describe what we actually did to recover power from Startup No. One. MR. MCKENNEY: First thing I wanted to do was kind of go through our electrical distribution system. So everybody has a baseline knowledge on this before we start talking about options that we take. So I'm going to point to the screen up here, so if you follow along with me, it will help us with that. We have, there's basically five sources of power to our vital AC. There's a Startup 1 transformer, which is fed from offsite. There's a Startup 2 transformer, which is shared with Unit 2.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So what this figure is designed to show you is what was actually damaged by the stator drop. And that's inside this shaded box here. The little figure on the thing doesn't have shaded, but it has a red dotted line around it. And what you can see is, is when the stator fell, it made unavailable the non-vital link between offsite and the vital. So what we're faced with was how to get power from the top, above the box, down to the bottom, to get power back if the diesels were to fail. MR. MITMAN: At the time of the event did you know the status of 2A9 and whether the 2A9 bus was functional or not? MR. MCKENNEY: There was no indication to the operators it was nonfunctional. We so the damage to the 2A9 bus is actually in the back where the termination points to Unit 1. So the bus MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman again. Let me rephrase it a different way. Did the operators think that they could use 2A9 immediately after the stator drop? MR. HATHCOAT: This is John Hathcoat, the Unit 2 Shift AO1, we had the report came from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to paint the picture of scope and what it took to do it and compare that to what we would have done in the event that we had a failure. And, again, if we get to the point where we're talking about the timelines and we haven't met your expectations, we will clearly provide the information that we need to meet those expectations. MR. SULLINS: Regarding the question on assessing the condition of the bus, we would well confer the dialog on the indications available to the operator and how we would access that if that's useful. Okay. The next phase of our section is David McKenney will describe what we actually did to recover power from Startup No. One. MR. MCKENNEY: First thing I wanted to do was kind of go through our electrical distribution system. So everybody has a baseline knowledge on this before we start talking about options that we take. So I'm going to point to the screen up here, so if you follow along with me, it will help us with that. We have, there's basically five sources of power to our vital AC. There's a Startup 1 transformer, which is fed from offsite. There's a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So what this figure is designed to show you is what was actually damaged by the stator drop. And that's inside this shaded box here. The little figure on the thing doesn't have shaded, but it has a red dotted line around it. And what you can see is, is when the stator fell, it made unavailable the non-vital link between offsite and the vital. So what we're faced with was how to get power from the top, above the box, down to the bottom, to get power back if the diesels were to fail. MR. MITMAN: At the time of the event did you know the status of 2A9 and whether the 2A9 bus was functional or not? MR. MCKENNEY: There was no indication to the operators it was nonfunctional. We so the damage to the 2A9 bus is actually in the back where the termination points to Unit 1. So the bus MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman again. Let me rephrase it a different way. Did the operators think that they could use 2A9 immediately after the stator drop? MR. HATHCOAT: This is John Hathcoat, the

10 (Pages 37 to 40)

vucicai	Regulatory Conference with Entergy Operations, Inc.		May 1, 201
	Page 41		Page 43
1	A1, A3 vital and non-vital Unit 1 back of 2A9 was	1	And not only is there damage to the 2A9 bus, but there's
2	damaged, but at that point Unit 2 believed that we	2	water on the floor in a room with 4,000 volts of
3	needed to assess what we had.	3	energized equipment.
4	Up to that point and even after that	4	It's a plant personnel have to be very
5	point on the Unit 2 side it was fully available and the	5	careful about what they're doing that the equipment that
6	operators would have used it if need be. It is a shared	6	is functioning and themselves, and I just want to draw
7	load between Unit 1 and Unit 2, so the functionality is	7	the distinction between what we know today and what was
8	really dependent on if there's anything damaged,	8	known at the time of the event. And what we knew they
9	challenging the functionality, we would call it	9	could have done at the time of the event today is not
10	unavailable or nonfunctional, but it was available.	10	what the control room knew at the time.
11	MR. MITMAN: But there's visible damage	11	MR. BROWNING: So John has the direct
12	to the 2A9 bus, and so far you haven't talked about	12	knowledge of what the control room would have known at
13	testing the 2A9 bus to see whether it's capable of	13	the time.
14	performing its design function, and I'm surprised that	14	MR. HATHCOAT: I was in the control room
15	you would contemplate energizing a 4,000-volt bus	15	at the time. We were stable on the Unit 2 side, so we
16	without doing at least a little bit of testing on it	16	did not have to pursue energizing 2A9, but, you know,
17	unless you were at a point where it was your last	17	our procedures, station blackout procedures, loss of
18	resource.	18	offsite power procedures, standard tasks, we're trained
19	MR. HATHCOAT: Absolutely. And from a	19	on that.
20	Unit 2 perspective, you know, H B Robinson was mentioned	20	That's one of our major recovery
21	in the control room four or five times, I was in there.	21	strategies, and I'll talk more about that, is to look at
22	And that question came up, and it was isolated what	22	your blackout condition for safety function. We're
23	we knew the report from the field was it was isolated	23	going to follow our procedure and energize 2A9 using the
24	to the Unit 1 side.	24	station blackout diesel.
25	And from the Unit 2 perspective, you	25	Now is it a proven action, knowing that
	Page 42		Page 44
1	know, I interviewed the controlling supervisor, the SDA,	1	there's potential damage to the back side of the 2A9
2	I was there, and if we were in a blackout condition, and	2	bus? Absolutely. We don't have time, we would have had
3	I'll talk more about that in the Unit 2 section, but,	3	time to engage the technicians, I sent them down there
4	yes, it would have been pursued.	4	looking at the back up 2A9, make sure that it was
5	The question came up, you know, locally	5	isolated just to the back feed on the Unit 1 side, and
6	going down there and looking at it. From a relay tech	6	it shouldn't have been any issue at all moving forward
7	standpoint we would have gone down, more than likely,	7	with energizing one of our vital buses.
8	and opened up the back and inspected and make sure it	8	MR. DAPAS: I think the key here is
9	was just isolated to the Unit 1 side before we pursued	9	this is Marc Dapas I think the key there is what in
10	on Unit 2.	10	your view do you think the operators and staff would
11	MR. KOWALESKI: To be clear, though, the	11	have been able to assess and I understand now that your
12	damage was on the connection points on the output of the	12	view there was that the damage was isolated to what the
1 2			

damage was on the connection points on the output of the
Unit 1 breakers, very visible and easily accessed and
assessed. So there was no damage to the actual bus, the
bus work supply from the alternate AC diesel, no damage
to any of the Unit 2 breakers or the feeder breaker to
the bus.

The damage was at the termination points
on the output side of the Unit 1 breakers, and the
breakers themselves were not damaged.

- MR. MITMAN: You know that today, but the
 people in the control room at the time of the event did
 not know that, so it's not a question of what the bus
- was capable of doing, it's a question of what the
 operators in the control room thought they could do.

Unit 1 breaker output determination? MR. HATHCOAT: There's two breakers --

MR. DAPAS: The question in my mind is,
is that readily apparent to the operators by going down
and looking at that and making that determination, or is
that a function of what you've been able to determine,
you know, after the fact there? What information was
available to the operators and what input was there for
their decision making, trying to understand that here

and looking back. MR. HATHCOAT: You can easily discern

that the queues are kind of split out, that it was
isolated to the A1 and A3 feeds to Unit 1. With that in

11 (Pages 41 to 44)

13

	Page 45		Page 47
1	mind, you know, the operators would have, knowing what	1	did there is we hooked a cable between the Startup 1
2	they did that the cable was pulled across the train bay,	2	transformer and a temporary 4160-volt breaker that was
3	and at the time they had known that, hey, as isolated	3	located in our transformer yard. Ran another capable
4	Unit 1 we could have moved forward with Unit 2.	4	around the south side of the Unit 1 turbine building,
5	Now the information came from back from	5	away from the damaged area and tied it to the A310-410,
6	the field about 1:30 in the afternoon. Now talking to	6	which is the cross connect between the two vital buses.
7	the shift manager at that point later he said, you know,	7	We were actually able to install this in
8	it might have been a good idea in a blackout condition	8	4.4 days and had it energized to this point
9	to send the relay techs down just to look in the back	9	here(indicating). All tested and energized up to that
10	just to confirm that it is, you know, isolated to A1-A3	10	point.
11	before we pursued on it because we would have had time	11	And where we spliced this cable, and this
12	in a blackout condition.	12	portion of the circuit was not impacted by any damage or
13	So, yes, they definitely would have	13	any of those kind of things, so that portion of the
14	pursued it for our procedural direction to restore power	14	circuit was still intact.
15	if needed.	15	MR. LOVELESS: Temporary breaker was
16	MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle. How	16	onsite for it, or was it brought in?
17	was the accessibility at that time if they had to do a	17	MR. MCKENNEY: No, we brought that in,
18	detailed examination of the switchgear?	18	ENTARK, Entergy Arkansas had that, and it was here the
19	MR. HATHCOAT: Well, we couldn't get down	19	next morning, after the event.
20	to it 'til around noon or after this, but at that time,	20	MR. SULLINS: Very good question. We're
21	you know, we didn't know there was no knowledge that	21	talking about what we actually did when we talk about
22	the blackout diesel on 2A9 was damaged. It wasn't until	22	the success paths that are modeled in our risk
23	we got down there, until about 1 o'clock is when we	23	assessment the breaker is not a part of that strategy.
24	actually noticed.	24	MR. MCKENNEY: This is just an overhead
25	MR. TINDELL: This is Brian Tindell the	25	view showing the layout of here's the Startup 1
25	WR. HINDELL. This is brian Thiden the		view showing the layout of here's the Startup 1
	Page 46		Page 48
1	Senior Resident at Arkansas Nuclear One, I think we're	1	Transformer as it exists, it's normal location. We put
2	getting confused between availability for Unit 1 and	2	the temporary breaker about approximately 50 feet away.

2	getting confused between availability for Unit 1 and	2	the temp
3	Unit 2. I think most of what you're talking about is	3	then we i
4	availability for Unit 2, but we're talking about the	4	and to ou
5	Unit 1.	5	
6	MR. HATHCOAT: Absolutely. And I'll talk	6	train bay,
7	a lot more about the Unit 2 and hopefully clarify that.	7	boxes her
8	MR. DAPAS: Just one overarching comment.	8	non-vital
9	I think it's important here that we're understanding the	9	
10	basis for your assumptions, so if our questions are	10	wouldn't
11	leaving you with the impression that we've already	11	do have f
12	reached a determination, it's really to understand the	12	
13	basis here and how you considered the various factors	13	slide 18,
14	here, you know, IE: If the bus needs to be tested, did	14	breaker.
15	you consider that? How did you factor that into your	15	that we p
16	timeline?	16	Transform
17	MR. FORD: I think we might answer those	17	landed af
18	questions better when we get into the strategies.	18	temporar
19	MR. MCKENNEY: First thing we're going to	19	the break
20	talk about is what we actually installed, post event,	20	opposite
21	and that's just to show you the basic electrical layout	21	switchge
22	of that and a physical overhead view of that.	22	
23	And so what we're going to do is go	23	general s
24	through this is a picture of the Startup 1	24	installed.
25	transformer that was on the previous slide. And what we	25	confusing
		1	

1	Transformer as it exists, it's normal location. We put
2	the temporary breaker about approximately 50 feet away,
3	then we ran the cable around the south side of the plant
4	and to our vital switchgear area.
5	This area here that's designated the
6	train bay, that is where the stator fell. And these two
7	boxes here, I know it's hard to see, that's our
8	non-vital A2 and A1 switchgear.
9	MR. WERNER: As a reminder, if you
L0	wouldn't mind just saying what page number you're on, we
L1	do have folks from headquarters listening in.
L2	MR. MCKENNEY: I'm on slide 17. This is
L3	slide 18, and this is a photograph of the temporary
L4	breaker. You can see the general location right here
L5	that we put in transformer yard. This is Startup
L6	Transformer No. 1. And this is the stator where it
L7	landed after the event. So you can see we have
L8	temporary cables here you can see coming in and out of
L9	the breaker from the transformer and then going down the
20	opposite end of plant, back around to the vital
21	switchgear.
22	This is slide 19. This is showing the
23	general scope of the actual installation that we
24	installed. And you can see that it might be a little
25	confusing. It's seven since we had to run parallel

uclear	• Regulatory Conference with Entergy Operations, Inc.		May 1, 2014
	Page 49		Page 51
1	conductors per phase, there's seven cables and one	1	you would not have this much capable on site?
2	neutral, so the actual length was 50 feet and 500 feet,	2	MR. MCKENNEY: That's correct.
3	so it's lot of, there's some parallel runs on that.	3	MR. BROWNING: But to that point, we not
4	MR. CIRCLE: We did have that question.	4	be lifting the stator if we weren't in a refueling
5	MR. MCKENNEY: Yeah. There's 28 splices	5	outage performing this work.
6	or terminations, some of them were splices, some were	6	MR. CIRCLE: Right, but this particular
7	terminations, 4160-volt that we installed for that.	7	outage, it was fortuitous that you had cable on site
8	MR. MITMAN: So, this will come up a	8	available.
9	little bit later, but you used about 4,000 foot of	9	MR. MCKENNEY: Cable is not terribly
10	cable as I understand it, right? How much additional	10	difficult to come by in the timeframe we're talking
11	cable did you have on site?	11	about. We were able to actually get the cable here in
12	MR. MCKENNEY: We had scheduled to	12	the timeframe we're talking about. But we did have
13	replace our circulating water pump cables, which is in	13	enough cable to do multiple of these options on site.
14	our intake structure, so we had quite a bit of cable on	14	I want to talk a little bit about the
15	site to do that particular job. We had not started that	15	implementation process because that's going to be
16	job yet. So we had a lot of cable and the termination	16	important as far as how do we get to the point that we
17	kits associated with replacing that cable, this	17	identified the need for one of these temporary
18	4160-volt cable, so.	18	installations, to actual implementation of those
19	MR. KOWALESKI: We had more, but you	19	installations.
20	don't know an exact length?	20	And so, we had I was in the TSC and we
21	MR. MCKENNEY: We had enough to do the	21	were working on multiple options because of the
22	alternate, we did bring in cable to finish this	22	condition we were in with just running on diesel
23	particular option, but the subsequent options, the	23	generators from the engineering and a station
24	capable length is a lot shorter and if we'd gone into	24	perspective that's not a very comfortable position to
25	that situation, we'd have done that.	25	be, so we were continuously looking at additional
	Page 50		Page 52
1	MR. MITMAN: So, again, I'm getting a	1	options, contingency plans because if we lose a diesel
2	little bit ahead, but the concern is how many of these	2	generator, then we'd want to be able to respond in a
3	options you could do? You obviously had enough to do	3	reasonable fashion.
4	this one, but if you had to do one or two additional	4	And so the implementation would be under
5	ones, you might have run out of cable.	5	our temporary modification process and our work
6	SPEAKER: This is headquarters. We're	6	management process. I'll go through this flowchart a
7	having a hard time hearing you, Jeff, could you please	7	little bit with you. This kind of describes our
8	speak up a little?	8	processes.
9	MR. MITMAN: Okay.	9	So if you'll look at the top here you'll
10	MR. BROWNING: How much cable did we	10	see where they have the TSC or OCC or OPS where
11	actually have on site, how much did we use for this?	11	engineering identifies a need. Engineering would define
12	MR. MCKENNEY: I can get you those	12	the concept and scope and then at that point, once we
13	numbers at break. I've got them in a book back here.	13	define the initial concept and scope, depending on the
14	MR. DAPAS: I think the intent of the	14	urgency, we would provide those directions to planning,
15	question was to understand if you had to pursue more	15	in which case they would start the planning process and
16	than one contingency option there did you have	16	get instructions to the field for the start of
17	sufficient cable for that?	17	installation.
18	MR. MCKENNEY: One thing is, and it's not	18	A lot of the stuff that we actually
19	listed in our presentation, if we really had to do this	19	install, like pulling capable, it's pretty straight
20	we could have run this cable a lot shorter than what we	20	forward, so you don't need a lot of detailed
21	did. And that's what we're going to talk about in a	21	instructions for that, but they were working under our
22		- 77	

21 instructions for that, but they were working under our 22 processes.

23 So as they're installing and testing the configuration, they're providing feedback to engineering as we are refining the scope. And then if there's any

13 (Pages 49 to 52)

24

25

moment.

MR. CIRCLE: Jeff Circle, just to

fact that you had already scheduled the circ water pump

clarify, and then I'll finish, had it not been for the

22

23

24

	Page 53		Page 55
1	changes to what engineering needs we provide that back	1	it says available for use until the process was
2	to planning, which kind of completes the circle on to	2	complete.
3	make sure that we're linked up.	3	MR. KENNEDY: How many other options did
4	Because what we're doing here is we're	4	you actually start down this path, this implementation
5	running in parallel paths, right? One is the	5	process path other options in parallel?
6	installation, one is the documentation and approvals	6	MR. BROWNING: Not in any great detail.
7	associated with the temporary modification.	7	MR. MCKENNEY: We were in this step
8	So this right here, the available for	8	block, right here, according to that and we had done
9	use, that's when the testing's done, the installation's	9	some of this (indicating).
10	done, oftentimes the engineering will lag a little bit	10	MR. BROWNING: But what you're going to
11	behind that if you're in a parallel path environment.	11	hopefully see is the work order instructions for
12	And for the installation we actual installed, that	12	installing a Raychem splice, for example. That Raychem
13	available for use, that's the 4.4 days we're talking	13	splice per order instructions can be translated over
14	about. It was installed, it was tested, and it was	14	into this option. The installation of this component
15	energized up to the point that all OPS had to do was	15	you just changed the nomenclature of where it's going,
16	close the breaker to provide power to either of the	16	and the fieldwork could have been done. If we were
17	vital buses.	17	halfway through option, the one we were doing, it's a
18	So if there was an immediate need or if	18	matter of cutting cable and redirecting that cable. The
19	we were to lose a diesel generator or something, we	19	work order instructions can come out in our process and
20	could have invoked an emergency team on and placed it in	20	use by the craft just in a different locations.
21	service. But the path we used, since there was no	21	MR. DAPAS: Marc Dapas, the salient point
22	immediate need, we were stable with both diesel	22	here is that you actually implemented this process and
23	generators, is it came through this way and we waited	23	the manner in which it was provided to restored
24	the additional day and a half to get our paper completed	24	4160-volt power. You would have used the same process
25	before we put it in service.	25	and you're assuming other three contingency success
	Page 54		Page 56
1	-	1	
1 2	Page 54 Any questions on that? MR. LOVELESS: This is David Loveless.	1 2	paths that you indicated that you could have received
	Any questions on that? MR. LOVELESS: This is David Loveless.		
2	Any questions on that?	2	paths that you indicated that you could have received MR. BROWNING: When we get into the risk
2 3	Any questions on that? MR. LOVELESS: This is David Loveless. How would you authorize an emergency temporary	2 3	paths that you indicated that you could have received MR. BROWNING: When we get into the risk that's correct.
2 3 4	Any questions on that? MR. LOVELESS: This is David Loveless. How would you authorize an emergency temporary modification?	2 3 4	paths that you indicated that you could have received MR. BROWNING: When we get into the risk that's correct. MR. DAPAS: So I understand where you're going next. I just wanted to make sure I understood that part.
2 3 4 5	Any questions on that? MR. LOVELESS: This is David Loveless. How would you authorize an emergency temporary modification? MR. MCKENNEY: Our process that is	2 3 4 5	paths that you indicated that you could have received MR. BROWNING: When we get into the risk that's correct. MR. DAPAS: So I understand where you're going next. I just wanted to make sure I understood
2 3 4 5 6	Any questions on that? MR. LOVELESS: This is David Loveless. How would you authorize an emergency temporary modification? MR. MCKENNEY: Our process that is involved in that involves it's considered an immediate threat to the safety or reliability of the plant or involves authorization from the shift manager	2 3 4 5 6	paths that you indicated that you could have received MR. BROWNING: When we get into the risk that's correct. MR. DAPAS: So I understand where you're going next. I just wanted to make sure I understood that part.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	Any questions on that? MR. LOVELESS: This is David Loveless. How would you authorize an emergency temporary modification? MR. MCKENNEY: Our process that is involved in that involves it's considered an immediate threat to the safety or reliability of the plant or involves authorization from the shift manager and the engineering director. So that's within our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	paths that you indicated that you could have received MR. BROWNING: When we get into the risk that's correct. MR. DAPAS: So I understand where you're going next. I just wanted to make sure I understood that part. MR. CIRCLE: Just one last question. This is Jeff Circle, again, did you retain those records from the last, from the implementation process
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	Any questions on that? MR. LOVELESS: This is David Loveless. How would you authorize an emergency temporary modification? MR. MCKENNEY: Our process that is involved in that involves it's considered an immediate threat to the safety or reliability of the plant or involves authorization from the shift manager and the engineering director. So that's within our existing processes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	paths that you indicated that you could have received MR. BROWNING: When we get into the risk that's correct. MR. DAPAS: So I understand where you're going next. I just wanted to make sure I understood that part. MR. CIRCLE: Just one last question. This is Jeff Circle, again, did you retain those records from the last, from the implementation process considering the restoring power if you needed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Any questions on that? MR. LOVELESS: This is David Loveless. How would you authorize an emergency temporary modification? MR. MCKENNEY: Our process that is involved in that involves it's considered an immediate threat to the safety or reliability of the plant or involves authorization from the shift manager and the engineering director. So that's within our existing processes. MR. BROWNING: This is Jeremy Browning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	paths that you indicated that you could have received MR. BROWNING: When we get into the risk that's correct. MR. DAPAS: So I understand where you're going next. I just wanted to make sure I understood that part. MR. CIRCLE: Just one last question. This is Jeff Circle, again, did you retain those records from the last, from the implementation process considering the restoring power if you needed contingencies?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Any questions on that? MR. LOVELESS: This is David Loveless. How would you authorize an emergency temporary modification? MR. MCKENNEY: Our process that is involved in that involves it's considered an immediate threat to the safety or reliability of the plant or involves authorization from the shift manager and the engineering director. So that's within our existing processes. MR. BROWNING: This is Jeremy Browning. What we're trying to communicate in the prior slide and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	paths that you indicated that you could have received MR. BROWNING: When we get into the risk that's correct. MR. DAPAS: So I understand where you're going next. I just wanted to make sure I understood that part. MR. CIRCLE: Just one last question. This is Jeff Circle, again, did you retain those records from the last, from the implementation process considering the restoring power if you needed contingencies? MR. KOWALESKI: Do we have any written
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Any questions on that? MR. LOVELESS: This is David Loveless. How would you authorize an emergency temporary modification? MR. MCKENNEY: Our process that is involved in that involves it's considered an immediate threat to the safety or reliability of the plant or involves authorization from the shift manager and the engineering director. So that's within our existing processes. MR. BROWNING: This is Jeremy Browning. What we're trying to communicate in the prior slide and this slide is the modeling that we did, is assuming that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	paths that you indicated that you could have received MR. BROWNING: When we get into the risk that's correct. MR. DAPAS: So I understand where you're going next. I just wanted to make sure I understood that part. MR. CIRCLE: Just one last question. This is Jeff Circle, again, did you retain those records from the last, from the implementation process considering the restoring power if you needed contingencies? MR. KOWALESKI: Do we have any written records of what we did?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Any questions on that? MR. LOVELESS: This is David Loveless. How would you authorize an emergency temporary modification? MR. MCKENNEY: Our process that is involved in that involves it's considered an immediate threat to the safety or reliability of the plant or involves authorization from the shift manager and the engineering director. So that's within our existing processes. MR. BROWNING: This is Jeremy Browning. What we're trying to communicate in the prior slide and this slide is the modeling that we did, is assuming that this process that we actually used would be applied to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	paths that you indicated that you could have received MR. BROWNING: When we get into the risk that's correct. MR. DAPAS: So I understand where you're going next. I just wanted to make sure I understood that part. MR. CIRCLE: Just one last question. This is Jeff Circle, again, did you retain those records from the last, from the implementation process considering the restoring power if you needed contingencies? MR. KOWALESKI: Do we have any written records of what we did? MR. CIRCLE: TLC logs.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Any questions on that? MR. LOVELESS: This is David Loveless. How would you authorize an emergency temporary modification? MR. MCKENNEY: Our process that is involved in that involves it's considered an immediate threat to the safety or reliability of the plant or involves authorization from the shift manager and the engineering director. So that's within our existing processes. MR. BROWNING: This is Jeremy Browning. What we're trying to communicate in the prior slide and this slide is the modeling that we did, is assuming that this process that we actually used would be applied to the process, or applied to the applications that we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	paths that you indicated that you could have received MR. BROWNING: When we get into the risk that's correct. MR. DAPAS: So I understand where you're going next. I just wanted to make sure I understood that part. MR. CIRCLE: Just one last question. This is Jeff Circle, again, did you retain those records from the last, from the implementation process considering the restoring power if you needed contingencies? MR. KOWALESKI: Do we have any written records of what we did? MR. CIRCLE: TLC logs. MR. MCKENNEY: I do not have that. I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Any questions on that? MR. LOVELESS: This is David Loveless. How would you authorize an emergency temporary modification? MR. MCKENNEY: Our process that is involved in that involves it's considered an immediate threat to the safety or reliability of the plant or involves authorization from the shift manager and the engineering director. So that's within our existing processes. MR. BROWNING: This is Jeremy Browning. What we're trying to communicate in the prior slide and this slide is the modeling that we did, is assuming that this process that we actually used would be applied to the process, or applied to the applications that we would be talking to you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	paths that you indicated that you could have received MR. BROWNING: When we get into the risk that's correct. MR. DAPAS: So I understand where you're going next. I just wanted to make sure I understood that part. MR. CIRCLE: Just one last question. This is Jeff Circle, again, did you retain those records from the last, from the implementation process considering the restoring power if you needed contingencies? MR. KOWALESKI: Do we have any written records of what we did? MR. CIRCLE: TLC logs. MR. MCKENNEY: I do not have that. I have some personal documents for, basically, how we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Any questions on that? MR. LOVELESS: This is David Loveless. How would you authorize an emergency temporary modification? MR. MCKENNEY: Our process that is involved in that involves it's considered an immediate threat to the safety or reliability of the plant or involves authorization from the shift manager and the engineering director. So that's within our existing processes. MR. BROWNING: This is Jeremy Browning. What we're trying to communicate in the prior slide and this slide is the modeling that we did, is assuming that this process that we actually used would be applied to the process, or applied to the applications that we would be talking to you. So it's what we actually did and it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	paths that you indicated that you could have received MR. BROWNING: When we get into the risk that's correct. MR. DAPAS: So I understand where you're going next. I just wanted to make sure I understood that part. MR. CIRCLE: Just one last question. This is Jeff Circle, again, did you retain those records from the last, from the implementation process considering the restoring power if you needed contingencies? MR. KOWALESKI: Do we have any written records of what we did? MR. CIRCLE: TLC logs. MR. MCKENNEY: I do not have that. I have some personal documents for, basically, how we transitioned off from one to the other because part of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Any questions on that? MR. LOVELESS: This is David Loveless. How would you authorize an emergency temporary modification? MR. MCKENNEY: Our process that is involved in that involves it's considered an immediate threat to the safety or reliability of the plant or involves authorization from the shift manager and the engineering director. So that's within our existing processes. MR. BROWNING: This is Jeremy Browning. What we're trying to communicate in the prior slide and this slide is the modeling that we did, is assuming that this process that we actually used would be applied to the process, or applied to the applications that we would be talking to you. So it's what we actually did and it's what we would have done had we had to implement one of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	paths that you indicated that you could have received MR. BROWNING: When we get into the risk that's correct. MR. DAPAS: So I understand where you're going next. I just wanted to make sure I understood that part. MR. CIRCLE: Just one last question. This is Jeff Circle, again, did you retain those records from the last, from the implementation process considering the restoring power if you needed contingencies? MR. KOWALESKI: Do we have any written records of what we did? MR. CIRCLE: TLC logs. MR. MCKENNEY: I do not have that. I have some personal documents for, basically, how we transitioned off from one to the other because part of this is, you know, we have to figure out how we're going
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Any questions on that? MR. LOVELESS: This is David Loveless. How would you authorize an emergency temporary modification? MR. MCKENNEY: Our process that is involved in that involves it's considered an immediate threat to the safety or reliability of the plant or involves authorization from the shift manager and the engineering director. So that's within our existing processes. MR. BROWNING: This is Jeremy Browning. What we're trying to communicate in the prior slide and this slide is the modeling that we did, is assuming that this process that we actually used would be applied to the process, or applied to the applications that we would be talking to you. So it's what we actually did and it's what we would have done had we had to implement one of those contingencies. That's what we're trying to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	paths that you indicated that you could have received MR. BROWNING: When we get into the risk that's correct. MR. DAPAS: So I understand where you're going next. I just wanted to make sure I understood that part. MR. CIRCLE: Just one last question. This is Jeff Circle, again, did you retain those records from the last, from the implementation process considering the restoring power if you needed contingencies? MR. KOWALESKI: Do we have any written records of what we did? MR. CIRCLE: TLC logs. MR. MCKENNEY: I do not have that. I have some personal documents for, basically, how we transitioned off from one to the other because part of this is, you know, we have to figure out how we're going to transition from these different options back and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Any questions on that? MR. LOVELESS: This is David Loveless. How would you authorize an emergency temporary modification? MR. MCKENNEY: Our process that is involved in that involves it's considered an immediate threat to the safety or reliability of the plant or involves authorization from the shift manager and the engineering director. So that's within our existing processes. MR. BROWNING: This is Jeremy Browning. What we're trying to communicate in the prior slide and this slide is the modeling that we did, is assuming that this process that we actually used would be applied to the process, or applied to the applications that we would be talking to you. So it's what we actually did and it's what we would have done had we had to implement one of those contingencies. That's what we're trying to communicate in these two slides. Which means the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	paths that you indicated that you could have received MR. BROWNING: When we get into the risk that's correct. MR. DAPAS: So I understand where you're going next. I just wanted to make sure I understood that part. MR. CIRCLE: Just one last question. This is Jeff Circle, again, did you retain those records from the last, from the implementation process considering the restoring power if you needed contingencies? MR. KOWALESKI: Do we have any written records of what we did? MR. CIRCLE: TLC logs. MR. MCKENNEY: I do not have that. I have some personal documents for, basically, how we transitioned off from one to the other because part of this is, you know, we have to figure out how we're going to transition from these different options back and forth.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Any questions on that? MR. LOVELESS: This is David Loveless. How would you authorize an emergency temporary modification? MR. MCKENNEY: Our process that is involved in that involves it's considered an immediate threat to the safety or reliability of the plant or involves authorization from the shift manager and the engineering director. So that's within our existing processes. MR. BROWNING: This is Jeremy Browning. What we're trying to communicate in the prior slide and this slide is the modeling that we did, is assuming that this process that we actually used would be applied to the process, or applied to the applications that we would be talking to you. So it's what we actually did and it's what we would have done had we had to implement one of those contingencies. That's what we're trying to communicate in these two slides. Which means the installation in the field would have been controlled to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	paths that you indicated that you could have received MR. BROWNING: When we get into the risk that's correct. MR. DAPAS: So I understand where you're going next. I just wanted to make sure I understood that part. MR. CIRCLE: Just one last question. This is Jeff Circle, again, did you retain those records from the last, from the implementation process considering the restoring power if you needed contingencies? MR. KOWALESKI: Do we have any written records of what we did? MR. CIRCLE: TLC logs. MR. MCKENNEY: I do not have that. I have some personal documents for, basically, how we transitioned off from one to the other because part of this is, you know, we have to figure out how we're going to transition from these different options back and forth. MR. KOWALESKI: The answer is, there's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Any questions on that? MR. LOVELESS: This is David Loveless. How would you authorize an emergency temporary modification? MR. MCKENNEY: Our process that is involved in that involves it's considered an immediate threat to the safety or reliability of the plant or involves authorization from the shift manager and the engineering director. So that's within our existing processes. MR. BROWNING: This is Jeremy Browning. What we're trying to communicate in the prior slide and this slide is the modeling that we did, is assuming that this process that we actually used would be applied to the process, or applied to the applications that we would be talking to you. So it's what we actually did and it's what we would have done had we had to implement one of those contingencies. That's what we're trying to communicate in these two slides. Which means the installation in the field would have been controlled to the four quarters. There would have been engineering	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	paths that you indicated that you could have received MR. BROWNING: When we get into the risk that's correct. MR. DAPAS: So I understand where you're going next. I just wanted to make sure I understood that part. MR. CIRCLE: Just one last question. This is Jeff Circle, again, did you retain those records from the last, from the implementation process considering the restoring power if you needed contingencies? MR. KOWALESKI: Do we have any written records of what we did? MR. CIRCLE: TLC logs. MR. MCKENNEY: I do not have that. I have some personal documents for, basically, how we transitioned off from one to the other because part of this is, you know, we have to figure out how we're going to transition from these different options back and forth. MR. KOWALESKI: The answer is, there's some personal notes that people have, but we don't have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Any questions on that? MR. LOVELESS: This is David Loveless. How would you authorize an emergency temporary modification? MR. MCKENNEY: Our process that is involved in that involves it's considered an immediate threat to the safety or reliability of the plant or involves authorization from the shift manager and the engineering director. So that's within our existing processes. MR. BROWNING: This is Jeremy Browning. What we're trying to communicate in the prior slide and this slide is the modeling that we did, is assuming that this process that we actually used would be applied to the process, or applied to the applications that we would be talking to you. So it's what we actually did and it's what we would have done had we had to implement one of those contingencies. That's what we're trying to communicate in these two slides. Which means the installation in the field would have been controlled to the four quarters. There would have been engineering support paperwork unless we declared that we had a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	paths that you indicated that you could have received MR. BROWNING: When we get into the risk that's correct. MR. DAPAS: So I understand where you're going next. I just wanted to make sure I understood that part. MR. CIRCLE: Just one last question. This is Jeff Circle, again, did you retain those records from the last, from the implementation process considering the restoring power if you needed contingencies? MR. KOWALESKI: Do we have any written records of what we did? MR. CIRCLE: TLC logs. MR. MCKENNEY: I do not have that. I have some personal documents for, basically, how we transitioned off from one to the other because part of this is, you know, we have to figure out how we're going to transition from these different options back and forth. MR. KOWALESKI: The answer is, there's some personal notes that people have, but we don't have any formal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Any questions on that? MR. LOVELESS: This is David Loveless. How would you authorize an emergency temporary modification? MR. MCKENNEY: Our process that is involved in that involves it's considered an immediate threat to the safety or reliability of the plant or involves authorization from the shift manager and the engineering director. So that's within our existing processes. MR. BROWNING: This is Jeremy Browning. What we're trying to communicate in the prior slide and this slide is the modeling that we did, is assuming that this process that we actually used would be applied to the process, or applied to the applications that we would be talking to you. So it's what we actually did and it's what we would have done had we had to implement one of those contingencies. That's what we're trying to communicate in these two slides. Which means the installation in the field would have been controlled to the four quarters. There would have been engineering	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	paths that you indicated that you could have received MR. BROWNING: When we get into the risk that's correct. MR. DAPAS: So I understand where you're going next. I just wanted to make sure I understood that part. MR. CIRCLE: Just one last question. This is Jeff Circle, again, did you retain those records from the last, from the implementation process considering the restoring power if you needed contingencies? MR. KOWALESKI: Do we have any written records of what we did? MR. CIRCLE: TLC logs. MR. MCKENNEY: I do not have that. I have some personal documents for, basically, how we transitioned off from one to the other because part of this is, you know, we have to figure out how we're going to transition from these different options back and forth. MR. KOWALESKI: The answer is, there's some personal notes that people have, but we don't have

ucicui	Regulatory Conference with Entergy operations, inc.	•	1111 I I I I
	Page 57		Page 59
1	circle back around, finish up the what we actually	1	option, that total length for both of these two options
2	installed, which is a demonstrated we're calling it a	2	is 2500 feet cable, 2450 feet of cable. The actually
3	demonstrated success was the Startup 1 source.	3	installed one was 3,500 feet of cable. So what we
4	So restored power to vital switchgear,	4	actually did is a thousand feet more cable than if we
5	the craft was qualified and to do the activities that	5	were doing this option and the next option in parallel.
6	we're talking about it provided the option tied to	6	MR. CLARK: This is Jeff Clark. I just
7	either of the vital buses and allowed the diesel	7	have a question. On the first demonstrated option we
8	generators to be available to feed their respective	8	had the breaker in here and I'm assuming that provided
9	train while we're installing it.	9	some safety feature to the bus as well. So did you have
10	And it was actually available if you	10	protective devices other than the (can't hear)
11	look at that block that we talked about in 4.4 days. It	11	transformer to the bus?
12	was actually energized up to the last breaker. And that	12	MR. MCKENNEY: The expedited option, or
13	was documented in station log for that was when it was	13	success path one we're calling it here, did not, but it
14	available.	14	had the upstream protection on the transformer itself.
15	The next thing I want to get into is the	15	MR. CLARK: From the transformer
16	3 4160 alternate success paths. And these are things	16	MR. MCKENNEY: Yeah, on the high side.
17	that we talked about were being scoped in parallel while	17	MR. CLARK: I understand.
18	we're installing the demonstrated success.	18	MR. MCKENNEY: The other reason why we
19	And the estimated times, if we're going	19	installed the breaker was to operating the breaker on
20	to compare back to what we actually installed on how	20	the high side of the transformer is an Entergy Arkansas
21	long it would take to do it. We're going to show you	21	function. So by putting the breaker inside we were able
22	that these are considerably more simple and less	22	to allow operations to have control over that within
23	involved.	23	their own station. So that was one of the key functions
24	So this first success path would be a	24	of that breaker.
25	simplification or an alternate to the actually installed	25	MR. BROWNING: And what we actually did
	Page 58		Page 60
1	success path. So what we've done here is eliminated the	1	was positioning ourselves for a long-term recovery,
2	temporary breaker. The temporary breaker provided some	2	giving us the maximum operational flexibility. Had we
3	additional flexibility, but if we were in a station	3	lost a piece of generator, that priority would have
4	blackout or loss of an additional diesel and we're on	4	completely shifted. We're no longer looking at
5	page - slide 24 it would, so it was basically, run	5	long-term recovery and operational flexibility, we're
6	the cable from Startup 1 transformer to the cross tie	6	looking at how do I connect to that bus in a safe,
7	between the safety buses or the vital buses.	7	efficient manner.
8	And what that looks like on slide 25 is	8	MR. DAPAS: This is Marc Dapas. Just a
9	we have the Startup 1 transformer and we still would	9	question to make sure I understand. The difference,
10	have routed it around the area where the damage was, but	10	then, between your success path one and what you
11	we would have taken a more direct route.	11	actually did to restore is connecting a cable directly
12	And so we would have used quite a bit	12	to the winding versus via temporary breaker
13	less cable, and we would have tied it to the exact same	13	MR. MCKENNEY: That's correct.
14	spot that we used in the actual installed installation.	14	MR. DAPAS: Startup point transformer?
15	If you look at this table, this is a	15	MR. BROWNING: And shorting the path.
16	comparison between the expedited or success path one and	16	MR. DAPAS: And the reason why it's a
17	the actual installed and you can see that it's half as	17	shorter path, why would you have not exercised the same
18	much cable, half as many terminations, and we do not	18	path you did in the actual restoration? I may have
19	have to install temporary breaker, we do not have to do	19	missed the
20	the testing on temporary breaker, the DC supply for the	20	MR. BROWNING: The real basis there was
21	temporary breaker, so there's quite a bit of scope that	21	that operational flexibility, the time we had and lay
22	would have been eliminated by that particular option.	22	down areas for recovery. Where we would have laid that
23	MR. KOWALESKI: This is Joe Kowaleski, to	23	cable for a direct path, would not have afforded us the
2.4	that measurable quastion on apple qualphility if you	. /4	opportunity to finish the recovery offerts that we know

15 (Pages 57 to 60)

opportunity to finish the recovery efforts that we knew

we needed to do. It would be outside of the area that

24

25

that previous question on cable availability, if you

look at that total length of capable plus the next

24

	Page 61		Page 63
1	was impacted, but because of where we needed to move	1	between the train bay and Unit 2.
2	material inside our turbine building, we wanted that	2	These were the route of the cables that
3	outside the turbine building altogether for maximum	3	went to A1 and also to the vital switchgear. So when
4	flexibility inside there.	4	and also from A2 was actually de-energized at that
5	But that's a different decision than I	5	point in the outage. So there's a cable that runs from
6	don't have power on one of my safety buses. I'm not	6	A2 switchgear and that's what feeds to the A4 vital
7	thinking about long-term recovery. I'm thinking about	7	switchgear.
8	power to my safety-related bus.	8	And I'm going to show where we're going
9	MR. MITMAN: So, before we leave that	9	to use this green cable here in a moment.
10	one, can we go back two slides, back to slide 24,	10	MR. KOWALESKI: And that end of the
11	please. This is Jeff Mitman. The scenario where you'd	11	switchgear was undamaged?
12	need immediately the offsite power would be some failure	12	MR. MCKENNEY: Yeah, this end of the
13	of the vital AC power. Now the largest contributor to	13	switchgear was undamaged, which is the west side, or to
14	that would be a failure of the diesel generators.	14	the left. And on the right this side right is where the
15	MR. MCKENNEY: Right.	15	stator, the main impact was to the switchgear. This
16	MR. MITMAN: It seems like that's what	16	side here was not damaged.
17	you're built your contingencies on, your success paths	17	MR. MITMAN: Before we leave this slide,
18	on, is failures to the diesels. But we're in a	18	what's the source of control power for the 2A9 bus?
19	condition where the stator has been dropped, there's	19	MR. HATHCOAT: The source of control
20	extensive damage on 1A1 and 1A2 and I can easily	20	power is DC, it's all from the Unit 2 control room. The
21	envision a situation where there's damage to the A3	21	Unit 2 control room basically has the controls to start
22	and/or the A4. Not directly from the stator drop	22	the alternate diesel generator and tie it on the.
23	itself, but because of problems in the electrical system	23	Unit 2 side.
24	that has caused failures in the associated electrical	24	MR. MITMAN: So the source of control
25	distribution system.	25	power is

Page 62

1 Did you consider any contingencies to MR. MCKENNEY: From Unit 2. 2 reenergize loads that didn't rely on the A3 or the A4? MR. MITMAN: -- from Unit 2 and on the DC 3 MR. KOWALESKI: Yeah. The third option, system? 4 or the fourth option that we'll talk about is one MR. MCKENNEY: So I'm on slide 28, and 5 directly, it's a 480-volt power directly, bypassing all what this does is we would -- we're going to hook a 6 4160-volt switchgear. cable from -- disconnect a cable from A2 which right 7 MR. MITMAN: So that's the contingency if here, from A2 and run it through the door into Unit 2 8 the failure is other than on the diesel generator? because these are on the same elevation and there's a 9 MR. KOWALESKI: In the event, although door, I'll show you an overhead view here in a moment, 10 the aux building is completely separate building, in and splice in approximately a hundred feet of cable and 11 relaying protecting the safety buses from damage on the tie it back into 2A901. 12 non safety buses. If all that had failed, both diesel So we had to make some very minor -- the 13 generators had failed, and the safety buses were termination points were damaged in 2A901. And when we 14 completely unavailable on the 4160-volt, there is a actually, physically repaired them, it took six hours. 15 So it was, the breakers were fine, it's just where the direct path to 480-volt power to the necessary makeup 16 cables terminated. pumps with multiple options that completely bypass the 17 Also important on this is, you can see 4160-volt system. 18 MR. BROWNING: David, let's get you back that this success path No. 2 is completely independent 19 on track. Let's move to success path two if there's no of success path 1 or what we installed. They use 20 different tie points. The physical location is more questions on success path one. 21 MR. MCKENNEY: I want to give a little different. The sources are different. overhead view on page 2, slide 27. This gives you a 22 And this is an overhead view on page --23 physical layout and the general area of the train bay slide 29. You can see where we disconnected the green 24 where the stator fail. Here is the 2A9 switchgear, cable from A201's cubicle and ran it through the door 25 which is located on the Unit 2 side. This is a wall and it'd make it about this far, so we just had to run

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

Page 64

Nuclea	r Regulatory Conference with Entergy Operations, Inc	•	Wiay 1, 201
	Page 65		Page 67
1	about a hundred feet of cable.	1	repaired were those connections.
2	Of course, that's a hundred feet times	2	MR. DAPAS: And this is Marc Dapas again.
3	seven because we have seven conductors or three parallel	3	Understand, you're looking at success path 1 or success
4	paths times three, plus one. And we would have tied it	4	path 2, right? Not both success paths, correct? You
5	in to the alternate AC switchgear in the back.	5	would have had to make a decision to use one or two or
6	MR. DAPAS: Just to make sure I'm	6	both
7	following this, can you show me why given our discussion	7	MR. KOWALESKI: These could have, and in
8	earlier about the ultimate AC, 4160-volt bus the damage	8	the event of diesel failure, would have been pursued in
9	associated with that bus did not impact this success	9	parallel.
10	path, too? I just wanted to make sure I fully	10	MR. DAPAS: So getting back to Jeff's
11	understand.	11	question here, factoring that into your timelines,
12	MR. MCKENNEY: We would have to make some	12	ensuring sufficient cable availability, using the
13	minor repairs in the back of 2A9. I have some	13	processes that you've described, you're going to be
14	photographs here I can show you, but we would have had	14	doing that with both of these contingency plans, would
15	to make some minor repairs and as I stated, it took six	15	that have resulted
16	hours to make those for the permanent repairs when we	16	I wanted to understand with the time you
17	actually did do that.	17	assumed to implement each contingency plan does that
18	MR. DAPAS: So what's the timeframe there	18	reflect the recognition that you're pursuing both of
19	to assess, if you will, the extent and condition	19	these in parallel and did you the right number of staff,
20	associated with the damage to determine minor repairs	20	you know, that were focused on each one individually, or
21	and all that's necessary and then the time to implement	21	are you relying on the same staff to make decisions and
22	those repairs were all factored into your timeline for	22	how did you factor the fact that you would potentially
23	how long it would take you to complete these success	23	be pursuing two paths at the same time?
24	paths?	24	MR. KOWALESKI: If you recall back on
25	MR. MCKENNEY: Yes. Let me get to the	25	page 9, there were 45 electricians per shift, so 45
	Page 66		Page 68
1	next couple slides down and we'll discuss that.	1	electricians per shift could easily pursue both of these
2	MR. SULLINS: I just wanted to add that	2	options. There were 40 engineers per shift to provide
3	while identified early, the tie point on the normal feed	3	support, and 60 operation staff per shift. So there was
4	to the A4 vital switchgear, we actually used this tie	4	sufficient resources to be able to pursue both of these
5	point for a second offsite power feed later in our	5	paths in parallel.
6	recovery and the splices were very near where	6	MR. BROWNING: If you looked at the scope
7	illustrated on this picture.	7	of work that we were planning on implementing on a given
8	MR. MCKENNEY: So this is slides 30 and	8	day during the outage, it would be comparable work.
9	this is talking about the differences between what we	9	Actually, it would be significantly less. To implement
10	actually installed, we're always tying back to that	10	what we're talking about would be significantly less
11	because it demonstrates that we were able to complete	11	than what we were already planning on doing during any
12	these splices and terminations and pulling this cable.	12	incident.
13	So on the right is what we actually	13	MR. DAPAS: The context of the questions
14	installed. On the left is what would be required to	14	I'd offer here, at least I'm not aware of risk
15	hook up success path No. 2. You can see it's about	15	assessment's allowed for credit for cable routing here
16	700 feet of cable, half as many terminations or splices,	16	and alternate power supplies, installed equipment and
17	14, and we'd have to make some minor termination point	17	when that equipment failed what redundancy do you have,
18	repairs in 2A901. So we can be pulling cable, we could	18	etc.? So, it's important that we understand clearly the
19	be making up the stress cones or the termination kits	19	timeline assumptions here when you pointed out in one of
20	while we're repairing the 2A9 switchgear. That could be	20	your earlier slides that you would have been able to
21	running in parallel and whatever electrical testing that	21	implement one of these contingency plans before you
22	wa falt wa naadad ta da	22	would have seen that a core uncovered

- 22 would have seen that a core uncovered.
 - MR. BROWNING: Yes, sir.
- 24 MR. KOWALESKI: And we do have a timeline 25

picture that may help clarify that.

23

we felt we needed to do.

MR. KOWALESKI: So the only damage to

that switchgear was the connection points on the outside

-- output of that breaker. That's all that had to be

22

23

24

Nuclear	Regulatory Conference with Entergy Operations, Inc.	•	May 1, 2014
	Page 69		Page 71
1	MR. LOVELESS: Before you leave the	1	able to go in and do these actions.
2	this is David Loveless. In this particular success path	2	MR. LOVELESS: I guess my point is that
3	you're talking about accessing two areas that were	3	most of risk we're looking at is, at time zero we go
4	significantly restricted, at least early on in the	4	into station blackout, and the times for recover that
5	event. My understanding from the AIT that the entire	5	you're talking about aren't from somewhere a couple days
6	switchgear area in Unit 1 was closed off. At some point	6	later after you stabilize and have been thinking about
7	no one was allowed in there, but then it was very	7	it while. It's now. You need power now, and you're
8	limited when it was. And then on the Unit 2 side	8	telling me I'm going to be going into an area that we
9	SPEAKER: This is headquarters we're	9	haven't assessed to determine if it's structurally sound
10	having trouble hearing you guys. Could you speak close	10	yet and I've got other electricians I'm sending into the
11	to the mic, please?	11	area full of water with energized equipment.
12	Thank you.	12	So I do see them as overlapping.
13	MR. LOVELESS: On the Unit 2 side, we're	13	MR. HATHCOAT: This is John Hathcoat. At
14	talking with th followup team about some of the work	14	least on the Unit 2 side with emergency class
15	or on some of the that plus 2 Alpha 1 where they	15	declaration around the 2A1-2A9 bus was a little bit
16	couldn't get in there. They said, no, we've got	16	delayed from when the actual explosion occurred. That
17	energized equipment in there, we've got water all over	17	was due to water on the floor, but after a couple hours,
18	the floor, nobody's going in there. So I would expect	18	and then about 13:30 is when we actually had the log
19	to see both of those restrictions somehow.	19	entry that we were able to assess the back of 2A9
20	When did we know that this green cable	20	safely.
21	was accessible and it was undamaged? When did we have	21	So it was roughly six hours of being
22	Unit 2 side cleared up enough that someone could	22	delayed, and we were able to access that back and
23	actually access it?	23	we'd been back there for awhile being able to access the
24	MR. MCKENNEY: If you look back on slide	24	area. So that's just a point of reference.
25	29 actually, let's go back to this one, slide 27,	25	MR. MCKENNEY: Are there any more
	Page 70		Page 72
1	okay? This cable, we actually had access up to this	1	questions on success path No. 2? And I'd like to move
2	point. The major damage, structural damage, was in this	2	onto success path No. 3 which is on slide 31. This has
3	area. So they did put a fence right across here, but	3	to do with it's a variation of the station blackout
4	this was visibly - was not damaged. So we could get to	4	connection that we just talked about in success path No.
5	this area easily. And we actually did do assessments	5	2.
6	the first day in all this area.	6	What that involves there is we connect to
7	MR. HARRIS: And David, let me see if I	7	the same green cable that we showed on some of those
8	can address your question. I believe what you're	8	other ones there and we would, instead of connecting to
9	referring to is at the onset immediately after the	9	the 2A9 switchgear cubicle, for some we couldn't repair
10	stator drop event occurred, there were limitations	10	that, and we had this particular option; we could have
11	allowing operator access into the Unit 2 area because of	11	disconnected a condensate pump, which is non-vital.
12	the water intrusion and certainly associated with that	12	This is Unit 2, 2A1, Unit 2 switchgear, not the Unit 1.
13	area.	13	And we would disconnect a condensate pump and connect a
14	That was immediately after, and we dealt	14 15	temporary cable to it's output breaker.
15 16	with that in relation to, you know, recognition of what	15	And, so we'd have to do some minor
17	the condition was for emergency classifications and the	17	reconfiguration of the control scheme for the breaker,
18	danger.	18	but we have it'd be the same as our load center
19	What David is talking about is - would be	19	breakers. So we'd have the scheme well defined, could easily have made the transition over to that.
20	- would come in a much later in relation to developing a	20	If you can see from slide 32 here, the
21	recovery strategy and getting access in this area. So I don't think there's any - these are not mutually	21	route is basically the same, cable splice would be in
22		22	the same spot instead of healing to 240 over here, we'd

22 the same spot, instead of hooking to 2A9 over here, we'd

23 just loop back the cable and hook into this spot, so. 24 We would run success path 1 and success 25

path 2 or 3 in parallel. We wouldn't do both of these

exclusive, or these issues are not contradicting each

did try to restrict operator access to that area, but

other, but -- because immediately after the accident we

later on during the recovery phase, we would have been

22

23

24

Job No. 18996 Nuclear Regulatory Conference with Entergy Operations, Inc.

	Page 73		Page 75
1	because they're this tie point on the opposite end	1	And I'm trying to differentiate, quite
2	here, 409, is a snake. But it does provide us an option	2	frankly, after the fact we could have pursue this
3	if for some reason we couldn't get the 2A9 switchgear	3	success path versus what was actually being considered
4	repaired or if so we could have another place to tie	4	by the staff that was involved in responding to the
5	to get power.	5	event?
6	It does provide some nice options also	6	MR. BROWNING: The three that we're
7	that 2A9 also and this cable from 2A2 to the is	7	discussing with you are the three that we are modeling
8	always energized. So this cable, which is shown in red	8	because they were the three primary success paths that
9	here, back on slide 31, from 2A2 to 2A904, that remained	9	we were considering; however, we did order the diesel
10	energized through the entire event.	10	generator. The diesel generator showed up to the site
11	MR. CIRCLE: You mean 2A1?	11	within 48 hours of the event occurring.
12	MR. MCKENNEY: 2A1, thank you.	12	The back feed option is something that we
13	MR. CIRCLE: See, I was paying attention.	13	have done before, had the station back feeding off of
14	But I do have one question. This is Jeff Circle again.	14	so it's not a concept, it's something we've actually
15	You mentioned success paths 1 and 2 might be done in	15	done, but we weren't actually pursuing that because we
16	parallel?	16	had stable transformers at that time.
17	MR. MCKENNEY: Or 1 and 3.	17	And the restoration of A1 non-vital to
18	MR. CIRCLE: 1 and 3?	18	Startup 2, again, we actually took an approach that we
19	MR. MCKENNEY: 1 and 2 or 1 and 3, but	19	brought in Startup 2 during the recovery and powered it
20	not 2 and 3.	20	up in the plant. But at the time of the event, those
21	MR. CIRCLE: So we needed some	21	were more concepts. We knew we could do them, but we
22	clarification.	22	really weren't putting a lot of effort into it, other
23	MR. MCKENNEY: Yes. That's what that	23	than we were ordering the materials and resources we
24	because 3 is a variation of 2.	24	needed to do it.
25	As you can see, it's basically, the scope	25	MR. DAPAS: And the context of my

Page 74

	Page 74		Page 76
1	is the same, pretty much, as what we did on the	1	questions here I think you've heard the general theme
2	alternate C breaker, which is 901, with the difference	2	of questioning. What was the understanding of the
3	being where we wouldn't have to repair the 901 breakers.	3	operators, what's involved in going out and verifying
4	We would have to do some minor interlock defeats and	4	what the plant conditions are, what are the equipment
5	reconfigurations so the breaker would now think that it	5	availabilities so we can pursue these contingency
6	had a condensate pump hooked to the other end.	6	options.
7	In addition to that, we were also looking	7	What there's a lot going on here,
8	at other and these were three primary methods. We	8	obviously, in response to this event, right? You had
9	were also looking at a unit back feed in case Startup 1	9	flooding as a result of the fire main being damaged, you
10	transformer was unavailable, which we'd back feed	10	had equipment that was damaged and understanding the
11	through our main transformers, hook to the unit aux,	11	full extent of that equipment damage to determine
12	we'd basically hook up the same way as we did the	12	whether these paths were viable here, and what you need
13	starter transformer. Just another source to get power	13	to do to ensure that the effort expended is going to
14	from the switchyard into the plant.	14	result in the desired outcome because you fully scoped
15	We also had a portable diesel generator	15	out the condition. That's what I really need to
16	that was being shipped in that we could have, basically	16	understand here.
17	480-volt, the step-up transformer, that could have	17	MR. MCKENNEY: To give you little context
18	provided us 480-volt power.	18	on what was scoped
19	MR. DAPAS: Can you elaborate this is	19	MR. JAMES: Before we answer that, let's
20	Marc Dapas. You have a slide there that would indicate	20	make sure we're talking about the options that you're
21	these additional success paths were considered and	21	interested in, Marc. I think you're interested in the
22	scoped. I'd like to hear, maybe Jeremy, you can provide	22	three that we discussed in detail; is that correct?
23	a little more context. Where did this occur, was it	23	MR. DAPAS: Well, the three that you
24	conceptual here or how far along were you in that	24	offer, the next step is to credit these and the risk
25	process scenario?	25	assessment, saying these were viable success paths,

19 (Pages 73 to 76)

Job No. 18996 Nuclear Regulatory Conference with Entergy Operations, Inc.

			• /
	Page 77		Page 79
1	therefore, NRC where you've assumed as a result of	1	a process that comes out, electrical power is my top
2	diesel failure here's where you end up. You're planning	2	priority and his resources.
3	to	3	He has to make decisions based on facts,
4	MR. JAMES: Because I think Jeremy was	4	but a flowchart gets him to the end. And that's where
5	answering that these three on these additional ones,	5	he would in this case we did have some challenges
6	so we need to make clear that we're responding to the	6	with our seals, but those seals, even if they would have
7	three that you asked, which were our three success paths	7	completely failed, the mechanisms that would have
8	that we proposed.	8	allowed that inventory could have been a challenge,
9	MR. BROWNING: So, have we answered your	9	but if electrical is gone, the flowchart is going to say
10	question?	10	priority is electrical, inventory is No. 2. As we
11	MR. DAPAS: After we've completed the	11	continue to watch that inventory because of the rate of
12	full discussion here today, I'll be able to answer.	12	loss.
13	MR. BROWNING: I wasn't sure we did.	13	So I don't know if I'm answering your
14	MR. DAPAS: I think we're in the at	14	question, but it's process driven against safety
15	least I'm in absorb mode right now and I'll need to take	15	functions and the information he has will drive him to
16	a little bit of time to make sure all the questions I	16	the that conclusion.
17	have are asked. Right now we're going on.	17	MR. WILLOUGHBY: You answered my
18	MR. MCKENNEY: That's a good segue into	18	question.
19	slide 35.	19	MR. BROWNING: I just wanted to make
20	MR. WILLOUGHBY: This is Leonard	20	sure.
21	Willoughby. I do have a question.	21	MR. MCKENNEY: I want to summarize the
22	MR. MCKENNEY: Yes.	22	different success paths in this slide. They're simple
23	MR. WILLOUGHBY: There was other things	23	design concept and simple to implement. Craft personnel
24	going on in the plant at the time. Right now we're just	24	were qualified and scheduled to perform the same type
25	focusing on the recovery of this area, but you had some	25	activities with the circ pump cable replacement, so they
	Page 78		Page 80
1	other things going on in the plant that you also had to	1	had the equipment on site, personnel on site that knew
2	expend resources to address, such as the steam generator	2	how to do that work. It's activities that we do on a
3	seal and stuff and how is that factored into all your	3	regular basis even with it online maintenance work.
4	decision making process and all those other items that	4	Cables were routed away from the damaged
5	you need to look at because there was a lot of things	5	area. It's important to know that the success paths,
6	going on over all?	6	other than 2 and 3, are spatially and electrically
7	MR. MCKENNEY: So different disciplines	7	independent of each other. They could be implemented in
8	in a lot of those cases, right, so this is mostly	8	parallel in sufficient time. Could have been done we
9	electrical so I've got mechanical disciplines that are	9	work these sequentially and we'll show that later in the
10	working on seals and mechanics, and this is heavy	10	presentation.
11	electrical here, right?	11	And all three of the success paths we
12	MR. WILLOUGHBY: But doesn't one person	12	presented are less complex than what we actually

12 MR. WILLOUGHBY: But doesn't one person 13 -- who makes the final decision? It all rolls up into 14 one. 15 MR. BROWNING: Just from my observation, 16 from the EOF to the TSC to the implementing organization

17 that day, those decisions are being made by an emergency 18 director. And that emergency director is assessing 19 safety functions. So when we expend resources, we would 20 have put our resources on a safety function that was the 21 most challenging. 22 If the assumption is two diesel

- 23 generators aren't running and they need them to be
- 24 running, then based on his understanding of safety
- 25 functions, the trigger process driven. He goes through

20 (Pages 77 to 80)

feel compelled to react to a simple design concepts.

safeguard buses is not where you want to be.

in a situation where you're relying on installed

You're relying on contingency plans here that involve

running cable runs here to establish power to 4160-volt

MR. DAPAS: This is Marc Dapas. I just

So, I understand you're going through and

explaining how you would have restored power. But this

is -- that's not where you want to be. You want to be

equipment here versus these contingency plans, cable

runs and terminated here and splicing. That's not the

desired approach here to be able to insure plant safety,

installed in 4.4 days.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

	Page 81		Page 83
-	-		
1	right?	1	MR. KOWALESKI: Yes and we will explain
2	MR. KOWALESKI: Absolutely. The fact	2	how we account for that when we cover that model.
3	that the event occurred is unacceptable. The damage	3	MR. CLARK: This is Jeff Clark. I have
4	that occurred to the plant is unacceptable. But in	4	one more technical question that I didn't ask before. I
5	determining the safety significance of that, we have to	5	thought you might covered it in some of the other
6	look at what would be a realistic response to it. And	6	diagrams, but going back to success path No. 1 and you
7	this is a realistic response to it.	7	had the temporary breaker with the DC control power.
8	MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle. Just	8	Was that just a local operating breaker, or did you have
9	keep in mind what we're talking about here is a station	9	auxiliary operations in control?
10	blackout. These success paths are paths for mitigation	10	MR. MCKENNEY: It was local operating,
11	of a station blackout, so conditions are not typical of	11	but we ran a cable from the Startup transformer DC and
12	normal outage. And it's not typical of normal outage	12	ran it over to the breaker to give it DC power.
13	activities, so there's going to be a lot of stress	13	MR. CLARK: Okay. I understand. Thank
14	involved.	14	you.
15	MR. KOWALESKI: Yes, and when you look	15	MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman. On slide 35, I
16	the timelines you'll see there is a substantial time	16	want to explore some of your characterization a little
17	margin. I would point out, though, that work in the	17	bit. The first two bullets, you talk about simple
18	Startup 1 area was done just as it would have been, the	18	design and simple to implement. First of all, it's my
19	environmental conditions, that the work done was the	19	understanding success paths 1, 2, 3, and 4 you haven't
20	same as a station blackout, the work done the Unit 2	20	completed the design today; is that is correct?
21	area around the alternate ACD generator switchgear would	21	MR. MCKENNEY: We did not implement these
22	have been the same as it was during the time we	22	designs because we didn't have to.
23	implemented would have been the same as a station	23	MR. MITMAN: Did you complete the
24	blackout because that is the opposite unit which had	24	designs?
25	different power sources.	25	MR. MCKENNEY: We scoped the design, we
	Dama 92		Dama 94
	Page 82		Page 84
1	So there's a consideration that the	1	did not complete a design.
2	actual installation that was done had a lot of	2	MR. MITMAN: So the designs are not
3	similarities of plant conditions to conditions they	3	complete. So a year and some months later the designs
4	would have seen during a station blackout.	4	are not finished. All right. Second
5	MR. DAPAS: I appreciate you're pointing	5	MR. KENNEDY: Hey, Jeff, hold on, just
6	out there this is not significantly different from the	6	for clarification. Did you intend to complete them?
7	actual response you invoked here, right, with how you	7	MR. MCKENNEY: No.
8	established power to 4160-volt. It's not just modeling	8	MR. MITMAN: What I'm trying to get at
9	here, you are extrapolating, right, from what you	9	is, conceptually they may be simple, but they're not
10	actually and ad up doing with timelines that reflect what	10	fine minutes month of month strong Cothe

	1490 02		1490 01
1	So there's a consideration that the	1	did not complete a design.
2	actual installation that was done had a lot of	2	MR. MITMAN: So the designs are not
3	similarities of plant conditions to conditions they	3	complete. So a year and some months later the designs
4	would have seen during a station blackout.	4	are not finished. All right. Second
5	MR. DAPAS: I appreciate you're pointing	5	MR. KENNEDY: Hey, Jeff, hold on, just
6	out there this is not significantly different from the	6	for clarification. Did you intend to complete them?
7	actual response you invoked here, right, with how you	7	MR. MCKENNEY: No.
8	established power to 4160-volt. It's not just modeling	8	MR. MITMAN: What I'm trying to get at
9	here, you are extrapolating, right, from what you	9	is, conceptually they may be simple, but they're not
10	actually ended up doing with timelines that reflect what	10	five minutes worth of work, okay? So the
11	occurred, right?	11	characterization of them as being simple designs, I
12	MR. KOWALESKI: That's correct.	12	think, in risk space is simple has a certain meaning
13	MR. DAPAS: So I appreciate that	13	in risk space, you know, typically simple is something
14	distinction. I think what you're hearing some of the	14	that an operator can do in five minutes. These are not
15	questions here is making sure we understand how you	15	five-minute activities. These are engineering
16	factor various things here, and the station blackout	16	activities that will take a team of engineers hours to
17	scenario is different than both diesel's are running,	17	complete. The implementation of these are not
18	continuing of power, the safeguard's buses here, you're	18	activities that are done in five minutes.
19	in a station blackout and you've indicated you would be	19	It took your over four days to implement
20	having different cable, you would be considering the	20	what you wanted with teams of electricians and operators
21	shorter length. That would be your primary focus here	21	and others to complete the work. So, I understand that
22	from a safety function and I understand that.	22	they're not rocket science, but nonetheless, in risk
23	But also, with that shift in focus is,	23	space, their complicated activities that take a lot of
24	there's a little bit different operating environment	24	checks on them and a lot of people verifying what's been
25	here, so just how do you account for that?	25	done and a lot of care in getting them implemented.

21 (Pages 81 to 84)

Job No. 18996 Nuclear Regulatory Conference with Entergy Operations, Inc.

ucical	Regulatory Conference with Entergy Operations, inc.	-	Way 1, 201
	Page 85		Page 87
1	Is my understanding of that correct?	1	had four of our six makeup sources available. And so
2	MR. MCKENNEY: The slide is intended from	2	this was not classified as a need or scoped at that
3	an engineering and installation standpoint that it's	3	time.
4	simple. Now as far as the time, that's a different	4	But given the assumption of a station
5	concept for engineering.	5	blackout, we would from four, actually more than that,
6	MR. KENNEDY: I would offer that "simple"	6	prevent to zero make up sources, so with an extended
7	probably is not the right word to choose for this	7	blackout we would recognize that inventory loss would
8	quorum.	8	become a concern, and we would be pursuing options
9	MR. DAPAS: I thought that was evident	9	through our support staff for that.
10	when I made my earlier comment. I don't want to belabor	10	Any questions on the concept?
11	the point here. I think the role I'll offer here of the	11	MR. LOVELESS: Just one point of
12	NRC staff is to fully understand the assumptions here	12	clarification. This David Loveless. Unless I'm missing
13	you've made, how you feel the success paths should be	13	something, this is what in risk we would call more of a
14	credited, and you need to be asking questions that will	14	delaying action, not a success path in and of itself.
15	further illuminate, if you will, how you factored this	15	It would give you more time to get a success path in
16	into your overall risk assessment here.	16	place. Am I hearing that right because we're going to
17	We'll have an opportunity to engage here	17	be boiling in the core and the spent fuel pool. We're
18	and determine, based on our independent review, an	18	not going to be a stable place.
19	assessment; how much credit we think is appropriate	19	MR. SULLINS: That's the first
20	considering uncertainties, etc. The vein of the	20	consideration of it. Much like our spent fuel pool, it
21	questions really need to get to a full understanding of	21	can be used for longtime cooling, but that involves
22	your conclusions and the basis for those.	22	getting energy out of the reactor building,
23	So let's proceed, please.	23	consideration of the venting, thing of that nature.
24	MR. SULLINS: Okay. We'll move to our	24	MR. LOVELESS: Okay.
25	success path 4. This is Gary Sullins again, and we are	25	MR. SULLINS: And to support this
	Page 86		Page 88
1	on slide 36. We understand that in the present risk	1	function we would, again, use a temporary modification.
2	assessment, inventory control considers gravity feed	2	This time using the London Line power that we referred
3	from a borated water storage tank that the assumption	3	to earlier and David will explain that for you.
4	that there's no electrical power available.	4	MR. MCKENNEY: Okay we're on slide 38.
5	In our loss of decay heat removal	5	This particular one we're showing a disconnect switch
6	procedure and strategy there actually are six prescribed	6	S-28 on this upper left-hand portion of your diagram
7	methods for make up. One has been analyzed, which is	7	here.
8	passive gravity feed. Three involve 4160-volt power.	8	This is actually 600 amp, 480-volt
9	That there are two others that rely on 480-volt driven	9	disconnect that's located in the south end of the
10	pumps for the mode of force. And so we'll be discussing	10	turbine building, very remote from where the stator
11	one of those alternatives.	11	dropped. And this is the disconnect we actually used
12	The success path that we'll be discussing	12	for restorations of our non-vital load centers post
13	involves use of our borated water recirc pump. And our	13	event. So this is and this is fed from the London
14	loss of decay heat removal procedure, we detailed	14	Line, which is our yard power, which is it was not in
15	guidance to align P-66 borated water recirc pump with a	15	the section where the stator dropped. So it wasn't
16	suction supply from either our BWST or our spent fuel	16 17	impacted by the stator drop.
17	pool for makeup to the RCS.	1	So what this success path involves is
18 19	I should also note that this pump also	18 19	running a cable, 480-volt cable, from the disconnect and
20	serves as makeup source for spent fuel pool, and given	20	tying directly to the B51 bus, which is the motor
20	an assumed station blackout, we are interested in	20	control, 480-volt motor control center, it's in our aux
22	restoring this capability for that purpose as well. This is a success path that was not	22	building. It's also located away from the stator drop area. And then we take from a spare breaker off of B51
23	evaluated at that time of that event. And the basis for	23	and feed B21, which is a non-vital. And these motor
24	that is we were setting priorities based on the	24	control centers, I'll show you in a photograph here in a
	and is not were betting priorities bused on the	1	control contero, in onon you in a photograph here in a
25	conditions that we had. After the stator drop event we	25	minute, are about 18 inches apart.

Job No. 18996 Nuclear Regulatory Conference with Entergy Operations, Inc.

ucicul	r Regulatory Conference with Entergy Operations, Inc.	•	May 1, 201
	Page 89		Page 91
1	This is very common type of activity that	1	it was located remotely from where the event happened,
2	we do during outages, run temporary power. We've	2	and it's independent of the 4160-volt path. And it
3	actually used this in the opposite direction where we	3	doesn't have any relationship between the 4160-volt
4	fed B21 power to B51 to supply the spent fuel pool pump	4	side.
5	when we had bus outages on the red train AC power during	5	And if for some reason that wasn't
6	refuelling outages.	6	available, we could have tied straight on top of the
7	What this does is it brings 480-volt to	7	contact here. There's less of the variations you can do
8	B51 which gives your battery charger back. So you would	8	on 480-volt side that could accomplish this in the same
9	be able to maintain your red DC. Also feeds the	9	timeframe. And we estimated this would take 20 hours to
10	inverter, spent fuel pump, instrument AC, and gets us	10	implement. And that includes some scoping time for
11	over here to B21 where it would feed our borated water	11	engineering to figure out exactly what to do because the
12	storage pump or excuse me, borated water pump, which	12	actual electricians I talked to said they could have it
13	is the pump Gary talked about earlier.	13	done in less than a shift.
14	MR. LOVELESS: And 600 amps is enough to	14	MR. WILLOUGHBY: I do have one question.
15	provide for all those loads?	15	You mention that this is Leonard Willoughby. You
16	MR. MCKENNEY: Yes. The largest load	16	mentioned that you do this every other outage or every
17	associated with that is the battery charger, and it has	17	outage. How long does it normally take you?
18	a 150-amp breaker, but it's a hundred-amp load. So	18	MR. MCKENNEY: Well, we have the, you
19	there'd be sufficient loads for that.	19	know, the papers all are proof for this, it's a
20	This is overhead view of the cable	20	repetitive kind of task, right, so, it we actually run
21	routing. The stator drop is off the page at the top, so	21	during outages we run a, do a conduit between that
22	this is in the very far south end, run a cable up	22	we wouldn't necessarily do, and in usually takes us a
23	through a door, through another door, and B51 is about	23	shift to install, 12 hours.
24	200 feet of cable. And then we run a jumper from 51 to	24	MR. LOVELESS: This is David Loveless.
25	21. You see the relative location of those two.	25	What you're talking about though is just what's labeled
	Page 90		Page 92
1	Page 90	1	Page 92
1	A photograph of the S-28 disconnect	1	as temporary cable B that you do every outage. You
2	A photograph of the S-28 disconnect switch. And this is in the room, this is B51. Here is	2	as temporary cable B that you do every outage. You don't connect to the
2 3	A photograph of the S-28 disconnect switch. And this is in the room, this is B51. Here is where we would terminate the cables behind these two	2 3	as temporary cable B that you do every outage. You don't connect to the MR. MCKENNEY: We do not connect to the
2 3 4	A photograph of the S-28 disconnect switch. And this is in the room, this is B51. Here is where we would terminate the cables behind these two doors here, and you can see the relative location	2 3 4	as temporary cable B that you do every outage. You don't connect to the MR. MCKENNEY: We do not connect to the London Line.
2 3 4 5	A photograph of the S-28 disconnect switch. And this is in the room, this is B51. Here is where we would terminate the cables behind these two doors here, and you can see the relative location between 51 and 21. And we would run the jumper cable	2 3 4 5	as temporary cable B that you do every outage. You don't connect to the MR. MCKENNEY: We do not connect to the London Line. MR. SULLINS: The 480-volt power that Mr.
2 3 4 5 6	A photograph of the S-28 disconnect switch. And this is in the room, this is B51. Here is where we would terminate the cables behind these two doors here, and you can see the relative location between 51 and 21. And we would run the jumper cable from one spare breaker to another and we would be able	2 3 4 5 6	as temporary cable B that you do every outage. You don't connect to the MR. MCKENNEY: We do not connect to the London Line. MR. SULLINS: The 480-volt power that Mr. McKenney described also supports our other two makeup
2 3 4 5 6 7	A photograph of the S-28 disconnect switch. And this is in the room, this is B51. Here is where we would terminate the cables behind these two doors here, and you can see the relative location between 51 and 21. And we would run the jumper cable from one spare breaker to another and we would be able to power the borated water recirc pump.	2 3 4 5 6 7	as temporary cable B that you do every outage. You don't connect to the MR. MCKENNEY: We do not connect to the London Line. MR. SULLINS: The 480-volt power that Mr. McKenney described also supports our other two makeup sources that don't rely on 4160-volt power; the spent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A photograph of the S-28 disconnect switch. And this is in the room, this is B51. Here is where we would terminate the cables behind these two doors here, and you can see the relative location between 51 and 21. And we would run the jumper cable from one spare breaker to another and we would be able to power the borated water recirc pump. So I'm hesitant to put this slide up	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	as temporary cable B that you do every outage. You don't connect to the MR. MCKENNEY: We do not connect to the London Line. MR. SULLINS: The 480-volt power that Mr. McKenney described also supports our other two makeup sources that don't rely on 4160-volt power; the spent fuel pool cooling pump spent fuel pool cooling pump, P-40
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A photograph of the S-28 disconnect switch. And this is in the room, this is B51. Here is where we would terminate the cables behind these two doors here, and you can see the relative location between 51 and 21. And we would run the jumper cable from one spare breaker to another and we would be able to power the borated water recirc pump. So I'm hesitant to put this slide up there when it has "simple" on it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	as temporary cable B that you do every outage. You don't connect to the MR. MCKENNEY: We do not connect to the London Line. MR. SULLINS: The 480-volt power that Mr. McKenney described also supports our other two makeup sources that don't rely on 4160-volt power; the spent fuel pool cooling pump spent fuel pool cooling pump, P-40 Alpha, it also sets us up for gravity feed capability.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A photograph of the S-28 disconnect switch. And this is in the room, this is B51. Here is where we would terminate the cables behind these two doors here, and you can see the relative location between 51 and 21. And we would run the jumper cable from one spare breaker to another and we would be able to power the borated water recirc pump. So I'm hesitant to put this slide up there when it has "simple" on it (Laughter)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	as temporary cable B that you do every outage. You don't connect to the MR. MCKENNEY: We do not connect to the London Line. MR. SULLINS: The 480-volt power that Mr. McKenney described also supports our other two makeup sources that don't rely on 4160-volt power; the spent fuel pool cooling pump spent fuel pool cooling pump, P-40 Alpha, it also sets us up for gravity feed capability. Our capability for the reactor building would be through
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A photograph of the S-28 disconnect switch. And this is in the room, this is B51. Here is where we would terminate the cables behind these two doors here, and you can see the relative location between 51 and 21. And we would run the jumper cable from one spare breaker to another and we would be able to power the borated water recirc pump. So I'm hesitant to put this slide up there when it has "simple" on it (Laughter) but it is simple, I mean, from a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	as temporary cable B that you do every outage. You don't connect to the MR. MCKENNEY: We do not connect to the London Line. MR. SULLINS: The 480-volt power that Mr. McKenney described also supports our other two makeup sources that don't rely on 4160-volt power; the spent fuel pool cooling pump spent fuel pool cooling pump, P-40 Alpha, it also sets us up for gravity feed capability. Our capability for the reactor building would be through the reactor building purge system. The inboard purge
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A photograph of the S-28 disconnect switch. And this is in the room, this is B51. Here is where we would terminate the cables behind these two doors here, and you can see the relative location between 51 and 21. And we would run the jumper cable from one spare breaker to another and we would be able to power the borated water recirc pump. So I'm hesitant to put this slide up there when it has "simple" on it (Laughter) but it is simple, I mean, from a construction aspect.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	as temporary cable B that you do every outage. You don't connect to the MR. MCKENNEY: We do not connect to the London Line. MR. SULLINS: The 480-volt power that Mr. McKenney described also supports our other two makeup sources that don't rely on 4160-volt power; the spent fuel pool cooling pump spent fuel pool cooling pump, P-40 Alpha, it also sets us up for gravity feed capability. Our capability for the reactor building would be through the reactor building purge system. The inboard purge isolation dampers rely on red DC power and instrument
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A photograph of the S-28 disconnect switch. And this is in the room, this is B51. Here is where we would terminate the cables behind these two doors here, and you can see the relative location between 51 and 21. And we would run the jumper cable from one spare breaker to another and we would be able to power the borated water recirc pump. So I'm hesitant to put this slide up there when it has "simple" on it (Laughter) but it is simple, I mean, from a construction aspect. MR. BROWNING: Dave, did you mention that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	as temporary cable B that you do every outage. You don't connect to the MR. MCKENNEY: We do not connect to the London Line. MR. SULLINS: The 480-volt power that Mr. McKenney described also supports our other two makeup sources that don't rely on 4160-volt power; the spent fuel pool cooling pump spent fuel pool cooling pump, P-40 Alpha, it also sets us up for gravity feed capability. Our capability for the reactor building would be through the reactor building purge system. The inboard purge isolation dampers rely on red DC power and instrument air, both of which were available to us, or would be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A photograph of the S-28 disconnect switch. And this is in the room, this is B51. Here is where we would terminate the cables behind these two doors here, and you can see the relative location between 51 and 21. And we would run the jumper cable from one spare breaker to another and we would be able to power the borated water recirc pump. So I'm hesitant to put this slide up there when it has "simple" on it (Laughter) but it is simple, I mean, from a construction aspect. MR. BROWNING: Dave, did you mention that we actually performed the jumper between those to buses	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	as temporary cable B that you do every outage. You don't connect to the MR. MCKENNEY: We do not connect to the London Line. MR. SULLINS: The 480-volt power that Mr. McKenney described also supports our other two makeup sources that don't rely on 4160-volt power; the spent fuel pool cooling pump spent fuel pool cooling pump, P-40 Alpha, it also sets us up for gravity feed capability. Our capability for the reactor building would be through the reactor building purge system. The inboard purge isolation dampers rely on red DC power and instrument air, both of which were available to us, or would be available to us with N2 supplying instrument air and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A photograph of the S-28 disconnect switch. And this is in the room, this is B51. Here is where we would terminate the cables behind these two doors here, and you can see the relative location between 51 and 21. And we would run the jumper cable from one spare breaker to another and we would be able to power the borated water recirc pump. So I'm hesitant to put this slide up there when it has "simple" on it (Laughter) but it is simple, I mean, from a construction aspect. MR. BROWNING: Dave, did you mention that we actually performed the jumper between those to buses every other outage?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	as temporary cable B that you do every outage. You don't connect to the MR. MCKENNEY: We do not connect to the London Line. MR. SULLINS: The 480-volt power that Mr. McKenney described also supports our other two makeup sources that don't rely on 4160-volt power; the spent fuel pool cooling pump spent fuel pool cooling pump, P-40 Alpha, it also sets us up for gravity feed capability. Our capability for the reactor building would be through the reactor building purge system. The inboard purge isolation dampers rely on red DC power and instrument air, both of which were available to us, or would be available to us with N2 supplying instrument air and this temporary mod powering our DC bus.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A photograph of the S-28 disconnect switch. And this is in the room, this is B51. Here is where we would terminate the cables behind these two doors here, and you can see the relative location between 51 and 21. And we would run the jumper cable from one spare breaker to another and we would be able to power the borated water recirc pump. So I'm hesitant to put this slide up there when it has "simple" on it (Laughter) but it is simple, I mean, from a construction aspect. MR. BROWNING: Dave, did you mention that we actually performed the jumper between those to buses every other outage? MR. MCKENNEY: Yeah, when we do those bus	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	as temporary cable B that you do every outage. You don't connect to the MR. MCKENNEY: We do not connect to the London Line. MR. SULLINS: The 480-volt power that Mr. McKenney described also supports our other two makeup sources that don't rely on 4160-volt power; the spent fuel pool cooling pump spent fuel pool cooling pump, P-40 Alpha, it also sets us up for gravity feed capability. Our capability for the reactor building would be through the reactor building purge system. The inboard purge isolation dampers rely on red DC power and instrument air, both of which were available to us, or would be available to us with N2 supplying instrument air and this temporary mod powering our DC bus. The last item on this slide gives urgency
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A photograph of the S-28 disconnect switch. And this is in the room, this is B51. Here is where we would terminate the cables behind these two doors here, and you can see the relative location between 51 and 21. And we would run the jumper cable from one spare breaker to another and we would be able to power the borated water recirc pump. So I'm hesitant to put this slide up there when it has "simple" on it (Laughter) but it is simple, I mean, from a construction aspect. MR. BROWNING: Dave, did you mention that we actually performed the jumper between those to buses every other outage? MR. MCKENNEY: Yeah, when we do those bus outages, we run the jumper between every other refuel	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	as temporary cable B that you do every outage. You don't connect to the MR. MCKENNEY: We do not connect to the London Line. MR. SULLINS: The 480-volt power that Mr. McKenney described also supports our other two makeup sources that don't rely on 4160-volt power; the spent fuel pool cooling pump spent fuel pool cooling pump, P-40 Alpha, it also sets us up for gravity feed capability. Our capability for the reactor building would be through the reactor building purge system. The inboard purge isolation dampers rely on red DC power and instrument air, both of which were available to us, or would be available to us with N2 supplying instrument air and this temporary mod powering our DC bus. The last item on this slide gives urgency to doing something with 480-volt and that is to preserve
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A photograph of the S-28 disconnect switch. And this is in the room, this is B51. Here is where we would terminate the cables behind these two doors here, and you can see the relative location between 51 and 21. And we would run the jumper cable from one spare breaker to another and we would be able to power the borated water recirc pump. So I'm hesitant to put this slide up there when it has "simple" on it (Laughter) but it is simple, I mean, from a construction aspect. MR. BROWNING: Dave, did you mention that we actually performed the jumper between those to buses every other outage? MR. MCKENNEY: Yeah, when we do those bus outages, we run the jumper between every other refuel outage, depending on which train outage we're in.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	as temporary cable B that you do every outage. You don't connect to the MR. MCKENNEY: We do not connect to the London Line. MR. SULLINS: The 480-volt power that Mr. McKenney described also supports our other two makeup sources that don't rely on 4160-volt power; the spent fuel pool cooling pump spent fuel pool cooling pump, P-40 Alpha, it also sets us up for gravity feed capability. Our capability for the reactor building would be through the reactor building purge system. The inboard purge isolation dampers rely on red DC power and instrument air, both of which were available to us, or would be available to us with N2 supplying instrument air and this temporary mod powering our DC bus. The last item on this slide gives urgency to doing something with 480-volt and that is to preserve our indication.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A photograph of the S-28 disconnect switch. And this is in the room, this is B51. Here is where we would terminate the cables behind these two doors here, and you can see the relative location between 51 and 21. And we would run the jumper cable from one spare breaker to another and we would be able to power the borated water recirc pump. So I'm hesitant to put this slide up there when it has "simple" on it (Laughter) but it is simple, I mean, from a construction aspect. MR. BROWNING: Dave, did you mention that we actually performed the jumper between those to buses every other outage? MR. MCKENNEY: Yeah, when we do those bus outages, we run the jumper between every other refuel outage, depending on which train outage we're in. MR. BROWNING: And understanding poor	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	as temporary cable B that you do every outage. You don't connect to the MR. MCKENNEY: We do not connect to the London Line. MR. SULLINS: The 480-volt power that Mr. McKenney described also supports our other two makeup sources that don't rely on 4160-volt power; the spent fuel pool cooling pump spent fuel pool cooling pump, P-40 Alpha, it also sets us up for gravity feed capability. Our capability for the reactor building would be through the reactor building purge system. The inboard purge isolation dampers rely on red DC power and instrument air, both of which were available to us, or would be available to us with N2 supplying instrument air and this temporary mod powering our DC bus. The last item on this slide gives urgency to doing something with 480-volt and that is to preserve our indication. If we were to experience a station
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A photograph of the S-28 disconnect switch. And this is in the room, this is B51. Here is where we would terminate the cables behind these two doors here, and you can see the relative location between 51 and 21. And we would run the jumper cable from one spare breaker to another and we would be able to power the borated water recirc pump. So I'm hesitant to put this slide up there when it has "simple" on it (Laughter) but it is simple, I mean, from a construction aspect. MR. BROWNING: Dave, did you mention that we actually performed the jumper between those to buses every other outage? MR. MCKENNEY: Yeah, when we do those bus outages, we run the jumper between every other refuel outage, depending on which train outage we're in. MR. BROWNING: And understanding poor choice of words, we've got that feedback. What we're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	as temporary cable B that you do every outage. You don't connect to the MR. MCKENNEY: We do not connect to the London Line. MR. SULLINS: The 480-volt power that Mr. McKenney described also supports our other two makeup sources that don't rely on 4160-volt power; the spent fuel pool cooling pump spent fuel pool cooling pump, P-40 Alpha, it also sets us up for gravity feed capability. Our capability for the reactor building would be through the reactor building purge system. The inboard purge isolation dampers rely on red DC power and instrument air, both of which were available to us, or would be available to us with N2 supplying instrument air and this temporary mod powering our DC bus. The last item on this slide gives urgency to doing something with 480-volt and that is to preserve our indication. If we were to experience a station blackout, it would be a priority, not as high as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A photograph of the S-28 disconnect switch. And this is in the room, this is B51. Here is where we would terminate the cables behind these two doors here, and you can see the relative location between 51 and 21. And we would run the jumper cable from one spare breaker to another and we would be able to power the borated water recirc pump. So I'm hesitant to put this slide up there when it has "simple" on it (Laughter) but it is simple, I mean, from a construction aspect. MR. BROWNING: Dave, did you mention that we actually performed the jumper between those to buses every other outage? MR. MCKENNEY: Yeah, when we do those bus outages, we run the jumper between every other refuel outage, depending on which train outage we're in. MR. BROWNING: And understanding poor choice of words, we've got that feedback. What we're trying to communicate is this is work that we would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	as temporary cable B that you do every outage. You don't connect to the MR. MCKENNEY: We do not connect to the London Line. MR. SULLINS: The 480-volt power that Mr. McKenney described also supports our other two makeup sources that don't rely on 4160-volt power; the spent fuel pool cooling pump spent fuel pool cooling pump, P-40 Alpha, it also sets us up for gravity feed capability. Our capability for the reactor building would be through the reactor building purge system. The inboard purge isolation dampers rely on red DC power and instrument air, both of which were available to us, or would be available to us with N2 supplying instrument air and this temporary mod powering our DC bus. The last item on this slide gives urgency to doing something with 480-volt and that is to preserve our indication. If we were to experience a station blackout, it would be a priority, not as high as restoring the ultimate heat sink, but to get some power
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A photograph of the S-28 disconnect switch. And this is in the room, this is B51. Here is where we would terminate the cables behind these two doors here, and you can see the relative location between 51 and 21. And we would run the jumper cable from one spare breaker to another and we would be able to power the borated water recirc pump. So I'm hesitant to put this slide up there when it has "simple" on it (Laughter) but it is simple, I mean, from a construction aspect. MR. BROWNING: Dave, did you mention that we actually performed the jumper between those to buses every other outage? MR. MCKENNEY: Yeah, when we do those bus outages, we run the jumper between every other refuel outage, depending on which train outage we're in. MR. BROWNING: And understanding poor choice of words, we've got that feedback. What we're trying to communicate is this is work that we would typically do and implement without a lot of challenges	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	as temporary cable B that you do every outage. You don't connect to the MR. MCKENNEY: We do not connect to the London Line. MR. SULLINS: The 480-volt power that Mr. McKenney described also supports our other two makeup sources that don't rely on 4160-volt power; the spent fuel pool cooling pump spent fuel pool cooling pump, P-40 Alpha, it also sets us up for gravity feed capability. Our capability for the reactor building would be through the reactor building purge system. The inboard purge isolation dampers rely on red DC power and instrument air, both of which were available to us, or would be available to us with N2 supplying instrument air and this temporary mod powering our DC bus. The last item on this slide gives urgency to doing something with 480-volt and that is to preserve our indication. If we were to experience a station blackout, it would be a priority, not as high as restoring the ultimate heat sink, but to get some power to our battery chargers before our batteries are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A photograph of the S-28 disconnect switch. And this is in the room, this is B51. Here is where we would terminate the cables behind these two doors here, and you can see the relative location between 51 and 21. And we would run the jumper cable from one spare breaker to another and we would be able to power the borated water recirc pump. So I'm hesitant to put this slide up there when it has "simple" on it (Laughter) but it is simple, I mean, from a construction aspect. MR. BROWNING: Dave, did you mention that we actually performed the jumper between those to buses every other outage? MR. MCKENNEY: Yeah, when we do those bus outages, we run the jumper between every other refuel outage, depending on which train outage we're in. MR. BROWNING: And understanding poor choice of words, we've got that feedback. What we're trying to communicate is this is work that we would typically do and implement without a lot of challenges to it's being successful.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	as temporary cable B that you do every outage. You don't connect to the MR. MCKENNEY: We do not connect to the London Line. MR. SULLINS: The 480-volt power that Mr. McKenney described also supports our other two makeup sources that don't rely on 4160-volt power; the spent fuel pool cooling pump spent fuel pool cooling pump, P-40 Alpha, it also sets us up for gravity feed capability. Our capability for the reactor building would be through the reactor building purge system. The inboard purge isolation dampers rely on red DC power and instrument air, both of which were available to us, or would be available to us with N2 supplying instrument air and this temporary mod powering our DC bus. The last item on this slide gives urgency to doing something with 480-volt and that is to preserve our indication. If we were to experience a station blackout, it would be a priority, not as high as restoring the ultimate heat sink, but to get some power to our battery chargers before our batteries are depleted. And this concept that was presented to in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A photograph of the S-28 disconnect switch. And this is in the room, this is B51. Here is where we would terminate the cables behind these two doors here, and you can see the relative location between 51 and 21. And we would run the jumper cable from one spare breaker to another and we would be able to power the borated water recirc pump. So I'm hesitant to put this slide up there when it has "simple" on it (Laughter) but it is simple, I mean, from a construction aspect. MR. BROWNING: Dave, did you mention that we actually performed the jumper between those to buses every other outage? MR. MCKENNEY: Yeah, when we do those bus outages, we run the jumper between every other refuel outage, depending on which train outage we're in. MR. BROWNING: And understanding poor choice of words, we've got that feedback. What we're trying to communicate is this is work that we would typically do and implement without a lot of challenges	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	as temporary cable B that you do every outage. You don't connect to the MR. MCKENNEY: We do not connect to the London Line. MR. SULLINS: The 480-volt power that Mr. McKenney described also supports our other two makeup sources that don't rely on 4160-volt power; the spent fuel pool cooling pump spent fuel pool cooling pump, P-40 Alpha, it also sets us up for gravity feed capability. Our capability for the reactor building would be through the reactor building purge system. The inboard purge isolation dampers rely on red DC power and instrument air, both of which were available to us, or would be available to us with N2 supplying instrument air and this temporary mod powering our DC bus. The last item on this slide gives urgency to doing something with 480-volt and that is to preserve our indication. If we were to experience a station blackout, it would be a priority, not as high as restoring the ultimate heat sink, but to get some power to our battery chargers before our batteries are

23 (Pages 89 to 92)

	Page 93		Page 95
1	Number one is recovering vital 4160-volt,	1	inventory from the spent fuel pool. I would then make up
2	the diesels, and ultimate source. Number two is keeping	2	to the spent fuel pool and you have mixing, past reactor
3	the DC so we can see what's going on in the reactor	3	engineering since we had not reloaded with fresh fuel
4	building, and that would prompt some time of power to	4	to maintain one and a half percent shutdown margin, we
5	the battery charger. Number three, we're without makeup	5	need approximately just slightly under 400 PPM boron
6	capability, we have six methods. They don't all rely on	6	in the RCS. So we would not go directly without
7	4160-volt power, what can you do with that? Given those	7	MR. KOWALESKI: But you're not leaking
8	priorities, this is what the engineers basically this	8	the boron? You're evaporating the boron stays in a
9	is an exercise that they would be the TSC engineer, I'm	9	solution, so you're replacing inventory and your boron
10	the TSC manager with those priorities in very short	10	is still there?
11	order you can this is what I would propose.	11	MR. SULLINS: That's right. But there is
12	The next slides illustrates	12	consideration for mixing and so the methodology I
13	MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman. Before we go	13	prescribed for you would be the course that I would
14	on, the condition the plant's in at this point is the	14	follow.
15	canal, the cavity is flooded. Now the normal source of	15	MR. BROWNING: I wanted to be clear. The
16	water to flood the cavity is normally the borated water	16	capacity is 100 gallons a minute, the need was 50
17	storage tank. It's my understanding that that's, in	17	gallons a minute.
18	fact, what had happened. You used the water in the	18	MR. MITMAN: And the operators knew that?
19	borated water storage tank to fill the cavity.	19	MR. SULLINS: Yes. We post required
20	Is my understanding correct?	20	makeup capacities.
21	MR. SULLINS: Yes, that is correct. We	21	MR. MITMAN: And, of course, you had some
22	had approximately four feet in BWST, it's 9,700 gallons	22	excess capacity in the spent fuel pool that you could
23	per foot plus some few more.	23	also use if the engineering judgment gets to that point.
24	MR. MITMAN: So approximately 30 to	24	You also talked about, on slide 43, the ability to
25	40,000 gallons. If you'd gone to using the borated	25	gravity feed.
	Page 94		Page 96

	Page 94		Page 96
1	water transfer pump at, say, a nominal flow rate of a	1	MR. SULLINS: Yes, sir.
2	hundred gallons a minute, that would give you something	2	MR. MITMAN: Now, my understanding is
3	like 40 minutes worth of water.	3	with four feet of water in the BWST, the water level in
4	Again, is my understanding correct?	4	the BWST is lower than the water level in the cavity,
5	MR. SULLINS: From the normal alignment	5	and therefore if you try establish gravity feed, you'll
6	that is correct. We did not describe the details of	6	try and won't succeed, but you'll try and refill the
7	this strategy, but I would direct that we set up our	7	BWST. So, I'm surprised could you explain a little
8	makeup capability from our B5B security procedure for	8	bit about what you mean by that bullet about gravity
9	BWST makeup and we have multiple sources, clean water	9	feed?
10	sources in our yard, and that would provide a makeup	10	MR. SULLINS: Certainly. We would need
11	capability to our BWST.	11	to make up the BWST again without borated water to our
12	MR. MITMAN: When you say clean water	12	procedurally required a value greater than 21 feet,
13	sources, do you mean non-borated water sources?	13	and then this is the last contingency because you are in
14	MR. SULLINS: Yes, that's correct.	14	that case relying on the boil-off effect and you might
15	MR. MITMAN: And so, you've got an	15	have some mixing concerns, but it does provide that
16	analysis you've contemplated putting non-borated water	16	capability.
17	into the primary system?	17	And that was really all I wanted to make
18	MR. SULLINS: Not directly into the RCS.	18	of that.
19	The strategy, provided we needed this for a longer	19	MR. MITMAN: And gravity feed, if I
20	period of time, the P-66 provides makeup to spent fuel	20	remember correctly, is describe in your loss of decay
21	pool or directly to the RCS.	21	heat removal procedures, correct?
22	So the sequence I would follow is I would	22	MR. SULLINS: That's correct. That's
23	first use the borated water in the BWST as makeup to the	23	where the 21-feet limit is supplied.
24	RCS for boil off. Then I would transfer using the same	24	MR. BROWNING: The makeup to the BWST is
25	lost decay heat removal procedure available from	25	proceduralized, we do not have to create that makeup
		1	

24 (Pages 93 to 96)

	Page 97		Page 99
1	source. We'd have to think of it.	1	MR. SULLINS: Yes, sir, that's correct.
2	MR. SULLINS: That answer your question?	2	SPEAKER: Now, given that you'll be
3	We've had a number of questions related to timing and	3	having some boil off, right, where does the steam go?
4	the fact that we appreciate that there are many	4	And would that affect any of those follow-up actions
5	things going on in our facility and that we would have	5	that you count on in the success path?
6	to establish priorities, but the most significant factor	6	MR. SULLINS: That's a good question.
7	for risk from our perspective is the passive cooling	7	Once the core reached the boiling condition that would
8	capacity that existed in the fuel transfer canal. That	8	prohibit access to the reactor building and we have
9	provide for us an available inventory of 4.8 days.	9	factored that in to what we credit for actions.
10	What this slide illustrates is the time	10	SPEAKER: Thank you.
11	required for each of our four success paths relative to	11	MR. SULLINS: Other questions?
12	the time available.	12	MR. KENNEDY: On the timeline, does it
13	And we appreciate the comments regarding	13	include everything today we've talked about today with
14	parallel paths for success path 1 and success paths 2 or	14	respect to the engineering work that would be done, the
15	3. What I'd like to point out here, if success path 1	15	laying out of cables and breakers, does it take into
16	were our first priority then we would begin that	16	account the delay in access to inspecting the switchgear
17	activity with plans to commence the backup if there's a	17	and the breakers, you know, initially after the event?
18	problem with our offsite power source from Startup 1,	18	You know, pretty much all the questions that were asked.
19	that we pursue parallel paths. It's illustrated in a	19	MR. KOWALESKI: Kriss, it's based on what
20	simple manner here, but what's key is the time available	20	we actually did. So we actually installed this in 4.4
21	and that what we've modeled, we've taken a reflective	21	days. So all those access issues and all those impact
22	look of how do we do business, and what would we	22	were part of that. And then what we looked at is what
23	reasonably do.	23	scope was eliminated because these didn't include all
24	And if we're in the TSC and we can't get	24	the breakers, relays and additional routing and
25	either of our diesel's back, we will pursue multiple	25	additional splices. It essentially prorated that
	Page 98		Page 100
1	Page 98 options if there's a problem, if that Startup	1	Page 100 estimate down.
1 2		1 2	
	options if there's a problem, if that Startup		estimate down.
2	options if there's a problem, if that Startup transformer, that first priority, we want a back up to	2	estimate down. But you can see that there's sufficient
2 3	options if there's a problem, if that Startup transformer, that first priority, we want a back up to go to. And Mr. McKenney's established that that was	2 3	estimate down. But you can see that there's sufficient margin that if there was 12 hours of delay, there's still substantial margin time to complete these options. MR. KENNEDY: Do you think that would
2 3 4	options – if there's a problem, if that Startup transformer, that first priority, we want a back up to go to. And Mr. McKenney's established that that was physically viable, and what this illustrates is that we	2 3 4 5 6	estimate down. But you can see that there's sufficient margin that if there was 12 hours of delay, there's still substantial margin time to complete these options. MR. KENNEDY: Do you think that would also bound implementing these actions, if you had a
2 3 4 5	options if there's a problem, if that Startup transformer, that first priority, we want a back up to go to. And Mr. McKenney's established that that was physically viable, and what this illustrates is that we had the time to execute that. Any questions? SPEAKER FROM PHONE: Yeah, this is Sunil	2 3 4 5 6 7	estimate down. But you can see that there's sufficient margin that if there was 12 hours of delay, there's still substantial margin time to complete these options. MR. KENNEDY: Do you think that would also bound implementing these actions, if you had a station blackout would there be any complications
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	options if there's a problem, if that Startup transformer, that first priority, we want a back up to go to. And Mr. McKenney's established that that was physically viable, and what this illustrates is that we had the time to execute that. Any questions? SPEAKER FROM PHONE: Yeah, this is Sunil Weerakkody at headquarters. I have a question on slide	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	estimate down. But you can see that there's sufficient margin that if there was 12 hours of delay, there's still substantial margin time to complete these options. MR. KENNEDY: Do you think that would also bound implementing these actions, if you had a station blackout would there be any complications that would be created by the fact that you were doing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	options if there's a problem, if that Startup transformer, that first priority, we want a back up to go to. And Mr. McKenney's established that that was physically viable, and what this illustrates is that we had the time to execute that. Any questions? SPEAKER FROM PHONE: Yeah, this is Sunil Weerakkody at headquarters. I have a question on slide 44.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	estimate down. But you can see that there's sufficient margin that if there was 12 hours of delay, there's still substantial margin time to complete these options. MR. KENNEDY: Do you think that would also bound implementing these actions, if you had a station blackout would there be any complications that would be created by the fact that you were doing these activities in a station blackout plus the
2 3 5 7 8 9 10	options if there's a problem, if that Startup transformer, that first priority, we want a back up to go to. And Mr. McKenney's established that that was physically viable, and what this illustrates is that we had the time to execute that. Any questions? SPEAKER FROM PHONE: Yeah, this is Sunil Weerakkody at headquarters. I have a question on slide 44. MR. SULLINS: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	estimate down. But you can see that there's sufficient margin that if there was 12 hours of delay, there's still substantial margin time to complete these options. MR. KENNEDY: Do you think that would also bound implementing these actions, if you had a station blackout would there be any complications that would be created by the fact that you were doing these activities in a station blackout plus the conditions that you have actually had?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	options if there's a problem, if that Startup transformer, that first priority, we want a back up to go to. And Mr. McKenney's established that that was physically viable, and what this illustrates is that we had the time to execute that. Any questions? SPEAKER FROM PHONE: Yeah, this is Sunil Weerakkody at headquarters. I have a question on slide 44. MR. SULLINS: Okay. SPEAKER: Just a clarification, I know	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	estimate down. But you can see that there's sufficient margin that if there was 12 hours of delay, there's still substantial margin time to complete these options. MR. KENNEDY: Do you think that would also bound implementing these actions, if you had a station blackout would there be any complications that would be created by the fact that you were doing these activities in a station blackout plus the conditions that you have actually had? MR. BROWNING: That's correct. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	options if there's a problem, if that Startup transformer, that first priority, we want a back up to go to. And Mr. McKenney's established that that was physically viable, and what this illustrates is that we had the time to execute that. Any questions? SPEAKER FROM PHONE: Yeah, this is Sunil Weerakkody at headquarters. I have a question on slide 44. MR. SULLINS: Okay. SPEAKER: Just a clarification, I know you're comparing the success path for the different	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	estimate down. But you can see that there's sufficient margin that if there was 12 hours of delay, there's still substantial margin time to complete these options. MR. KENNEDY: Do you think that would also bound implementing these actions, if you had a station blackout would there be any complications that would be created by the fact that you were doing these activities in a station blackout plus the conditions that you have actually had? MR. BROWNING: That's correct. And that's what Joe was trying to explain earlier. If you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	options if there's a problem, if that Startup transformer, that first priority, we want a back up to go to. And Mr. McKenney's established that that was physically viable, and what this illustrates is that we had the time to execute that. Any questions? SPEAKER FROM PHONE: Yeah, this is Sunil Weerakkody at headquarters. I have a question on slide 44. MR. SULLINS: Okay. SPEAKER: Just a clarification, I know you're comparing the success path for the different success options for the 4.4 days after the core uncovery	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	estimate down. But you can see that there's sufficient margin that if there was 12 hours of delay, there's still substantial margin time to complete these options. MR. KENNEDY: Do you think that would also bound implementing these actions, if you had a station blackout would there be any complications that would be created by the fact that you were doing these activities in a station blackout plus the conditions that you have actually had? MR. BROWNING: That's correct. And that's what Joe was trying to explain earlier. If you looked at the turbines and look where some of these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	options if there's a problem, if that Startup transformer, that first priority, we want a back up to go to. And Mr. McKenney's established that that was physically viable, and what this illustrates is that we had the time to execute that. Any questions? SPEAKER FROM PHONE: Yeah, this is Sunil Weerakkody at headquarters. I have a question on slide 44. MR. SULLINS: Okay. SPEAKER: Just a clarification, I know you're comparing the success path for the different success options for the 4.4 days after the core uncovery then you have the time to start boiling which is about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	estimate down. But you can see that there's sufficient margin that if there was 12 hours of delay, there's still substantial margin time to complete these options. MR. KENNEDY: Do you think that would also bound implementing these actions, if you had a station blackout would there be any complications that would be created by the fact that you were doing these activities in a station blackout plus the conditions that you have actually had? MR. BROWNING: That's correct. And that's what Joe was trying to explain earlier. If you looked at the turbines and look where some of these cables would be routed we routed, we spliced around
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	options if there's a problem, if that Startup transformer, that first priority, we want a back up to go to. And Mr. McKenney's established that that was physically viable, and what this illustrates is that we had the time to execute that. Any questions? SPEAKER FROM PHONE: Yeah, this is Sunil Weerakkody at headquarters. I have a question on slide 44. MR. SULLINS: Okay. SPEAKER: Just a clarification, I know you're comparing the success path for the different success options for the 4.4 days after the core uncovery then you have the time to start boiling which is about 12 hours. So am I understanding this correct that given	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	estimate down. But you can see that there's sufficient margin that if there was 12 hours of delay, there's still substantial margin time to complete these options. MR. KENNEDY: Do you think that would also bound implementing these actions, if you had a station blackout would there be any complications that would be created by the fact that you were doing these activities in a station blackout plus the conditions that you have actually had? MR. BROWNING: That's correct. And that's what Joe was trying to explain earlier. If you looked at the turbines and look where some of these cables would be routed we routed, we spliced around Startup 3, it would be no different than a blackout.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	options if there's a problem, if that Startup transformer, that first priority, we want a back up to go to. And Mr. McKenney's established that that was physically viable, and what this illustrates is that we had the time to execute that. Any questions? SPEAKER FROM PHONE: Yeah, this is Sunil Weerakkody at headquarters. I have a question on slide 44. MR. SULLINS: Okay. SPEAKER: Just a clarification, I know you're comparing the success path for the different success options for the 4.4 days after the core uncovery then you have the time to start boiling which is about 12 hours. So am I understanding this correct that given any of these success paths you would boil the core,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	estimate down. But you can see that there's sufficient margin that if there was 12 hours of delay, there's still substantial margin time to complete these options. MR. KENNEDY: Do you think that would also bound implementing these actions, if you had a station blackout would there be any complications that would be created by the fact that you were doing these activities in a station blackout plus the conditions that you have actually had? MR. BROWNING: That's correct. And that's what Joe was trying to explain earlier. If you looked at the turbines and look where some of these cables would be routed we routed, we spliced around Startup 3, it would be no different than a blackout. The environment we would have been working in were very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	options if there's a problem, if that Startup transformer, that first priority, we want a back up to go to. And Mr. McKenney's established that that was physically viable, and what this illustrates is that we had the time to execute that. Any questions? SPEAKER FROM PHONE: Yeah, this is Sunil Weerakkody at headquarters. I have a question on slide 44. MR. SULLINS: Okay. SPEAKER: Just a clarification, I know you're comparing the success path for the different success options for the 4.4 days after the core uncovery then you have the time to start boiling which is about 12 hours. So am I understanding this correct that given any of these success paths you would boil the core, start boiling the core or is that also?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	estimate down. But you can see that there's sufficient margin that if there was 12 hours of delay, there's still substantial margin time to complete these options. MR. KENNEDY: Do you think that would also bound implementing these actions, if you had a station blackout would there be any complications that would be created by the fact that you were doing these activities in a station blackout plus the conditions that you have actually had? MR. BROWNING: That's correct. And that's what Joe was trying to explain earlier. If you looked at the turbines and look where some of these cables would be routed we routed, we spliced around Startup 3, it would be no different than a blackout. The environment we would have been working in were very similar environments to actually work in, where these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	options if there's a problem, if that Startup transformer, that first priority, we want a back up to go to. And Mr. McKenney's established that that was physically viable, and what this illustrates is that we had the time to execute that. Any questions? SPEAKER FROM PHONE: Yeah, this is Sunil Weerakkody at headquarters. I have a question on slide 44. MR. SULLINS: Okay. SPEAKER: Just a clarification, I know you're comparing the success path for the different success options for the 4.4 days after the core uncovery then you have the time to start boiling which is about 12 hours. So am I understanding this correct that given any of these success paths you would boil the core, start boiling the core or is that also? MR. SULLINS: In the unlikely event of a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	estimate down. But you can see that there's sufficient margin that if there was 12 hours of delay, there's still substantial margin time to complete these options. MR. KENNEDY: Do you think that would also bound implementing these actions, if you had a station blackout would there be any complications that would be created by the fact that you were doing these activities in a station blackout plus the conditions that you have actually had? MR. BROWNING: That's correct. And that's what Joe was trying to explain earlier. If you looked at the turbines and look where some of these cables would be routed we routed, we spliced around Startup 3, it would be no different than a blackout. The environment we would have been working in were very similar environments to actually work in, where these splices were occurring.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	options if there's a problem, if that Startup transformer, that first priority, we want a back up to go to. And Mr. McKenney's established that that was physically viable, and what this illustrates is that we had the time to execute that. Any questions? SPEAKER FROM PHONE: Yeah, this is Sunil Weerakkody at headquarters. I have a question on slide 44. MR. SULLINS: Okay. SPEAKER: Just a clarification, I know you're comparing the success path for the different success options for the 4.4 days after the core uncovery then you have the time to start boiling which is about 12 hours. So am I understanding this correct that given any of these success paths you would boil the core, start boiling the core or is that also? MR. SULLINS: In the unlikely event of a station blackout where we could not recover diesel, we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	estimate down. But you can see that there's sufficient margin that if there was 12 hours of delay, there's still substantial margin time to complete these options. MR. KENNEDY: Do you think that would also bound implementing these actions, if you had a station blackout would there be any complications that would be created by the fact that you were doing these activities in a station blackout plus the conditions that you have actually had? MR. BROWNING: That's correct. And that's what Joe was trying to explain earlier. If you looked at the turbines and look where some of these cables would be routed we routed, we spliced around Startup 3, it would be no different than a blackout. The environment we would have been working in were very similar environments to actually work in, where these splices were occurring. MR. MCKENNEY: They were in the turbine
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	options if there's a problem, if that Startup transformer, that first priority, we want a back up to go to. And Mr. McKenney's established that that was physically viable, and what this illustrates is that we had the time to execute that. Any questions? SPEAKER FROM PHONE: Yeah, this is Sunil Weerakkody at headquarters. I have a question on slide 44. MR. SULLINS: Okay. SPEAKER: Just a clarification, I know you're comparing the success path for the different success options for the 4.4 days after the core uncovery then you have the time to start boiling which is about 12 hours. So am I understanding this correct that given any of these success paths you would boil the core, start boiling the core or is that also? MR. SULLINS: In the unlikely event of a station blackout where we could not recover diesel, we predict that there would be core boiling in that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	estimate down. But you can see that there's sufficient margin that if there was 12 hours of delay, there's still substantial margin time to complete these options. MR. KENNEDY: Do you think that would also bound implementing these actions, if you had a station blackout would there be any complications that would be created by the fact that you were doing these activities in a station blackout plus the conditions that you have actually had? MR. BROWNING: That's correct. And that's what Joe was trying to explain earlier. If you looked at the turbines and look where some of these cables would be routed we routed, we spliced around Startup 3, it would be no different than a blackout. The environment we would have been working in were very similar environments to actually work in, where these splices were occurring. MR. MCKENNEY: They were in the turbine building, they weren't anywhere that had any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	options if there's a problem, if that Startup transformer, that first priority, we want a back up to go to. And Mr. McKenney's established that that was physically viable, and what this illustrates is that we had the time to execute that. Any questions? SPEAKER FROM PHONE: Yeah, this is Sunil Weerakkody at headquarters. I have a question on slide 44. MR. SULLINS: Okay. SPEAKER: Just a clarification, I know you're comparing the success path for the different success options for the 4.4 days after the core uncovery then you have the time to start boiling which is about 12 hours. So am I understanding this correct that given any of these success paths you would boil the core, start boiling the core or is that also? MR. SULLINS: In the unlikely event of a station blackout where we could not recover diesel, we predict that there would be core boiling in that recovery.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	estimate down. But you can see that there's sufficient margin that if there was 12 hours of delay, there's still substantial margin time to complete these options. MR. KENNEDY: Do you think that would also bound implementing these actions, if you had a station blackout would there be any complications that would be created by the fact that you were doing these activities in a station blackout plus the conditions that you have actually had? MR. BROWNING: That's correct. And that's what Joe was trying to explain earlier. If you looked at the turbines and look where some of these cables would be routed we routed, we spliced around Startup 3, it would be no different than a blackout. The environment we would have been working in were very similar environments to actually work in, where these splices were occurring. MR. MCKENNEY: They were in the turbine building, they weren't anywhere that had any radiological concerns.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	options if there's a problem, if that Startup transformer, that first priority, we want a back up to go to. And Mr. McKenney's established that that was physically viable, and what this illustrates is that we had the time to execute that. Any questions? SPEAKER FROM PHONE: Yeah, this is Sunil Weerakkody at headquarters. I have a question on slide 44. MR. SULLINS: Okay. SPEAKER: Just a clarification, I know you're comparing the success path for the different success options for the 4.4 days after the core uncovery then you have the time to start boiling which is about 12 hours. So am I understanding this correct that given any of these success paths you would boil the core, start boiling the core or is that also? MR. SULLINS: In the unlikely event of a station blackout where we could not recover diesel, we predict that there would be core boiling in that recovery. SPEAKER: Again, this is something that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	estimate down. But you can see that there's sufficient margin that if there was 12 hours of delay, there's still substantial margin time to complete these options. MR. KENNEDY: Do you think that would also bound implementing these actions, if you had a station blackout would there be any complications that would be created by the fact that you were doing these activities in a station blackout plus the conditions that you have actually had? MR. BROWNING: That's correct. And that's what Joe was trying to explain earlier. If you looked at the turbines and look where some of these cables would be routed we routed, we spliced around Startup 3, it would be no different than a blackout. The environment we would have been working in were very similar environments to actually work in, where these splices were occurring. MR. MCKENNEY: They were in the turbine building, they weren't anywhere that had any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	options if there's a problem, if that Startup transformer, that first priority, we want a back up to go to. And Mr. McKenney's established that that was physically viable, and what this illustrates is that we had the time to execute that. Any questions? SPEAKER FROM PHONE: Yeah, this is Sunil Weerakkody at headquarters. I have a question on slide 44. MR. SULLINS: Okay. SPEAKER: Just a clarification, I know you're comparing the success path for the different success options for the 4.4 days after the core uncovery then you have the time to start boiling which is about 12 hours. So am I understanding this correct that given any of these success paths you would boil the core, start boiling the core or is that also? MR. SULLINS: In the unlikely event of a station blackout where we could not recover diesel, we predict that there would be core boiling in that recovery.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	estimate down. But you can see that there's sufficient margin that if there was 12 hours of delay, there's still substantial margin time to complete these options. MR. KENNEDY: Do you think that would also bound implementing these actions, if you had a station blackout would there be any complications that would be created by the fact that you were doing these activities in a station blackout plus the conditions that you have actually had? MR. BROWNING: That's correct. And that's what Joe was trying to explain earlier. If you looked at the turbines and look where some of these cables would be routed we routed, we spliced around Startup 3, it would be no different than a blackout. The environment we would have been working in were very similar environments to actually work in, where these splices were occurring. MR. MCKENNEY: They were in the turbine building, they weren't anywhere that had any radiological concerns. MR. KENNEDY: lighting access
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	options if there's a problem, if that Startup transformer, that first priority, we want a back up to go to. And Mr. McKenney's established that that was physically viable, and what this illustrates is that we had the time to execute that. Any questions? SPEAKER FROM PHONE: Yeah, this is Sunil Weerakkody at headquarters. I have a question on slide 44. MR. SULLINS: Okay. SPEAKER: Just a clarification, I know you're comparing the success path for the different success options for the 4.4 days after the core uncovery then you have the time to start boiling which is about 12 hours. So am I understanding this correct that given any of these success paths you would boil the core, start boiling the core or is that also? MR. SULLINS: In the unlikely event of a station blackout where we could not recover diesel, we predict that there would be core boiling in that recovery. SPEAKER: Again, this is something that I'm reflecting on, so when I call this a success path,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	estimate down. But you can see that there's sufficient margin that if there was 12 hours of delay, there's still substantial margin time to complete these options. MR. KENNEDY: Do you think that would also bound implementing these actions, if you had a station blackout would there be any complications that would be created by the fact that you were doing these activities in a station blackout plus the conditions that you have actually had? MR. BROWNING: That's correct. And that's what Joe was trying to explain earlier. If you looked at the turbines and look where some of these cables would be routed we routed, we spliced around Startup 3, it would be no different than a blackout. The environment we would have been working in were very similar environments to actually work in, where these splices were occurring. MR. MCKENNEY: They were in the turbine building, they weren't anywhere that had any radiological concerns. MR. KENNEDY: lighting access MR. BROWNING: Actual conditions were

25 (Pages 97 to 100)

	Page 101		Page 103
_			
1 2	up. I have a question, and I don't know if this is a	1 2	depended on the 480-volt on the red side. And when the
3	significant time contributor, but I think he	3	non-vital sources went away, the No. 1 diesel started using it's battery and then provided DC power to the
4	acknowledged that if you lost the diesel you'd have to understand why and was it the result of a faulty bus	4	green side.
5	here, and what testing you need to do before you go and	5	So the sequence I believe we're talking
6	power that bus via your alternate cable routing	6	about is the No. 1 diesel fails to start and now we're
7	associated with your success paths. So there's some of	7	in a blackout. So in terms of assessing conditions of
8	our time associated with that, right? Is that factored	8	our green train switchgear, it's not been exposed to
9	in?	9	we would treat it as functional, but that we haven't
10	MR. BROWNING: That would be a correct	10	given the diesel the opportunity to tie to it.
11	statement.	11	MR. CIRCLE: Would you have considered
12	MR. SULLINS: Let me take just a moment	12	PDG 2 operable under those conditions? Because you
13	if I could, Jeremy. We have clear distinction through	13	wouldn't have any indication of a problem at that point.
14	our alarms for the probable cause of loss of the diesel.	14	MR. SULLINS: We would know that it's not
15	If we have a switchgear lockout, then we know we've got	15	got control power, and we would consider it operable and
16	a problem with the switchgear itself and the conditions	16	work toward establishing control power to it for its
17	that caused the diesel itself to lockout would point	17	operation. In our station blackout procedure we're
18	toward a problem with the diesel alone. So we do have	18	directed to use the EDG procedure and restore the EDG
19	good indications and alarms to direct us to the cause.	19	and that's where we
20	MR. MITMAN: This is Jeff Mitman. How	20	MR. DAPAS: If it doesn't have control
21	would the fact that you don't have a train B battery	21	power, it's not functional.
22	affect this? Because without the train B battery, you	22 23	MR. SULLINS: Yes.
23 24	don't have some of your indications, some of your	23	MR. DAPAS: So you say you consider it
24 25	alarms.	25	operable. If you don't have control power to that diesel, it's not available.
	MR. SULLINS: Okay. You're referring to		diesei, it's not available.
	Page 102		Page 104
1		1	
1 2	Page 102 our initial condition with the D06 battery disconnect? MR. MITMAN: Correct.	1 2	Page 104 MR. SULLINS: Yes, thank you for the clarification Mr. Dapas. What I'm saying is we don't
	our initial condition with the D06 battery disconnect?		MR. SULLINS: Yes, thank you for the clarification Mr. Dapas. What I'm saying is we don't consider it damaged or suspect. And I thought that I
2 3 4	our initial condition with the D06 battery disconnect? MR. MITMAN: Correct. MR. SULLINS: The affect would be that, if we had the station blackout and we're having trouble	2 3 4	MR. SULLINS: Yes, thank you for the clarification Mr. Dapas. What I'm saying is we don't consider it damaged or suspect. And I thought that I misunderstood the question.
2 3 4 5	our initial condition with the D06 battery disconnect? MR. MITMAN: Correct. MR. SULLINS: The affect would be that, if we had the station blackout and we're having trouble starting the No. 2 diesel then we would address that DC	2 3 4 5	MR. SULLINS: Yes, thank you for the clarification Mr. Dapas. What I'm saying is we don't consider it damaged or suspect. And I thought that I misunderstood the question. MR. DAPAS: But that diesel wouldn't be
2 3 4 5 6	our initial condition with the D06 battery disconnect? MR. MITMAN: Correct. MR. SULLINS: The affect would be that, if we had the station blackout and we're having trouble starting the No. 2 diesel then we would address that DC power source on recovery, the No. 2 diesel. Beyond	2 3 4 5 6	MR. SULLINS: Yes, thank you for the clarification Mr. Dapas. What I'm saying is we don't consider it damaged or suspect. And I thought that I misunderstood the question. MR. DAPAS: But that diesel wouldn't be available because you don't have control power?
2 3 4 5 6 7	our initial condition with the D06 battery disconnect? MR. MITMAN: Correct. MR. SULLINS: The affect would be that, if we had the station blackout and we're having trouble starting the No. 2 diesel then we would address that DC power source on recovery, the No. 2 diesel. Beyond that, it's one additional operator action is how I would	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. SULLINS: Yes, thank you for the clarification Mr. Dapas. What I'm saying is we don't consider it damaged or suspect. And I thought that I misunderstood the question. MR. DAPAS: But that diesel wouldn't be available because you don't have control power? MR. SULLINS: Absolutely.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	our initial condition with the D06 battery disconnect? MR. MITMAN: Correct. MR. SULLINS: The affect would be that, if we had the station blackout and we're having trouble starting the No. 2 diesel then we would address that DC power source on recovery, the No. 2 diesel. Beyond that, it's one additional operator action is how I would assess it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. SULLINS: Yes, thank you for the clarification Mr. Dapas. What I'm saying is we don't consider it damaged or suspect. And I thought that I misunderstood the question. MR. DAPAS: But that diesel wouldn't be available because you don't have control power? MR. SULLINS: Absolutely. MR. DAPAS: You learned that when you
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	our initial condition with the D06 battery disconnect? MR. MITMAN: Correct. MR. SULLINS: The affect would be that, if we had the station blackout and we're having trouble starting the No. 2 diesel then we would address that DC power source on recovery, the No. 2 diesel. Beyond that, it's one additional operator action is how I would assess it. MR. BROWNING: I don't know that we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. SULLINS: Yes, thank you for the clarification Mr. Dapas. What I'm saying is we don't consider it damaged or suspect. And I thought that I misunderstood the question. MR. DAPAS: But that diesel wouldn't be available because you don't have control power? MR. SULLINS: Absolutely. MR. DAPAS: You learned that when you went to start the diesel. You didn't otherwise
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	our initial condition with the D06 battery disconnect? MR. MITMAN: Correct. MR. SULLINS: The affect would be that, if we had the station blackout and we're having trouble starting the No. 2 diesel then we would address that DC power source on recovery, the No. 2 diesel. Beyond that, it's one additional operator action is how I would assess it. MR. BROWNING: I don't know that we actually answered the question. We had a 480-volt buses	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. SULLINS: Yes, thank you for the clarification Mr. Dapas. What I'm saying is we don't consider it damaged or suspect. And I thought that I misunderstood the question. MR. DAPAS: But that diesel wouldn't be available because you don't have control power? MR. SULLINS: Absolutely. MR. DAPAS: You learned that when you went to start the diesel. You didn't otherwise recognize it as having lost diesel 1?
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	our initial condition with the D06 battery disconnect? MR. MITMAN: Correct. MR. SULLINS: The affect would be that, if we had the station blackout and we're having trouble starting the No. 2 diesel then we would address that DC power source on recovery, the No. 2 diesel. Beyond that, it's one additional operator action is how I would assess it. MR. BROWNING: I don't know that we actually answered the question. We had a 480-volt buses cross tied, so we did have DC power. We didn't have the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. SULLINS: Yes, thank you for the clarification Mr. Dapas. What I'm saying is we don't consider it damaged or suspect. And I thought that I misunderstood the question. MR. DAPAS: But that diesel wouldn't be available because you don't have control power? MR. SULLINS: Absolutely. MR. DAPAS: You learned that when you went to start the diesel. You didn't otherwise recognize it as having lost diesel 1? MR. SULLINS: And just to directly answer
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	our initial condition with the D06 battery disconnect? MR. MITMAN: Correct. MR. SULLINS: The affect would be that, if we had the station blackout and we're having trouble starting the No. 2 diesel then we would address that DC power source on recovery, the No. 2 diesel. Beyond that, it's one additional operator action is how I would assess it. MR. BROWNING: I don't know that we actually answered the question. We had a 480-volt buses cross tied, so we did have DC power. We didn't have the battery connected, but we did have DC power.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. SULLINS: Yes, thank you for the clarification Mr. Dapas. What I'm saying is we don't consider it damaged or suspect. And I thought that I misunderstood the question. MR. DAPAS: But that diesel wouldn't be available because you don't have control power? MR. SULLINS: Absolutely. MR. DAPAS: You learned that when you went to start the diesel. You didn't otherwise recognize it as having lost diesel 1? MR. SULLINS: And just to directly answer your question, we've not considered the diesel
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	our initial condition with the D06 battery disconnect? MR. MITMAN: Correct. MR. SULLINS: The affect would be that, if we had the station blackout and we're having trouble starting the No. 2 diesel then we would address that DC power source on recovery, the No. 2 diesel. Beyond that, it's one additional operator action is how I would assess it. MR. BROWNING: I don't know that we actually answered the question. We had a 480-volt buses cross tied, so we did have DC power. We didn't have the battery connected, but we did have DC power. MR. MITMAN: But in the scenario we're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. SULLINS: Yes, thank you for the clarification Mr. Dapas. What I'm saying is we don't consider it damaged or suspect. And I thought that I misunderstood the question. MR. DAPAS: But that diesel wouldn't be available because you don't have control power? MR. SULLINS: Absolutely. MR. DAPAS: You learned that when you went to start the diesel. You didn't otherwise recognize it as having lost diesel 1? MR. SULLINS: And just to directly answer your question, we've not considered the diesel operative.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	our initial condition with the D06 battery disconnect? MR. MITMAN: Correct. MR. SULLINS: The affect would be that, if we had the station blackout and we're having trouble starting the No. 2 diesel then we would address that DC power source on recovery, the No. 2 diesel. Beyond that, it's one additional operator action is how I would assess it. MR. BROWNING: I don't know that we actually answered the question. We had a 480-volt buses cross tied, so we did have DC power. We didn't have the battery connected, but we did have DC power. MR. MITMAN: But in the scenario we're exploring is the station blackout, and with a station	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. SULLINS: Yes, thank you for the clarification Mr. Dapas. What I'm saying is we don't consider it damaged or suspect. And I thought that I misunderstood the question. MR. DAPAS: But that diesel wouldn't be available because you don't have control power? MR. SULLINS: Absolutely. MR. DAPAS: You learned that when you went to start the diesel. You didn't otherwise recognize it as having lost diesel 1? MR. SULLINS: And just to directly answer your question, we've not considered the diesel operative. MR. HARRIS: So this is Richard
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	our initial condition with the D06 battery disconnect? MR. MITMAN: Correct. MR. SULLINS: The affect would be that, if we had the station blackout and we're having trouble starting the No. 2 diesel then we would address that DC power source on recovery, the No. 2 diesel. Beyond that, it's one additional operator action is how I would assess it. MR. BROWNING: I don't know that we actually answered the question. We had a 480-volt buses cross tied, so we did have DC power. We didn't have the battery connected, but we did have DC power. MR. MITMAN: But in the scenario we're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. SULLINS: Yes, thank you for the clarification Mr. Dapas. What I'm saying is we don't consider it damaged or suspect. And I thought that I misunderstood the question. MR. DAPAS: But that diesel wouldn't be available because you don't have control power? MR. SULLINS: Absolutely. MR. DAPAS: You learned that when you went to start the diesel. You didn't otherwise recognize it as having lost diesel 1? MR. SULLINS: And just to directly answer your question, we've not considered the diesel operative.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	our initial condition with the D06 battery disconnect? MR. MITMAN: Correct. MR. SULLINS: The affect would be that, if we had the station blackout and we're having trouble starting the No. 2 diesel then we would address that DC power source on recovery, the No. 2 diesel. Beyond that, it's one additional operator action is how I would assess it. MR. BROWNING: I don't know that we actually answered the question. We had a 480-volt buses cross tied, so we did have DC power. We didn't have the battery connected, but we did have DC power. MR. MITMAN: But in the scenario we're exploring is the station blackout, and with a station blackout there is no battery on the train B DC power.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. SULLINS: Yes, thank you for the clarification Mr. Dapas. What I'm saying is we don't consider it damaged or suspect. And I thought that I misunderstood the question. MR. DAPAS: But that diesel wouldn't be available because you don't have control power? MR. SULLINS: Absolutely. MR. DAPAS: You learned that when you went to start the diesel. You didn't otherwise recognize it as having lost diesel 1? MR. SULLINS: And just to directly answer your question, we've not considered the diesel operative. MR. HARRIS: So this is Richard Harris. There is a dependency on the No. 1 diesel.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	our initial condition with the D06 battery disconnect? MR. MITMAN: Correct. MR. SULLINS: The affect would be that, if we had the station blackout and we're having trouble starting the No. 2 diesel then we would address that DC power source on recovery, the No. 2 diesel. Beyond that, it's one additional operator action is how I would assess it. MR. BROWNING: I don't know that we actually answered the question. We had a 480-volt buses cross tied, so we did have DC power. We didn't have the battery connected, but we did have DC power. MR. MITMAN: But in the scenario we're exploring is the station blackout, and with a station blackout there is no battery on the train B DC power. And so when we start talking about knowing, you know, we'll have lockouts, we'll see the lockouts in the control room, we'll know what's going on, whether we've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. SULLINS: Yes, thank you for the clarification Mr. Dapas. What I'm saying is we don't consider it damaged or suspect. And I thought that I misunderstood the question. MR. DAPAS: But that diesel wouldn't be available because you don't have control power? MR. SULLINS: Absolutely. MR. DAPAS: You learned that when you went to start the diesel. You didn't otherwise recognize it as having lost diesel 1? MR. SULLINS: And just to directly answer your question, we've not considered the diesel operative. MR. HARRIS: So this is Richard Harris. There is a dependency on the No. 1 diesel. That was accounted for in the unit in our modeling, the ANO modeling. MR. SULLINS: Does that answer your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	our initial condition with the D06 battery disconnect? MR. MITMAN: Correct. MR. SULLINS: The affect would be that, if we had the station blackout and we're having trouble starting the No. 2 diesel then we would address that DC power source on recovery, the No. 2 diesel. Beyond that, it's one additional operator action is how I would assess it. MR. BROWNING: I don't know that we actually answered the question. We had a 480-volt buses cross tied, so we did have DC power. We didn't have the battery connected, but we did have DC power. MR. MITMAN: But in the scenario we're exploring is the station blackout, and with a station blackout there is no battery on the train B DC power. And so when we start talking about knowing, you know, we'll have lockouts, we'll see the lockouts in the control room, we'll know what's going on, whether we've got a lockout or whether we've got a diesel problem, Im	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. SULLINS: Yes, thank you for the clarification Mr. Dapas. What I'm saying is we don't consider it damaged or suspect. And I thought that I misunderstood the question. MR. DAPAS: But that diesel wouldn't be available because you don't have control power? MR. SULLINS: Absolutely. MR. DAPAS: You learned that when you went to start the diesel. You didn't otherwise recognize it as having lost diesel 1? MR. SULLINS: And just to directly answer your question, we've not considered the diesel operative. MR. HARRIS: So this is Richard Harris. There is a dependency on the No. 1 diesel. That was accounted for in the unit in our modeling, the ANO modeling. MR. SULLINS: Does that answer your question, Mr. Mitman?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	our initial condition with the D06 battery disconnect? MR. MITMAN: Correct. MR. SULLINS: The affect would be that, if we had the station blackout and we're having trouble starting the No. 2 diesel then we would address that DC power source on recovery, the No. 2 diesel. Beyond that, it's one additional operator action is how I would assess it. MR. BROWNING: I don't know that we actually answered the question. We had a 480-volt buses cross tied, so we did have DC power. We didn't have the battery connected, but we did have DC power. MR. MITMAN: But in the scenario we're exploring is the station blackout, and with a station blackout there is no battery on the train B DC power. And so when we start talking about knowing, you know, we'll have lockouts, we'll see the lockouts in the control room, we'll know what's going on, whether we've got a lockout or whether we've got a diesel problem, Im just trying to explore the impacts of what the control	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. SULLINS: Yes, thank you for the clarification Mr. Dapas. What I'm saying is we don't consider it damaged or suspect. And I thought that I misunderstood the question. MR. DAPAS: But that diesel wouldn't be available because you don't have control power? MR. SULLINS: Absolutely. MR. DAPAS: You learned that when you went to start the diesel. You didn't otherwise recognize it as having lost diesel 1? MR. SULLINS: And just to directly answer your question, we've not considered the diesel operative. MR. HARRIS: So this is Richard Harris. There is a dependency on the No. 1 diesel. That was accounted for in the unit in our modeling, the ANO modeling. MR. SULLINS: Does that answer your question, Mr. Mitman? MR. MITMAN: I think we're getting there.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	our initial condition with the D06 battery disconnect? MR. MITMAN: Correct. MR. SULLINS: The affect would be that, if we had the station blackout and we're having trouble starting the No. 2 diesel then we would address that DC power source on recovery, the No. 2 diesel. Beyond that, it's one additional operator action is how I would assess it. MR. BROWNING: I don't know that we actually answered the question. We had a 480-volt buses cross tied, so we did have DC power. We didn't have the battery connected, but we did have DC power. MR. MITMAN: But in the scenario we're exploring is the station blackout, and with a station blackout there is no battery on the train B DC power. And so when we start talking about knowing, you know, we'll have lockouts, we'll see the lockouts in the control room, we'll know what's going on, whether we've got a lockout or whether we've got a diesel problem, I'm just trying to explore the impacts of what the control room would know if, in the middle of a station blackout,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. SULLINS: Yes, thank you for the clarification Mr. Dapas. What I'm saying is we don't consider it damaged or suspect. And I thought that I misunderstood the question. MR. DAPAS: But that diesel wouldn't be available because you don't have control power? MR. SULLINS: Absolutely. MR. DAPAS: You learned that when you went to start the diesel. You didn't otherwise recognize it as having lost diesel 1? MR. SULLINS: And just to directly answer your question, we've not considered the diesel operative. MR. HARRIS: So this is Richard Harris. There is a dependency on the No. 1 diesel. That was accounted for in the unit in our modeling, the ANO modeling. MR. SULLINS: Does that answer your question, Mr. Mitman? MR. MITMAN: I think we're getting there. One of the questions that was asked was, if you have a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	our initial condition with the D06 battery disconnect? MR. MITMAN: Correct. MR. SULLINS: The affect would be that, if we had the station blackout and we're having trouble starting the No. 2 diesel then we would address that DC power source on recovery, the No. 2 diesel. Beyond that, it's one additional operator action is how I would assess it. MR. BROWNING: I don't know that we actually answered the question. We had a 480-volt buses cross tied, so we did have DC power. We didn't have the battery connected, but we did have DC power. MR. MITMAN: But in the scenario we're exploring is the station blackout, and with a station blackout there is no battery on the train B DC power. And so when we start talking about knowing, you know, we'll have lockouts, we'll see the lockouts in the control room, we'll know what's going on, whether we've got a lockout or whether we've got a diesel problem, Im just trying to explore the impacts of what the control room would know if, in the middle of a station blackout, there's also minus the train Bravo DC power?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. SULLINS: Yes, thank you for the clarification Mr. Dapas. What I'm saying is we don't consider it damaged or suspect. And I thought that I misunderstood the question. MR. DAPAS: But that diesel wouldn't be available because you don't have control power? MR. SULLINS: Absolutely. MR. DAPAS: You learned that when you went to start the diesel. You didn't otherwise recognize it as having lost diesel 1? MR. SULLINS: And just to directly answer your question, we've not considered the diesel operative. MR. HARRIS: So this is Richard Harris. There is a dependency on the No. 1 diesel. That was accounted for in the unit in our modeling, the ANO modeling. MR. SULLINS: Does that answer your question, Mr. MiTMAN: I think we're getting there. One of the questions that was asked was, if you have a lockout of, say, the A3 bus, okay, now there's a fault
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	our initial condition with the D06 battery disconnect? MR. MITMAN: Correct. MR. SULLINS: The affect would be that, if we had the station blackout and we're having trouble starting the No. 2 diesel then we would address that DC power source on recovery, the No. 2 diesel. Beyond that, it's one additional operator action is how I would assess it. MR. BROWNING: I don't know that we actually answered the question. We had a 480-volt buses cross tied, so we did have DC power. We didn't have the battery connected, but we did have DC power. MR. MITMAN: But in the scenario we're exploring is the station blackout, and with a station blackout there is no battery on the train B DC power. And so when we start talking about knowing, you know, we'll have lockouts, we'll see the lockouts in the control room, we'll know what's going on, whether we've got a lockout or whether we've got a diesel problem, I'm just trying to explore the impacts of what the control room would know if, in the middle of a station blackout, there's also minus the train Bravo DC power? MR. SULLINS: We are getting quite	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. SULLINS: Yes, thank you for the clarification Mr. Dapas. What I'm saying is we don't consider it damaged or suspect. And I thought that I misunderstood the question. MR. DAPAS: But that diesel wouldn't be available because you don't have control power? MR. SULLINS: Absolutely. MR. DAPAS: You learned that when you went to start the diesel. You didn't otherwise recognize it as having lost diesel 1? MR. SULLINS: And just to directly answer your question, we've not considered the diesel operative. MR. HARRIS: So this is Richard Harris. There is a dependency on the No. 1 diesel. That was accounted for in the unit in our modeling, the ANO modeling. MR. SULLINS: Does that answer your question, Mr. Mitman? MR. MITMAN: I think we're getting there. One of the questions that was asked was, if you have a lockout of, say, the A3 bus, okay, now there's a fault on the A3 bus. It's not what happened that day, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	our initial condition with the D06 battery disconnect? MR. MITMAN: Correct. MR. SULLINS: The affect would be that, if we had the station blackout and we're having trouble starting the No. 2 diesel then we would address that DC power source on recovery, the No. 2 diesel. Beyond that, it's one additional operator action is how I would assess it. MR. BROWNING: I don't know that we actually answered the question. We had a 480-volt buses cross tied, so we did have DC power. We didn't have the battery connected, but we did have DC power. MR. MITMAN: But in the scenario we're exploring is the station blackout, and with a station blackout there is no battery on the train B DC power. And so when we start talking about knowing, you know, we'll have lockouts, we'll see the lockouts in the control room, we'll know what's going on, whether we've got a lockout or whether we've got a diesel problem, I'm just trying to explore the impacts of what the control room would know if, in the middle of a station blackout, there's also minus the train Bravo DC power? MR. SULLINS: We are getting quite technical, but I'll try to answer that question. At the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. SULLINS: Yes, thank you for the clarification Mr. Dapas. What I'm saying is we don't consider it damaged or suspect. And I thought that I misunderstood the question. MR. DAPAS: But that diesel wouldn't be available because you don't have control power? MR. SULLINS: Absolutely. MR. DAPAS: You learned that when you went to start the diesel. You didn't otherwise recognize it as having lost diesel 1? MR. SULLINS: And just to directly answer your question, we've not considered the diesel operative. MR. HARRIS: So this is Richard Harris. There is a dependency on the No. 1 diesel. That was accounted for in the unit in our modeling, the ANO modeling. MR. SULLINS: Does that answer your question, Mr. Mitman? MR. MITMAN: I think we're getting there. One of the questions that was asked was, if you have a lockout of, say, the A3 bus, okay, now there's a fault on the A3 bus. It's not what happened that day, but we're ahead of ourselves in our risk analysis, our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	our initial condition with the D06 battery disconnect? MR. MITMAN: Correct. MR. SULLINS: The affect would be that, if we had the station blackout and we're having trouble starting the No. 2 diesel then we would address that DC power source on recovery, the No. 2 diesel. Beyond that, it's one additional operator action is how I would assess it. MR. BROWNING: I don't know that we actually answered the question. We had a 480-volt buses cross tied, so we did have DC power. We didn't have the battery connected, but we did have DC power. MR. MITMAN: But in the scenario we're exploring is the station blackout, and with a station blackout there is no battery on the train B DC power. And so when we start talking about knowing, you know, we'll have lockouts, we'll see the lockouts in the control room, we'll know what's going on, whether we've got a lockout or whether we've got a diesel problem, I'm just trying to explore the impacts of what the control room would know if, in the middle of a station blackout, there's also minus the train Bravo DC power? MR. SULLINS: We are getting quite	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. SULLINS: Yes, thank you for the clarification Mr. Dapas. What I'm saying is we don't consider it damaged or suspect. And I thought that I misunderstood the question. MR. DAPAS: But that diesel wouldn't be available because you don't have control power? MR. SULLINS: Absolutely. MR. DAPAS: You learned that when you went to start the diesel. You didn't otherwise recognize it as having lost diesel 1? MR. SULLINS: And just to directly answer your question, we've not considered the diesel operative. MR. HARRIS: So this is Richard Harris. There is a dependency on the No. 1 diesel. That was accounted for in the unit in our modeling, the ANO modeling. MR. SULLINS: Does that answer your question, Mr. Mitman? MR. MITMAN: I think we're getting there. One of the questions that was asked was, if you have a lockout of, say, the A3 bus, okay, now there's a fault on the A3 bus. It's not what happened that day, but

26 (Pages 101 to 104)

	Page 105		Page 107
1	A3 bus and you do have a lockout, now, do you know you	1	is would we start pursuing these success paths, and what
2	have a lockout because you've got DC power on that	2	I'm trying to assure you of, I personally would not have
3	division. But you don't have DC power on the other	3	to know if I had a damaged bus or a damaged diesel. I
4	division and so you don't know what the condition of the	4	would be asking my TSE and my EOF what are we doing to
5	other bus is. And now you don't have the DC power that	5	establish a connection from offsite to onsite.
6	you need to start the train the train B diesel, you	6	Now before we land that lead and turn it
7	don't have DC power on it, and half the plant, half the	7	on, I would want to know the condition of that bus and I
8	indication, half the alarms, half the annunciators are	8	know my staff would want to know. But what we're trying
9	not working because they don't have DC power.	9	to communicate is we didn't wait. We knew we had
10	MR. HARRIS: Jeff, this is Richard	10	diesels running, we knew we had to get offsite power, we
11	Harris. Let me see if I can address that from the	11	immediately started assessing the condition of the
12		12	plant, we immediately started implementing our plan in
13	perspective of analysis. When you look at the	13	parallel with the contingencies, and all I'm telling you
14	switchgear in the lockout, there is a probability of	14	is if that diesel went away, whether is was the bus that
15	failure associated with that. When you look at overall	15	drove it offline, DC that took it offline, or a support
16	risk of diesel failure, then you look at if it fails to	16	
17	start, fails to run, you're looking at support systems, which would be the air supply, the surface water, you're	17	system, these guys would have implemented one of those contingency plans.
18		18	
19	looking at fuel. So all of that rolls into the diesel	19	But before we energized it, clearly, we would have understood the condition of that plant.
20	ability to run and then probability of failure. The	20	MR. CIRCLE: Right. And we don't doubt
21	switchgear is only a small part of that failure. It	21	it. We're just looking at the impact and trying to
22	should be included, but I would move that it's not a	22	assess the impact. As far as the actions are concerned,
23		23	we know that you would do something.
24	significant impact on risk in relation to the diesel MR. CIRCLE: For the base case it	24	MR. DAPAS: What I've also heard, this is
25		25	Marc Dapas, that your timeline accounts for the fact
15	wouldn't be, but for this particular case this		Marc Dapas, that you timenne accounts for the fact
	Page 106		Page 108
1	configuration is very sensitive. Because in this case	1	that you have to ensure that the buses in this condition
2	you're feeding the B train DC from an A train charger.	2	where you could power the feed successfully, and that's
3	You've disconnected the B train battery. So anything	3	accounted for in the timeline.
4	that happens on switchgear A3 is going to have a big	4	MR. BROWNING: Yes, sir. We're running
5	impact.	5	cables in parallel, we're splicing in parallel, we're
6	MR. HARRIS: You're right, the	6	accessing what it is that happened.
7	consequences would be significant; however, the	7	MR. MCKENNEY: When we put Startup 1, the
8	probability is not significant.	8	path that we put in service, so we did testing on that
9	MR. CIRCLE: I don't quite believe that,	9	transformer and that was part of the 4.4 days, right?
10	but you can go on.	10	So we went through and made sure that the health of
11	MR. SULLINS: The question was related to	11	Startup 1 was intact before we energized that
12	the operator response. And where he had time to respond	12	transformer.
13	and that was implemented, factored into our strategies	13	MR. DAPAS: I do think the line of
14	in our recovery. We operated for weeks with diesels in	14	question was we have train A DC power cross connected to
15	pull-to-lock with operator control of starting the	15	train B and it impacts control power to a diesel which
16	diesel, since it was not necessary to automatically to	16	then gets to the probability that you could have lost
17	tie onto the bus with a blind condition, we wouldn't go	17	that diesel, you know, it's not a normal electrical
18	blindly close in the DC breaker, but you would go toward	18	lineup here, right, for providing full power to the
19	a controlled restoration.	19	diesel source. However, the questions remains and what
20	This is first time presented with the	20	we're trying to understand is that is there any
21	scenario, but I would predict that we would do a	21	additional element there and how did you factor that
	controlled restantion where loads are around up and	22	into your analysis?
22	controlled restoration where loads are opened up and	2.2	
22 23 24	then you first energize the bus, and then in a controlled manner recover control power to the diesel.	23 24	MR. SULLINS: I do want to assure that the questions are adequately answered. Appreciate the

27 (Pages 105 to 108)

	Page 109	Page 111
1	To summarize, our technical presentation	¹ Let's say you had failure in diesel 1 or
2	of the success paths, the key item, I guess, is	² some fault or something that blacked out the A3 bus.
3	confidence in the success of these the time margin, 4.8	³ Now if diesel 2 failed along with diesel 1, there's a
4	days. The second factor is the substantial resources	⁴ chance that they might not have picked up the electrical
5	available for response, as we've discussed earlier, we	⁵ configuration which was responsible for diesel 2
6	would have the support structure of an emergency	⁶ failing, would they be that quick to restart diesel 2
7	response organization setting priorities and supporting	7 given there state of knowledge?
8	operations and maintenance. We have straight forward	⁸ That's the question that we asked,
9	installations for which our people were trained and it's	⁹ actually.
10	consistent with their outage responsibilities.	¹⁰ MR. SULLINS: Make sure I understand the
11	The defense in depth aspect is important	¹¹ question. You have diesel 2 operating with DC control
12	to me. The fact that we had available to us parallel	¹² power provided from a red train.
13	paths for 4160 and available to us an alternate diverse	¹³ MR. MITMAN: Right.
14	means for RCS makeup.	¹⁴ MR. SULLINS: And if diesel 2 fails
15	And then lastly, the demonstrated success	¹⁵ MR. MITMAN: If diesel 1 fails. If
16	with what we did with the full package with the breaker	¹⁶ something on I guess red train is your train A, I'm
17	still within the allowed 4.8 days.	¹⁷ having a little trouble with the color designations. If
18	Any questions for David?	¹⁸ diesel on train A, diesel 1 fails or something happens
19	MR. KENNEDY: I would propose that we	19 to the switchgear
20	take a break at this point. We've been going for about	20 MR. SULLINS: Okay.
21	two and a half hours. Maybe take a ten-minute break	²¹ MR. MITMAN: Then power is going to be
22	before we get into the really good stuff and interesting	²² lost in DC control power, and power is going to be lost
23	stuff which is the risk significance. It's 3:31	²³ to A4 and force the start of diesel2, but diesel 2 would
24	central, if we could be back at 3:41 central and	²⁴ not start. So you'll have a situation where diesel 1
25	restart. The bathrooms are down out the door to the	²⁵ would lockout for some reason. Diesel 2 wouldn't start.
	Page 110	Page 112
1	Page 110 left.	Page 112 And it may not be apparent to the watch what's going on
1 2		
	left.	¹ And it may not be apparent to the watch what's going on
2	left. (Break taken from 3:31 p m. to 3:46 p m.)	 And it may not be apparent to the watch what's going on at that time. So, would they be quick to restore let's say they restore DC power and manage to get diesel
2 3	left. (Break taken from 3:31 p m. to 3:46 p m.) MR. WERNER: Operator, are you on the line? OPERATOR SYLVIA: Yes, sir, Im on the	 And it may not be apparent to the watch what's going on at that time. So, would they be quick to restore let's say they restore DC power and manage to get diesel 2 started, would they be quick to start diesel 2, not
2 3 4 5 6	left. (Break taken from 3:31 p m. to 3:46 p m.) MR. WERNER: Operator, are you on the line? OPERATOR SYLVIA: Yes, sir, I'm on the line. Just opened up all the lines.	 And it may not be apparent to the watch what's going on at that time. So, would they be quick to restore let's say they restore DC power and manage to get diesel 2 started, would they be quick to start diesel 2, not knowing if there was some electrical fault that failed
2 3 4 5 6 7	left. (Break taken from 3:31 p m. to 3:46 p m.) MR. WERNER: Operator, are you on the line? OPERATOR SYLVIA: Yes, sir, Im on the	 And it may not be apparent to the watch what's going on at that time. So, would they be quick to restore let's say they restore DC power and manage to get diesel 2 started, would they be quick to start diesel 2, not knowing if there was some electrical fault that failed it in the first place?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	left. (Break taken from 3:31 p m. to 3:46 p m.) MR. WERNER: Operator, are you on the line? OPERATOR SYLVIA: Yes, sir, I'm on the line. Just opened up all the lines. MR. WERNER: All right. We're ready to restart.	 And it may not be apparent to the watch what's going on at that time. So, would they be quick to restore let's say they restore DC power and manage to get diesel 2 started, would they be quick to start diesel 2, not knowing if there was some electrical fault that failed it in the first place? MR. SULLINS: MR circle, now that I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	left. (Break taken from 3:31 p m. to 3:46 p m.) MR. WERNER: Operator, are you on the line? OPERATOR SYLVIA: Yes, sir, I'm on the line. Just opened up all the lines. MR. WERNER: All right. We're ready to restart. OPERATOR SYLVIA: You may begin.	 And it may not be apparent to the watch what's going on at that time. So, would they be quick to restore let's say they restore DC power and manage to get diesel 2 started, would they be quick to start diesel 2, not knowing if there was some electrical fault that failed it in the first place? MR. SULLINS: MR circle, now that I understand the question, what I'd like to do is to give
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	left. (Break taken from 3:31 p m. to 3:46 p m.) MR. WERNER: Operator, are you on the line? OPERATOR SYLVIA: Yes, sir, I'm on the line. Just opened up all the lines. MR. WERNER: All right. We're ready to restart. OPERATOR SYLVIA: You may begin. MR. KOWALESKI: Before Richard goes, this	 And it may not be apparent to the watch what's going on at that time. So, would they be quick to restore let's say they restore DC power and manage to get diesel 2 started, would they be quick to start diesel 2, not knowing if there was some electrical fault that failed it in the first place? MR. SULLINS: MR circle, now that I understand the question, what I'd like to do is to give it some thought and then come back to it later so we can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	left. (Break taken from 3:31 p m. to 3:46 p m.) MR. WERNER: Operator, are you on the line? OPERATOR SYLVIA: Yes, sir, I'm on the line. Just opened up all the lines. MR. WERNER: All right. We're ready to restart. OPERATOR SYLVIA: You may begin. MR. KOWALESKI: Before Richard goes, this is Joe Kowaleski, we'll provide a written timeline for	 And it may not be apparent to the watch what's going on at that time. So, would they be quick to restore let's say they restore DC power and manage to get diesel 2 started, would they be quick to start diesel 2, not knowing if there was some electrical fault that failed it in the first place? MR. SULLINS: MR circle, now that I understand the question, what I'd like to do is to give it some thought and then come back to it later so we can proceed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	left. (Break taken from 3:31 p m. to 3:46 p m.) MR. WERNER: Operator, are you on the line? OPERATOR SYLVIA: Yes, sir, I'm on the line. Just opened up all the lines. MR. WERNER: All right. We're ready to restart. OPERATOR SYLVIA: You may begin. MR. KOWALESKI: Before Richard goes, this is Joe Kowaleski, we'll provide a written timeline for how to safely assess the condition of the bus as input.	 And it may not be apparent to the watch what's going on at that time. So, would they be quick to restore let's say they restore DC power and manage to get diesel 2 started, would they be quick to start diesel 2, not knowing if there was some electrical fault that failed it in the first place? MR. SULLINS: MR circle, now that I understand the question, what I'd like to do is to give it some thought and then come back to it later so we can proceed. MR. CIRCLE: That's perfectly fine.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	left. (Break taken from 3:31 p m. to 3:46 p m.) MR. WERNER: Operator, are you on the line? OPERATOR SYLVIA: Yes, sir, I'm on the line. Just opened up all the lines. MR. WERNER: All right. We're ready to restart. OPERATOR SYLVIA: You may begin. MR. KOWALESKI: Before Richard goes, this is Joe Kowaleski, we'll provide a written timeline for how to safely assess the condition of the bus as input. MR. MITMAN: Thank you.	 And it may not be apparent to the watch what's going on at that time. So, would they be quick to restore let's say they restore DC power and manage to get diesel 2 started, would they be quick to start diesel 2, not knowing if there was some electrical fault that failed it in the first place? MR. SULLINS: MR circle, now that I understand the question, what I'd like to do is to give it some thought and then come back to it later so we can proceed. MR. CIRCLE: That's perfectly fine. MR. HARRIS: Okay. Let's get started on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	left. (Break taken from 3:31 p m. to 3:46 p m.) MR. WERNER: Operator, are you on the line? OPERATOR SYLVIA: Yes, sir, I'm on the line. Just opened up all the lines. MR. WERNER: All right. We're ready to restart. OPERATOR SYLVIA: You may begin. MR. KOWALESKI: Before Richard goes, this is Joe Kowaleski, we'll provide a written timeline for how to safely assess the condition of the bus as input. MR. MITMAN: Thank you. MR. SULLINS: This is Gary Sullins. A	 And it may not be apparent to the watch what's going on at that time. So, would they be quick to restore let's say they restore DC power and manage to get diesel 2 started, would they be quick to start diesel 2, not knowing if there was some electrical fault that failed it in the first place? MR. SULLINS: MR circle, now that I understand the question, what I'd like to do is to give it some thought and then come back to it later so we can proceed. MR. CIRCLE: That's perfectly fine. MR. HARRIS: Okay. Let's get started on the significant termination discussion. My name again
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	left. (Break taken from 3:31 p m. to 3:46 p m.) MR. WERNER: Operator, are you on the line? OPERATOR SYLVIA: Yes, sir, I'm on the line. Just opened up all the lines. MR. WERNER: All right. We're ready to restart. OPERATOR SYLVIA: You may begin. MR. KOWALESKI: Before Richard goes, this is Joe Kowaleski, we'll provide a written timeline for how to safely assess the condition of the bus as input. MR. MITMAN: Thank you. MR. SULLINS: This is Gary Sullins. A point of clarification, we had questions regarding	 And it may not be apparent to the watch what's going on at that time. So, would they be quick to restore let's say they restore DC power and manage to get diesel 2 started, would they be quick to start diesel 2, not knowing if there was some electrical fault that failed it in the first place? MR. SULLINS: MR circle, now that I understand the question, what I'd like to do is to give it some thought and then come back to it later so we can proceed. MR. CIRCLE: That's perfectly fine. MR. HARRIS: Okay. Let's get started on the significant termination discussion. My name again is Richard Harris and I am the Manager of Emergency
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	left. (Break taken from 3:31 p m. to 3:46 p m.) MR. WERNER: Operator, are you on the line? OPERATOR SYLVIA: Yes, sir, I'm on the line. Just opened up all the lines. MR. WERNER: All right. We're ready to restart. OPERATOR SYLVIA: You may begin. MR. KOWALESKI: Before Richard goes, this is Joe Kowaleski, we'll provide a written timeline for how to safely assess the condition of the bus as input. MR. MITMAN: Thank you. MR. SULLINS: This is Gary Sullins. A point of clarification, we had questions regarding operation of our No. 2 diesel for station blackout and	 And it may not be apparent to the watch what's going on at that time. So, would they be quick to restore let's say they restore DC power and manage to get diesel 2 started, would they be quick to start diesel 2, not knowing if there was some electrical fault that failed it in the first place? MR. SULLINS: MR circle, now that I understand the question, what I'd like to do is to give it some thought and then come back to it later so we can proceed. MR. CIRCLE: That's perfectly fine. MR. HARRIS: Okay. Let's get started on the significant termination discussion. My name again is Richard Harris and I am the Manager of Emergency Planning at ANO, and you might ask yourself why is the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	left. (Break taken from 3:31 p m. to 3:46 p m.) MR. WERNER: Operator, are you on the line? OPERATOR SYLVIA: Yes, sir, I'm on the line. Just opened up all the lines. MR. WERNER: All right. We're ready to restart. OPERATOR SYLVIA: You may begin. MR. KOWALESKI: Before Richard goes, this is Joe Kowaleski, we'll provide a written timeline for how to safely assess the condition of the bus as input. MR. MITMAN: Thank you. MR. SULLINS: This is Gary Sullins. A point of clarification, we had questions regarding operation of our No. 2 diesel for station blackout and the question was related to operability. We would not	 And it may not be apparent to the watch what's going on at that time. So, would they be quick to restore let's say they restore DC power and manage to get diesel 2 started, would they be quick to start diesel 2, not knowing if there was some electrical fault that failed it in the first place? MR. SULLINS: MR circle, now that I understand the question, what I'd like to do is to give it some thought and then come back to it later so we can proceed. MR. CIRCLE: That's perfectly fine. MR. HARRIS: Okay. Let's get started on the significant termination discussion. My name again is Richard Harris and I am the Manager of Emergency Planning at ANO, and you might ask yourself why is the Manager of Emergency Planning talking to you about risk
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	left. (Break taken from 3:31 p m. to 3:46 p m.) MR. WERNER: Operator, are you on the line? OPERATOR SYLVIA: Yes, sir, I'm on the line. Just opened up all the lines. MR. WERNER: All right. We're ready to restart. OPERATOR SYLVIA: You may begin. MR. KOWALESKI: Before Richard goes, this is Joe Kowaleski, we'll provide a written timeline for how to safely assess the condition of the bus as input. MR. MITMAN: Thank you. MR. SULLINS: This is Gary Sullins. A point of clarification, we had questions regarding operation of our No. 2 diesel for station blackout and the question was related to operability. We would not consider the diesel operable without DC power; however,	 And it may not be apparent to the watch what's going on at that time. So, would they be quick to restore let's say they restore DC power and manage to get diesel 2 started, would they be quick to start diesel 2, not knowing if there was some electrical fault that failed it in the first place? MR. SULLINS: MR circle, now that I understand the question, what I'd like to do is to give it some thought and then come back to it later so we can proceed. MR. CIRCLE: That's perfectly fine. MR. HARRIS: Okay. Let's get started on the significant termination discussion. My name again is Richard Harris and I am the Manager of Emergency Planning at ANO, and you might ask yourself why is the Manager of Emergency Planning talking to you about risk significance. Previous before assuming the position of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	left. (Break taken from 3:31 p m. to 3:46 p m.) MR. WERNER: Operator, are you on the line? OPERATOR SYLVIA: Yes, sir, I'm on the line. Just opened up all the lines. MR. WERNER: All right. We're ready to restart. OPERATOR SYLVIA: You may begin. MR. KOWALESKI: Before Richard goes, this is Joe Kowaleski, we'll provide a written timeline for how to safely assess the condition of the bus as input. MR. MITMAN: Thank you. MR. SULLINS: This is Gary Sullins. A point of clarification, we had questions regarding operation of our No. 2 diesel for station blackout and the question was related to operability. We would not consider the diesel operable without DC power; however, we have procedures for starting the diesel without DC	 And it may not be apparent to the watch what's going on at that time. So, would they be quick to restore let's say they restore DC power and manage to get diesel 2 started, would they be quick to start diesel 2, not knowing if there was some electrical fault that failed it in the first place? MR. SULLINS: MR circle, now that I understand the question, what I'd like to do is to give it some thought and then come back to it later so we can proceed. MR. CIRCLE: That's perfectly fine. MR. HARRIS: Okay. Let's get started on the significant termination discussion. My name again is Richard Harris and I am the Manager of Emergency Planning at ANO, and you might ask yourself why is the Manager of Emergency Planning talking to you about risk significance. Previous before assuming the position of emergency planning, I was a risk analyst for ANO. I've
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	left. (Break taken from 3:31 p m. to 3:46 p m.) MR. WERNER: Operator, are you on the line? OPERATOR SYLVIA: Yes, sir, I'm on the line. Just opened up all the lines. MR. WERNER: All right. We're ready to restart. OPERATOR SYLVIA: You may begin. MR. KOWALESKI: Before Richard goes, this is Joe Kowaleski, we'll provide a written timeline for how to safely assess the condition of the bus as input. MR. MITMAN: Thank you. MR. SULLINS: This is Gary Sullins. A point of clarification, we had questions regarding operation of our No. 2 diesel for station blackout and the question was related to operability. We would not consider the diesel operable without DC power; however, we have procedures for starting the diesel without DC power and are trained on those procedures, so that start	 And it may not be apparent to the watch what's going on at that time. So, would they be quick to restore let's say they restore DC power and manage to get diesel 2 started, would they be quick to start diesel 2, not knowing if there was some electrical fault that failed it in the first place? MR. SULLINS: MR circle, now that I understand the question, what I'd like to do is to give it some thought and then come back to it later so we can proceed. MR. CIRCLE: That's perfectly fine. MR. HARRIS: Okay. Let's get started on the significant termination discussion. My name again is Richard Harris and I am the Manager of Emergency Planning at ANO, and you might ask yourself why is the Manager of Emergency Planning talking to you about risk significance. Previous before assuming the position of emergency planning, I was a risk analyst for ANO. Ive also previously held an operating license on Unit 1, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	left. (Break taken from 3:31 p m. to 3:46 p m.) MR. WERNER: Operator, are you on the line? OPERATOR SYLVIA: Yes, sir, I'm on the line. Just opened up all the lines. MR. WERNER: All right. We're ready to restart. OPERATOR SYLVIA: You may begin. MR. KOWALESKI: Before Richard goes, this is Joe Kowaleski, we'll provide a written timeline for how to safely assess the condition of the bus as input. MR. MITMAN: Thank you. MR. SULLINS: This is Gary Sullins. A point of clarification, we had questions regarding operation of our No. 2 diesel for station blackout and the question was related to operability. We would not consider the diesel operable without DC power; however, we have procedures for starting the diesel without DC power and are trained on those procedures, so that start capability exists for us.	 And it may not be apparent to the watch what's going on at that time. So, would they be quick to restore let's say they restore DC power and manage to get diesel 2 started, would they be quick to start diesel 2, not knowing if there was some electrical fault that failed it in the first place? MR. SULLINS: MR circle, now that I understand the question, what I'd like to do is to give it some thought and then come back to it later so we can proceed. MR. CIRCLE: That's perfectly fine. MR. HARRIS: Okay. Let's get started on the significant termination discussion. My name again is Richard Harris and I am the Manager of Emergency Planning at ANO, and you might ask yourself why is the Manager of Emergency Planning talking to you about risk significance. Previous before assuming the position of emergency planning, I was a risk analyst for ANO. Ive also previously held an operating license on Unit 1, but more importantly, Jason Hall, our PRA engineer, is in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	left. (Break taken from 3:31 p m. to 3:46 p m.) MR. WERNER: Operator, are you on the line? OPERATOR SYLVIA: Yes, sir, I'm on the line. Just opened up all the lines. MR. WERNER: All right. We're ready to restart. OPERATOR SYLVIA: You may begin. MR. KOWALESKI: Before Richard goes, this is Joe Kowaleski, we'll provide a written timeline for how to safely assess the condition of the bus as input. MR. MITMAN: Thank you. MR. SULLINS: This is Gary Sullins. A point of clarification, we had questions regarding operation of our No. 2 diesel for station blackout and the question was related to operability. We would not consider the diesel operable without DC power; however, we have procedures for starting the diesel without DC power and are trained on those procedures, so that start capability exists for us. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle. Just	 And it may not be apparent to the watch what's going on at that time. So, would they be quick to restore let's say they restore DC power and manage to get diesel 2 started, would they be quick to start diesel 2, not knowing if there was some electrical fault that failed it in the first place? MR. SULLINS: MR circle, now that I understand the question, what I'd like to do is to give it some thought and then come back to it later so we can proceed. MR. CIRCLE: That's perfectly fine. MR. HARRIS: Okay. Let's get started on the significant termination discussion. My name again is Richard Harris and I am the Manager of Emergency Planning at ANO, and you might ask yourself why is the Manager of Emergency Planning talking to you about risk significance. Previous before assuming the position of emergency planning, I was a risk analyst for ANO. I've also previously held an operating license on Unit 1, but more importantly, Jason Hall, our PRA engineer, is in the back of the here, so we may call on him if you have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	left. (Break taken from 3:31 p m. to 3:46 p m.) MR. WERNER: Operator, are you on the line? OPERATOR SYLVIA: Yes, sir, Im on the line. Just opened up all the lines. MR. WERNER: All right. We're ready to restart. OPERATOR SYLVIA: You may begin. MR. KOWALESKI: Before Richard goes, this is Joe Kowaleski, we'll provide a written timeline for how to safely assess the condition of the bus as input. MR. MITMAN: Thank you. MR. SULLINS: This is Gary Sullins. A point of clarification, we had questions regarding operation of our No. 2 diesel for station blackout and the question was related to operability. We would not consider the diesel operable without DC power; however, we have procedures for starting the diesel without DC power and are trained on those procedures, so that start capability exists for us. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle. Just to clarify that question is, actually, what would be the	 And it may not be apparent to the watch what's going on at that time. So, would they be quick to restore let's say they restore DC power and manage to get diesel 2 started, would they be quick to start diesel 2, not knowing if there was some electrical fault that failed it in the first place? MR. SULLINS: MR circle, now that I understand the question, what I'd like to do is to give it some thought and then come back to it later so we can proceed. MR. CIRCLE: That's perfectly fine. MR. HARRIS: Okay. Let's get started on the significant termination discussion. My name again is Richard Harris and I am the Manager of Emergency Planning at ANO, and you might ask yourself why is the Manager of Emergency Planning talking to you about risk significance. Previous before assuming the position of emergency planning, I was a risk analyst for ANO. I've also previously held an operating license on Unit 1, but more importantly, Jason Hall, our PRA engineer, is in the back of the here, so we may call on him if you have any questions, because he actually performed the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	left. (Break taken from 3:31 p m. to 3:46 p m.) MR. WERNER: Operator, are you on the line? OPERATOR SYLVIA: Yes, sir, I'm on the line. Just opened up all the lines. MR. WERNER: All right. We're ready to restart. OPERATOR SYLVIA: You may begin. MR. KOWALESKI: Before Richard goes, this is Joe Kowaleski, we'll provide a written timeline for how to safely assess the condition of the bus as input. MR. MITMAN: Thank you. MR. SULLINS: This is Gary Sullins. A point of clarification, we had questions regarding operation of our No. 2 diesel for station blackout and the question was related to operability. We would not consider the diesel operable without DC power; however, we have procedures for starting the diesel without DC power and are trained on those procedures, so that start capability exists for us. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle. Just	 And it may not be apparent to the watch what's going on at that time. So, would they be quick to restore let's say they restore DC power and manage to get diesel 2 started, would they be quick to start diesel 2, not knowing if there was some electrical fault that failed it in the first place? MR. SULLINS: MR circle, now that I understand the question, what I'd like to do is to give it some thought and then come back to it later so we can proceed. MR. CIRCLE: That's perfectly fine. MR. HARRIS: Okay. Let's get started on the significant termination discussion. My name again is Richard Harris and I am the Manager of Emergency Planning at ANO, and you might ask yourself why is the Manager of Emergency Planning talking to you about risk significance. Previous before assuming the position of emergency planning, I was a risk analyst for ANO. I've also previously held an operating license on Unit 1, but more importantly, Jason Hall, our PRA engineer, is in the back of the here, so we may call on him if you have any questions, because he actually performed the

28 (Pages 109 to 112)

information provided today, you'll be able to take this

The assumption relating to 4160-volt

and also associated with DHR, mainly because there are

some assumptions in the DHR cut sets that are driven by

information and use it in your full PRA analysis.

power, it's currently in the model and if you look at

event tree, what I'm talking about is this branch here

a loss of power. We believe that the assumptions are

not realistic simply from the fact that we did recover

Again, this is the event tree that we

On slide 50, one of the things that we

method do you use to perform an HRA-type of analysis for

were challenged with, and I believe it's one of the

things the NRC was challenged with as well, is what

the conditions and the situation we found ourselves in

onsite power in the available time.

just looked at.

	Page 113		Page 115
1	could pull together to go through the analysis and	1	based upon the stator drop.
2	provide the results that we'll talk about today.	2	We were in a shutdown condition, the fuel
3	The main point that I think we should get	3	transfer canal was flooded up. So what we did is we
4	out of the previous discussion from David and Gary is	4	took we felt like it was imperative upon ANO to
5	that when you look at the timeline for the available	5	develop a methodology that could be used by the NRC
6	time to core uncovery, and you look at the actual time	6	going forward.
7	that it took us to restore power to Startup 1, we	7	We reviewed the standards that were
8	restored power before our estimated time to core	8	available in the industry and could not identify a
9	uncovery and that's a fact.	9	definitive standard that could be used for this type of
10	So when you consider that fact then you	10	analysis. But, again, our ultimate goal is to get a
11	have to acknowledge that the probability of failure	11	best estimate factor to be used and acknowledging that
12	restoring off that power is something less than one.	12	it's not 1.0.
13	What we want to do in addition to that	13	So what we did is we determined a we
14	discussion is talk about the success paths that Gary and	14	assembled an expert team and we considered the different
15	David outlined and how we considered those in our risk	15	methods that were available. At the end of day the
16	assessment, and the methodologies that we looked at in	16	following methods that we ultimately selected were the
17	relation to this particular issue.	17	HRA calculator and we also used EPRI's SHARP 1,
18	So our key objective that I think we want	18	Systematic Human Action Reliability Procedure.
19	to come away is that we want to insure that we have a	19	The elements that we considered when we
20	realistic estimate of risk using the best available	20	went through this development and this methodology was
21	information that we have.	21	we looked at cognitive and decision making portion of
22	At the end of the presentation, I will	22	the HEP or the human error probability calculation. We
23	provide and discuss real briefly the results that we	23	also looked at the design development. And I want to
24	derived independently for ANO.	24	spend a little bit of time on the design development
25	So, what we started with was the event	25	just based on some discussions we had earlier during
	so, what we started with was the event		Just bused on some discussions we nut carnet during
	Page 114		Page 116
1	tree model that provided to us, and we reviewed that	1	Gary and David's presentation. And also the execution.
2	model to understand the method used and the results that	2	So the first thing we want to talk about
3	were obtained. We didn't have the complete model that	3	is the cognitive decision making.
4	the NRC utilized, so we were somewhat restricted in our	4	Much like the operator in the control
5	review and our analysis on the information that was	5	room, when he gets a cue, the cues were self-evident
6	available.	6	post stator drop. We knew that we had lost our
7	So, you know, at the end of day, whenever	7	connectivity to offsite power. The engineering starr
8	we go back and whenever you guys go back and look at the	8	and the TSC in the plant recognized that we had to
-			

1	Gary and David's presentation. And also the execution.
2	So the first thing we want to talk about
3	is the cognitive decision making.
4	Much like the operator in the control
5	room, when he gets a cue, the cues were self-evident
6	post stator drop. We knew that we had lost our
7	connectivity to offsite power. The engineering starr
8	and the TSC in the plant recognized that we had to
9	protect ourselves against protect the safety
10	functions of plant. And we also recognized that we had
11	resources available, and we had to look the
12	modifications that were also available.
13	Given these conditions, we reviewed the
14	HRA calculator for it applicability. And when we looked
15	at the cognitive portion of the HRA calculator, we
16	deemed that that portion of the HRA calculator for this
17	particular element of the human error probability.
18	MR. MITMAN: Before you move on, Jeff
19	Mitman here, the HRA calculator has several methods
20	imbedded in it to do cognitive analysis. Which of the
21	embedded methods did you use for this?
22	MR. HARRIS: Jason, I'll let you speak to
23	that.
24	MR. HALL: We used the cause-based
25	decision.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

luclea	r Regulatory Conference with Entergy Operations, Inc.		May 1, 2014	
	Page 117		Page 119	
1	MR. MITMAN: Could I get a copy of the	1	be to determine which access to go after first, and	
2	analysis, please?	2	which modifications that needed to be planned and	
3	MR. HALL: Yeah.	3	developed first.	
4	MR. HARRIS: Moving on to the next	4	MR. LOVELESS: And all of that, that you	
5	element that we had to consider was the design	5	just described, was done with cause-based HRA	
6	development. As was discussed during Gary and David's	6	calculator.	
7	presentation, you know, there weren't any procedures in	7	MR. HARRIS: The portion of the HRA	
8	place. There wasn't any guidance in place post stator	8	calculator that would apply to that, we did.	
9	drop. It was up to the engineering team to develop	9	So moving on to the looking at the	
10	these design factors or do the design development going	10	recover event tree, what we used was, and we've talked	
11	forward.	11	about, I think, most of these in Gary and David's	
12	So, looking at the resource limitations,	12	presentation, so I won't spend all our time we spent	
13	the effect on effect on existing systems, the operating	13	a lot of time earlier talking about simple versus	
14	crew and the staff interaction, taking credit for the	14	complex. From an engineering perspective, this was a	
15	fact that we've done this before, the type of	15	very simple modification, and that's why we chose the	
16	modifications we're talking about here were not unique	16	simple branch on this particular event tree. Again,	
17	to ANO and they've been performed many times during	17	because we've done it so many times in the past, the	
18	outages, we did conclude and looking at this	18	engineering team, as David mentioned, he's got a lot of	
19	particular portion of the HEP that the HRA calculator	19	years of experience and done this with many outages, the	
20	really didn't do a good job of adequately addressing	20	practice and the ability to do this, the training was	
21	this issue.	21	there.	
22	So alternate approaches were considered.	22	We did consider that the nature of the	
23	And at the end of day we decided we determined that	23	work environment was poor based on stress and safety	
24	the SHARP event tree, recovery event tree approach would	24	factors associated with the issue that the team may have	
25	be an adequate approach to assess this different element	25	been under at the time.	
	Page 118		Page 120	
1	in the HRA analysis.	1	And that would have led us to a	
2	MR. KOWALESKI: Just want to make sure of	2	qualitative probability failure to moderate flow and	
3	a clarification on a point. We didn't have one	3	then using screening values as defined by SHARP, we	
4	individual do this risk assessment in the HRA	4	determined that that value would be.03 for this	
5	calculator. We had a team of experts, we contracted	5	particular aspect of the HRA.	
6	experts in to assist us with this. So we had	6	MR. MITMAN: I'm going to have a couple	
7	considerable resources applied to this. Just wanted	7	questions on this slide. I was able to get a hold of a	
8	make sure that was clear.	8	copy of SHARP 1 and take a quick look at it last night.	
9	MR. LOVELESS: This is David Loveless.	9	I found in there the event tree, the decision tree that	
10	Can you spend a moment explaining the demarcation	10	you're looking at here, and I understand where you got	
11	between where you said the cognitive portion of the	11	the questions from and the splits on that.	
12	action was done versus this, I'm assuming it's part of	12	Could you talk a little bit about the	
13	the action of the design development?	13	values that put in there that describe short,	
14	MR. HARRIS: Certainly. In the cognitive	14	intermediate, and long, and how you came up with less	
15	portion, you would have to consider the cues that were	15	than one hour, one to four hours, and greater than 4	
16	available to the team as they determine what the status	16	hours?	
17	of plan is. They would also have to look at compare	17	MR. HARRIS: The long leg associated with	
18	that cue against the safety's functions because,	18	this particular branch is the fact that we had 4.8 days.	
19	ultimately, that's what we want to protect.	19	MR. MITMAN: Yes, but, again, it was only	
20	The team would then go in and look at	20	a quick review of SHARP 1, but I didn't see SHARP 1	
21	those safety functions to prioritize. They would look	21	defining long as greater than 4 hours, and so I assume	
22	at the resources available. They would look at the	22	that that was a decision that your expert team made as	
23	temporary modifications that needed to be developed to	23	they evaluated that.	
24	protoct that sofety function And they would make a	24	Is that a fair assumption?	

23 temporary modifications that needed to be developed to 24

protect that safety function. And they would make a 25 decision as -- the decision-making point of that would Is that a fair assumption?

24

	Page 121		Page 123
1	You're saying, where did that 4 hours come from?	1	come out of your expert judgment?
2	MR. MITMAN: Correct.	2	MR. HARRIS: If you look in SHARP, it
3	MR. HARRIS: It came from our HRA anal	3	will define an upper bound of 0.1 and lower bound of
4	the fleet, southern fleet have an HRA analysis, and the	4	0.01 and then it also specifies that for those that a
5	guiding principles within the HRA analysis are defined	5	range between low and high, that the range be
6	based on 4 hours. So that's typically what we use for a	6	distributed evenly. So it's somewhat subjective as to
7	typical HRA analysis would be a 4-hour timeframe.	7	what goes where, but there is a little bit of guidance
8	Obviously, in this case, the 4 hours	8	to chart as to how to assign these values.
9	didn't apply, and so and we probably should have	9	And our fleet guidance, the Entergy fleet
10	taken it off of this presentation because it does add a	10	guidance, we've used, we've done that. So this
11	little confusion, but the fact that we had 4.8 days did	11	information that you see here, these numbers came right
12	provide us that we had time available for the action.	12	out of our guidance, our internal fleet procedures.
13	MR. DAPAS: I guess the question I have	13	MR. MITMAN: I'd like to see could I
14	is does this human action reliability procedure which I	14	get a copy of that guidance, please, and could I get a
15	guess is the SHARP 1, does it provide any guidance there	15	copy of the entire analysis on, you know, how you set
16	regarding the timeframe that you're talking about, long	16	the tree up and how you made the decisions on the branch
17	or medium or short differentiation?	17	points?
18	MR. MITMAN: Based on I haven't	18	MR. HARRIS: Okay.
19	thoroughly read SHARP 1 yet to know, and so I turn it	19	MR. MITMAN: And the last question about
20	over to Entergy and say, does SHARP 1 tell you how to	20	this is, you've characterized it as a decision tree for
21	define short, intermediate, and long?	21	evaluating the engineering judgment. But isn't it a
22	MR. HARRIS: I'd have to go back and look	22	little bit more than that? It's the engineering
23	and see if there's any specific guides there.	23	judgment and the actual construction work that went into
24	MR. MITMAN: Next question is, you're	24	building the connection between offsite and onsite
25	using this as an	25	power?
	Page 122		Page 124

Page 122

1	MR. KOWALESKI: That was an output of the	
2	expert team, so what we need to do is provide that for	
3	you.	
4	MR. DAPAS: Yeah, I think it would be of	
5	value for I'll ask the risk analysts here on this	
6	side of the table, but I think it would be of value for	
7	us to understand where you relied on, if you will, the	
8	expert judgment of the team you assembled versus	
9	applying the guidance that exists and the standards that	
10	you were using	
11	MR. HARRIS: Certainly.	
12	MR. DAPAS: HRA calculator or the	
13	SHARP procedure.	
14	MR. HARRIS: Certainly. I think that	
15	would be we can certainly do that.	
16	MR. DAPAS: And of course, associated	
17	with that is the basis for the judgment of the exercise	
18	and why you considered that reasonable.	
19	MR. HARRIS: Okay.	
20	MR. MITMAN: And looking at SHARP in the	
21	column that's labeled qualitative probability of	
22	failure, if I remember, that comes right out of SHARP.	
23	The low through high-end state qualitative values. In	
24	the far right column you associated some quantitative	1
25	values. Did that come directly out of SHARP or did that	

Page 124

1	MR. HARRIS: No, this is just dealing
2	with the design development where we looked at, you
3	know, what the engineers had to do to put a process in
4	place and develop the guidance, the written
5	instructions, to provide to the craft in the field to
6	perform that execution that activity.
7	MR. MITMAN: So you're going to talk
8	shortly about the evaluation of the execution?
9	MR. HARRIS: That's right. So the next
10	element we would talk about is the execution factor.
11	And what we looked at here was the execution steps that
12	were developed for successful implementation. Again,
13	what Jason did in his analysis, was he took the,
14	actually, work order instructions that were developed
15	and he used those in the context.
16	We did determ the team say I'll
17	clarify that. The team determined that the HRA
18	calculator could be used for this application because if
19	you think in terms of the HRA calculator and how it's
20	structured, it's structured to be used via procedures
21	for execution. By the time we get to this portion of
22	the recovery, the team in the field will have
23	constructions available to them that were developed by
24	the engineering team.
25	And so using the temp mod process the

31 (Pages 121 to 124)

	Page 125		Page 127
1	written instructions were developed. We used those	1	model.
2	written instructions as part of this analysis and deemed	2	MR. HARRIS: So, using this fault tree
3	that the HRA calculator could indeed be used.	3	MR. LOVELESS: Can we go back for a
4	So now that we've gone through these	4	moment? This is David Loveless. I guess I'm trying to
5	various elements and we've determined which tools could	5	understand exactly what you're modeling here in the two
6	be applied, what we did was we actually did the	6	recoveries under an or gate those are recoveries 2
7	quantification. And I'm just going jump right along,	7	and 3 that have some combination, so there's really a
8	move right along and we'll look at the fault tree that	8	50/50 chance that you take on each one of those, right?
9	we used to quantify this particular recovery.	9	I'm not sure the quantification is right putting those
10	What you'll see on the left side of the	10	both under an or gate.
11	screen or on your hard copies in front of you is	11	MR. HARRIS: And I'll have to look at
12	actually the recovery associated with the Startup 1	12	that in a little bit more detail, David, you may be
13	recovery. The branch the event that you're looking	13	right. But I will point to the fact that this risk here
14	at here at the bottom actually is the numeric value	14	is going to dominate these results.
15	quantification results from the HRA calculator for this	15	MR. MCKENNEY: In actuality this is
16	particular element.	16	David McKenney we would have pursued that particular
17	On the right side of the branch here	17	path and you could use it either place, so it wasn't
18	you'll see the recovery efforts associated with the 2A9	18	in the development and the design section you could have
19	and also the condensate pump feeder breaker. And you'll	19	just moved the termination point from one place to
20	note than that they are anded as two independent	20	another.
21	recovery efforts, but there is a dependency here	21	MR. HARRIS: So it would have been a true
22	associated with the alternate AC 2A9 recovery and the	22	or.
23	condensate pump recovery.	23	MR. MCKENNEY: If we had a problem with
24	Also you'll note at the top of the tree,	24	one of the two breakers, we could have moved to the
25	the development of the design development factor.	25	other breaker with sufficient time.
	the development of the design development inclusion.		
	Page 126		Page 128
1	Page 126 This is the factor that came out of the SHARP 1	1	
1 2	This is the factor that came out of the SHARP 1	1 2	MR. MITMAN: But the way you've got it
	This is the factor that came out of the SHARP 1 methodology. So what we've done is we've used this		MR. MITMAN: But the way you've got it modeled, if one fails then the whole train, then the
2	This is the factor that came out of the SHARP 1 methodology. So what we've done is we've used this fault three tree to capture the portion of the analysis	2	MR. MITMAN: But the way you've got it modeled, if one fails then the whole train, then the whole then the or gate fails?
2 3	This is the factor that came out of the SHARP 1 methodology. So what we've done is we've used this fault three tree to capture the portion of the analysis we could perform in the HRA calculator and the portion	2 3	MR. MITMAN: But the way you've got it modeled, if one fails then the whole train, then the whole then the or gate fails? MR. HARRIS: Right.
2 3 4	This is the factor that came out of the SHARP 1 methodology. So what we've done is we've used this fault three tree to capture the portion of the analysis we could perform in the HRA calculator and the portion of the analysis that we could would pull from the	2 3 4	MR. MITMAN: But the way you've got it modeled, if one fails then the whole train, then the whole then the or gate fails? MR. HARRIS: Right. MR. LOVELESS: The other question I have
2 3 4 5	This is the factor that came out of the SHARP 1 methodology. So what we've done is we've used this fault three tree to capture the portion of the analysis we could perform in the HRA calculator and the portion of the analysis that we could would pull from the SHARP methodology, the event tree.	2 3 4 5	MR. MITMAN: But the way you've got it modeled, if one fails then the whole train, then the whole then the or gate fails? MR. HARRIS: Right. MR. LOVELESS: The other question I have is that, I guess, are these numbers your cognitive and
2 3 4 5 6	This is the factor that came out of the SHARP 1 methodology. So what we've done is we've used this fault three tree to capture the portion of the analysis we could perform in the HRA calculator and the portion of the analysis that we could would pull from the SHARP methodology, the event tree. And using this quantification or this	2 3 4 5 6	MR. MITMAN: But the way you've got it modeled, if one fails then the whole train, then the whole then the or gate fails? MR. HARRIS: Right. MR. LOVELESS: The other question I have is that, I guess, are these numbers your cognitive and your execution
2 3 4 5 6 7	This is the factor that came out of the SHARP 1 methodology. So what we've done is we've used this fault three tree to capture the portion of the analysis we could perform in the HRA calculator and the portion of the analysis that we could would pull from the SHARP methodology, the event tree. And using this quantification or this fault tree, we did calculate a recovery factor	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. MITMAN: But the way you've got it modeled, if one fails then the whole train, then the whole then the or gate fails? MR. HARRIS: Right. MR. LOVELESS: The other question I have is that, I guess, are these numbers your cognitive and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	This is the factor that came out of the SHARP 1 methodology. So what we've done is we've used this fault three tree to capture the portion of the analysis we could perform in the HRA calculator and the portion of the analysis that we could would pull from the SHARP methodology, the event tree. And using this quantification or this fault tree, we did calculate a recovery factor associated with 4160-volt. And you note that rather	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. MITMAN: But the way you've got it modeled, if one fails then the whole train, then the whole then the or gate fails? MR. HARRIS: Right. MR. LOVELESS: The other question I have is that, I guess, are these numbers your cognitive and your execution MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. MR. LOVELESS: values?
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	This is the factor that came out of the SHARP 1 methodology. So what we've done is we've used this fault three tree to capture the portion of the analysis we could perform in the HRA calculator and the portion of the analysis that we could would pull from the SHARP methodology, the event tree. And using this quantification or this fault tree, we did calculate a recovery factor associated with 4160-volt. And you note that rather than put the recovery factor for the design development	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. MITMAN: But the way you've got it modeled, if one fails then the whole train, then the whole then the or gate fails? MR. HARRIS: Right. MR. LOVELESS: The other question I have is that, I guess, are these numbers your cognitive and your execution MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. MR. LOVELESS: values? MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. We didn't
2 3 5 7 8 9 10	This is the factor that came out of the SHARP 1 methodology. So what we've done is we've used this fault three tree to capture the portion of the analysis we could perform in the HRA calculator and the portion of the analysis that we could would pull from the SHARP methodology, the event tree. And using this quantification or this fault tree, we did calculate a recovery factor associated with 4160-volt. And you note that rather than put the recovery factor for the design development down in the tree, as for each one of these elements	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. MITMAN: But the way you've got it modeled, if one fails then the whole train, then the whole then the or gate fails? MR. HARRIS: Right. MR. LOVELESS: The other question I have is that, I guess, are these numbers your cognitive and your execution MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. MR. LOVELESS: values? MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. We didn't break them down in used HRA calculators using those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	This is the factor that came out of the SHARP 1 methodology. So what we've done is we've used this fault three tree to capture the portion of the analysis we could perform in the HRA calculator and the portion of the analysis that we could would pull from the SHARP methodology, the event tree. And using this quantification or this fault tree, we did calculate a recovery factor associated with 4160-volt. And you note that rather than put the recovery factor for the design development	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. MITMAN: But the way you've got it modeled, if one fails then the whole train, then the whole then the or gate fails? MR. HARRIS: Right. MR. LOVELESS: The other question I have is that, I guess, are these numbers your cognitive and your execution MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. MR. LOVELESS: values? MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. We didn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	This is the factor that came out of the SHARP 1 methodology. So what we've done is we've used this fault three tree to capture the portion of the analysis we could perform in the HRA calculator and the portion of the analysis that we could would pull from the SHARP methodology, the event tree. And using this quantification or this fault tree, we did calculate a recovery factor associated with 4160-volt. And you note that rather than put the recovery factor for the design development down in the tree, as for each one of these elements we pulled it to the top which provides a little bit of an overestimation of risk associated with that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. MITMAN: But the way you've got it modeled, if one fails then the whole train, then the whole then the or gate fails? MR. HARRIS: Right. MR. LOVELESS: The other question I have is that, I guess, are these numbers your cognitive and your execution MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. MR. LOVELESS: values? MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. We didn't break them down in used HRA calculators using those two elements to come up with a value that we used in this fault tree.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	This is the factor that came out of the SHARP 1 methodology. So what we've done is we've used this fault three tree to capture the portion of the analysis we could perform in the HRA calculator and the portion of the analysis that we could would pull from the SHARP methodology, the event tree. And using this quantification or this fault tree, we did calculate a recovery factor associated with 4160-volt. And you note that rather than put the recovery factor for the design development down in the tree, as for each one of these elements we pulled it to the top which provides a little bit of an overestimation of risk associated with that particular parameter.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. MITMAN: But the way you've got it modeled, if one fails then the whole train, then the whole then the or gate fails? MR. HARRIS: Right. MR. LOVELESS: The other question I have is that, I guess, are these numbers your cognitive and your execution MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. MR. LOVELESS: values? MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. We didn't break them down in used HRA calculators using those two elements to come up with a value that we used in this fault tree. MR. LOVELESS: And when send those to us,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	This is the factor that came out of the SHARP 1 methodology. So what we've done is we've used this fault three tree to capture the portion of the analysis we could perform in the HRA calculator and the portion of the analysis that we could would pull from the SHARP methodology, the event tree. And using this quantification or this fault tree, we did calculate a recovery factor associated with 4160-volt. And you note that rather than put the recovery factor for the design development down in the tree, as for each one of these elements we pulled it to the top which provides a little bit of an overestimation of risk associated with that particular parameter. MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman. Before you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. MITMAN: But the way you've got it modeled, if one fails then the whole train, then the whole then the or gate fails? MR. HARRIS: Right. MR. LOVELESS: The other question I have is that, I guess, are these numbers your cognitive and your execution MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. MR. LOVELESS: values? MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. We didn't break them down in used HRA calculators using those two elements to come up with a value that we used in this fault tree. MR. LOVELESS: And when send those to us, we'd like to actually have the calculator files so we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	This is the factor that came out of the SHARP 1 methodology. So what we've done is we've used this fault three tree to capture the portion of the analysis we could perform in the HRA calculator and the portion of the analysis that we could would pull from the SHARP methodology, the event tree. And using this quantification or this fault tree, we did calculate a recovery factor associated with 4160-volt. And you note that rather than put the recovery factor for the design development down in the tree, as for each one of these elements we pulled it to the top which provides a little bit of an overestimation of risk associated with that particular parameter. MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman. Before you leave that, the far left solution is the actual solution	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. MITMAN: But the way you've got it modeled, if one fails then the whole train, then the whole then the or gate fails? MR. HARRIS: Right. MR. LOVELESS: The other question I have is that, I guess, are these numbers your cognitive and your execution MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. MR. LOVELESS: values? MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. We didn't break them down in used HRA calculators using those two elements to come up with a value that we used in this fault tree. MR. LOVELESS: And when send those to us, we'd like to actually have the calculator files so we can pull it up in calculator and look at your selections
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	This is the factor that came out of the SHARP 1 methodology. So what we've done is we've used this fault three tree to capture the portion of the analysis we could perform in the HRA calculator and the portion of the analysis that we could would pull from the SHARP methodology, the event tree. And using this quantification or this fault tree, we did calculate a recovery factor associated with 4160-volt. And you note that rather than put the recovery factor for the design development down in the tree, as for each one of these elements we pulled it to the top which provides a little bit of an overestimation of risk associated with that particular parameter. MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman. Before you leave that, the far left solution is the actual solution that you implement, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. MITMAN: But the way you've got it modeled, if one fails then the whole train, then the whole then the or gate fails? MR. HARRIS: Right. MR. LOVELESS: The other question I have is that, I guess, are these numbers your cognitive and your execution MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. MR. LOVELESS: values? MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. We didn't break them down in used HRA calculators using those two elements to come up with a value that we used in this fault tree. MR. LOVELESS: And when send those to us, we'd like to actually have the calculator files so we can pull it up in calculator and look at your selections on your usages.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	This is the factor that came out of the SHARP 1 methodology. So what we've done is we've used this fault three tree to capture the portion of the analysis we could perform in the HRA calculator and the portion of the analysis that we could would pull from the SHARP methodology, the event tree. And using this quantification or this fault tree, we did calculate a recovery factor associated with 4160-volt. And you note that rather than put the recovery factor for the design development down in the tree, as for each one of these elements we pulled it to the top which provides a little bit of an overestimation of risk associated with that particular parameter. MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman. Before you leave that, the far left solution is the actual solution that you implement, correct? MR. HARRIS: No, this is actually the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. MITMAN: But the way you've got it modeled, if one fails then the whole train, then the whole then the or gate fails? MR. HARRIS: Right. MR. HARRIS: Right. MR. LOVELESS: The other question I have is that, I guess, are these numbers your cognitive and your execution MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. MR. LOVELESS: values? MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. We didn't break them down in used HRA calculators using those two elements to come up with a value that we used in this fault tree. MR. LOVELESS: And when send those to us, we'd like to actually have the calculator files so we can pull it up in calculator and look at your selections on your usages. MR. HARRIS: Sure. Okay. So as we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	This is the factor that came out of the SHARP 1 methodology. So what we've done is we've used this fault three tree to capture the portion of the analysis we could perform in the HRA calculator and the portion of the analysis that we could would pull from the SHARP methodology, the event tree. And using this quantification or this fault tree, we did calculate a recovery factor associated with 4160-volt. And you note that rather than put the recovery factor for the design development down in the tree, as for each one of these elements we pulled it to the top which provides a little bit of an overestimation of risk associated with that particular parameter. MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman. Before you leave that, the far left solution is the actual solution that you implement, correct? MR. HARRIS: No, this is actually the success, this is actually one of the success paths that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. MITMAN: But the way you've got it modeled, if one fails then the whole train, then the whole then the or gate fails? MR. HARRIS: Right. MR. HARRIS: Right. MR. LOVELESS: The other question I have is that, I guess, are these numbers your cognitive and your execution MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. MR. LOVELESS: values? MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. We didn't break them down in used HRA calculators using those two elements to come up with a value that we used in this fault tree. MR. LOVELESS: And when send those to us, we'd like to actually have the calculator files so we can pull it up in calculator and look at your selections on your usages. MR. HARRIS: Sure. Okay. So as we quantify the fault tree, our resulting point estimate is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	This is the factor that came out of the SHARP 1 methodology. So what we've done is we've used this fault three tree to capture the portion of the analysis we could perform in the HRA calculator and the portion of the analysis that we could would pull from the SHARP methodology, the event tree. And using this quantification or this fault tree, we did calculate a recovery factor associated with 4160-volt. And you note that rather than put the recovery factor for the design development down in the tree, as for each one of these elements we pulled it to the top which provides a little bit of an overestimation of risk associated with that particular parameter. MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman. Before you leave that, the far left solution is the actual solution that you implement, correct? MR. HARRIS: No, this is actually the success, this is actually one of the success paths that we presented to you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. MITMAN: But the way you've got it modeled, if one fails then the whole train, then the whole then the or gate fails? MR. HARRIS: Right. MR. LOVELESS: The other question I have is that, I guess, are these numbers your cognitive and your execution MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. MR. LOVELESS: values? MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. We didn't break them down in used HRA calculators using those two elements to come up with a value that we used in this fault tree. MR. LOVELESS: And when send those to us, we'd like to actually have the calculator files so we can pull it up in calculator and look at your selections on your usages. MR. HARRIS: Sure. Okay. So as we quantify the fault tree, our resulting point estimate is 3.1E-2 for this particular recovery pattern.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	This is the factor that came out of the SHARP 1 methodology. So what we've done is we've used this fault three tree to capture the portion of the analysis we could perform in the HRA calculator and the portion of the analysis that we could would pull from the SHARP methodology, the event tree. And using this quantification or this fault tree, we did calculate a recovery factor associated with 4160-volt. And you note that rather than put the recovery factor for the design development down in the tree, as for each one of these elements we pulled it to the top which provides a little bit of an overestimation of risk associated with that particular parameter. MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman. Before you leave that, the far left solution is the actual solution that you implement, correct? MR. HARRIS: No, this is actually the success, this is actually one of the success paths that we presented to you. Now, given the way that we quantify this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. MITMAN: But the way you've got it modeled, if one fails then the whole train, then the whole then the or gate fails? MR. HARRIS: Right. MR. LOVELESS: The other question I have is that, I guess, are these numbers your cognitive and your execution MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. MR. LOVELESS: values? MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. We didn't break them down in used HRA calculators using those two elements to come up with a value that we used in this fault tree. MR. LOVELESS: And when send those to us, we'd like to actually have the calculator files so we can pull it up in calculator and look at your selections on your usages. MR. HARRIS: Sure. Okay. So as we quantify the fault tree, our resulting point estimate is 3.1E-2 for this particular recovery pattern. MR. LOVELESS: Before we leave this, one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	This is the factor that came out of the SHARP 1 methodology. So what we've done is we've used this fault three tree to capture the portion of the analysis we could perform in the HRA calculator and the portion of the analysis that we could would pull from the SHARP methodology, the event tree. And using this quantification or this fault tree, we did calculate a recovery factor associated with 4160-volt. And you note that rather than put the recovery factor for the design development down in the tree, as for each one of these elements we pulled it to the top which provides a little bit of an overestimation of risk associated with that particular parameter. MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman. Before you leave that, the far left solution is the actual solution that you implement, correct? MR. HARRIS: No, this is actually the success, this is actually one of the success paths that we presented to you. Now, given the way that we quantify this value, it wouldn't change very much if we were to assess	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. MITMAN: But the way you've got it modeled, if one fails then the whole train, then the whole then the or gate fails? MR. HARRIS: Right. MR. HARRIS: Right. MR. LOVELESS: The other question I have is that, I guess, are these numbers your cognitive and your execution MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. MR. LOVELESS: values? MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. We didn't break them down in used HRA calculators using those two elements to come up with a value that we used in this fault tree. MR. LOVELESS: And when send those to us, we'd like to actually have the calculator files so we can pull it up in calculator and look at your selections on your usages. MR. HARRIS: Sure. Okay. So as we quantify the fault tree, our resulting point estimate is 3.1E-2 for this particular recovery pattern. MR. LOVELESS: Before we leave this, one more thing that I struggle with as Im looking at this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	This is the factor that came out of the SHARP 1 methodology. So what we've done is we've used this fault three tree to capture the portion of the analysis we could perform in the HRA calculator and the portion of the analysis that we could would pull from the SHARP methodology, the event tree. And using this quantification or this fault tree, we did calculate a recovery factor associated with 4160-volt. And you note that rather than put the recovery factor for the design development down in the tree, as for each one of these elements we pulled it to the top which provides a little bit of an overestimation of risk associated with that particular parameter. MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman. Before you leave that, the far left solution is the actual solution that you implement, correct? MR. HARRIS: No, this is actually the success, this is actually one of the success paths that we presented to you. Now, given the way that we quantify this value, it wouldn't change very much if we were to assess it based on what we actually did.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. MITMAN: But the way you've got it modeled, if one fails then the whole train, then the whole then the or gate fails? MR. HARRIS: Right. MR. HARRIS: Right. MR. LOVELESS: The other question I have is that, I guess, are these numbers your cognitive and your execution MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. MR. LOVELESS: values? MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. We didn't break them down in used HRA calculators using those two elements to come up with a value that we used in this fault tree. MR. LOVELESS: And when send those to us, we'd like to actually have the calculator files so we can pull it up in calculator and look at your selections on your usages. MR. HARRIS: Sure. Okay. So as we quantify the fault tree, our resulting point estimate is 3.1E-2 for this particular recovery pattern. MR. LOVELESS: Before we leave this, one more thing that I struggle with as I'm looking at this and I struggle with it every time we're looking at a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	This is the factor that came out of the SHARP 1 methodology. So what we've done is we've used this fault three tree to capture the portion of the analysis we could perform in the HRA calculator and the portion of the analysis that we could would pull from the SHARP methodology, the event tree. And using this quantification or this fault tree, we did calculate a recovery factor associated with 4160-volt. And you note that rather than put the recovery factor for the design development down in the tree, as for each one of these elements we pulled it to the top which provides a little bit of an overestimation of risk associated with that particular parameter. MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman. Before you leave that, the far left solution is the actual solution that you implement, correct? MR. HARRIS: No, this is actually the success, this is actually one of the success paths that we presented to you. Now, given the way that we quantify this value, it wouldn't change very much if we were to assess	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. MITMAN: But the way you've got it modeled, if one fails then the whole train, then the whole then the or gate fails? MR. HARRIS: Right. MR. HARRIS: Right. MR. LOVELESS: The other question I have is that, I guess, are these numbers your cognitive and your execution MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. MR. LOVELESS: values? MR. HARRIS: Yes they are. We didn't break them down in used HRA calculators using those two elements to come up with a value that we used in this fault tree. MR. LOVELESS: And when send those to us, we'd like to actually have the calculator files so we can pull it up in calculator and look at your selections on your usages. MR. HARRIS: Sure. Okay. So as we quantify the fault tree, our resulting point estimate is 3.1E-2 for this particular recovery pattern. MR. LOVELESS: Before we leave this, one more thing that I struggle with as Im looking at this

32 (Pages 125 to 128)

	Page 129		Page 131
1	determined at this point would be success paths. But at	1	to option two, failed it and gone to option four
2	the time of an event, it just happens, you're not sure	2	sequentially.
3	what the conditions are, there are going to be failure	3	If we'd have done that, we'd have pursued
4	paths, and those paths are going to be split fractions	4	parallel paths, but given a different set of
5	with these, so they're going to pull off resources,	5	circumstances, would the design evaluations come up a
6	they're going to pull off decisions and you may make the	6	little differently? Yes. But what we are looking at
7	decision to go down a failure path, and that's not	7	the circumstances that occurred, which is the whole
8	modeled in here.	8	basis for setting the event frequency at one in the
9	MR. HARRIS: Well, HRA we don't model	9	first place.
10	failures of commission.	10	MR. LOVELESS: Well, we set the event
11	MR. LOVELESS: We don't typically try to	11	frequency to one and then we have, what we'll call
12	model recovery after a dropped stator.	12	failure memory model where everything beyond that can
13	MR. HARRIS: The questions you're asking	13	fail in different ways at whatever their nominal value
14	are very good questions, and I was thinking earlier when	14	is. Unfortunately we don't have data to show what's the
15	you guys were quizzing Dave and Gary, the questions you	15	nominal value of your TSC failing to come up with these
16	asked us are questions any good PRA or risk analyst	16	ideas. That's the struggle in using these.
17	would ask. And so, when I came on board to participate	17	You're modeling the three that you
18	we asked those same questions.	18	thought of on that day, and I'm not they're probably
19	And I asked these guys, you know, did you	19	the best thing for your plant, you know your plant
20	really do this? And if you did, how did you come to	20	better than I do, I'm not challenging that at all.
21	this conclusion? And if you came to this conclusion,	21	We're simply looking at the frequency and probability of
22	how did you develop these success paths and how far did	22	failing under those types of conditions.
23	you take it? And I walked away from that conversation	23	MR. DAPAS: You had a comment.
24	with these gentleman convinced that those guys had done	24	MCCANN: Thank you. John McCann,
25	the right thing and developed the right tools and the	25	Entergy. We clearly acknowledge that this is, to some
	Page 130		Page 132
1	right models and the right strategies to develop this	1	degree, new ground, right? I mean, we're at a place
2	particular recovery action.	2	where, I think we would all agree, probability of
	L		

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3 MR. LOVELESS: And I understand that. I 4 understand that you took a look at one item and said 5 they did the right thing here, but we're talking about 6 failure probabilities in each of those in the one in a 7 hundred range. So this happens a hundred times and 8 you're going to have different groups of people in your 9 TSC, different response teams, how many times do you 10 have to get that group together before they come up with 11 a failure path that goes the other direction? 12 MR. KOWALESKI: The whole premise, 13 because it's an event that occurred and setting the 14 event frequency to one, is that this event occurred. 15 And so it occurred during this outage. And that's in 16 essence what's bothering you. And I think if you look 17 at the timelines, there is substantial margin in time to 18 account for a lot of these deviations from normal 19 practice. 20 And typically the timelines for an online 21 model your talking about are a couple hours to taking 22 action, minutes to taking action. And we're talking 23 days to taking action. And so, we could have given 24 these installations -- design an installation in time,

could have gone down the path, failed option one, gone

33 (Pages 129 to 132)

failure of any of these success paths is not a hundred

I think this approach that we've come up

with is clearly going to be subject to some tweaking, to

some rethinking. But what we're trying to get across

probabilistic risk assessment. I'm sure we will have

more than ample opportunity, hopefully, to discuss it

MR. DAPAS: I'd offer, John, from looking

Now how do you best determine what that

further, but, you know, for now, that's what we're

at your slides and listening to your discussion, you

indicated you're looking for the realistic estimate of

risk here and you feel that the probability for failure

to restore offsite power was something less than one.

probability is, and then, you know, what influence does

that have when you apply that to your event tree. And

The methodologies and guidance that is

so, I heard there's no definitive standard for

calculating the recovery actions you were using.

available in trying to determine how best to provide

here is this is a logical way to approach it that is

kind of consistent with the way we normally do

percent. But then what is it?

trying to get across.

	Page 133		Page 135
1	that realistic estimate of the risk. I'll offer the	1	MR. LOVELESS: We read this slide earlier
2	questions you are hearing here is in a vein seeking to	2	and weren't completely sure what you were saying. You
3	understand how you apply those and may have some	3	started with well, maybe I'm wrong. Why don't you
4	different views on how best to apply those, but the	4	start with how you applied that.
5	objective, clearly, of this conference is to understand	5	MR. HARRIS: We didn't apply this, first
6	how you applied those and how you arrived at your	6	off. We did not apply this. All we're doing here is
7	results.	7	we've already established what we feel like is the best
8	And I'll offer, should we arrive at a	8	estimate, and using the method that we discussed a few
9	different conclusion, we are subject to the same	9	minutes ago.
10	rigorous evaluation or review of how we got there and we	10	MR. DAPAS: 3.1E-2.
11	have to clearly justify our conclusions and what	11	MR. HARRIS: That's correct.
12	methodology's we used and do that.	12	MR. KOWALESKI: So this is just if you
13	MR. SULLINS: I hope it will help, I was	13	look at it a different way is it even close.
14	a member of the team from the operations' perspective	14	MR. LOVELESS: I understand, but we're
15	and I would look at final result and is say, is that	15	not clear on how you looked at it.
16	reasonable, also look at the activity involved and what	16	MR. HARRIS: So, we simply took a macro
17	are the fatal errors that one could make. And the key	17	that was set up to do, using normal distribution,
18	thing is you don't cause damage through your recovery	18	calculate a probability of success, probability of
19	activities, and there are very few of those type errors	19	failure. We went into that, again, looking at the mean
20	to make, given that we would apply electrical testing	20	time to repair, which, again, we assume to be 60 hours.
21	standards, measuring and checking that there's integrity	21	20 hours we assume for the standard deviation, and then
22	before you put power on a circuit.	22	we calculated, basically it's a plug and chug within
23	And given the time, it's in the modeled,	23	this particular application, put in those values, see
24	but when I looked at are those numbers reasonable, I'm	24	what you get out for success.
25	recognizing that if there's a logic error when they were	25	MR. LOVELESS: So the distribution was a
	Page 134		Page 136
1	Page 134	1	Page 136
1	correcting the or adjusting the logic in the circ	1	time distribution and you just randomly sampled the
2	correcting the or adjusting the logic in the circ water pump breaker, there's ample time to adjust for	2	time distribution and you just randomly sampled the across it and said the tail is
	correcting the or adjusting the logic in the circ water pump breaker, there's ample time to adjust for that and achieve success. So that was the sanity check	2 3	time distribution and you just randomly sampled the across it and said the tail is MR. HARRIS: That's right. It's a very
2 3	correcting the or adjusting the logic in the circ water pump breaker, there's ample time to adjust for that and achieve success. So that was the sanity check applied from an operations perspective.	2	time distribution and you just randomly sampled the across it and said the tail is MR. HARRIS: That's right. It's a very simple analysis.
2 3 4	correcting the or adjusting the logic in the circ water pump breaker, there's ample time to adjust for that and achieve success. So that was the sanity check applied from an operations perspective. MR. HARRIS: And the main thing we want	2 3 4	time distribution and you just randomly sampled the across it and said the tail is MR. HARRIS: That's right. It's a very simple analysis. MR. MITMAN: So the 2.63 is the mean
2 3 4 5	correcting the or adjusting the logic in the circ water pump breaker, there's ample time to adjust for that and achieve success. So that was the sanity check applied from an operations perspective. MR. HARRIS: And the main thing we want you to get out of this is to understand what we did.	2 3 4 5	time distribution and you just randomly sampled the across it and said the tail is MR. HARRIS: That's right. It's a very simple analysis. MR. MITMAN: So the 2.63 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis?
2 3 4 5 6	correcting the or adjusting the logic in the circ water pump breaker, there's ample time to adjust for that and achieve success. So that was the sanity check applied from an operations perspective. MR. HARRIS: And the main thing we want you to get out of this is to understand what we did. And you asked some good questions and you've asked for	2 3 4 5 6	time distribution and you just randomly sampled the across it and said the tail is MR. HARRIS: That's right. It's a very simple analysis. MR. MITMAN: So the 2.63 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis? MR. HARRIS: That's correct. Jeff
2 3 4 5 6 7	correcting the or adjusting the logic in the circ water pump breaker, there's ample time to adjust for that and achieve success. So that was the sanity check applied from an operations perspective. MR. HARRIS: And the main thing we want you to get out of this is to understand what we did. And you asked some good questions and you've asked for some documentation that we owe you. So we can sit down,	2 3 4 5 6 7	time distribution and you just randomly sampled the across it and said the tail is MR. HARRIS: That's right. It's a very simple analysis. MR. MITMAN: So the 2.63 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis? MR. HARRIS: That's correct. Jeff clarified that in his slide.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	correcting the or adjusting the logic in the circ water pump breaker, there's ample time to adjust for that and achieve success. So that was the sanity check applied from an operations perspective. MR. HARRIS: And the main thing we want you to get out of this is to understand what we did. And you asked some good questions and you've asked for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	time distribution and you just randomly sampled the across it and said the tail is MR. HARRIS: That's right. It's a very simple analysis. MR. MITMAN: So the 2.63 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis? MR. HARRIS: That's correct. Jeff
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	correcting the or adjusting the logic in the circ water pump breaker, there's ample time to adjust for that and achieve success. So that was the sanity check applied from an operations perspective. MR. HARRIS: And the main thing we want you to get out of this is to understand what we did. And you asked some good questions and you've asked for some documentation that we owe you. So we can sit down, you know, outside of this purview and go through the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	time distribution and you just randomly sampled the across it and said the tail is MR. HARRIS: That's right. It's a very simple analysis. MR. MITMAN: So the 2.63 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis? MR. HARRIS: That's correct. Jeff clarified that in his slide. MR. MITMAN: The 2.6E-3 is
2 3 5 7 8 9 10	correcting the or adjusting the logic in the circ water pump breaker, there's ample time to adjust for that and achieve success. So that was the sanity check applied from an operations perspective. MR. HARRIS: And the main thing we want you to get out of this is to understand what we did. And you asked some good questions and you've asked for some documentation that we owe you. So we can sit down, you know, outside of this purview and go through the analysis and we'll be available to answer any of these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	time distribution and you just randomly sampled the across it and said the tail is MR. HARRIS: That's right. It's a very simple analysis. MR. MITMAN: So the 2.63 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis? MR. HARRIS: That's correct. Jeff clarified that in his slide. MR. MITMAN: The 2.6E-3 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis.
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	correcting the or adjusting the logic in the circ water pump breaker, there's ample time to adjust for that and achieve success. So that was the sanity check applied from an operations perspective. MR. HARRIS: And the main thing we want you to get out of this is to understand what we did. And you asked some good questions and you've asked for some documentation that we owe you. So we can sit down, you know, outside of this purview and go through the analysis and we'll be available to answer any of these questions as well.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	time distribution and you just randomly sampled the across it and said the tail is MR. HARRIS: That's right. It's a very simple analysis. MR. MITMAN: So the 2.63 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis? MR. HARRIS: That's correct. Jeff clarified that in his slide. MR. MITMAN: The 2.6E-3 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis. MR. HARRIS: That's right.
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	correcting the or adjusting the logic in the circ water pump breaker, there's ample time to adjust for that and achieve success. So that was the sanity check applied from an operations perspective. MR. HARRIS: And the main thing we want you to get out of this is to understand what we did. And you asked some good questions and you've asked for some documentation that we owe you. So we can sit down, you know, outside of this purview and go through the analysis and we'll be available to answer any of these questions as well. So, in the alternate evaluation, really	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	time distribution and you just randomly sampled the across it and said the tail is MR. HARRIS: That's right. It's a very simple analysis. MR. MITMAN: So the 2.63 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis? MR. HARRIS: That's correct. Jeff clarified that in his slide. MR. MITMAN: The 2.6E-3 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis. MR. HARRIS: That's right. (Many speakers on top of one another)
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 12	correcting the or adjusting the logic in the circ water pump breaker, there's ample time to adjust for that and achieve success. So that was the sanity check applied from an operations perspective. MR. HARRIS: And the main thing we want you to get out of this is to understand what we did. And you asked some good questions and you've asked for some documentation that we owe you. So we can sit down, you know, outside of this purview and go through the analysis and we'll be available to answer any of these questions as well. So, in the alternate evaluation, really what we're doing here is we're just trying to take some different approaches, much like Gary said, that it makes sense to him that what we were doing was reasonable and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	time distribution and you just randomly sampled the across it and said the tail is MR. HARRIS: That's right. It's a very simple analysis. MR. MITMAN: So the 2.63 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis? MR. HARRIS: That's correct. Jeff clarified that in his slide. MR. MITMAN: The 2.6E-3 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis. MR. HARRIS: That's right. (Many speakers on top of one another) But it's all driven based on the assumption that 60 hours and a 20-hour standard deviation are correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	correcting the or adjusting the logic in the circ water pump breaker, there's ample time to adjust for that and achieve success. So that was the sanity check applied from an operations perspective. MR. HARRIS: And the main thing we want you to get out of this is to understand what we did. And you asked some good questions and you've asked for some documentation that we owe you. So we can sit down, you know, outside of this purview and go through the analysis and we'll be available to answer any of these questions as well. So, in the alternate evaluation, really what we're doing here is we're just trying to take some different approaches, much like Gary said, that it makes sense to him that what we were doing was reasonable and the results we were getting were reasonable. So we took	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	time distribution and you just randomly sampled the across it and said the tail is MR. HARRIS: That's right. It's a very simple analysis. MR. MITMAN: So the 2.63 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis? MR. HARRIS: That's correct. Jeff clarified that in his slide. MR. MITMAN: The 2.6E-3 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis. MR. HARRIS: That's right. (Many speakers on top of one another) But it's all driven based on the assumption that 60 hours and a 20-hour standard deviation are correct. that is correct
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	correcting the or adjusting the logic in the circ water pump breaker, there's ample time to adjust for that and achieve success. So that was the sanity check applied from an operations perspective. MR. HARRIS: And the main thing we want you to get out of this is to understand what we did. And you asked some good questions and you've asked for some documentation that we owe you. So we can sit down, you know, outside of this purview and go through the analysis and we'll be available to answer any of these questions as well. So, in the alternate evaluation, really what we're doing here is we're just trying to take some different approaches, much like Gary said, that it makes sense to him that what we were doing was reasonable and the results we were getting were reasonable. So we took just a couple of different approaches to say does the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	time distribution and you just randomly sampled the across it and said the tail is MR. HARRIS: That's right. It's a very simple analysis. MR. MITMAN: So the 2.63 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis? MR. HARRIS: That's correct. Jeff clarified that in his slide. MR. MITMAN: The 2.6E-3 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis. MR. HARRIS: That's right. (Many speakers on top of one another) But it's all driven based on the assumption that 60 hours and a 20-hour standard deviation are correct. that is correct we have a high degree of confidence
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	correcting the or adjusting the logic in the circ water pump breaker, there's ample time to adjust for that and achieve success. So that was the sanity check applied from an operations perspective. MR. HARRIS: And the main thing we want you to get out of this is to understand what we did. And you asked some good questions and you've asked for some documentation that we owe you. So we can sit down, you know, outside of this purview and go through the analysis and we'll be available to answer any of these questions as well. So, in the alternate evaluation, really what we're doing here is we're just trying to take some different approaches, much like Gary said, that it makes sense to him that what we were doing was reasonable and the results we were getting were reasonable. So we took just a couple of different approaches to say does the numbers that we're getting make sense in relation to a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	time distribution and you just randomly sampled the across it and said the tail is MR. HARRIS: That's right. It's a very simple analysis. MR. MITMAN: So the 2.63 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis? MR. HARRIS: That's correct. Jeff clarified that in his slide. MR. MITMAN: The 2.6E-3 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis. MR. HARRIS: That's right. (Many speakers on top of one another) But it's all driven based on the assumption that 60 hours and a 20-hour standard deviation are correct. that is correct we have a high degree of confidence if you could change those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	correcting the or adjusting the logic in the circ water pump breaker, there's ample time to adjust for that and achieve success. So that was the sanity check applied from an operations perspective. MR. HARRIS: And the main thing we want you to get out of this is to understand what we did. And you asked some good questions and you've asked for some documentation that we owe you. So we can sit down, you know, outside of this purview and go through the analysis and we'll be available to answer any of these questions as well. So, in the alternate evaluation, really what we're doing here is we're just trying to take some different approaches, much like Gary said, that it makes sense to him that what we were doing was reasonable and the results we were getting were reasonable. So we took just a couple of different approaches to say does the numbers that we're getting make sense in relation to a different look.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	time distribution and you just randomly sampled the across it and said the tail is MR. HARRIS: That's right. It's a very simple analysis. MR. MITMAN: So the 2.63 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis? MR. HARRIS: That's correct. Jeff clarified that in his slide. MR. MITMAN: The 2.6E-3 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis. MR. HARRIS: That's right. (Many speakers on top of one another) But it's all driven based on the assumption that 60 hours and a 20-hour standard deviation are correct. that is correct we have a high degree of confidence if you could change those based on the discussions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	correcting the or adjusting the logic in the circ water pump breaker, there's ample time to adjust for that and achieve success. So that was the sanity check applied from an operations perspective. MR. HARRIS: And the main thing we want you to get out of this is to understand what we did. And you asked some good questions and you've asked for some documentation that we owe you. So we can sit down, you know, outside of this purview and go through the analysis and we'll be available to answer any of these questions as well. So, in the alternate evaluation, really what we're doing here is we're just trying to take some different approaches, much like Gary said, that it makes sense to him that what we were doing was reasonable and the results we were getting was reasonable. So we took just a couple of different approaches to say does the numbers that we're getting make sense in relation to a different look. Here we looked we just used a simple	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	time distribution and you just randomly sampled the across it and said the tail is MR. HARRIS: That's right. It's a very simple analysis. MR. MITMAN: So the 2.63 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis? MR. HARRIS: That's correct. Jeff clarified that in his slide. MR. MITMAN: The 2.6E-3 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis. MR. HARRIS: That's right. (Many speakers on top of one another) But it's all driven based on the assumption that 60 hours and a 20-hour standard deviation are correct. that is correct we have a high degree of confidence if you could change those based on the discussions the 20 hours, we could debate that all
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	correcting the or adjusting the logic in the circ water pump breaker, there's ample time to adjust for that and achieve success. So that was the sanity check applied from an operations perspective. MR. HARRIS: And the main thing we want you to get out of this is to understand what we did. And you asked some good questions and you've asked for some documentation that we owe you. So we can sit down, you know, outside of this purview and go through the analysis and we'll be available to answer any of these questions as well. So, in the alternate evaluation, really what we're doing here is we're just trying to take some different approaches, much like Gary said, that it makes sense to him that what we were doing was reasonable and the results we were getting was reasonable. So we took just a couple of different approaches to say does the numbers that we're getting make sense in relation to a different look. Here we looked we just used a simple statistical method, and using a normal distribution,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	time distribution and you just randomly sampled the across it and said the tail is MR. HARRIS: That's right. It's a very simple analysis. MR. MITMAN: So the 2.63 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis? MR. HARRIS: That's correct. Jeff clarified that in his slide. MR. MITMAN: The 2.6E-3 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis. MR. HARRIS: That's right. (Many speakers on top of one another) But it's all driven based on the assumption that 60 hours and a 20-hour standard deviation are correct. that is correct we have a high degree of confidence if you could change those the 20 hours, we could debate that all day, but I don't think that would serve our mutual
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	correcting the or adjusting the logic in the circ water pump breaker, there's ample time to adjust for that and achieve success. So that was the sanity check applied from an operations perspective. MR. HARRIS: And the main thing we want you to get out of this is to understand what we did. And you asked some good questions and you've asked for some documentation that we owe you. So we can sit down, you know, outside of this purview and go through the analysis and we'll be available to answer any of these questions as well. So, in the alternate evaluation, really what we're doing here is we're just trying to take some different approaches, much like Gary said, that it makes sense to him that what we were doing was reasonable and the results we were getting were reasonable. So we took just a couple of different approaches to say does the numbers that we're getting make sense in relation to a different look. Here we looked we just used a simple statistical method, and using a normal distribution, mean time to repair, assuming 60 hours, which is the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>time distribution and you just randomly sampled the across it and said the tail is MR. HARRIS: That's right. It's a very simple analysis. MR. MITMAN: So the 2.63 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis? MR. HARRIS: That's correct. Jeff clarified that in his slide. MR. MITMAN: The 2.6E-3 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis. MR. HARRIS: That's right. (Many speakers on top of one another) But it's all driven based on the assumption that 60 hours and a 20-hour standard deviation are correct. that is correct we have a high degree of confidence if you could change those based on the discussions the 20 hours, we could debate that all day, but I don't think that would serve our mutual purpose.</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	correcting the or adjusting the logic in the circ water pump breaker, there's ample time to adjust for that and achieve success. So that was the sanity check applied from an operations perspective. MR. HARRIS: And the main thing we want you to get out of this is to understand what we did. And you asked some good questions and you've asked for some documentation that we owe you. So we can sit down, you know, outside of this purview and go through the analysis and we'll be available to answer any of these questions as well. So, in the alternate evaluation, really what we're doing here is we're just trying to take some different approaches, much like Gary said, that it makes sense to him that what we were doing was reasonable and the results we were getting were reasonable. So we took just a couple of different approaches to say does the numbers that we're getting make sense in relation to a different look. Here we looked we just used a simple statistical method, and using a normal distribution, mean time to repair, assuming 60 hours, which is the long leg for the Startup 1 recovery effort, and a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>time distribution and you just randomly sampled the across it and said the tail is MR. HARRIS: That's right. It's a very simple analysis. MR. MITMAN: So the 2.63 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis? MR. HARRIS: That's correct. Jeff clarified that in his slide. MR. MITMAN: The 2.6E-3 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis. MR. HARRIS: That's right. (Many speakers on top of one another) But it's all driven based on the assumption that 60 hours and a 20-hour standard deviation are correct. that is correct we have a high degree of confidence if you could change those based on the discussions the 20 hours, we could debate that all day, but I don't think that would serve our mutual purpose. MR. DAPAS: I think we're making progress</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	correcting the or adjusting the logic in the circ water pump breaker, there's ample time to adjust for that and achieve success. So that was the sanity check applied from an operations perspective. MR. HARRIS: And the main thing we want you to get out of this is to understand what we did. And you asked some good questions and you've asked for some documentation that we owe you. So we can sit down, you know, outside of this purview and go through the analysis and we'll be available to answer any of these questions as well. So, in the alternate evaluation, really what we're doing here is we're just trying to take some different approaches, much like Gary said, that it makes sense to him that what we were doing was reasonable and the results we were getting were reasonable. So we took just a couple of different approaches to say does the numbers that we're getting make sense in relation to a different look. Here we looked we just used a simple statistical method, and using a normal distribution, mean time to repair, assuming 60 hours, which is the long leg for the Startup 1 recovery effort, and a standard deviation of 20 hours, gives you a probability	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<pre>time distribution and you just randomly sampled the across it and said the tail is MR. HARRIS: That's right. It's a very simple analysis. MR. MITMAN: So the 2.63 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis? MR. HARRIS: That's correct. Jeff clarified that in his slide. MR. MITMAN: The 2.6E-3 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis. MR. HARRIS: That's right. (Many speakers on top of one another) But it's all driven based on the assumption that 60 hours and a 20-hour standard deviation are correct. that is correct we have a high degree of confidence if you could change those based on the discussions the 20 hours, we could debate that all day, but I don't think that would serve our mutual purpose. MR. DAPAS: I think we're making progress in terms of it being all day here.</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	correcting the or adjusting the logic in the circ water pump breaker, there's ample time to adjust for that and achieve success. So that was the sanity check applied from an operations perspective. MR. HARRIS: And the main thing we want you to get out of this is to understand what we did. And you asked some good questions and you've asked for some documentation that we owe you. So we can sit down, you know, outside of this purview and go through the analysis and we'll be available to answer any of these questions as well. So, in the alternate evaluation, really what we're doing here is we're just trying to take some different approaches, much like Gary said, that it makes sense to him that what we were doing was reasonable and the results we were getting were reasonable. So we took just a couple of different approaches to say does the numbers that we're getting make sense in relation to a different look. Here we looked we just used a simple statistical method, and using a normal distribution, mean time to repair, assuming 60 hours, which is the long leg for the Startup 1 recovery effort, and a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>time distribution and you just randomly sampled the across it and said the tail is MR. HARRIS: That's right. It's a very simple analysis. MR. MITMAN: So the 2.63 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis? MR. HARRIS: That's correct. Jeff clarified that in his slide. MR. MITMAN: The 2.6E-3 is the mean failure probability out of that analysis. MR. HARRIS: That's right. (Many speakers on top of one another) But it's all driven based on the assumption that 60 hours and a 20-hour standard deviation are correct. that is correct we have a high degree of confidence if you could change those based on the discussions the 20 hours, we could debate that all day, but I don't think that would serve our mutual purpose. MR. DAPAS: I think we're making progress</pre>

34 (Pages 133 to 136)

	Page 137		Page 139
1	So alternate two, in this case all we did was we assumed	1	developed to supply power to the 4160 buses. Those were
2	the fact that we did have off offsite power restored in	2	to some degree scoped out during the event, okay you had
3	4.4 days, we knew that we had an available time of	3	those conceptually in your mind, you started to think
4	4.8 days. We look at the fact that night orders were	4	about them and what resources you would need and what
5	in place, operator actions to close the breakers and	5	analysis you would have to do and maybe even start
6	energize the buses were not complicated, and we simply	6	thinking about writing work orders.
7	did an HRA used the HRA calculator in this particular	7	But this other contingency to supply
8	application to find out what the value would be for	8	480-volt power to the borated water transfer pump, you
9	failure probability, and we came up with 2.0E-3.	9	didn't think of that during the process, during the
10	Again, this assumes actual condition. We	10	event. That was something that was developed after the
11	were, we actually had power, how long would it take us	11	event was over, you restored power, and now you were
12	to get that power in place should we need it.	12	thinking about risk.
13	MR. LOVELESS: Rather than assume for	13	Do I understand that correctly?
14	you, once you the conditions you were at, my	14	MR. HARRIS: That is correct. But as
15	understanding, you had to make a decision that you were	15	David and Gary talked about earlier, our processes would
16	in an emergency, you met your emergency standards. Some	16	have driven this.
17	amount of time, I'm assuming not a lot, at that point	17	MR. MITMAN: Personally, I think that
18	you had to go out and close the breaker, what's the next	18	this is a success path with it's a very valuable
19	operator actions at that point? You've been boiling in	19	success path. Have you incorporated it into your
20	there for a long time, you're way down, I'm going to	20	procedures as of this point more than it was previously
21	guess probably whatever the next operator actions, the	21	incorporated into your procedures.
22	timing, just getting power to the bus is not successful	22	MR. HARRIS: I'll let Gary or David
23	by itself.	23	respond to that.
24	MR. HARRIS: That's a very good point.	24	MR. SULLINS: Not yet, but we've had
25	All this looks at is restoring power to that bus. There	25	active discussions regarding that. It highlighted the
	Page 138		Page 140
1	would be additional operator actions that are needed.	1	value of this pump and this strategy.
2	We didn't look at those. And those would increase this	2	MR. MITMAN: I think your point here is a
3	value as well.	3	very vital one, and that is that it's a method that's
4	But again, looking just looking at this	4	completely independent of your failure. And so you

5 perspective, we felt like we've got at least an insight 6 that we didn't have before. And were we to include the 7 things you're talking about, this number would go up. 8 How much would it go up? My guess, it would probably 9 double or triple. So it really wouldn't invalidate what 10 we had done before. Good question. 11 So the final thing we're going to talk 12 about is the inventory recovery in relation to the NRC. 13 We looked at the event tree here and concluded there was 14 no real credit given for this particular recovery action 15 here and David spent a lot of time looking at it. One 16 of the things we looked at in relation to the 4160-volt 17 and the inventory recoveries was, is there any 18 dependencies? 19

And the conclusion, ultimately, is, as
was discussed earlier, there were no dependencies
between 4160-volt recovery and the inventory control.
We had sufficient resources on site to pursue those
paths.

MR. MITMAN: Before you leave that - Jeff Mitman -- the three other contingencies that you

	value of this pump and this strategy.
2	MR. MITMAN: I think your point here is a
3	very vital one, and that is that it's a method that's
4	completely independent of your failure. And so you
5	don't have to worry about, well, if it happened a little
6	bit differently, you know, the damage would have been
7	somewhat different. It doesn't matter. You can simply
8	run something into the plant, know it's coming from a
9	good source, know it's going to an MCC that can be
10	thoroughly isolated from whatever the fault is.
11	MR. HARRIS: Let's go ahead and move on
12	and we'll look at how we modeled this in the fault tree.
13	On the right side of the fault tree, what you'll see is
14	the alternate source of water, the BWST, and that was a
15	question, I think, Jeff had asked earlier today in the
16	discussion was what about the BWST. What we've done is
17	we've modeled restoration of water to the BWST in order
18	to account for this particular recovery.
19	We've also thrown in the failure,
20	mechanical failures for the necessary pumps and then
21	over on the left here, you'll see the development of
22	recovery, the same thing we used from the SHARP 1 event
23	tree model, and the HRA calculations assuming the
24	cognitive execution steps.
25	MR. LOVELESS: This is David Loveless.

35 (Pages 137 to 140)

	Page 141		Page 143
1	The whole right side of this looks like it's fire water.	1	gate.
2	MR. HARRIS: We have the B5B pump. We	2	MR. HARRIS: And just to go to the top
3	assumed credit for a fire truck that was on site at the	3	again, you know, the operator action. If the operator
4	time. And then we had also a decent fire water pump.	4	fails to perform this action, this top gate fails,
5	MR. LOVELESS: Well, during the event we	5	regardless of anything else. That's the biggest
6	had broken headers and that affected mostly how do we	6	argument for the or gate.
7	how would that have come into play?	7	If you quantify this model, or this fault
8	MR. SULLINS: We have three portable	8	tree, we get a value of 4.0E-2. So, given the recovery
9	pumps. And this would have been given priority for at	9	factor we've talked about the results, when we apply
10	least one. We called the local fire department, the	10	these to the NRC's event tree model, and again, we don't
11	London Fire Department was on station standby as a	11	have the entire model, but given what we do have, we
12	contingency for fire water. We did isolate the fire	12	feel like the well, from the results that we've
13	main, the ruptured section, within a couple hours so the	13	determined would be around 5.5E-06 conditional core
14	fire water pumps were available to restore pressure to	14	damage probability.
15	the header in short order. So I don't see that as a	15	MR. KOWALESKI: I do believe when you
16	competing factor.	16	look at two of the inputs on the ultimate source of
17	MR. LOVELESS: The portions that were	17	water, I believe one of them should be an and gate here.
18	damaged were not used in your fire water makeup	18	I think they're all or, but I think we did have an and.
19	procedures?	19	MR. HARRIS: We can certainly go back and
20	MR. SULLINS: No, it's independent.	20	revisit that. It really won't affect the overall
21	MR. BROWNING: It's completely on the	21	results. The numbers down there are not going to be
22	other side.	22	significantly was there another question?
23	MR. MITMAN: The fault tree that you've	23	MR. BROWNING: This is Jeremy. I was
24	set up here and we've been talking about this fire	24	going to make a comment about the concept around what we
25	protection component of it. That's an or gate up there.	25	were doing. If I could bring you back to the
	Page 142		Page 144
1	Didn't you intend that to be an and gate that not one	1	discussion. An element of this is something that we
2	of, you know, the way it's currently written, any one of	2	would have done during every other refueling outage, so
3	these five things fail and the whole scenario fails.	3	the concept to put it in place, given the question, you
4	MR. HARRIS: That's right.	4	said, you'd have had to thought all this up because you
5	MR. MITMAN: And so it should been an and	5	didn't have it.
6	gate and not an or gate.	6	The concept would have already been there
7	MR. HARRIS: Well, when you look at the	7	because we're jumpering between two buses that we would
8	failures, though, we've got a common cause failure of	8	typically do. That other leg that would come off from
9	all the pumps you've got a common cause failure	9	this connection, we have used that, not in this specific
10		1.0	

Didn't you intend that to be an and gate that not one of, you know, the way it's currently written, any one of these five things fail and the whole scenario fails. MR. HARRIS: That's right.	1 2 3 4	discussion. An element of this is something that we would have done during every other refueling outage, so the concept to put it in place, given the question, you said, you'd have had to thought all this up because you
MR. MITMAN: And so it should been an and	5	didn't have it.
gate and not an or gate.	6	The concept would have already been there
MR. HARRIS: Well, when you look at the	7	because we're jumpering between two buses that we would
failures, though, we've got a common cause failure of	8	typically do. That other leg that would come off from
all the pumps you've got a common cause failure	9	this connection, we have used that, not in this specific
you also have a hydrant we have a valve closure here.	10	application, but in a similar application. So that's
So these failures and then the operator action to	11	why, from my perspective, the basis for why this would
align off that water source the recovery action to	12	be credible is the concepts were pretty much already on
actually take those steps so any of one of those	13	the table. Although we didn't ask the question during
failures would have caused failures to the	14	the event because the need never arose.
MR. CIRCLE: They need to isolate the	15	MR. HARRIS: What you're looking at here
hydrant from everything else.	16	in relation to we performed a sensitivity analysis on
MR. DAPAS: The answer here is you feel	17	the results. Basically, using a factor of about 10 low
an or gate is appropriate. We were questioning why it	18	and a bounding upper value estimate of 0.1 for the
shouldn't be an and gate.	19	4160-volt recovery and the inventory control, Jason
MR. HARRIS: We believe it would be	20	performed this analysis. And basically, we got a range
nonconservative to apply an and gate there. Something	21	of values in E-06. You'll notice the gray blocks in the
we would definitely go back we'll go back and revisit	22	middle is approximately what we got for the point
that. But we believe that to be the case.	23	estimate.
MR. DAPAS: I think our role here is to	24	MR. LOVELESS: Can you explain this to us
see if we can understand why you decided to use an or	25	a little bit better? What it is your

36 (Pages 141 to 144)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Job No. 18996 Nuclear Regulatory Conference with Entergy Operations, Inc.

vucical	Regulatory Conference with Entergy Operations, Inc.	•	Way 1, 201
	Page 145		Page 147
1	MR. HARRIS: If you'll look in this	1	calculator, which has a large number of methods in it.
2	column here on the left you'll see 4kV recovery. The	2	I don't think we have enough information right now to
3	mean value, the point estimate value that we used in the	3	put our hands around it and say that we agree with their
4	analysis is here. Simply went, approximately, in order	4	decision that it was the best tool. I think we do agree
5	of magnitude low and then a bounding value of 0.1 to the	5	that there isn't a definitive method for doing this kind
6	high end.	6	of work.
7	Same thing here for inventory control.	7	MR. MITMAN: And if I can add to that.
8	The mean value is here with a lower value of about,	8	This is Jeff Mitman. It does add some insights in that
9	approximately, 10 and up or down 0.1. So if you go to	9	it's only method that I've ever seen that talks about
10	either one of those boxes here, you can cross reference	10	non-proceduralized actions and untrained actions and
11	and determine what the value you would get if you assume	11	speaks directly to equipment trying to calculate
12	0.1 and 0.1.	12	equipment recovery probabilities using a human
13	MR. CIRCLE: So all the 4kV recoveries	13	reliability method.
14	are all the success paths? Combinations of success	14	So it adds some insights that we didn't
15	paths?	15	have otherwise. But it's not a widely used, widely
16	MR. HARRIS: The 4kV would be the fault	16	adapted, widely geared to methodology. But there's a
17	tree.	17	lot of interesting insights from it.
18	MR. SULLINS: It was dominated by the	18	MR. KENNEDY: Then just another
19	design development factor which was applied at common	19	follow-up. Making an assumption about what our HRA
20	point.	20	calculator limitations are, but just to confirm, I
21	MR. CIRCLE: Right, thanks.	21	assume our limitations are associated with what you just
22	MR. HARRIS: Now, real quickly I would	22	described, Jeff, lack of procedures, lack of training,
23	like just to present, you know, we looked at Jason	23	et cetera or
24	developed an event tree model and quantified the ANO	24	MR. MITMAN: It goes a little bit beyond
25	model using the same results that we've talked about in	25	that. The guidance that we have on how to deal with
	Page 146		Page 148
1	this discussion today for recovery factors.	1	this is expressly laid out in RIS 2008-15, which is
2	Modifying that model, we calculated the	2	specifically written to how to credit in pure A for SDP
3	value of 4.8E-06, which is relatively close to the value	3	and applications. What we call B5B measures, which is
4	that we projected that the NRC model would provide. So	4	what we're discussing here. It's un-proceduralized use
5	in conclusion, I think we can all agree that	5	of non-permanently installed equipment.
6	overwhelming evidence that the fault of the failure for	6	And the guidance in there says that if
7	4160-volt KV is not 1.0. And ANO has researched and	7	you don't train and you don't have procedures and you
8	instituted what we believe to be a reasonable method for	8	don't have the methodology in the base model, you get no
9	assessing risk of recovery factors.	9	credit. All right? That's what the risk says, and
10	And the bottom is just simply restating	10	that's what collectively the circ panel had to contend
11	what I stated a few minutes ago, that we believe the	11	with during our evaluation process. And that's what
12	value to be in the E-6 range associated with risk for	12	we'll have to contend with as we go back to make a
13	the stator drop event in Unit 1.	13	decision.
14	MR. DAPAS: You came up with 4.8E-06 as	14	MR. DAPAS: I just want to comment. I
15	the overall CDF, right?	15	was going to make reference to this in my closing, but I
16	MR. HARRIS: Not CDF, CCDP. That is	16	think it's appropriate to comment now. We have
17	correct.	17	guidance. We need to look at that and, you know, your

- correct. And that concludes our presentation. MR. KENNEDY: I know we asked a lot of
- 20 questions about the SHARP 1 methodology and your 21 evaluation and the process, but I want to hear from both 22 sides. Is the use of that a revolutionary method in our 23 opinion or we just don't know enough about it? 24 MR. LOVELESS: I think SHARP is kind of
- 25 somewhat outdated method. It wasn't put into the HRA

37 (Pages 145 to 148)

overarching point here is that the recovery probability

provided your view on what is the best estimate to use

I think we need to look at that in the

determine does your approach seem reasonable here. I

understand where you used SHARP. I understand where

context of what existing guidance we have here and

here is not failure to recover, is not 1.0. You

18

19

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

for that.

	Page 149		Page 151
1	you've used the HRA calculator. We need to look at that	1	substantially different. So when you do kind of a
2	and determine independently here, do we feel that you	2	comparative to the plant condition after the event to
3	applied that appropriately and are your conclusions	3	normal outage required conditions, and tech spec
4	reasonable here.	4	required conditions, it seems very reasonable that a one
5	Probably a reason why our guidance	5	order magnitude of risk is represented. Because all
6	says, you know, you should use X, Y, and Z here, right,	6	you've done that's different from tech spec requirements
7	because it's probably a function of our experience over	7	is replace an offsite power supply with an emergency
8	time and the challenges you face in trying to come up	8	one.
9	with reasonable risk estimates. So, I think you've done	9	Just an alternative way of looking at it
10	a very good job in my view of explaining how you applied	10	in terms of is this realistic, believable, reasonable
11	the methodology, how you arrived at the risk numbers	11	that this would be the outcome of a significant success.
12	that is you did.	12	Do we need a break?
13	I's offer, unless we have any other	13	MR. BROWNING: Mr. Dapas, it's up to you.
14	questions about how they applied it, I actually see we	14	If you would like a break we can take a break. When you
15	have "break" on the slide here, which leads me to the	15	come back we will look into the Unit 2 risk assessment
16	next point here. Do you want to take about a 10-minute	16	and insights and additional information we would like to
17	break? How would you like to proceed here? We've been	17	provide. And conclude with our corrective actions
18	at it for awhile.	18	around the event.
19	MR. KOWALESKI: Before we go there, I	19	MR. DAPAS: All right. Let's take a
20	would like to add one more point of view to whether a	20	five-minute break here. And I will try to set the
21	order of magnitude risk from normal risk is reasonable	21	example by being disciplined in that regard. If we
22	for the post-event conditions that existed. And that	22	could come back in five minutes that would be great.
23	point of view would be to go look at what's the required	23	(Break taken from 4:44 p m. to 4:52 p m.)
24	power supplies, given a normal outage.	24	MR. BROWNING: Okay. This is Jeremy
25	So in a normal outage with reactor vessel	25	Browning again. Just kind of refocus us a little bit.
	Page 150		Page 152

head off and 23 feet of water above the vessel. The shutdown outage protection plan would require one offsite power supply and two other power supplies or two emergency diesel generators, three power supplies. It would require only one decay heat train and that's because that large inventory of water is essentially credited because if you have a decay heat train fail, there's substantial time to recovery that opposite decay train service. So that the difference between the equipment available after this event in a normal shutdown outage protection plan is the one offsite power supply. If you look at tech spec requirements for reactor vessel head off, it's flooded up, 23 feet above the fuel, the requirements are two power supplies. It requires on offsite and one generator. It requires only one decay heat train. So the difference between what we had and what's required by tech specs for that plant condition, flooded up with the vessel head off, is that one of our power supplies was a diesel generator instead of an offsite power supply. That's the only difference.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	We're switching units. We're going to start talking about Unit 2. Unit 2 is a quite a bit different in that what we're going to be talking about from success paths, we're not talking about design development-type things. Everything that we're going to talk about asking for or pursuing credit is already modeled in our PRA. There's no difference on Unit 2 than Unit 1, the operators did respond in an appropriate manner and all our safety-related equipment in actuality did perform it's intended function. Some of our priorities, what we decided to do and what we decided to pursue on Unit 2 is based on actual plant configuration and not the postulated. If I could I'd introduce John Hathcoat, he is our shift AOM, and he was in the control room the day of the event. MR. HATHCOAT: Thanks. I want to try to move things along, so if I move too fast, please stop me. We'll go back and I'll answer questions. The objectives I want to talk are procedurally directed electrical power recovery strategies. Specifically three different options we had: Offsite power coming
flooded up with the vessel head off, is that one of our	20 21	objectives I want to talk are procedurally directed

4 emergency diesel generators, three power suppli-5 It would require only one decay heat 6 train and that's because that large inventory of w 7 is essentially credited because if you have a dec 8 train fail, there's substantial time to recovery that 9 opposite decay train service. So that the different 10 between the equipment available after this even 11 normal shutdown outage protection plan is the c 12 offsite power supply. 13 If you look at tech spec requirements 14 reactor vessel head off, it's flooded up, 23 feet a 15 the fuel, the requirements are two power supplie 16 requires on offsite and one generator. It require 17 one decay heat train. 18 So the difference between what we ha 19 what's required by tech specs for that plant cond 20 flooded up with the vessel head off, is that one 21 power supplies was a diesel generator instead of 22 offsite power supply. That's the only difference 23 And when you look at the reliability o 24 diesel versus the reliability of the offsite power 25 the frequency of the loss of offsite power, they a

38 (Pages 149 to 152)

1

2

Job No. 18996 Nuclear Regulatory Conference with Entergy Operations, Inc.

Juclear	r Regulatory Conference with Entergy Operations, Inc.	,	May 1, 2014
	Page 153		Page 155
1	availability path. Alternate AC diesel generator to	1	MR. MCKENNEY: And then the reason the
2	4160-volt 2A9 bus, which we already talked quite a bit	2	diesel generator started on the green side was because
3	about that, that availability path. And also the	3	of the Startup 2 breaker being in (gets too quiet to
4	ability to cross tie between red train vital 2A3 bus,	4	hear).
5	4160-volt bus, and green train 2A4 4160-volt bus. The	5	MR. KOWALESKI: There's a particular
6	ability to cross tie those.	6	vulnerability for how that bus comes through the floor.
7	So those are the three main recovery	7	It's different than a breaker. So a small amount of
8	strategies I want to talk about. And the availability	8	water on the floor doesn't cause an issue with the
9	of each one of those independently reduces the overall	9	breakers like it does with that bus coming through.
10	risk profile for Unit 2. And then talk a little bit	10	MR. WILLOUGHBY: This is Leonard
11	about the differences between the NRC model and the ANO	11	Willoughby. I have one question. It was on slide 75.
12	model and how there's no credit provided with the NRC	12	You said you had an uncomplicated post-trip response.
13	model.	13	Can you please define uncomplicated?
14	Just a quick overview. Unit 2 was a	14	MR. HATHCOAT: Yes, sir. At that point
15	hundred percent power when the event occurred. We had a	15	uncomplicated means that there was no adverse conditions
16	reactor trip, as you guys have alluded to, uncomplicated	16	that we had to additionally address as far as, like,
17	post-trip response. The staff did a good job	17	feed water control, or steam bypass control system; any
18	stabilizing everything, going through diagnosing reactor	18	other additional complications that would create a
19	trip recovery.	19	diagnosis other than reactor trip recovery. So the
20	We had normal fast transfer from our unit	20	control room stamped diagnosis reactor trip recovery and
21	aux transformer over to our Startup 3 transformer that	21	stabilized the plant at that point.
22	powered our red side and our green side. And there was	22	MR. WILLOUGHBY: My understanding is that
23	no issues with the plant. Everything was stable at that	23	you had a problem with the feed reg valve, you had a
24	point. And we were supporting Unit 1 at that time.	24	mismatch indication, wouldn't that complicate the trip
25	About 90 minutes later, we had a Startup	25	response? Because you had to send operators out.
	Page 154	<u> </u>	Page 156
1	_	1	
2	3 lockout. And that was a result, the water migration into the 2A1 bus from our Startup 3 to 2A113. That	2	MR. HATHCOAT: We did, we actually actuated emergency feed water during the trip, but the
3	created a Startup 3 lockout, at that point we fast	3	alpha main feed reg valve failure did not constitute a
4	transferred power over to Startup 2. Startup 2	4	complication. That question's come up and we've
5	automatically tied onto our red side, 2A1 bus to our 2A3	5	addressed it.
6	vital bus, stable.	6	MR. BROWNING: I guess by definition, we
7	I did want to point out it did not fast	7	call an uncomplicated reactor (unintelligible) if we go
8	transfer over to the 2A2 non-vital side because of the	8	into reactor trip recovery. If we diagnose an off
9	configuration of our hand switch. We hadn't pull-to-	9	normal procedure that would require us to go to an
10	lock, which basically is a configuration that will not	10	emergency operating procedure or an abnormal operating
11	allow the breaker to automatically close.	11	procedure, we consider it somewhat complicated. But
12	I do want to point out it was available	12	because the operators reactor trip recovery, there were
13	the whole time if we needed it. I'll talk a little bit	13	no significant challenges, although there was a problem
14	about that. We had a hundred voltage condition on the	14	with the P reg valve that did not constitute, for
15	green side 2A4 bus, the No. 2 emergency diesel generator	15	example, a loss of heat or challenge the operator's
16	automatically started as designed, tied on, we had a	16	recovery.
17	stable condition. We had power on the green side, a	17	MR. MITMAN: Jeff Mitman. Just so I'm
18	vital from our diesel, red side from offsite, everything	18	clear. It's my understanding that Unit 2 being a CE
19	was stable, we were focusing on Unit 1 at that point.	19	plant, post trip the normal feed water supply to the
20	MR. MCKENNEY: John, just a couple	20	steam generator to this main feed water.
21	clarifying. This is David McKenney. The fault actually	21	MR. HATHCOAT: It is normal.
22	happened between the transformer and the breaker. So it	22	MR. MITMAN: But because of an indication
23	did not happen in the breaker, it was in the bus work	23	problem with a feed reg valve, the operators shut down
24	batwaan those two	24	normal food water main food water and want to I

normal feed water, main feed water and went to -- I

don't know whether you call it emergency feed water or

between those two.

MR. HATHCOAT: Thank you, David.

24

25

24

Nuclea	r Regulatory Conference with Entergy Operations, Inc.	•	May 1, 201
	Page 157		Page 159
1	aux feed water?	1	diesels available to us and offsite power. We had at
2	MR. HATHCOAT: That's right. Emergency	2	this point, basically four or five power supplies
3	feed water. We have a condition called reactor trip	3	available to us.
4	override, and that main feed water control system goes	4	MR. LOVELESS: This is David Loveless. I
5	into, and if it did not go into reactor trip override,	5	know we talked a little bit about it when we were in
6	which the indication was it didn't, we trip our feed	6	talking abut Unit 1, but I do believe the AIT interviews
7	pump and make sure emergency feed water is actuated.	7	indicated that operators in Unit 2 did not believe
8	That did occur.	8	alternate AC diesel was available to them for some
9	MR. MITMAN: And just so everybody	9	period of time.
10	understands, the analysis that we did, we didn't do a	10	MR. HATHCOAT: To answer your question,
11	normal transient analysis, we did loss of feed water	11	I've talked to the control room supervisor, the shift
12	analysis. We used the loss of feed water train event	12	technical advisor, the shift manager, and multiple SROs
13	tree rather than a transient event tree. Giving credit	13	that were there, and I was there that day, too. We
14	for emergency feed water.	14	didn't really have a good understanding of any damage of
15	MR. HATHCOAT: Leonard, did we answer	15	2A9 until that afternoon. So it was, we fully believed
16	your question, sir?	16	it was available to us to that point. Then we got the
17	MR. WILLOUGHBY: Uh-huh.	17	indication that, hey, there's damage or the cable pull
18	MR. HATHCOAT: So talk a little bit about	18	from going to Unit 1 is pulled out.
19	our Startup 2 design and why we were in a (pull-to-lock?)	19	Now at that point, the question is kind
20	configuration to 2A2. Basically, Startup 2 is capable	20	of subjective. It's like, okay, well, do you follow
21	of supplying both units as we talked about. We have	21	your procedure if you need it in a blackout condition or
22	procedures that limit the number of the buses that can	22	do you go down and asses it before you actually use it?
23	be automatically transferred to 2A2, but as I mentioned,	23	Half of the SROs I asked would basically say we would
24	the configuration we were in, we could have came out of	24	follow through. I know it was just the damage to the
25	the pull lock condition and it would automatically tie	25	Unit 1 side, there was no issue with the breakers on
	Page 158		Page 160
1	on the 2A2 if needed. And it's capable of manually	1	Unit 2. We would have used it, the shift manager
2	loading 2A2 from our Startup to our transformer.	2	basically indicated that, yeah, I know there's
3	So we had Startup 2 transformer available	3	something, I think it's isolated to Unit 1 feeds. I
4	for green train. We had procedural guidance to manually	4	would have relay techs go down there and look in the
5	energize 2A2 if we needed it, but we were in a stable	5	back just to make sure it is isolated. So there is some
6	condition at the time with red power being supplied from	6	subjectivity to that, but every one of the SROs that I
7	off site and our green vital switchgear being powered	7	talked to believed it was available.
8	from our No. 2 diesel.	8	MR. LOVELESS: Do we have capability I
9	So we were in a stable condition, and we	9	know that on the bridge the AIT team lead, but I also
10	did later transfer power to 2A2 from Startup 2	10	know he can't ask a question.
11	successfully with no issues.	11	SPEAKER FROM PHONE: Actually, David,
12	So Unit 2 was in a stable condition with	12	this is Geoff Miller, I led the augmented inspection
13	power to all our safety equipment. Redundant systems	13	team. There was a log entry in the Unit 2 control room
14	were available for decay heat removal, and the alternate	14	logs at 1:30 p m. that indicated that the 2alpha9 bus
15	AC diesel generator was not damaged from the Unit 2 side	15	was degraded and the alternate AC diesel generator was
16	as we talked about earlier, and it was available.	16	unavailable for either unit.
17		17	NO HATHGO AT DI L

- 16 as we talked about earlier, and it was available. 17 And we initially declared the alternate 18 AC diesel generator in 2A9 unavailable, and that was 19 based on the function of 2A9 and alternate AC diesel 20 generator having to supply Unit 1 and Unit 2, both. So 21 we did not fully assess the damage to 2A9. We believe 22 it was just from the feeds going to A1 and A3 on the 23 Unit 1 side. We later confirmed that. 24 I mean, the big thing is we didn't need
- ²⁵ it to support Unit 2. We had, as I mentioned, both

declared unavailable at 13:30 when we got the feed back

MR. KENNEDY: I was wondering where they

MR. HATHCOAT: Yeah, that is not -- that

from the field at that point.
MR KENNEDY:

unavailable. So I think that ...

MR. KENNEDY: But up until that time,

were going because your bullet says initially declared

is a poor choice of words right there. Initially it was

MR. HATHCOAT: Right.

17

18

19

20

21

22

ucieai	Regulatory Conference with Entergy Operations, Inc.	•	Wiay 1, 201
	Page 161		Page 163
1	operators that's what we're talking about. Between	1	hand switch for 2A211 how to pull a line, it would
2	the time of the event 1300, the question is whether	2	automatically tie on. So procedural guidance, operators
3	operators thought it was available or unavailable?	3	would have that available to them to do that.
4	SPEAKER FROM PHONE: This is Geoff Miller	4	The second path in a blackout condition
5	again. I'd also like to just bring out that in that	5	would be the alternate AC diesel generator, and again,
6	period of time there also there had been an emergency	6	we're talking about the availability of it. The fact of
7	declaration on Unit 2 and there was a loss of let down,	7	the matter is, it's physically available to us. We
8	a loss of charging, trip of all reactor coolant pumps,	8	confirmed that later. The question is, how would the
9	so by this point I wouldn't consider to have been	9	operating crew go about getting to that point to
10	uncomplicated.	10	starting it up and loading it. And that's kind of up to
11	MR. HATHCOAT: Well, now that was later.	11	debate a little bit right now as to whether we go down
12	This was the Startup 3 lockout which was 90 minutes	12	and inspect it or we would just execute the procedure as
13	later when all those conditions we were dealing with in	13	it's written and tie it on.
14	the control room. The post trip response was	14	And then the cross tie capability of 2A3
15	uncomplicated. Just to clarify that.	15	and 2A4 is another point that we would use, depending on
16	SPEAKER FROM PHONE: That is true, but	16	where power was coming in, we had the diesel available
17	power for Unit 2 really didn't become an issue until	17	on this side, our offsite power available on this side,
18	that point.	18	we could cross tie over and get our electric driven
19	MR. HATHCOAT: That's right.	19	steam pump to our steam generators which is supplied
20	MR. DAPAS: I think it's fair to say you	20	from the red side.
21	had some challenges here in dealing with the event and	21	So that gives us that capability. Same
22	recovery associated with Unit 2. I understand the	22	thing here, if we had power coming in we could cross tie
23	post-trip recovery was uncomplicated per your definition	23	2A1 and 2A2 you get [coughing] steam pump, which is
24	of what constitutes complicated versus uncomplicated,	24	non-vital but is fully capable of supplying our steam
25	but I think the salient point here is, you had some	25	generator. Do depending on the combination and safety
	Page 162		Page 164
1	challenges here that you had to address subsequent to	1	function that we needed at the time, we could cross tie
2	the initial event here as a result of the impact on the	2	our buses.
3	bus work here, right?	3	As I mentioned, the feed from Startup 2,
4	MR. HATHCOAT: That's correct. Let's	4	we proceduralized – I won't talk about that a whole lot
5	talk a little bit about priorities being dictated by our	5	more, I think everybody has a picture on it. Certainly
6	circumstances. If additional power challenges were to	6	available to us. I don't want to say simple action, but
7	occur after the Startup 3 lockout, we would assess the	7	it's one hand switch in the control room
8	condition that we had, whether it be a loss of offsite	8	MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle. Does
9	power of Startup 2, transformer were to go away we would	9	Startup 2 have enough capacity for both trains?
10	have lost both of our diesels and we would have had a	10	MR. HATHCOAT: It does. And then the
11	station blackout condition, or if we would have had a	11	alternate AC diesel generator, you know, the feeds to
12	feed source with our steam driven EFW pump, we would	12	Unit 2 were unaffected. Visible damage, we talked about
13	have diagnosed appropriate EOP, and we would have	13	being on the Unit 1 side only. It's fully capable of
14	pursued recovery power based on that scenario where we	14	supplying our loads. And this was later confirmed by
15	re-diagnosed.	15	engineering and electrical maintenance that there was no
16	The priority would be feeding from	16	issue on the Unit 2 feeds from 2A9.
17	Startup 2 if it would be available. In the loss of all	17	And the big thing I want to point out is
18	site power condition, obviously wouldn't be, but in this	18	2A9 at this point was not given a high priority because
19	case, if it was available and we lost power to our vital	19	of the stability of the plan on Unit 2. We had offsite
20	buses, we would pursue bringing power in from Startup 2	20	power in, we had a diesel that was running, another
21	is it was available.	21	operable diesel. So our focus, really was on Unit 1 and
~~			

operable diesel. So our focus, really was on Unit 1 and
 supporting them at this time.
 And I mentioned emergency you know EOP

And I mentioned, emergency, you know, EOP
 for station blackout condition, we would have used the
 alternate AC diesel generator to start it and tie it on.

41 (Pages 161 to 164)

We had procedural direction to do that.

Operators are trained on it in the simulator and the

classroom. And really the only action that we would

have to take in the control room would be taking the

22

23

24

	Page 165		Page 167
1		1	
2	Just to give everybody perspective, it takes about	1	side from 2A9 to A3 and A1, right? What I think I heard
3	once the time the blackout would occur it takes us about 15 minutes to re-diagnose the blackout and give the	3	you say is, operators you would have dispatched relay
4	direction to the director operator to actually start it	4	technicians to do a Megger test and that would have been
5	and tie it on.	5	the extent of the condition for you to determine if 2A9
6	So it's about a 15 minute evolution once	6	was in fact available and could be energized from the
7	we actually have the condition. And that's adequate	7	alternate AC diesel and then power the Unit 2 safely.
8	time available to establish a feed source to our steam	8	MR. HATHCOAT: That's correct. We did
9		9	that several days after when conditions were stable and
10	generators. And that's considering, you know, we have in this scenario, in a blackout, we have our steam	10	it tuned out the Meggers test were good and the breakers
11		11	were good.
12	driven EFW pump feeding both steam generators.	12	MR. DAPAS: Okay. What I'm hearing from
13	A blackout gives it, at six-hour point,	13	John is that you were confident that that bus was
14	due to battery depletion, we actually say, okay, let's go ahead and send a local operator down, take manual	14	available and those are the actions you would have
15		15	expected and the operators considered that as an available
16	control of the 2P7 alpha turbine due to DC control circuitry and the DC valves and then transition over to	16	
17	that.	17	MR. HATHCOAT: Absolutely, sir. And I
18	Before go to that point, 6 hours into the	18	was in the control room at the time and I followed up and asked each one of them.
19	procedure, we would have had adequate time for the	19	MR. MITMAN: This is Jeff Mitman. 2A9 is
20	control room staff to call relay techs, send them down	20	immediately next to 2A1 if I remember correctly. All
21	to 2A9, look in the back of it and say, yep, it is just	21	right. In 2A1, there was water on the floor on 2A1. So
22	isolated to Unit 1, and you guys can move forward with	22	is it safe to assume there was water on the floor in
23	tieing it on to one of our safety buses.	23	front of 2A9, all right? And the question I'm getting
24	That's why I wanted to point that out.	24	at is, I would think that the staff would be cautious
25	Even though there is some question about some SROs would	25	about performing a lot of testing on 4160-volt bus work
-	Even though there is some question about some SKO's would		about performing a lot of testing on 4100-volt bus work
	Page 166		Page 168
1	Page 166 move forward with it, some of them would, maybe, suggest	1	Page 168 with water on the floor, and that they're going to be
1 2	_	1 2	_
	move forward with it, some of them would, maybe, suggest		with water on the floor, and that they're going to be
2	move forward with it, some of them would, maybe, suggest going out and getting the relay techs.	2	with water on the floor, and that they're going to be hesitant to do that work.
2 3	move forward with it, some of them would, maybe, suggest going out and getting the relay techs. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle. Are	2 3	with water on the floor, and that they're going to be hesitant to do that work. MR. MCKENNEY: The water on the floor was
2 3 4	move forward with it, some of them would, maybe, suggest going out and getting the relay techs. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle. Are you saying that this all these activities could be	2 3 4	with water on the floor, and that they're going to be hesitant to do that work. MR. MCKENNEY: The water on the floor was very small and had ran in the back of the one cubicle.
2 3 4 5	move forward with it, some of them would, maybe, suggest going out and getting the relay techs. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle. Are you saying that this all these activities could be completed in 15 minutes? Send technicians down?	2 3 4 5	with water on the floor, and that they're going to be hesitant to do that work. MR. MCKENNEY: The water on the floor was very small and had ran in the back of the one cubicle. So this is next to it. There was some water on the
2 3 4 5 6	move forward with it, some of them would, maybe, suggest going out and getting the relay techs. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle. Are you saying that this all these activities could be completed in 15 minutes? Send technicians down? MR. HATHCOAT: No, sir. I'm saying	2 3 4 5 6	with water on the floor, and that they're going to be hesitant to do that work. MR. MCKENNEY: The water on the floor was very small and had ran in the back of the one cubicle. So this is next to it. There was some water on the floor in the front and a little bit in the back. All
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	move forward with it, some of them would, maybe, suggest going out and getting the relay techs. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle. Are you saying that this all these activities could be completed in 15 minutes? Send technicians down? MR. HATHCOAT: No, sir. I'm saying normal procedural guidances is to diagnose the blackout and then give the direction to tie it on procedurally in the control room.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	with water on the floor, and that they're going to be hesitant to do that work. MR. MCKENNEY: The water on the floor was very small and had ran in the back of the one cubicle. So this is next to it. There was some water on the floor in the front and a little bit in the back. All the feeder cables from the alternate AC diesel generator come in the bottom, but it's cables. It's not bus work like this other so, and all the other feeders that go
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	move forward with it, some of them would, maybe, suggest going out and getting the relay techs. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle. Are you saying that this all these activities could be completed in 15 minutes? Send technicians down? MR. HATHCOAT: No, sir. I'm saying normal procedural guidances is to diagnose the blackout and then give the direction to tie it on procedurally in the control room. MR. CIRCLE: Right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	with water on the floor, and that they're going to be hesitant to do that work. MR. MCKENNEY: The water on the floor was very small and had ran in the back of the one cubicle. So this is next to it. There was some water on the floor in the front and a little bit in the back. All the feeder cables from the alternate AC diesel generator come in the bottom, but it's cables. It's not bus work like this other so, and all the other feeders that go out of it come out the top.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	move forward with it, some of them would, maybe, suggest going out and getting the relay techs. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle. Are you saying that this all these activities could be completed in 15 minutes? Send technicians down? MR. HATHCOAT: No, sir. I'm saying normal procedural guidances is to diagnose the blackout and then give the direction to tie it on procedurally in the control room. MR. CIRCLE: Right. MR. HATHCOAT: But if we'd have had a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	with water on the floor, and that they're going to be hesitant to do that work. MR. MCKENNEY: The water on the floor was very small and had ran in the back of the one cubicle. So this is next to it. There was some water on the floor in the front and a little bit in the back. All the feeder cables from the alternate AC diesel generator come in the bottom, but it's cables. It's not bus work like this other so, and all the other feeders that go out of it come out the top. MR. MITMAN: I understand the actual
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	move forward with it, some of them would, maybe, suggest going out and getting the relay techs. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle. Are you saying that this all these activities could be completed in 15 minutes? Send technicians down? MR. HATHCOAT: No, sir. I'm saying normal procedural guidances is to diagnose the blackout and then give the direction to tie it on procedurally in the control room. MR. CIRCLE: Right. MR. HATHCOAT: But if we'd have had a condition where, say the shift manager hey, I want to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	with water on the floor, and that they're going to be hesitant to do that work. MR. MCKENNEY: The water on the floor was very small and had ran in the back of the one cubicle. So this is next to it. There was some water on the floor in the front and a little bit in the back. All the feeder cables from the alternate AC diesel generator come in the bottom, but it's cables. It's not bus work like this other so, and all the other feeders that go out of it come out the top. MR. MITMAN: I understand the actual situation, but we're talking about working around
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	move forward with it, some of them would, maybe, suggest going out and getting the relay techs. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle. Are you saying that this all these activities could be completed in 15 minutes? Send technicians down? MR. HATHCOAT: No, sir. I'm saying normal procedural guidances is to diagnose the blackout and then give the direction to tie it on procedurally in the control room. MR. CIRCLE: Right. MR. HATHCOAT: But if we'd have had a condition where, say the shift manager hey, I want to call relay, send them down there, look in the back of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	with water on the floor, and that they're going to be hesitant to do that work. MR. MCKENNEY: The water on the floor was very small and had ran in the back of the one cubicle. So this is next to it. There was some water on the floor in the front and a little bit in the back. All the feeder cables from the alternate AC diesel generator come in the bottom, but it's cables. It's not bus work like this other so, and all the other feeders that go out of it come out the top. MR. MITMAN: I understand the actual situation, but we're talking about working around energized switchgear at 4,000 volts with water also in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	move forward with it, some of them would, maybe, suggest going out and getting the relay techs. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle. Are you saying that this all these activities could be completed in 15 minutes? Send technicians down? MR. HATHCOAT: No, sir. I'm saying normal procedural guidances is to diagnose the blackout and then give the direction to tie it on procedurally in the control room. MR. CIRCLE: Right. MR. HATHCOAT: But if we'd have had a condition where, say the shift manager hey, I want to call relay, send them down there, look in the back of 2A9 and make sure that there's no issue with it, we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	with water on the floor, and that they're going to be hesitant to do that work. MR. MCKENNEY: The water on the floor was very small and had ran in the back of the one cubicle. So this is next to it. There was some water on the floor in the front and a little bit in the back. All the feeder cables from the alternate AC diesel generator come in the bottom, but it's cables. It's not bus work like this other so, and all the other feeders that go out of it come out the top. MR. MITMAN: I understand the actual situation, but we're talking about working around energized switchgear at 4,000 volts with water also in the vicinity. We've got a busted fire main that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	move forward with it, some of them would, maybe, suggest going out and getting the relay techs. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle. Are you saying that this all these activities could be completed in 15 minutes? Send technicians down? MR. HATHCOAT: No, sir. I'm saying normal procedural guidances is to diagnose the blackout and then give the direction to tie it on procedurally in the control room. MR. CIRCLE: Right. MR. HATHCOAT: But if we'd have had a condition where, say the shift manager hey, I want to call relay, send them down there, look in the back of 2A9 and make sure that there's no issue with it, we would have done that in, say, an hour or less.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	with water on the floor, and that they're going to be hesitant to do that work. MR. MCKENNEY: The water on the floor was very small and had ran in the back of the one cubicle. So this is next to it. There was some water on the floor in the front and a little bit in the back. All the feeder cables from the alternate AC diesel generator come in the bottom, but it's cables. It's not bus work like this other so, and all the other feeders that go out of it come out the top. MR. MITMAN: I understand the actual situation, but we're talking about working around energized switchgear at 4,000 volts with water also in the vicinity. We've got a busted fire main that's distributing water places were it's never intended to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	move forward with it, some of them would, maybe, suggest going out and getting the relay techs. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle. Are you saying that this all these activities could be completed in 15 minutes? Send technicians down? MR. HATHCOAT: No, sir. I'm saying normal procedural guidances is to diagnose the blackout and then give the direction to tie it on procedurally in the control room. MR. CIRCLE: Right. MR. HATHCOAT: But if we'd have had a condition where, say the shift manager hey, I want to call relay, send them down there, look in the back of 2A9 and make sure that there's no issue with it, we would have done that in, say, an hour or less. MR. MCKENNEY: Yeah, I talked to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	with water on the floor, and that they're going to be hesitant to do that work. MR. MCKENNEY: The water on the floor was very small and had ran in the back of the one cubicle. So this is next to it. There was some water on the floor in the front and a little bit in the back. All the feeder cables from the alternate AC diesel generator come in the bottom, but it's cables. It's not bus work like this other so, and all the other feeders that go out of it come out the top. MR. MITMAN: I understand the actual situation, but we're talking about working around energized switchgear at 4,000 volts with water also in the vicinity. We've got a busted fire main that's distributing water places were it's never intended to be water, okay? And I think it's going to slow things down
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	move forward with it, some of them would, maybe, suggest going out and getting the relay techs. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle. Are you saying that this all these activities could be completed in 15 minutes? Send technicians down? MR. HATHCOAT: No, sir. I'm saying normal procedural guidances is to diagnose the blackout and then give the direction to tie it on procedurally in the control room. MR. CIRCLE: Right. MR. HATHCOAT: But if we'd have had a condition where, say the shift manager hey, I want to call relay, send them down there, look in the back of 2A9 and make sure that there's no issue with it, we would have done that in, say, an hour or less. MR. MCKENNEY: Yeah, I talked to the relay techs and asked them specifically how long would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	with water on the floor, and that they're going to be hesitant to do that work. MR. MCKENNEY: The water on the floor was very small and had ran in the back of the one cubicle. So this is next to it. There was some water on the floor in the front and a little bit in the back. All the feeder cables from the alternate AC diesel generator come in the bottom, but it's cables. It's not bus work like this other so, and all the other feeders that go out of it come out the top. MR. MITMAN: I understand the actual situation, but we're talking about working around energized switchgear at 4,000 volts with water also in the vicinity. We've got a busted fire main that's distributing water places were it's never intended to be water, okay? And I think it's going to slow things down at a minimum.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	move forward with it, some of them would, maybe, suggest going out and getting the relay techs. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle. Are you saying that this all these activities could be completed in 15 minutes? Send technicians down? MR. HATHCOAT: No, sir. I'm saying normal procedural guidances is to diagnose the blackout and then give the direction to tie it on procedurally in the control room. MR. CIRCLE: Right. MR. HATHCOAT: But if we'd have had a condition where, say the shift manager hey, I want to call relay, send them down there, look in the back of 2A9 and make sure that there's no issue with it, we would have done that in, say, an hour or less. MR. MCKENNEY: Yeah, I talked to the relay techs and asked them specifically how long would it take in a blackout condition. They said it would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	with water on the floor, and that they're going to be hesitant to do that work. MR. MCKENNEY: The water on the floor was very small and had ran in the back of the one cubicle. So this is next to it. There was some water on the floor in the front and a little bit in the back. All the feeder cables from the alternate AC diesel generator come in the bottom, but it's cables. It's not bus work like this other so, and all the other feeders that go out of it come out the top. MR. MITMAN: I understand the actual situation, but we're talking about working around energized switchgear at 4,000 volts with water also in the vicinity. We've got a busted fire main that's distributing water places were it's never intended to be water, okay? And I think it's going to slow things down at a minimum.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	move forward with it, some of them would, maybe, suggest going out and getting the relay techs. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle. Are you saying that this all these activities could be completed in 15 minutes? Send technicians down? MR. HATHCOAT: No, sir. I'm saying normal procedural guidances is to diagnose the blackout and then give the direction to tie it on procedurally in the control room. MR. CIRCLE: Right. MR. HATHCOAT: But if we'd have had a condition where, say the shift manager hey, I want to call relay, send them down there, look in the back of 2A9 and make sure that there's no issue with it, we would have done that in, say, an hour or less. MR. MCKENNEY: Yeah, I talked to the relay techs and asked them specifically how long would it take in a blackout condition. They said it would take about an hour and about an hour to get it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 with water on the floor, and that they're going to be hesitant to do that work. MR. MCKENNEY: The water on the floor was very small and had ran in the back of the one cubicle. So this is next to it. There was some water on the floor in the front and a little bit in the back. All the feeder cables from the alternate AC diesel generator come in the bottom, but it's cables. It's not bus work like this other so, and all the other feeders that go out of it come out the top. MR. MITMAN: I understand the actual situation, but we're talking about working around energized switchgear at 4,000 volts with water also in the vicinity. We've got a busted fire main that's distributing water places were it's never intended to be water, okay? And I think it's going to slow things down at a minimum. MR. MCKENNEY: Well, in this particular case we'd be in a blackout and be de-energized, right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	move forward with it, some of them would, maybe, suggest going out and getting the relay techs. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle. Are you saying that this all these activities could be completed in 15 minutes? Send technicians down? MR. HATHCOAT: No, sir. I'm saying normal procedural guidances is to diagnose the blackout and then give the direction to tie it on procedurally in the control room. MR. CIRCLE: Right. MR. HATHCOAT: But if we'd have had a condition where, say the shift manager hey, I want to call relay, send them down there, look in the back of 2A9 and make sure that there's no issue with it, we would have done that in, say, an hour or less. MR. MCKENNEY: Yeah, I talked to the relay techs and asked them specifically how long would it take in a blackout condition. They said it would take about an hour and about an hour to get it reenergized. To go to Megger the bus to verify that it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 with water on the floor, and that they're going to be hesitant to do that work. MR. MCKENNEY: The water on the floor was very small and had ran in the back of the one cubicle. So this is next to it. There was some water on the floor in the front and a little bit in the back. All the feeder cables from the alternate AC diesel generator come in the bottom, but it's cables. It's not bus work like this other so, and all the other feeders that go out of it come out the top. MR. MITMAN: I understand the actual situation, but we're talking about working around energized switchgear at 4,000 volts with water also in the vicinity. We've got a busted fire main that's distributing water places were it's never intended to be water, okay? And I think it's going to slow things down at a minimum. MR. MCKENNEY: Well, in this particular case we'd be in a blackout and be de-energized, right? MR. HATHCOAT: Yes. And if I may, Til
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	move forward with it, some of them would, maybe, suggest going out and getting the relay techs. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle. Are you saying that this all these activities could be completed in 15 minutes? Send technicians down? MR. HATHCOAT: No, sir. I'm saying normal procedural guidances is to diagnose the blackout and then give the direction to tie it on procedurally in the control room. MR. CIRCLE: Right. MR. HATHCOAT: But if we'd have had a condition where, say the shift manager hey, I want to call relay, send them down there, look in the back of 2A9 and make sure that there's no issue with it, we would have done that in, say, an hour or less. MR. MCKENNEY: Yeah, I talked to the relay techs and asked them specifically how long would it take in a blackout condition. They said it would take about an hour and about an hour to get it reenergized. To go to Megger the bus to verify that it was not damaged configuration and the breakers were off.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 with water on the floor, and that they're going to be hesitant to do that work. MR. MCKENNEY: The water on the floor was very small and had ran in the back of the one cubicle. So this is next to it. There was some water on the floor in the front and a little bit in the back. All the feeder cables from the alternate AC diesel generator come in the bottom, but it's cables. It's not bus work like this other so, and all the other feeders that go out of it come out the top. MR. MITMAN: I understand the actual situation, but we're talking about working around energized switchgear at 4,000 volts with water also in the vicinity. We've got a busted fire main that's distributing water places were it's never intended to be water, okay? And I think it's going to slow things down at a minimum. MR. MCKENNEY: Well, in this particular case we'd be in a blackout and be de-energized, right? MR. HATHCOAT: Yes. And if I may, I'll try to give a better picture. It wasn't water all over
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	move forward with it, some of them would, maybe, suggest going out and getting the relay techs. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle. Are you saying that this all these activities could be completed in 15 minutes? Send technicians down? MR. HATHCOAT: No, sir. I'm saying normal procedural guidances is to diagnose the blackout and then give the direction to tie it on procedurally in the control room. MR. CIRCLE: Right. MR. HATHCOAT: But if we'd have had a condition where, say the shift manager hey, I want to call relay, send them down there, look in the back of 2A9 and make sure that there's no issue with it, we would have done that in, say, an hour or less. MR. MCKENNEY: Yeah, I talked to the relay techs and asked them specifically how long would it take in a blackout condition. They said it would take about an hour and about an hour to get it reenergized. To go to Megger the bus to verify that it was not damaged configuration and the breakers were off. MR. DAPAS: And so just so I understand.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 with water on the floor, and that they're going to be hesitant to do that work. MR. MCKENNEY: The water on the floor was very small and had ran in the back of the one cubicle. So this is next to it. There was some water on the floor in the front and a little bit in the back. All the feeder cables from the alternate AC diesel generator come in the bottom, but it's cables. It's not bus work like this other so, and all the other feeders that go out of it come out the top. MR. MITMAN: I understand the actual situation, but we're talking about working around energized switchgear at 4,000 volts with water also in the vicinity. We've got a busted fire main that's distributing water places were it's never intended to be water, okay? And I think it's going to slow things down at a minimum. MR. MATHCOAT: Yes. And if I may, I'll try to give a better picture. It wasn't water all over the floor. There was a couple of puddles behind 2A1.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	move forward with it, some of them would, maybe, suggest going out and getting the relay techs. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle. Are you saying that this all these activities could be completed in 15 minutes? Send technicians down? MR. HATHCOAT: No, sir. I'm saying normal procedural guidances is to diagnose the blackout and then give the direction to tie it on procedurally in the control room. MR. CIRCLE: Right. MR. HATHCOAT: But if we'd have had a condition where, say the shift manager hey, I want to call relay, send them down there, look in the back of 2A9 and make sure that there's no issue with it, we would have done that in, say, an hour or less. MR. MCKENNEY: Yeah, I talked to the relay techs and asked them specifically how long would it take in a blackout condition. They said it would take about an hour and about an hour to get it reenergized. To go to Megger the bus to verify that it was not damaged configuration and the breakers were off. MR. DAPAS: And so just so I understand. There's been a lot of discussion about what the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 with water on the floor, and that they're going to be hesitant to do that work. MR. MCKENNEY: The water on the floor was very small and had ran in the back of the one cubicle. So this is next to it. There was some water on the floor in the front and a little bit in the back. All the feeder cables from the alternate AC diesel generator come in the bottom, but it's cables. It's not bus work like this other so, and all the other feeders that go out of it come out the top. MR. MITMAN: I understand the actual situation, but we're talking about working around energized switchgear at 4,000 volts with water also in the vicinity. We've got a busted fire main that's distributing water places were it's never intended to be water, okay? And I think it's going to slow things down at a minimum. MR. MATHCOAT: Yes. And if I may, I'll try to give a better picture. It wasn't water all over the floor. There was a couple of puddles behind 2A1. The busted fire main was outside the wall in the train
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	move forward with it, some of them would, maybe, suggest going out and getting the relay techs. MR. CIRCLE: This is Jeff Circle. Are you saying that this all these activities could be completed in 15 minutes? Send technicians down? MR. HATHCOAT: No, sir. I'm saying normal procedural guidances is to diagnose the blackout and then give the direction to tie it on procedurally in the control room. MR. CIRCLE: Right. MR. HATHCOAT: But if we'd have had a condition where, say the shift manager hey, I want to call relay, send them down there, look in the back of 2A9 and make sure that there's no issue with it, we would have done that in, say, an hour or less. MR. MCKENNEY: Yeah, I talked to the relay techs and asked them specifically how long would it take in a blackout condition. They said it would take about an hour and about an hour to get it reenergized. To go to Megger the bus to verify that it was not damaged configuration and the breakers were off. MR. DAPAS: And so just so I understand.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 with water on the floor, and that they're going to be hesitant to do that work. MR. MCKENNEY: The water on the floor was very small and had ran in the back of the one cubicle. So this is next to it. There was some water on the floor in the front and a little bit in the back. All the feeder cables from the alternate AC diesel generator come in the bottom, but it's cables. It's not bus work like this other so, and all the other feeders that go out of it come out the top. MR. MITMAN: I understand the actual situation, but we're talking about working around energized switchgear at 4,000 volts with water also in the vicinity. We've got a busted fire main that's distributing water places were it's never intended to be water, okay? And I think it's going to slow things down at a minimum. MR. MATHCOAT: Yes. And if I may, I'll try to give a better picture. It wasn't water all over the floor. There was a couple of puddles behind 2A1.

42 (Pages 165 to 168)

Nuclea	r Regulatory Conference with Entergy Operations, Inc.		May 1, 2014
	Page 169		Page 171
1	enough water and enough problems with 2A1 to keep people	1	your
2	away from that bus for hours because they weren't sure	2	MR. BROWNING: That's absolutely fair.
3	what was going on, and there was a reluctance to go in	3	MR. HATHCOAT: I'll move us along here.
4	front of the bus and check out cubicles, and which one's	4	We've already talked about the building the cross tie,
5	damaged and what's the extent of damage? So there's	5	2A3 and 2A4 are vital. 4160-volt buses, we have
6	damage on the bus, there's water in the vicinity, we	6	standard attachments and proceduralized and operators
7	know that water caused the damage on the bus.	7	would have certainly used it if need be on the day of
8	I just think there's going to be the	8	the event.
9	reluctance and the caution, which I think is appropriate	9	So in conclusion, on the Unit 2 side,
10	around this kind of equipment would extend to, at least	10	we've talked about the pretty specific paths that we
11	slow down the normal response that you wouldn't have	11	don't have credit for in the NRC model, and the
12	under more normal circumstances.	12	differences between the NRC model and the ANO model.
13	MR. BROWNING: And those cautions, again,	13	The Startup 2 availability, alternate AC diesel
14	in my mind I'm trying to see what actually happened. We	14	generator, and ability to cross tie or vital buses.
15	were protecting that area because we did have energized	15	So in the end, we ended up with four out
16	equipment. In station blackout when the operators get	16	of five possible power sources were available to the
17	to that step that says go bought the alternate AC	17	Unit 2 control room that day of the event. We had the
18	generator in, it is de-energized.	18	resources, the specific training, and the specific
19	Now before we whatever we would have	19	procedures to utilize all those power sources if needed,
20	done or how we would have approached that would have	20	and the confidence to know that we would have been
21	been a different mindset. When we're in a blackout,	21	there.
22	it's de-energized and how we approach it would be a	22	
23	different approach than the way we actually approached	23	MR. CLARK: Let me ask a question before
24		24	you go on. This is Jeff Clark. So you lost reactor
25	it the day of the event when we had power on those	25	cooling pumps. Did you go into the cool down? MR. HATHCOAT: We did.
23	buses.		MR. HATHCOAT: we did.
	Page 170		Page 172
1	MR. MITMAN: But blackout, as I	1	MR. CLARK: So that was a natural-circ
2	understand it, is defined as de-energizing the vital	2	cool down?
3	buses 2A3 and 2A4. So you could be there with power on	3	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That is correct.
4	2A1 and 2A2 and no power on 2A3 and 2A4. Again, all I'm	4	MR. CLARK: Is that considered normal for
5	suggesting is that there's going to be a little bit	5	Unit 2?
6	extra caution taken when addressing the issue and trying	6	MR. HATHCOAT: Absolutely not. That is
7	to reenergize the vital buses from the AC diesel	7	not normal.
8	generator.	8	MR. KOWALESKI: That is not normal
9	MR. KOWALESKI: We agree, and the	9	operating procedure.
10	probability of failure has been adjusted for that.	10	MR. HATHCOAT: That occurred, not in that
11	MR. DAPAS: That's where I was going to	11	post-trip, that occurred after the Startup 2 lockout
12	go. I think it might be Jeff's done a very good job	12	which caused us to lose our 6900-volt buses.
13	articulating the challenges the operators faced here,	13	MR. KOWALESKI: The immediate trip was
14	and what reluctance may exist. If you think, John, you	14	uncomplicated. 90 minutes later when we lost our
15	accurately, if you characterize from your perspective	15	[unclear] that's when these additional complications
16	how you would approach that. If Jeremy, right, the	16	occurred.
17	mindset that exists when you're in a station blackout	17	MR. BROWNING: Operators re-diagnosed and
18	here.	18	diagnosed the conditions, this is not normal procedure,
19	I think we need to understand how you	19	so they would, again, if we lost the diesel, they would
20	accounted for that. We'll need to in our internal	20	have re-diagnosed and put us in an appropriate EOP where
21	discussions reach a view on how we should appropriately	21	it's functional or blacked out or whatever.
22	account for that. But I'd be interested in	22	MR. CLARK: Okay. Thank you.
23	and another dime have seen for stand that When it as to to	23	MD LIADDIC, Latia managements

- 22 account for that. But I'd be interested in 23
- understanding how you factored that. When it gets to 24
- the uncertainty aspect, you know, we're trying to bound 25 liability analysis and how you accounted for that in

43 (Pages 169 to 172)

MR. HARRIS: Let's move on to

day, I'm going to move through this pretty quickly. And

significance determination. It's getting late in the

23

24

	Page 173		Page 175
1	I just want to hit on the very critical points. We	1	that operator action.
2	looked the at the dominant cut sets that were provided	2	MR. LOVELESS: So you added a new
3	in the NRC assessment for the loss of feed water model,	3	operator action into your model that wasn't there
4	and we looked at what was contributing to that on a	4	before?
5	sequences we noted that we needed power, okay?	5	MR. HATHCOAT: Correct.
6	Given that and the discussion that John	6	MR. LOVELESS: And what is that specific
7	just provided with you, we looked at 2A2, alternate AC,	7	action?
8	and the cross tie between 2A3 and 2A4. As John	8	MR. HALL: If one of those breakers when
9	indicated, 2A2 was available. It's a simple matter of	9	you load shed from Startup 2, If they don't if the
10	pull the lock, procedures in place by operations. Our	10	breakers fail, an operator will go down and pull, and
11	current model for ANO 2 has a failure to recover that	11	manually operate the breaker. And there's several
12	8.0E-4 because it is in the control room, it's a simple	12	breakers. That's included in my analysis for the
13	action, not much time taken to do that.	13	MR. LOVELESS: Okay.
14	I guess the recovery that's most	14	MR. HARRIS: So performing a using an
15	challenging would be alternate AC and taking credit for	15	insert program, simply using insert, performed a
16	that. Model we do have a recovery action in the	16	sensitivity analysis surrounding a point estimate we
17	model for the alternate AC. However, because of the	17	calculated for the Unit 2 results. We determined that
18	issues associated with alternate AC, we felt like we	18	3.9E-07 is the probability for the lower bound and
19	needed to make some adjustments in model to account for	19	5.3E-06 for the upper bound.
20	these.	20	MR. LOVELESS: What was it that you
21	And what we did was pretty simply we took	21	adjusted for that sensitivity analysis?
22	out availability on the alternate AC and we applied a	22	MR. HARRIS: That we adjusted we ran
23	0.1 factor for unavailability to increase that to .17	23	insert using the point estimate for the additional core
24	from the nominal value to account for the fact that the	24	damage probability.
25	alternate AC did have some issues, it wasn't straight	25	MR. LOVELESS: So it's like a Monte Carlo

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	forward, it wouldn't, you know the operator may have had to take additional time to insure that that particular success path was available. And the final one, again, is the 2A3/2A4 cross tie capability. Again, it is in our model and we have a value of 2.0E-4 associated with that value. So when we look at the Unit 2 model because we don't have the NRC model again in this case, we calculated a risk of 1.8E-6 conditional core damage probability for Unit 2. MR. LOVELESS: I guess this is what I really don't understand. You say you used values that were in your current model. You say you adjusted the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	simulation? MR. HARRIS: That's right. MR. CIRCLE: So you didn't change any values, you just ran the insert program? MR. HARRIS: That's all we did. That concludes my presentation. MR. KENNEDY: We're getting ready to transition from risk to some other discussions. I just want to make sure we'll have another opportunity, but before we leave the risk, make sure that the senior reactor analyst and these folks don't have any questions before we move on to what is really the non-risk discussion. We'll have another opportunity, you time to
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	were in your current model. You say you adjusted the probability of failure of the alternate AC diesel up a little bit, and yet in October-September timeframe you provided an analysis that shows CCDP of 3.0E-5, presumably from your current model. What's different? MR. HARRIS: And I can't answer that	13 14 15 16 17 18 19	discussion. We'll have another opportunity, you time to think about it. Okay. Not right now? MR. DAPAS: Just check maybe if we could with the risk analyst who joined us on the bridge. I thought I heard a couple. MR. KENNEDY: Sunil, Antonio, do you have
20 21 22 23 24 25	 question. I'll let Jason respond to that. MR. HALL: Originally, with the we had the two 2A9 unavailable in that analysis. It drove the risk up to 3.0E-5 for the CCDP. And we also credited an operator action for the breakers when they were in Startup 2 is being could fail, these breakers would cause the Startup 2 transfer to fail. So we credited 	20 21 22 23 24 25	any comments for us. SPEAKER ON PHONE: Sunil has he left for the day. I don't think that the questions I think I'm having questions asking for information from the licensee to give us an understanding of the basis of the calculations. I think those questions have been asked and we will wait for this information and review

Page 174

44 (Pages 173 to 176)

	Page 177		Page 179
1	it.	1	Basically what we did is include those
2	MR. DAPAS: Thanks See-Meng.	2	same requirements now in our procedural requirements and
3	MR. JAMES: Okay. I'm going to cover	3	the material handling procedure. Those are all
4	very briefly with you the site actions that we took	4	specified in that procedure for these detailed type
5	associated with corrections or improvements to our	5	evaluations will be documented for all future
6	material handling procedure that dealt directly with the	6	applications of similar nature.
7	lifting of the stator. And I'll be very brief on that.	7	We also revised our fleet procedures
8	I think we've covered that in quite a bit of detail	8	associated with project management. What we saw there
9	already. And also describe in more detail actions that	9	is that there was enhancements that could be made,
10	we've taken associated with our project management	10	particularly with respect to the guidance for contract
11	procedure from the root cause that we saw, enhancements	11	language. What we are weren't getting is the details
12	that have been made there to further enhance the	12	that we needed to perform a thorough evaluation. So
13	oversight of those activities.	13	went into that procedure and verified went into that
14	And then finally describe the common	14	procedure and made modifications to ensure that those
15	cause initiative that we have underway that will provide	15	type of documentation associated with code compliance,
16	us with some additional insights as well as any	16	vendor detailed design, calculations were provided, not
17	additional corrective actions that we could take. That	17	just for this type of application, but from any
18	will include a review of the standard op.	18	applications where that would be necessary for us to
19	Just briefly, out of the stator drop root	19	perform an independent review.
20	cause, looking at the activities surrounding the review	20	We also looked at that procedure with
21	that was performed associated with the temporary lift	21	respect to its guidance on the makeup of the project
22	assembly. What we saw is there were weaknesses in our	22	management team. When you looked at the particular team
23	procedure our material handling procedure Unit A 119.	23	makeup for the stator project, what we found is it
24	Clearly that procedure could be improved by us providing	24	lacked the expertise necessary to evaluate this type of
25	additional specification for the review and approval of	25	special application.
	Page 178		Page 180

-		2
design documentation associated with those temporary	1	We had individuals on that team with
lift assemblies.	2	expertise in load handling, large load handling, and
We actually took those lessons learned	3	expertise with respect to civil engineering, but they
and applied them in the lift of the refurbished stator	4	didn't have this particular expertise associated with
that went back into the unit once the construction	5	this application.
activity were completed. Included in there were	6	So what we went and did is went back into
detailed engineering calculation package that documented	7	that procedure and revised it to specifically look for
all that material, which included both the computer	8	specifically require when we put together one of
modeling of the assembly that was used in that	9	these project management teams that we go look at these
particular application as well as hand calculations,	10	particular applications where high consequence
detailed documentation of load testing that was	11	evolutions are occurring as a result of the project and
performed.	12	ensuring that the team makeup either has that expertise
This particular instance we actually load	13	within the staff or that it requires that expertise
tested the complete assembly at vendor's facility as it	14	through a third party or some other application.
would be constructed in the ANO turbine building at	15	MR. DAPAS: Dale, this is Marc Dapas.
greater than 125 percent of anticipated load. That	16	I've got a question along those lines where I see that
assembly was then disassembled and shipped to the site	17	you're looking at verification of a third party,
where we examined all the critical welds associated with	18	independent review of vendor calculations and I assume
it and then reassembled it in the turbine building with	19	that specific to the material handling program
an examination performed by Entergy Engineering at that	20	MR. JAMES: That is correct.
point in time also.	21	MR. DAPAS: The question I have, more
And then finally, a third-party	22	broadly, do you look at do you have the expertise
independent review was performed by an expert that is	23	inhouse to independently assess the quality of the
familiar with all these codes that are applicable to the	24	deliverable products that you're getting from the
design of this particular application.	25	vendors there because there's other applications where

45 (Pages 177 to 180)

	Page 181	Page 183
1	you use contractors, use vendors, so did you leverage	¹ instance, identified the failure of the temporary lift
2	the learnings from this to look at other processes for	² assembly rack, the drop of the stator as a high
3	which we use contractors to ensure that it's not some	³ consequence, low probability event. And we actually
4	issue there that hasn't been identified as a result of	⁴ based upon that put into place a risk mitigation plan to
5	appropriate oversight?	⁵ address that.
6	MR. KOWALESKI: Maybe I could address	6 Part of that risk mitigation plan
7	that. This is Joe Kowaleski. You could put the	7 included a requirement to do a load test on that
8	engineering work by vendors into two broad categories.	⁸ assembly. Now the root cause describes how, why that
9	One would be engineering work which would effect the	⁹ didn't occur, but what we is at that level of decision
10	design of the plant and plant equipment. And we have a	¹⁰ making we could add another barrier by requiring that
11	robust procedure that looks at the risks and	¹¹ those risk mitigation plans be specifically the
12	consequences associated with those activities.	¹² responsibility of a management level individual within
13	And then it applies a structured set of	¹³ our organization that will be accountable to ensure that
14	mitigating actions which include for high consequence	¹⁴ the plan is carried out appropriately and fully
15	items, independent third-party reviews. Sometimes we	¹⁵ documented and evaluated to assure the adequacy of those
16	have that expertise, but more often we'll hire an	¹⁶ plans. We put that in place also since the root cause
17	independent third party to come in and do that type of	¹⁷ was completed.
18	work.	18 As far as communicating the lessons
19	Where this improves our oversight is for	¹⁹ learned out, we've had extensive input with INPO. They
20	vendor, or more particularly, usually, project specialty	²⁰ have provided them the lessons learned so they could
21	vendors that have to do design engineering or	²¹ communicate that information out to the industry. In
22	engineering calculations in support of project work,	²² fact, Jeremy just recently participated in a web cast to
23	such as a special lifter. Now, and there's other	²³ the industry where we discussed the event and the
24	examples of that, like a generator bundle.	²⁴ lessons learned, I believe there was over 150 industry
25	So this, where we needed to improve this	²⁵ participant.
	Page 182	Page 184
1	Page 182	Page 184 MR BROWNING: Actually it was closer to
1 2	was relative to engineering done in support of project	¹ MR. BROWNING: Actually, it was closer to
	was relative to engineering done in support of project activities. And so that's what this is looking at.	 MR. BROWNING: Actually, it was closer to 200. And the significance of that is IER is coming out
2	was relative to engineering done in support of project activities. And so that's what this is looking at. We've taken some actions with that, which is	 MR. BROWNING: Actually, it was closer to 200. And the significance of that is IER is coming out on this event. It was very focused on cause and
2 3	was relative to engineering done in support of project activities. And so that's what this is looking at. We've taken some actions with that, which is identification to make sure we've got the expertise. We	 MR. BROWNING: Actually, it was closer to 200. And the significance of that is IER is coming out on this event. It was very focused on cause and corrective actions and because this event occurred in
2 3 4	was relative to engineering done in support of project activities. And so that's what this is looking at. We've taken some actions with that, which is identification to make sure we've got the expertise. We have an ongoing evaluation to look at applying that	 MR. BROWNING: Actually, it was closer to 200. And the significance of that is IER is coming out on this event. It was very focused on cause and corrective actions and because this event occurred in Arkansas, you can say Im the primary sponsor of that
2 3 4 5	was relative to engineering done in support of project activities. And so that's what this is looking at. We've taken some actions with that, which is identification to make sure we've got the expertise. We have an ongoing evaluation to look at applying that engineering procedure to project task engineering as	 MR. BROWNING: Actually, it was closer to 200. And the significance of that is IER is coming out on this event. It was very focused on cause and corrective actions and because this event occurred in Arkansas, you can say Im the primary sponsor of that IER and I'm going to be imposing through INPO actions
2 3 4 5 6	was relative to engineering done in support of project activities. And so that's what this is looking at. We've taken some actions with that, which is identification to make sure we've got the expertise. We have an ongoing evaluation to look at applying that engineering procedure to project task engineering as well as design engineering. And that is not is complete	 MR. BROWNING: Actually, it was closer to 200. And the significance of that is IER is coming out on this event. It was very focused on cause and corrective actions and because this event occurred in Arkansas, you can say Im the primary sponsor of that IER and Im going to be imposing through INPO actions for the industry to take.
2 3 4 5 6 7	was relative to engineering done in support of project activities. And so that's what this is looking at. We've taken some actions with that, which is identification to make sure we've got the expertise. We have an ongoing evaluation to look at applying that engineering procedure to project task engineering as	 MR. BROWNING: Actually, it was closer to 200. And the significance of that is IER is coming out on this event. It was very focused on cause and corrective actions and because this event occurred in Arkansas, you can say I'm the primary sponsor of that IER and I'm going to be imposing through INPO actions for the industry to take. 8 So if I felt it was very important for my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	was relative to engineering done in support of project activities. And so that's what this is looking at. We've taken some actions with that, which is identification to make sure we've got the expertise. We have an ongoing evaluation to look at applying that engineering procedure to project task engineering as well as design engineering. And that is not is complete yet for the fleet, but we are in the process of doing that.	 MR. BROWNING: Actually, it was closer to 200. And the significance of that is IER is coming out on this event. It was very focused on cause and corrective actions and because this event occurred in Arkansas, you can say I'm the primary sponsor of that IER and I'm going to be imposing through INPO actions for the industry to take. So if I felt it was very important for my peers to understand the significance of the consequence,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	was relative to engineering done in support of project activities. And so that's what this is looking at. We've taken some actions with that, which is identification to make sure we've got the expertise. We have an ongoing evaluation to look at applying that engineering procedure to project task engineering as well as design engineering. And that is not is complete yet for the fleet, but we are in the process of doing	 MR. BROWNING: Actually, it was closer to 200. And the significance of that is IER is coming out on this event. It was very focused on cause and corrective actions and because this event occurred in Arkansas, you can say I'm the primary sponsor of that IER and I'm going to be imposing through INPO actions for the industry to take. So if I felt it was very important for my peers to understand the significance of the consequence, the importance of the cause, and the understanding of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	was relative to engineering done in support of project activities. And so that's what this is looking at. We've taken some actions with that, which is identification to make sure we've got the expertise. We have an ongoing evaluation to look at applying that engineering procedure to project task engineering as well as design engineering. And that is not is complete yet for the fleet, but we are in the process of doing that. MR. DAPAS: Okay. Thank you.	 MR. BROWNING: Actually, it was closer to 200. And the significance of that is IER is coming out on this event. It was very focused on cause and corrective actions and because this event occurred in Arkansas, you can say I'm the primary sponsor of that IER and I'm going to be imposing through INPO actions for the industry to take. So if I felt it was very important for my peers to understand the significance of the consequence, the importance of the cause, and the understanding of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	was relative to engineering done in support of project activities. And so that's what this is looking at. We've taken some actions with that, which is identification to make sure we've got the expertise. We have an ongoing evaluation to look at applying that engineering procedure to project task engineering as well as design engineering. And that is not is complete yet for the fleet, but we are in the process of doing that. MR. DAPAS: Okay. Thank you. MR. JAMES: We also, as part of our	 MR. BROWNING: Actually, it was closer to 200. And the significance of that is IER is coming out on this event. It was very focused on cause and corrective actions and because this event occurred in Arkansas, you can say Im the primary sponsor of that IER and I'm going to be imposing through INPO actions for the industry to take. So if I felt it was very important for my peers to understand the significance of the consequence, the importance of the cause, and the understanding of the cause, and then this IER results in industry-wide
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	was relative to engineering done in support of project activities. And so that's what this is looking at. We've taken some actions with that, which is identification to make sure we've got the expertise. We have an ongoing evaluation to look at applying that engineering procedure to project task engineering as well as design engineering. And that is not is complete yet for the fleet, but we are in the process of doing that. MR. DAPAS: Okay. Thank you. MR. JAMES: We also, as part of our corrective actions took an action to reinforce the	 MR. BROWNING: Actually, it was closer to 200. And the significance of that is IER is coming out on this event. It was very focused on cause and corrective actions and because this event occurred in Arkansas, you can say I'm the primary sponsor of that IER and I'm going to be imposing through INPO actions for the industry to take. So if I felt it was very important for my peers to understand the significance of the consequence, the importance of the cause, and the understanding of the cause, and then this IER results in industry-wide actions, that they understand the basis for those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	was relative to engineering done in support of project activities. And so that's what this is looking at. We've taken some actions with that, which is identification to make sure we've got the expertise. We have an ongoing evaluation to look at applying that engineering procedure to project task engineering as well as design engineering. And that is not is complete yet for the fleet, but we are in the process of doing that. MR. DAPAS: Okay. Thank you. MR. JAMES: We also, as part of our corrective actions took an action to reinforce the standards in our associated with vendor oversights	 MR. BROWNING: Actually, it was closer to 200. And the significance of that is IER is coming out on this event. It was very focused on cause and corrective actions and because this event occurred in Arkansas, you can say Im the primary sponsor of that IER and Im going to be imposing through INPO actions for the industry to take. So if I felt it was very important for my peers to understand the significance of the consequence, the importance of the cause, and the understanding of the cause, and then this IER results in industry-wide actions, that they understand the basis for those actions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 was relative to engineering done in support of project activities. And so that's what this is looking at. We've taken some actions with that, which is identification to make sure we've got the expertise. We have an ongoing evaluation to look at applying that engineering procedure to project task engineering as well as design engineering. And that is not is complete yet for the fleet, but we are in the process of doing that. MR. DAPAS: Okay. Thank you. MR. JAMES: We also, as part of our corrective actions took an action to reinforce the standards in our associated with vendor oversights that are already specified in our EN-DC-114 procedure, 	1MR. BROWNING: Actually, it was closer to2200. And the significance of that is IER is coming out3on this event. It was very focused on cause and4corrective actions and because this event occurred in5Arkansas, you can say I'm the primary sponsor of that6IER and I'm going to be imposing through INPO actions7for the industry to take.8So if I felt it was very important for my9peers to understand the significance of the consequence,10the importance of the cause, and the understanding of11the cause, and then this IER results in industry-wide12actions, that they understand the basis for those13actions.14So they heard that from me personally
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 was relative to engineering done in support of project activities. And so that's what this is looking at. We've taken some actions with that, which is identification to make sure we've got the expertise. We have an ongoing evaluation to look at applying that engineering procedure to project task engineering as well as design engineering. And that is not is complete yet for the fleet, but we are in the process of doing that. MR. DAPAS: Okay. Thank you. MR. JAMES: We also, as part of our corrective actions took an action to reinforce the standards in our associated with vendor oversights that are already specified in our EN-DC-114 procedure, our project management procedure. 	1MR. BROWNING: Actually, it was closer to2200. And the significance of that is IER is coming out3on this event. It was very focused on cause and4corrective actions and because this event occurred in5Arkansas, you can say I'm the primary sponsor of that6IER and I'm going to be imposing through INPO actions7for the industry to take.8So if I felt it was very important for my9peers to understand the significance of the consequence,10the importance of the cause, and the understanding of11the cause, and then this IER results in industry-wide12actions, that they understand the basis for those13actions.14So they heard that from me personally15through this web cast and there were over 200 hundred
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 was relative to engineering done in support of project activities. And so that's what this is looking at. We've taken some actions with that, which is identification to make sure we've got the expertise. We have an ongoing evaluation to look at applying that engineering procedure to project task engineering as well as design engineering. And that is not is complete yet for the fleet, but we are in the process of doing that. MR. DAPAS: Okay. Thank you. MR. JAMES: We also, as part of our corrective actions took an action to reinforce the standards in our associated with vendor oversights that are already specified in our EN-DC-114 procedure, our project management procedure. Followed by that we developed what we call a what it looks like sheet or "WILL" sheet, which is a tool that we use to, basically have the project 	1MR. BROWNING: Actually, it was closer to2200. And the significance of that is IER is coming out3on this event. It was very focused on cause and4corrective actions and because this event occurred in5Arkansas, you can say Im the primary sponsor of that6IER and Im going to be imposing through INPO actions7for the industry to take.8So if I felt it was very important for my9peers to understand the significance of the consequence,10the importance of the cause, and the understanding of11the cause, and then this IER results in industry-wide12actions, that they understand the basis for those13actions.14So they heard that from me personally15through this web cast and there were over 200 hundred16participants in the nuclear industry that were on that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 was relative to engineering done in support of project activities. And so that's what this is looking at. We've taken some actions with that, which is identification to make sure we've got the expertise. We have an ongoing evaluation to look at applying that engineering procedure to project task engineering as well as design engineering. And that is not is complete yet for the fleet, but we are in the process of doing that. MR. DAPAS: Okay. Thank you. MR. JAMES: We also, as part of our corrective actions took an action to reinforce the standards in our associated with vendor oversights that are already specified in our EN-DC-114 procedure, our project management procedure. Followed by that we developed what we call a what it looks like sheet or "WILL" sheet, which is a tool that we use to, basically have the project manager assess those particular aspects out of our 	1MR. BROWNING: Actually, it was closer to2200. And the significance of that is IER is coming out3on this event. It was very focused on cause and4corrective actions and because this event occurred in5Arkansas, you can say I'm the primary sponsor of that6IER and I'm going to be imposing through INPO actions7for the industry to take.8So if I felt it was very important for my9peers to understand the significance of the consequence,10the importance of the cause, and the understanding of11the cause, and then this IER results in industry-wide12actions, that they understand the basis for those13actions.14So they heard that from me personally15through this web cast and there were over 200 hundred16participants in the nuclear industry that were on that17web cast.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 was relative to engineering done in support of project activities. And so that's what this is looking at. We've taken some actions with that, which is identification to make sure we've got the expertise. We have an ongoing evaluation to look at applying that engineering procedure to project task engineering as well as design engineering. And that is not is complete yet for the fleet, but we are in the process of doing that. MR. DAPAS: Okay. Thank you. MR. JAMES: We also, as part of our corrective actions took an action to reinforce the standards in our associated with vendor oversights that are already specified in our EN-DC-114 procedure, our project management procedure. Followed by that we developed what we call a what it looks like sheet or "WILL" sheet, which is a tool that we use to, basically have the project 	1MR. BROWNING: Actually, it was closer to2200. And the significance of that is IER is coming out3on this event. It was very focused on cause and4corrective actions and because this event occurred in5Arkansas, you can say I'm the primary sponsor of that6IER and I'm going to be imposing through INPO actions7for the industry to take.8So if I felt it was very important for my9peers to understand the significance of the consequence,10the importance of the cause, and the understanding of11the cause, and then this IER results in industry-wide12actions, that they understand the basis for those13actions.14So they heard that from me personally15through this web cast and there were over 200 hundred16participants in the nuclear industry that were on that17web cast.18MR. DAPAS: Is that IER capture a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	was relative to engineering done in support of project activities. And so that's what this is looking at. We've taken some actions with that, which is identification to make sure we've got the expertise. We have an ongoing evaluation to look at applying that engineering procedure to project task engineering as well as design engineering. And that is not is complete yet for the fleet, but we are in the process of doing that. MR. DAPAS: Okay. Thank you. MR. JAMES: We also, as part of our corrective actions took an action to reinforce the standards in our associated with vendor oversights that are already specified in our EN-DC-114 procedure, our project management procedure. Followed by that we developed what we call a what it looks like sheet or "WILL" sheet, which is a tool that we use to, basically have the project manager assess those particular aspects out of our project manager procedure that deals with the vendor oversight on the projects that they are involved with.	1MR. BROWNING: Actually, it was closer to2200. And the significance of that is IER is coming out3on this event. It was very focused on cause and4corrective actions and because this event occurred in5Arkansas, you can say Im the primary sponsor of that6IER and Im going to be imposing through INPO actions7for the industry to take.8So if I felt it was very important for my9peers to understand the significance of the consequence,10the importance of the cause, and the understanding of11the cause, and then this IER results in industry-wide12actions, that they understand the basis for those13actions.14So they heard that from me personally15through this web cast and there were over 200 hundred16participants in the nuclear industry that were on that17web cast.18MR. DAPAS: Is that IER capture a19contract on oversight? You talked about aspects of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	was relative to engineering done in support of project activities. And so that's what this is looking at. We've taken some actions with that, which is identification to make sure we've got the expertise. We have an ongoing evaluation to look at applying that engineering procedure to project task engineering as well as design engineering. And that is not is complete yet for the fleet, but we are in the process of doing that. MR. DAPAS: Okay. Thank you. MR. JAMES: We also, as part of our corrective actions took an action to reinforce the standards in our associated with vendor oversights that are already specified in our EN-DC-114 procedure, our project management procedure. Followed by that we developed what we call a what it looks like sheet or "WILL" sheet, which is a tool that we use to, basically have the project manager assess those particular aspects out of our project manager procedure that deals with the vendor oversight on the projects that they are involved with. Those documents have been reviewed by the senior project	1MR. BROWNING: Actually, it was closer to2200. And the significance of that is IER is coming out3on this event. It was very focused on cause and4corrective actions and because this event occurred in5Arkansas, you can say I'm the primary sponsor of that6IER and I'm going to be imposing through INPO actions7for the industry to take.8So if I felt it was very important for my9peers to understand the significance of the consequence,10the importance of the cause, and the understanding of11the cause, and then this IER results in industry-wide12actions, that they understand the basis for those13actions.14So they heard that from me personally15through this web cast and there were over 200 hundred16participants in the nuclear industry that were on that17web cast.18MR. DAPAS: Is that IER capture a19contract on oversight? You talked about aspects of20that.21MR. BROWNING: It captures everything22that we are discussing with you today.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	was relative to engineering done in support of project activities. And so that's what this is looking at. We've taken some actions with that, which is identification to make sure we've got the expertise. We have an ongoing evaluation to look at applying that engineering procedure to project task engineering as well as design engineering. And that is not is complete yet for the fleet, but we are in the process of doing that. MR. DAPAS: Okay. Thank you. MR. JAMES: We also, as part of our corrective actions took an action to reinforce the standards in our associated with vendor oversights that are already specified in our EN-DC-114 procedure, our project management procedure. Followed by that we developed what we call a what it looks like sheet or "WILL" sheet, which is a tool that we use to, basically have the project manager assess those particular aspects out of our project manager procedure that deals with the vendor oversight on the projects that they are involved with. Those documents have been reviewed by the senior project management on site.	1MR. BROWNING: Actually, it was closer to2200. And the significance of that is IER is coming out3on this event. It was very focused on cause and4corrective actions and because this event occurred in5Arkansas, you can say I'm the primary sponsor of that6IER and I'm going to be imposing through INPO actions7for the industry to take.8So if I felt it was very important for my9peers to understand the significance of the consequence,10the importance of the cause, and the understanding of11the cause, and then this IER results in industry-wide12actions, that they understand the basis for those13actions.14So they heard that from me personally15through this web cast and there were over 200 hundred16participants in the nuclear industry that were on that17web cast.18MR. DAPAS: Is that IER capture a19contract on oversight? You talked about aspects of20that.21MR. BROWNING: It captures everything22that we are discussing with you today.23MR. KOWALESKI: There was a second
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	was relative to engineering done in support of project activities. And so that's what this is looking at. We've taken some actions with that, which is identification to make sure we've got the expertise. We have an ongoing evaluation to look at applying that engineering procedure to project task engineering as well as design engineering. And that is not is complete yet for the fleet, but we are in the process of doing that. MR. DAPAS: Okay. Thank you. MR. JAMES: We also, as part of our corrective actions took an action to reinforce the standards in our associated with vendor oversights that are already specified in our EN-DC-114 procedure, our project management procedure. Followed by that we developed what we call a what it looks like sheet or "WILL" sheet, which is a tool that we use to, basically have the project manager assess those particular aspects out of our project manager procedure that deals with the vendor oversight on the projects that they are involved with. Those documents have been reviewed by the senior project	1MR. BROWNING: Actually, it was closer to2200. And the significance of that is IER is coming out3on this event. It was very focused on cause and4corrective actions and because this event occurred in5Arkansas, you can say I'm the primary sponsor of that6IER and I'm going to be imposing through INPO actions7for the industry to take.8So if I felt it was very important for my9peers to understand the significance of the consequence,10the importance of the cause, and the understanding of11the cause, and then this IER results in industry-wide12actions, that they understand the basis for those13actions.14So they heard that from me personally15through this web cast and there were over 200 hundred16participants in the nuclear industry that were on that17web cast.18MR. DAPAS: Is that IER capture a19contract on oversight? You talked about aspects of20that.21MR. BROWNING: It captures everything22that we are discussing with you today.

46 (Pages 181 to 184)

Job No. 18996 Nuclear Regulatory Conference with Entergy Operations, Inc.

	Page 185	Page 187
1	that more broadly addresses contract oversight in	¹ that.
2	general. So this is specific to this event, but there	² And also we had them specifically looking
3	is one that talks about broad enterprise risk, large	³ for this as part of this evaluation with respect to
4	consequence to nuclear safety in plant equipment, it	⁴ oversight, and did oversight play a role in any of those
5	addresses other industry that	⁵ events? So we're anticipating getting some good
6	SPEAKER: Specifically to the senior	⁶ information from that evaluation with respect to
7	level oversight of contract work scope.	7 oversight specifically also.
8	MR. JAMES: I'm on slide 97 now. This	⁸ That effort should be wrapping up this
9	last month we also initiated an effort to perform a	⁹ month and we'll be sharing those results.
10	common cause review of conditions that have occurred in	¹⁰ MR. DAPAS: I do have a related question
11	this plant over the last 15 months. That included a	¹¹ and perhaps the team can answer quickly. You mentioned
12	standard drop event in that, there were seven total	¹² the alternate AC diesel and the speed trip and I know
13	conditions that we had them look.	¹³ that we put it was a vendor recommendation preventative
14	This is being performed by a team of	¹⁴ maintenance associated with a capacitor, am I recalling
15	outside analysts with expertise in performing this type	¹⁵ that correctly?
16	of analysis, also with fleet and ANO resources. In	16 MR. JAMES: Yes, sir.
17	addition to looking at those seven specific events,	¹⁷ MR. DAPAS: The question I have is, you
18	we're also looking back over the last two years at all	¹⁸ know, we were conducting a risk assessment, going
19	of our more significant alpha and bravo condition	¹⁹ through that process, but I do have a question, it may
20	reports to see what additional insights that may give us	²⁰ be for internal discussion here. To what degree was
21	using trend coding as well as keyword searches of those	²¹ that diesel available given that latent condition that
22	documents.	existed and does it have any impact we heard
23	We are also looking at the part of the	²³ extensive discussion about alternate AC diesel and 2A9,
24	last two years worth of external assessments that have	et cetera, but I do have a question regarding any
25	been performed on site both from outside agency and then	²⁵ overlap such that the reliability of that diesel given
	Page 186	Page 188
1	Page 186	Page 188
1	internal assessment reports.	¹ that latent condition existed because it didn't manifest
2	internal assessment reports. We also were part of that review	 that latent condition existed because it didn't manifest itself on the actual overspeed trip, right?
2 3	internal assessment reports. We also were part of that review utilizing interviews of personnel on that evaluation.	 that latent condition existed because it didn't manifest itself on the actual overspeed trip, right? MR. JAMES: Yes, sir.
2 3 4	internal assessment reports. We also were part of that review utilizing interviews of personnel on that evaluation. MR. DAPAS: You say you were looking for	 that latent condition existed because it didn't manifest itself on the actual overspeed trip, right? MR. JAMES: Yes, sir. MR. DAPAS: And I, quite frankly, don't
2 3 4 5	internal assessment reports. We also were part of that review utilizing interviews of personnel on that evaluation. MR. DAPAS: You say you were looking for common causes you focused on keyword searches like	 that latent condition existed because it didn't manifest itself on the actual overspeed trip, right? MR. JAMES: Yes, sir. MR. DAPAS: And I, quite frankly, don't recall the timeframes, but I think that's something we
2 3 4 5 6	internal assessment reports. We also were part of that review utilizing interviews of personnel on that evaluation. MR. DAPAS: You say you were looking for common causes you focused on keyword searches like oversight as example. Can you give a little more	 that latent condition existed because it didn't manifest itself on the actual overspeed trip, right? MR. JAMES: Yes, sir. MR. DAPAS: And I, quite frankly, don't recall the timeframes, but I think that's something we need to look at if we haven't already.
2 3 4 5 6 7	internal assessment reports. We also were part of that review utilizing interviews of personnel on that evaluation. MR. DAPAS: You say you were looking for common causes you focused on keyword searches like oversight as example. Can you give a little more context to this common cause factor and how you	 that latent condition existed because it didn't manifest itself on the actual overspeed trip, right? MR. JAMES: Yes, sir. MR. DAPAS: And I, quite frankly, don't recall the timeframes, but I think that's something we need to look at if we haven't already. MR. KENNEDY: When did the overspeed trip
2 3 4 5 6	internal assessment reports. We also were part of that review utilizing interviews of personnel on that evaluation. MR. DAPAS: You say you were looking for common causes you focused on keyword searches like oversight as example. Can you give a little more context to this common cause factor and how you approached it?	 that latent condition existed because it didn't manifest itself on the actual overspeed trip, right? MR. JAMES: Yes, sir. MR. DAPAS: And I, quite frankly, don't recall the timeframes, but I think that's something we need to look at if we haven't already. MR. KENNEDY: When did the overspeed trip occur? Before the event or after? So it was before
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	internal assessment reports. We also were part of that review utilizing interviews of personnel on that evaluation. MR. DAPAS: You say you were looking for common causes you focused on keyword searches like oversight as example. Can you give a little more context to this common cause factor and how you approached it? MR. JAMES: Well, particularly when they	 that latent condition existed because it didn't manifest itself on the actual overspeed trip, right? MR. JAMES: Yes, sir. MR. DAPAS: And I, quite frankly, don't recall the timeframes, but I think that's something we need to look at if we haven't already. MR. KENNEDY: When did the overspeed trip occur? Before the event or after? So it was before March 31st?
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	internal assessment reports. We also were part of that review utilizing interviews of personnel on that evaluation. MR. DAPAS: You say you were looking for common causes you focused on keyword searches like oversight as example. Can you give a little more context to this common cause factor and how you approached it? MR. JAMES: Well, particularly when they were using keywords or using trend codes, they were	 that latent condition existed because it didn't manifest itself on the actual overspeed trip, right? MR. JAMES: Yes, sir. MR. DAPAS: And I, quite frankly, don't recall the timeframes, but I think that's something we need to look at if we haven't already. MR. KENNEDY: When did the overspeed trip occur? Before the event or after? So it was before March 31st? MR. BROWNING: And corrective actions.
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	internal assessment reports. We also were part of that review utilizing interviews of personnel on that evaluation. MR. DAPAS: You say you were looking for common causes you focused on keyword searches like oversight as example. Can you give a little more context to this common cause factor and how you approached it? MR. JAMES: Well, particularly when they were using keywords or using trend codes, they were looking for any particular trend code or keyword that	 that latent condition existed because it didn't manifest itself on the actual overspeed trip, right? MR. JAMES: Yes, sir. MR. DAPAS: And I, quite frankly, don't recall the timeframes, but I think that's something we need to look at if we haven't already. MR. KENNEDY: When did the overspeed trip occur? Before the event or after? So it was before MR. BROWNING: And corrective actions. MR. DAPAS: And, well, any other I
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	internal assessment reports. We also were part of that review utilizing interviews of personnel on that evaluation. MR. DAPAS: You say you were looking for common causes you focused on keyword searches like oversight as example. Can you give a little more context to this common cause factor and how you approached it? MR. JAMES: Well, particularly when they were using keywords or using trend codes, they were looking for any particular trend code or keyword that was occurred more readily then others for looking for	 that latent condition existed because it didn't manifest itself on the actual overspeed trip, right? MR. JAMES: Yes, sir. MR. DAPAS: And I, quite frankly, don't recall the timeframes, but I think that's something we need to look at if we haven't already. MR. KENNEDY: When did the overspeed trip occur? Before the event or after? So it was before March 31st? MR. DAPAS: And, well, any other I know we've had some discussions about, you know, we look
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	internal assessment reports. We also were part of that review utilizing interviews of personnel on that evaluation. MR. DAPAS: You say you were looking for common causes you focused on keyword searches like oversight as example. Can you give a little more context to this common cause factor and how you approached it? MR. JAMES: Well, particularly when they were using keywords or using trend codes, they were looking for any particular trend code or keyword that was occurred more readily then others for looking for a common causal type evaluation. But also with respect	 that latent condition existed because it didn't manifest itself on the actual overspeed trip, right? MR. JAMES: Yes, sir. MR. DAPAS: And I, quite frankly, don't recall the timeframes, but I think that's something we need to look at if we haven't already. MR. KENNEDY: When did the overspeed trip occur? Before the event or after? So it was before March 31st? MR. DAPAS: And, well, any other I know we've had some discussions about, you know, we look at this event probability of failure of one, but then we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	internal assessment reports. We also were part of that review utilizing interviews of personnel on that evaluation. MR. DAPAS: You say you were looking for common causes you focused on keyword searches like oversight as example. Can you give a little more context to this common cause factor and how you approached it? MR. JAMES: Well, particularly when they were using keywords or using trend codes, they were looking for any particular trend code or keyword that was occurred more readily then others for looking for a common causal type evaluation. But also with respect to the identified issues out of the seven specific	 that latent condition existed because it didn't manifest itself on the actual overspeed trip, right? MR. JAMES: Yes, sir. MR. DAPAS: And I, quite frankly, don't recall the timeframes, but I think that's something we need to look at if we haven't already. MR. KENNEDY: When did the overspeed trip occur? Before the event or after? So it was before March 31st? MR. DAPAS: And, well, any other I know we've had some discussions about, you know, we look at this event probability of failure of one, but then we also looked at trying to model this if it occurred at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	internal assessment reports. We also were part of that review utilizing interviews of personnel on that evaluation. MR. DAPAS: You say you were looking for common causes you focused on keyword searches like oversight as example. Can you give a little more context to this common cause factor and how you approached it? MR. JAMES: Well, particularly when they were using keywords or using trend codes, they were looking for any particular trend code or keyword that was occurred more readily then others for looking for a common causal type evaluation. But also with respect to the identified issues out of the seven specific events that they were looking for, looking for those	 that latent condition existed because it didn't manifest itself on the actual overspeed trip, right? MR. JAMES: Yes, sir. MR. DAPAS: And I, quite frankly, don't recall the timeframes, but I think that's something we need to look at if we haven't already. MR. KENNEDY: When did the overspeed trip occur? Before the event or after? So it was before March 31st? MR. DAPAS: And, well, any other I know we've had some discussions about, you know, we look at this event probability of failure of one, but then we also looked at trying to model this if it occurred at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	internal assessment reports. We also were part of that review utilizing interviews of personnel on that evaluation. MR. DAPAS: You say you were looking for common causes you focused on keyword searches like oversight as example. Can you give a little more context to this common cause factor and how you approached it? MR. JAMES: Well, particularly when they were using keywords or using trend codes, they were looking for any particular trend code or keyword that was occurred more readily then others for looking for a common causal type evaluation. But also with respect to the identified issues out of the seven specific events that they were looking for, looking for those also in any of those other condition reports using the	 that latent condition existed because it didn't manifest itself on the actual overspeed trip, right? MR. JAMES: Yes, sir. MR. DAPAS: And I, quite frankly, don't recall the timeframes, but I think that's something we need to look at if we haven't already. MR. KENNEDY: When did the overspeed trip occur? Before the event or after? So it was before MR. DAPAS: And, well, any other I Know we've had some discussions about, you know, we look at this event probability of failure of one, but then we any outage at all. So that's why I wanted to make sure
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	internal assessment reports. We also were part of that review utilizing interviews of personnel on that evaluation. MR. DAPAS: You say you were looking for common causes you focused on keyword searches like oversight as example. Can you give a little more context to this common cause factor and how you approached it? MR. JAMES: Well, particularly when they were using keywords or using trend codes, they were looking for any particular trend code or keyword that was occurred more readily then others for looking for a common causal type evaluation. But also with respect to the identified issues out of the seven specific events that they were looking for, looking for those	 that latent condition existed because it didn't manifest itself on the actual overspeed trip, right? MR. JAMES: Yes, sir. MR. DAPAS: And I, quite frankly, don't recall the timeframes, but I think that's something we need to look at if we haven't already. MR. KENNEDY: When did the overspeed trip occur? Before the event or after? So it was before MR. BROWNING: And corrective actions. MR. DAPAS: And, well, any other I know we've had some discussions about, you know, we look at this event probability of failure of one, but then we also looked at trying to model this if it occurred at any outage at all. So that's why I wanted to make sure I was able to connect the dots there. I think I've
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	internal assessment reports. We also were part of that review utilizing interviews of personnel on that evaluation. MR. DAPAS: You say you were looking for common causes you focused on keyword searches like oversight as example. Can you give a little more context to this common cause factor and how you approached it? MR. JAMES: Well, particularly when they were using keywords or using trend codes, they were looking for any particular trend code or keyword that was occurred more readily then others for looking for a common causal type evaluation. But also with respect to the identified issues out of the seven specific events that they were looking for, looking for those also in any of those other condition reports using the keywords and causal code evaluations.	 that latent condition existed because it didn't manifest itself on the actual overspeed trip, right? MR. JAMES: Yes, sir. MR. DAPAS: And I, quite frankly, don't recall the timeframes, but I think that's something we need to look at if we haven't already. MR. KENNEDY: When did the overspeed trip occur? Before the event or after? So it was before MR. DAPAS: And, well, any other I Know we've had some discussions about, you know, we look at this event probability of failure of one, but then we also looked at trying to model this if it occurred at any outage at all. So that's why I wanted to make sure I was able to connect the dots there. I think I've nuked this out, thanks.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	internal assessment reports. We also were part of that review utilizing interviews of personnel on that evaluation. MR. DAPAS: You say you were looking for common causes you focused on keyword searches like oversight as example. Can you give a little more context to this common cause factor and how you approached it? MR. JAMES: Well, particularly when they were using keywords or using trend codes, they were looking for any particular trend code or keyword that was occurred more readily then others for looking for a common causal type evaluation. But also with respect to the identified issues out of the seven specific events that they were looking for, looking for those also in any of those other condition reports using the keywords and causal code evaluations. MR. DAPAS: Were these events that	 that latent condition existed because it didn't manifest itself on the actual overspeed trip, right? MR. JAMES: Yes, sir. MR. DAPAS: And I, quite frankly, don't recall the timeframes, but I think that's something we need to look at if we haven't already. MR. KENNEDY: When did the overspeed trip occur? Before the event or after? So it was before March 31st? MR. DAPAS: And, well, any other I know we've had some discussions about, you know, we look at this event probability of failure of one, but then we any outage at all. So that's why I wanted to make sure I was able to connect the dots there. I think I've mk. MITMAN: Just one quick addition to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	internal assessment reports. We also were part of that review utilizing interviews of personnel on that evaluation. MR. DAPAS: You say you were looking for common causes you focused on keyword searches like oversight as example. Can you give a little more context to this common cause factor and how you approached it? MR. JAMES: Well, particularly when they were using keywords or using trend codes, they were looking for any particular trend code or keyword that was occurred more readily then others for looking for a common causal type evaluation. But also with respect to the identified issues out of the seven specific events that they were looking for, looking for those also in any of those other condition reports using the keywords and causal code evaluations. MR. DAPAS: Were these events that involved mechanical failures, human error, a combination	 that latent condition existed because it didn't manifest itself on the actual overspeed trip, right? MR. JAMES: Yes, sir. MR. DAPAS: And I, quite frankly, don't recall the timeframes, but I think that's something we need to look at if we haven't already. MR. KENNEDY: When did the overspeed trip occur? Before the event or after? So it was before MR. DAPAS: And, well, any other I MR. DAPAS: And, well, any other I know we've had some discussions about, you know, we look at this event probability of failure of one, but then we also looked at trying to model this if it occurred at any outage at all. So that's why I wanted to make sure I was able to connect the dots there. I think I've nuked this out, thanks. MR. MITMAN: Just one quick addition to that. The rules of the road for RP is you don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	internal assessment reports. We also were part of that review utilizing interviews of personnel on that evaluation. MR. DAPAS: You say you were looking for common causes you focused on keyword searches like oversight as example. Can you give a little more context to this common cause factor and how you approached it? MR. JAMES: Well, particularly when they were using keywords or using trend codes, they were looking for any particular trend code or keyword that was occurred more readily then others for looking for a common causal type evaluation. But also with respect to the identified issues out of the seven specific events that they were looking for, looking for those also in any of those other condition reports using the keywords and causal code evaluations. MR. DAPAS: Were these events that involved mechanical failures, human error, a combination of? Just curious how you targeted those seven.	 that latent condition existed because it didn't manifest itself on the actual overspeed trip, right? MR. JAMES: Yes, sir. MR. DAPAS: And I, quite frankly, don't recall the timeframes, but I think that's something we need to look at if we haven't already. MR. KENNEDY: When did the overspeed trip occur? Before the event or after? So it was before March 31st? MR. DAPAS: And, well, any other I know we've had some discussions about, you know, we look at this event probability of failure of one, but then we also looked at trying to model this if it occurred at any outage at all. So that's why I wanted to make sure I was able to connect the dots there. I think I've nuked this out, thanks. MR. MITMAN: Just one quick addition to that. The rules of the road for RP is you don't normally add more than one form of sufficiency. There
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	internal assessment reports. We also were part of that review utilizing interviews of personnel on that evaluation. MR. DAPAS: You say you were looking for common causes you focused on keyword searches like oversight as example. Can you give a little more context to this common cause factor and how you approached it? MR. JAMES: Well, particularly when they were using keywords or using trend codes, they were looking for any particular trend code or keyword that was occurred more readily then others for looking for a common causal type evaluation. But also with respect to the identified issues out of the seven specific events that they were looking for, looking for those also in any of those other condition reports using the keywords and causal code evaluations. MR. DAPAS: Were these events that involved mechanical failures, human error, a combination of? Just curious how you targeted those seven. MR. JAMES: Yeah. They were, I'll give	 that latent condition existed because it didn't manifest itself on the actual overspeed trip, right? MR. JAMES: Yes, sir. MR. DAPAS: And I, quite frankly, don't recall the timeframes, but I think that's something we need to look at if we haven't already. MR. KENNEDY: When did the overspeed trip occur? Before the event or after? So it was before March 31st? MR. DAPAS: And, well, any other I know we've had some discussions about, you know, we look at this event probability of failure of one, but then we also looked at trying to model this if it occurred at any outage at all. So that's why I wanted to make sure I was able to connect the dots there. I think I've nuked this out, thanks. MR. MITMAN: Just one quick addition to that. The rules of the road for RP is you don't normally add more than one form of sufficiency. There all evaluated independently. So we have to look at how
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	internal assessment reports. We also were part of that review utilizing interviews of personnel on that evaluation. MR. DAPAS: You say you were looking for common causes you focused on keyword searches like oversight as example. Can you give a little more context to this common cause factor and how you approached it? MR. JAMES: Well, particularly when they were using keywords or using trend codes, they were looking for any particular trend code or keyword that was occurred more readily then others for looking for a common causal type evaluation. But also with respect to the identified issues out of the seven specific events that they were looking for, looking for those also in any of those other condition reports using the keywords and causal code evaluations. MR. DAPAS: Were these events that involved mechanical failures, human error, a combination of? Just curious how you targeted those seven. MR. JAMES: Yeah. They were, I'll give you some examples. They were the overspeed trip of the ultimate AC diesel generator, the bravo decay heat pump breaker failure, the stator drop itself, the flooding	 that latent condition existed because it didn't manifest itself on the actual overspeed trip, right? MR. JAMES: Yes, sir. MR. DAPAS: And I, quite frankly, don't recall the timeframes, but I think that's something we need to look at if we haven't already. MR. KENNEDY: When did the overspeed trip occur? Before the event or after? So it was before March 31st? MR. DAPAS: And, well, any other I know we've had some discussions about, you know, we look at this event probability of failure of one, but then we also looked at trying to model this if it occurred at any outage at all. So that's why I wanted to make sure I was able to connect the dots there. I think I've nuked this out, thanks. MR. MITMAN: Just one quick addition to that. The rules of the road for RP is you don't normally add more than one form of sufficiency. There all evaluated independently. So we have to look at how that applies here, and whether we would be appropriate under our guidance and procedures to combine, normally we don't combine two analysts.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	internal assessment reports. We also were part of that review utilizing interviews of personnel on that evaluation. MR. DAPAS: You say you were looking for common causes you focused on keyword searches like oversight as example. Can you give a little more context to this common cause factor and how you approached it? MR. JAMES: Well, particularly when they were using keywords or using trend codes, they were looking for any particular trend code or keyword that was occurred more readily then others for looking for a common causal type evaluation. But also with respect to the identified issues out of the seven specific events that they were looking for, looking for those also in any of those other condition reports using the keywords and causal code evaluations. MR. DAPAS: Were these events that involved mechanical failures, human error, a combination of? Just curious how you targeted those seven. MR. JAMES: Yeah. They were, I'll give you some examples. They were the overspeed trip of the ultimate AC diesel generator, the bravo decay heat pump	 that latent condition existed because it didn't manifest itself on the actual overspeed trip, right? MR. JAMES: Yes, sir. MR. DAPAS: And I, quite frankly, don't recall the timeframes, but I think that's something we need to look at if we haven't already. MR. KENNEDY: When did the overspeed trip occur? Before the event or after? So it was before March 31st? MR. DAPAS: And, well, any other I know we've had some discussions about, you know, we look at this event probability of failure of one, but then we also looked at trying to model this if it occurred at any outage at all. So that's why I wanted to make sure I was able to connect the dots there. I think I've nuked this out, thanks. MR. MITMAN: Just one quick addition to that. The rules of the road for RP is you don't normally add more than one form of sufficiency. There all evaluated independently. So we have to look at how that applies here, and whether we would be appropriate under our guidance and procedures to combine, normally

Nuclear	r Regulatory Conference with Entergy Operations, Inc.	•	May 1, 2014
	Page 189		Page 191
1	like you've implemented corrective actions such that	1	defines the oversight for each project given a risk
2	that diesel was available at the time of the event. The	2	matrix for that project.
3	issue had been corrected, so we're focusing on plant	3	Development a risk matrix, identify the
4	configuration, equipment availability during the time of	4	high consequences, we've put a structure for oversight
5	the event here, so thanks.	5	plan in place around those consequences to ensure that
6	MR. JAMES: That concludes my remarks	6	they're mitigated.
7	unless there are any further questions.	7	We've met multiple times with members of
8	MR. KOWALESKI: Everything we just talked	8	the fleet to give them the lessons learned associated
9	about, the site response and the cause analysis and what	9	with this event and contractor oversight. We've made
10	I was going to address is this last section is fleet	10	some organizational changes to be more effective with
11	learnings, both actions completed and actions that we	11	the contractor oversight. Specifically, for major
12	currently have in progress associated with primarily	12	projects, which is where a lot of these high consequence
13	contractor oversight.	13	vendor contract design activities occur, we put in place
14	We talked a lot about the safety	14	a corporate engineering group to do those risk
15	significance of this in terms of what was the realistic	15	assessments and help oversee that the mitigation
16	estimate of potential for core damage frequency and	16	strategies that are put in place for those
17	we've given you our belief or the best estimate of that.	17	engineering-related activities and also the non
18	I don't want that to take away at all the	18	engineering related activities in terms of risk.
19	other significance of this event which is the fact that	19	And we've also added oversight for our
20	we did have a fatality, we did injure other employees,	20	maintenance support and site project manager. So we now
21	and we did put the plant at some level of risk. And	21	have director levels and senior managers that are
22	that should not have happened.	22	providing oversight of our main support services
23	We depend on contractors because of	23	contractors and all those contractors that are doing
24	resource leads and for specific skill sets that we as a	24	minor projects at our sites.
25	utility don't have. But we have to have that	25	Across the board, we've made improvements
	Page 190		Page 192
1	dependence. We are seeing issues, the industry is	1	in the skill assessments of the supplemental supervision
2	seeing issues with performance of those contractors. So	2	that we utilize at the site. So we will assess their
3	we have to have in place a robust process of oversight	3	skills for being able to implement, hopefully,
4	that protects and corrects those errors that a vendor	4	verifications, peer checks, safety rules, performance
5	may make before they produce a consequence to the plant	5	rules that we have on the site.
6	or to people.	6	So those skill assessments have been
7	We are committed to putting such a robust	7	improved by assuring that there's an Entergy presence in
8	process in place to ensure that this never happens	8	terms of [can't hear] for those supervisors and also to
9	again. I've been involved in the industry for over 30	9	have a demonstrated activity that does an assessment of
10	years and it's the first time a fatality's occurred in	10	how well they do in observation how well they give feed
11	any kind of relationship to a plant or multiple plants	11	back to workers to make sure they follow the rules.
12	that I've had oversight of. And it's quite disturbing.	12	MR. DAPAS: Just a follow-up question.
13	You just can't allow it to happen again.	13	This is an application for the entire fleet, right?
14	That said, actions completed. We talked	14	MR. KOWALESKI: Yes, these are fleet-wide
15	about the material handling procedures for the fleet has	15	actions.
16	been changed to reflect the lessons learned that Dale	16	MR. DAPAS: Not just Entergy south?
17		17	

48 (Pages 189 to 192)

MR. KOWALESKI: That's correct. The

The additional actions in progress.

We've initiated a common cause evaluation for contract

initial piece of that, which is a select group of

significant contractor issues we've seen on projects.

significant contract, major contract issues we've had.

performance issues. We've started that and completed an

We have selected a group of the most

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

entire fleet.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

discussed, specifically strengthening controls and

with this. And we also talked about the project

engineering activities to support projects for

activities that a project vendor may perform.

documentation of load lifts, calculations associated

specification design documentation requirements for

determining specific expertise for high consequence

management procedure for the fleet has been modified for

And for putting in place a structure that

uclear	Regulatory Conference with Entergy Operations, inc.		Way 1, 201
	Page 193		Page 195
1	We've done a vending exercise to try to determine if	1	actions.
2	there's anything immediate we need to go after reflected	2	Elevating that oversight to a management
3	at.	3	level and providing more rigor in the documentation
4	What we found is this last action that	4	validation process. And that's the action that we're
5	I'll talk about that we are starting to implement for	5	going to proceed with implementing through the fleet
6	the fleet. Again, these are in progress, but we're	6	that we think will have the biggest impact to improve
7	going to complete that common cause evaluation by	7	our contract oversight to reduce risk.
8	looking at two years worth of any project-related cause	8	MR. BROWNING: So if there's no
9	evaluation that we've done. Any project-related	9	additional questions, then I do have a few closing
10	commission report that documented an issue with document	10	comments that I would like to make and one of the
11	limitation, we went back to all the alphas and bravos	11	fears that I had entering this conference was what I
12	and the cause analysis and specifically looked into	12	stated in my opening comments. In my mind there's a
13	oversight and how the projects were managed	13	very distinct difference between us trying to establish
14	MR. BILL JAMES: Bill James, the project	14	a reasonable estimate of the risk of core damage as a
15	management. Just for clarity we are going to look at	15	result of this event. Clearly, we put the plant and the
16	all alpha and bravo across the entire Entergy fleet. We	16	operators in a challenging configuration that we should
17	are going to then, the conditions found within those	17	have never done. That resulted in some level of
18	conditions reports, we're going to look at them from the	18	increased risk and our job is to achieve an accurate
19	vantage point of project management and engineering as	19	assessment of that.
20	well as engineering associated with project management.	20	And the distinction between that and what
21	Anything in the maintenance contractor or	21	Joe talked about, the actual consequences and the
22	otherwise arena that doesn't have an engineering or	22	unacceptable consequences that occurred that day,
23	project management aspect to it, will go to the	23	they're real and they're personal to me.
24	maintenance organization who will be participating. So	24	I know where I was Easter Sunday at 7:30.
25	it's going to be across the board looking at all the	25	And those consequences are real. And there's a
			The disse consequences are real. The diere's a
	Page 194		Page 196
1	condition reports and the alpha and bravo space that	1	commitment to what Joe is talking about and what I'm
2	we've had. So we're not going to go back and pick it up	2	talking about, too.
3	in the future. We're going to do it all the first time	3	Again, the objective of this conference
4	through.	4	is one in part to make sure you understand that we
5	Objective is to be complete with this	5	recognize the significance, and I know from dialoging
6	summer and then based on the insights, the learnings out	6	and based on the feedback that I whether it's body
7	of that, that would complement what we've done to date,	7	language or eyes, I'm not underplaying the significance
8	those will go back into our processes to begin to judge	8	of the consequence.
9	point to preclude something like this from happening to	9	I'm not underplaying the challenge that
10	us again.	10	we unnecessarily put our operators on the unnecessary
11	MR. KOWALESKI: Jeremy is participating	11	challenge that we put on our safety-related equipment
12	on a committee that's looking at contractor oversight	12	and that can never happen again, and make a distinction
13	law and helping mold the document that was just	13	between what was the actual best assessment of the risk
14	released, that's going to go through the entire industry	14	of core damage that was present.
15	for these limitation improvements to contract oversight.	15	There's a very clear distinction in my
16	So we will have both our Entergy-specific analysis as	16	mind that there's two different things. And our
17	well as the industry analysis to form future actions.	17	objective was to present to you, and I know it's
18	And the last item. When we did that	18	additional information, information we haven't provided
19	initial bit, what we identified as the most single	19	to you. It's a methodology that we created that needs
20	impact we've had [coughing] in the past. If we do a	20	challenge to make sure we get to that accurate
21	good job of identifying the high consequence tasks or	21	assessment of risk, but it is our best attempt to take
22	risks in our existing project, if we do a good job of	22	the facts that we have, provide you with that
23	identifying what are acceptable mitigating actions to	23	information and our methodology and we're open to
24	take, what we can improve on is how we validate or	24	receive your challenge and feedback on that methodology.

provide oversight of the completion of those mitigating ²⁵ And I do appreciate the opportunity to be

49 (Pages 193 to 196)

	Page 197		Page 199
1	able to share with you today.	1	Friday, next Friday. I think that'd be good for
2	MR. WERNER: This is Greg Werner of the	2	anything that we've talked about so far.
3	Nuclear Regulatory Commission. We're going to take a	3	MR. KENNEDY: And then if something comes
4	break. The NRC is going to leave the room and we are	4	up between now and then, just let Greg know and he'll
5	going to get on a conference with our counterparts at	5	touch base with the folks that requested the information
6	headquarters and other areas and caucus. And then we're	6	and we'll work through that. Appreciate you, Stephanie
7	going to see if we have any additional questions or	7	and Mike, for documenting those and getting together and
8	information that we need to ask before we complete the	8	make sure we have all the I also asked the risk
9	conference.	9	analysts to get together, too, since we want to make
10	So we're going to go to the room next	10	sure that we've captured the specific requests.
11	door. Entergy folks, if you guys want to caucus in this	11	MR. WERNER: I think Jeff and Mike
12	room next door, it's also available for y'all if you	12	Bloodgood and Stephanie will get together.
13	want to have some internal discussions outside the	13	MR. KENNEDY: We had just a couple of
14	meeting room.	14	questions and Jeff mitt man has the first one regarding
15	MR. DAPAS: This is Marc Dapas. For	15	the flooding aspect of the event.
16	those folks on the phone, members of the public that	16	MR. MITMAN: This is Jeff Mitman. With
17	have patiently been waiting for the opportunity to ask	17	the Stator drop, a fire water header was severed and it
18	questions, I'll just outline it is our intent to	18	took a length of time to get the fire water system shut
19	expeditiously reach a determination whether we have any	19	down. And in that length of time it put a certain
20	additional questions here. And then I'll be closing the	20	amount quite a bit of water under the basement of the
21	regulatory conference here formally and then open it up	21	turbine building and some of that migrated over into the
22	for any questions to members of public.	22	aux building. And some of that water ended up in decay
23	So we'll do our best to reach closure	23	heat removal pump fault, and we were wondering if, and
24	here on any additional questions that we have in	24	if so, how you factored that into any into your risk
25	relatively short order, seeing as we've been at this for	25	analysis or your review of the risk analysis, and then
			- •••
	Page 198		Page 200
1	five hours.	1	any of the consequences it might have had on or
2	five hours. MR. WERNER: We're estimating about 10-15	2	any of the consequences it might have had on or impact on that risk analysis?
2 3	five hours. MR. WERNER: We're estimating about 10-15 minutes probably.	2 3	any of the consequences it might have had on or impact on that risk analysis? MR. SULLINS: I'm not familiar with risk
2 3 4	five hours. MR. WERNER: We're estimating about 10-15 minutes probably. MR. DAPAS: I was reluctant to provide an	2 3 4	any of the consequences it might have had on or impact on that risk analysis? MR. SULLINS: I'm not familiar with risk analysis details, I'm sorry.
2 3 4 5	five hours. MR. WERNER: We're estimating about 10-15 minutes probably. MR. DAPAS: I was reluctant to provide an estimate, but since you my goal would be 10-15	2 3 4 5	any of the consequences it might have had on or impact on that risk analysis? MR. SULLINS: I'm not familiar with risk analysis details, I'm sorry. MR. HARRIS: I'm talking with Jeff right
2 3 4 5 6	five hours. MR. WERNER: We're estimating about 10-15 minutes probably. MR. DAPAS: I was reluctant to provide an estimate, but since you my goal would be 10-15 minutes.	2 3 4 5 6	any of the consequences it might have had on or impact on that risk analysis? MR. SULLINS: I'm not familiar with risk analysis details, I'm sorry. MR. HARRIS: I'm talking with Jeff right now.
2 3 4 5 6 7	five hours. MR. WERNER: We're estimating about 10-15 minutes probably. MR. DAPAS: I was reluctant to provide an estimate, but since you my goal would be 10-15 minutes. (Break taken from 5:55 p.m. to	2 3 4 5 6 7	any of the consequences it might have had on or impact on that risk analysis? MR. SULLINS: I'm not familiar with risk analysis details, I'm sorry. MR. HARRIS: I'm talking with Jeff right now. MR. DAPAS: I will add one comment. We
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	five hours. MR. WERNER: We're estimating about 10-15 minutes probably. MR. DAPAS: I was reluctant to provide an estimate, but since you my goal would be 10-15 minutes. (Break taken from 5:55 p.m. to 6:25 p m.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	any of the consequences it might have had on or impact on that risk analysis? MR. SULLINS: I'm not familiar with risk analysis details, I'm sorry. MR. HARRIS: I'm talking with Jeff right now. MR. DAPAS: I will add one comment. We are, of course, looking at that separately in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	five hours. MR. WERNER: We're estimating about 10-15 minutes probably. MR. DAPAS: I was reluctant to provide an estimate, but since you my goal would be 10-15 minutes. (Break taken from 5:55 p.m. to 6:25 p m.) MR. KENNEDY: Let's see, the length of	2 3 5 6 7 8 9	any of the consequences it might have had on or impact on that risk analysis? MR. SULLINS: I'm not familiar with risk analysis details, I'm sorry. MR. HARRIS: I'm talking with Jeff right now. MR. DAPAS: I will add one comment. We are, of course, looking at that separately in the context of flooding vulnerabilities, or the context
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	five hours. MR. WERNER: We're estimating about 10-15 minutes probably. MR. DAPAS: I was reluctant to provide an estimate, but since you my goal would be 10-15 minutes. (Break taken from 5:55 p.m. to 6:25 p m.) MR. KENNEDY: Let's see, the length of time we were out doesn't reflect the quality of the	2 3 5 7 8 9 10	any of the consequences it might have had on or impact on that risk analysis? MR. SULLINS: I'm not familiar with risk analysis details, I'm sorry. MR. HARRIS: I'm talking with Jeff right now. MR. DAPAS: I will add one comment. We are, of course, looking at that separately in the context of flooding vulnerabilities, or the context there that they have an impact on this event and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	five hours. MR. WERNER: We're estimating about 10-15 minutes probably. MR. DAPAS: I was reluctant to provide an estimate, but since you my goal would be 10-15 minutes. (Break taken from 5:55 p.m. to 6:25 p m.) MR. KENNEDY: Let's see, the length of time we were out doesn't reflect the quality of the discussion so, but, I think what does reflect the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	any of the consequences it might have had on or impact on that risk analysis? MR. SULLINS: I'm not familiar with risk analysis details, I'm sorry. MR. HARRIS: I'm talking with Jeff right now. MR. DAPAS: I will add one comment. We are, of course, looking at that separately in the context of flooding vulnerabilities, or the context there that they have an impact on this event and response associated with this event.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	five hours. MR. WERNER: We're estimating about 10-15 minutes probably. MR. DAPAS: I was reluctant to provide an estimate, but since you my goal would be 10-15 minutes. (Break taken from 5:55 p.m. to 6:25 p m.) MR. KENNEDY: Let's see, the length of time we were out doesn't reflect the quality of the discussion so, but, I think what does reflect the quality of the discussion is a few questions that we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	any of the consequences it might have had on or impact on that risk analysis? MR. SULLINS: I'm not familiar with risk analysis details, I'm sorry. MR. HARRIS: I'm talking with Jeff right now. MR. DAPAS: I will add one comment. We are, of course, looking at that separately in the context of flooding vulnerabilities, or the context there that they have an impact on this event and response associated with this event. MR. HARRIS: Okay. I talked to Jason.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	five hours. MR. WERNER: We're estimating about 10-15 minutes probably. MR. DAPAS: I was reluctant to provide an estimate, but since you my goal would be 10-15 minutes. (Break taken from 5:55 p.m. to 6:25 p m.) MR. KENNEDY: Let's see, the length of time we were out doesn't reflect the quality of the discussion so, but, I think what does reflect the quality of the discussion is a few questions that we actually have. So we do have two follow-up I think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	any of the consequences it might have had on or impact on that risk analysis? MR. SULLINS: I'm not familiar with risk analysis details, I'm sorry. MR. HARRIS: I'm talking with Jeff right now. MR. DAPAS: I will add one comment. We are, of course, looking at that separately in the context of flooding vulnerabilities, or the context there that they have an impact on this event and response associated with this event. MR. HARRIS: Okay. I talked to Jason. The analysis associated with the flooding of the default
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	five hours. MR. WERNER: We're estimating about 10-15 minutes probably. MR. DAPAS: I was reluctant to provide an estimate, but since you my goal would be 10-15 minutes. (Break taken from 5:55 p.m. to 6:25 p m.) MR. KENNEDY: Let's see, the length of time we were out doesn't reflect the quality of the discussion so, but, I think what does reflect the quality of the discussion is a few questions that we actually have. So we do have two follow-up I think it's two follow-up questions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	any of the consequences it might have had on or impact on that risk analysis? MR. SULLINS: I'm not familiar with risk analysis details, I'm sorry. MR. HARRIS: I'm talking with Jeff right now. MR. DAPAS: I will add one comment. We are, of course, looking at that separately in the context of flooding vulnerabilities, or the context there that they have an impact on this event and response associated with this event. MR. HARRIS: Okay. I talked to Jason. The analysis associated with the flooding of the default was done as part of a separate analysis versus flooding
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	five hours. MR. WERNER: We're estimating about 10-15 minutes probably. MR. DAPAS: I was reluctant to provide an estimate, but since you my goal would be 10-15 minutes. (Break taken from 5:55 p.m. to 6:25 p m.) MR. KENNEDY: Let's see, the length of time we were out doesn't reflect the quality of the discussion so, but, I think what does reflect the quality of the discussion is a few questions that we actually have. So we do have two follow-up I think it's two follow-up questions. So, we'll go through those. In addition,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	any of the consequences it might have had on or impact on that risk analysis? MR. SULLINS: I'm not familiar with risk analysis details, I'm sorry. MR. HARRIS: I'm talking with Jeff right now. MR. DAPAS: I will add one comment. We are, of course, looking at that separately in the context of flooding vulnerabilities, or the context there that they have an impact on this event and response associated with this event. MR. HARRIS: Okay. I talked to Jason. The analysis associated with the flooding of the default was done as part of a separate analysis versus flooding events. He did not include any information from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	five hours. MR. WERNER: We're estimating about 10-15 minutes probably. MR. DAPAS: I was reluctant to provide an estimate, but since you my goal would be 10-15 minutes. (Break taken from 5:55 p.m. to 6:25 p m.) MR. KENNEDY: Let's see, the length of time we were out doesn't reflect the quality of the discussion so, but, I think what does reflect the quality of the discussion is a few questions that we actually have. So we do have two follow-up I think it's two follow-up questions. So, we'll go through those. In addition, we have a number of information requests. What I would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	any of the consequences it might have had on or impact on that risk analysis? MR. SULLINS: I'm not familiar with risk analysis details, I'm sorry. MR. HARRIS: I'm talking with Jeff right now. MR. DAPAS: I will add one comment. We are, of course, looking at that separately in the context of flooding vulnerabilities, or the context there that they have an impact on this event and response associated with this event. MR. HARRIS: Okay. I talked to Jason. The analysis associated with the flooding of the default was done as part of a separate analysis versus flooding events. He did not include any information from the impact of that flood in the analysis he performed as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	five hours. MR. WERNER: We're estimating about 10-15 minutes probably. MR. DAPAS: I was reluctant to provide an estimate, but since you my goal would be 10-15 minutes. (Break taken from 5:55 p.m. to 6:25 p m.) MR. KENNEDY: Let's see, the length of time we were out doesn't reflect the quality of the discussion so, but, I think what does reflect the quality of the discussion is a few questions that we actually have. So we do have two follow-up I think it's two follow-up questions. So, we'll go through those. In addition, we have a number of information requests. What I would propose is that Mike Bloodgood get together with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	any of the consequences it might have had on or impact on that risk analysis? MR. SULLINS: I'm not familiar with risk analysis details, I'm sorry. MR. HARRIS: I'm talking with Jeff right now. MR. DAPAS: I will add one comment. We are, of course, looking at that separately in the context of flooding vulnerabilities, or the context there that they have an impact on this event and response associated with this event. MR. HARRIS: Okay. I talked to Jason. The analysis associated with the flooding of the default was done as part of a separate analysis versus flooding events. He did not include any information from the impact of that flood in the analysis he performed as part of the Stator drop that we talked about today.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	five hours. MR. WERNER: We're estimating about 10-15 minutes probably. MR. DAPAS: I was reluctant to provide an estimate, but since you my goal would be 10-15 minutes. (Break taken from 5:55 p.m. to 6:25 p m.) MR. KENNEDY: Let's see, the length of time we were out doesn't reflect the quality of the discussion so, but, I think what does reflect the quality of the discussion is a few questions that we actually have. So we do have two follow-up I think it's two follow-up questions. So, we'll go through those. In addition, we have a number of information requests. What I would propose is that Mike Bloodgood get together with Stephanie and go through those in detail. We think that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	any of the consequences it might have had on or impact on that risk analysis? MR. SULLINS: I'm not familiar with risk analysis details, I'm sorry. MR. HARRIS: I'm talking with Jeff right now. MR. DAPAS: I will add one comment. We are, of course, looking at that separately in the context of flooding vulnerabilities, or the context there that they have an impact on this event and response associated with this event. MR. HARRIS: Okay. I talked to Jason. The analysis associated with the flooding of the default was done as part of a separate analysis versus flooding events. He did not include any information from the impact of that flood in the analysis he performed as part of the Stator drop that we talked about today. MR. MITMAN: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	five hours. MR. WERNER: We're estimating about 10-15 minutes probably. MR. DAPAS: I was reluctant to provide an estimate, but since you my goal would be 10-15 minutes. (Break taken from 5:55 p.m. to 6:25 p m.) MR. KENNEDY: Let's see, the length of time we were out doesn't reflect the quality of the discussion so, but, I think what does reflect the quality of the discussion is a few questions that we actually have. So we do have two follow-up I think it's two follow-up questions. So, we'll go through those. In addition, we have a number of information requests. What I would propose is that Mike Bloodgood get together with Stephanie and go through those in detail. We think that what we ask for you all will not have to develop, so we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	any of the consequences it might have had on or impact on that risk analysis? MR. SULLINS: I'm not familiar with risk analysis details, I'm sorry. MR. HARRIS: I'm talking with Jeff right now. MR. DAPAS: I will add one comment. We are, of course, looking at that separately in the context of flooding vulnerabilities, or the context there that they have an impact on this event and response associated with this event. MR. HARRIS: Okay. I talked to Jason. The analysis associated with the flooding of the default was done as part of a separate analysis versus flooding events. He did not include any information from the impact of that flood in the analysis he performed as part of the Stator drop that we talked about today. MR. MITMAN: Okay. MR. KENNEDY: Then if you could hand the
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	five hours. MR. WERNER: We're estimating about 10-15 minutes probably. MR. DAPAS: I was reluctant to provide an estimate, but since you my goal would be 10-15 minutes. (Break taken from 5:55 p.m. to 6:25 p m.) MR. KENNEDY: Let's see, the length of time we were out doesn't reflect the quality of the discussion so, but, I think what does reflect the quality of the discussion is a few questions that we actually have. So we do have two follow-up I think it's two follow-up questions. So, we'll go through those. In addition, we have a number of information requests. What I would propose is that Mike Bloodgood get together with Stephanie and go through those in detail. We think that what we ask for you all will not have to develop, so we think that you should be able to provide us that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	any of the consequences it might have had on or impact on that risk analysis? MR. SULLINS: I'm not familiar with risk analysis details, I'm sorry. MR. HARRIS: I'm talking with Jeff right now. MR. DAPAS: I will add one comment. We are, of course, looking at that separately in the context of flooding vulnerabilities, or the context there that they have an impact on this event and response associated with this event. MR. HARRIS: Okay. I talked to Jason. The analysis associated with the flooding of the default was done as part of a separate analysis versus flooding events. He did not include any information from the impact of that flood in the analysis he performed as part of the Stator drop that we talked about today. MR. MITMAN: Okay. MR. KENNEDY: Then if you could hand the remote mic to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	five hours. MR. WERNER: We're estimating about 10-15 minutes probably. MR. DAPAS: I was reluctant to provide an estimate, but since you my goal would be 10-15 minutes. (Break taken from 5:55 p.m. to 6:25 p m.) MR. KENNEDY: Let's see, the length of time we were out doesn't reflect the quality of the discussion so, but, I think what does reflect the quality of the discussion is a few questions that we actually have. So we do have two follow-up I think it's two follow-up questions. So, we'll go through those. In addition, we have a number of information requests. What I would propose is that Mike Bloodgood get together with Stephanie and go through those in detail. We think that what we ask for you all will not have to develop, so we think that you should be able to provide us that information sooner rather than later.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	any of the consequences it might have had on or impact on that risk analysis? MR. SULLINS: I'm not familiar with risk analysis details, I'm sorry. MR. HARRIS: I'm talking with Jeff right now. MR. DAPAS: I will add one comment. We are, of course, looking at that separately in the context of flooding vulnerabilities, or the context there that they have an impact on this event and response associated with this event. MR. HARRIS: Okay. I talked to Jason. The analysis associated with the flooding of the default was done as part of a separate analysis versus flooding events. He did not include any information from the impact of that flood in the analysis he performed as part of the Stator drop that we talked about today. MR. MITMAN: Okay. MR. KENNEDY: Then if you could hand the remote mic to MR. KOWALESKI: When we provide the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	five hours. MR. WERNER: We're estimating about 10-15 minutes probably. MR. DAPAS: I was reluctant to provide an estimate, but since you my goal would be 10-15 minutes. (Break taken from 5:55 p.m. to 6:25 p m.) MR. KENNEDY: Let's see, the length of time we were out doesn't reflect the quality of the discussion so, but, I think what does reflect the quality of the discussion is a few questions that we actually have. So we do have two follow-up I think it's two follow-up questions. So, we'll go through those. In addition, we have a number of information requests. What I would propose is that Mike Bloodgood get together with Stephanie and go through those in detail. We think that what we ask for you all will not have to develop, so we think that you should be able to provide us that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	any of the consequences it might have had on or impact on that risk analysis? MR. SULLINS: I'm not familiar with risk analysis details, I'm sorry. MR. HARRIS: I'm talking with Jeff right now. MR. DAPAS: I will add one comment. We are, of course, looking at that separately in the context of flooding vulnerabilities, or the context there that they have an impact on this event and response associated with this event. MR. HARRIS: Okay. I talked to Jason. The analysis associated with the flooding of the default was done as part of a separate analysis versus flooding events. He did not include any information from the impact of that flood in the analysis he performed as part of the Stator drop that we talked about today. MR. MITMAN: Okay. MR. KENNEDY: Then if you could hand the remote mic to MR. KOWALESKI: When we provide the information we talked about providing we should go ahead
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	five hours. MR. WERNER: We're estimating about 10-15 minutes probably. MR. DAPAS: I was reluctant to provide an estimate, but since you my goal would be 10-15 minutes. (Break taken from 5:55 p.m. to 6:25 p m.) MR. KENNEDY: Let's see, the length of time we were out doesn't reflect the quality of the discussion so, but, I think what does reflect the quality of the discussion is a few questions that we actually have. So we do have two follow-up I think it's two follow-up questions. So, we'll go through those. In addition, we have a number of information requests. What I would propose is that Mike Bloodgood get together with Stephanie and go through those in detail. We think that what we ask for you all will not have to develop, so we think that you should be able to provide us that information sooner rather than later. MR. KOWALESKI: Is May 9th a week from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	any of the consequences it might have had on or impact on that risk analysis? MR. SULLINS: I'm not familiar with risk analysis details, I'm sorry. MR. HARRIS: I'm talking with Jeff right now. MR. DAPAS: I will add one comment. We are, of course, looking at that separately in the context of flooding vulnerabilities, or the context there that they have an impact on this event and response associated with this event. MR. HARRIS: Okay. I talked to Jason. The analysis associated with the flooding of the default was done as part of a separate analysis versus flooding events. He did not include any information from the impact of that flood in the analysis he performed as part of the Stator drop that we talked about today. MR. MITMAN: Okay. MR. KENNEDY: Then if you could hand the remote mic to MR. KOWALESKI: When we provide the information we talked about providing we should go ahead and provide an assessment of potential impact.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	five hours. MR. WERNER: We're estimating about 10-15 minutes probably. MR. DAPAS: I was reluctant to provide an estimate, but since you my goal would be 10-15 minutes. (Break taken from 5:55 p.m. to 6:25 p m.) MR. KENNEDY: Let's see, the length of time we were out doesn't reflect the quality of the discussion so, but, I think what does reflect the quality of the discussion is a few questions that we actually have. So we do have two follow-up I think it's two follow-up questions. So, we'll go through those. In addition, we have a number of information requests. What I would propose is that Mike Bloodgood get together with Stephanie and go through those in detail. We think that what we ask for you all will not have to develop, so we think that you should be able to provide us that information sooner rather than later.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	any of the consequences it might have had on or impact on that risk analysis? MR. SULLINS: I'm not familiar with risk analysis details, I'm sorry. MR. HARRIS: I'm talking with Jeff right now. MR. DAPAS: I will add one comment. We are, of course, looking at that separately in the context of flooding vulnerabilities, or the context there that they have an impact on this event and response associated with this event. MR. HARRIS: Okay. I talked to Jason. The analysis associated with the flooding of the default was done as part of a separate analysis versus flooding events. He did not include any information from the impact of that flood in the analysis he performed as part of the Stator drop that we talked about today. MR. MITMAN: Okay. MR. KENNEDY: Then if you could hand the remote mic to MR. KOWALESKI: When we provide the information we talked about providing we should go ahead

Job No. 18996 Nuclear Regulatory Conference with Entergy Operations, Inc.

	Page 201		Page 203
1	did you account for the EALs in your recovery action	1	MR. WERNER: I think that concludes
2	credit for both Unit 1 and Unit 2?	2	questions for the caucus. Mark, did you want to make
3	MR. WERNER: And I think that in	3	any additional closing remarks?
4	particular, he was interested in how the personnel	4	MR. DAPAS: Yes I do. Thanks. Couple
5	availability, if you went beyond alert would be	5	thoughts. One, I really do appreciate the perseverance,
6	impacted?	6	patience, and discipline you've exercised here in
7	MR. KENNEDY: So you declare site area	7	providing us your perspective in the stator drop events.
8	emergency or a general emergency, in some of these	8	We've been at it for over five and a half hours here.
9	scenarios and you have accountability to deal with, how	9	We've had extensive discussions and a lot of detailed
10	did you factor that into	10	questions, but very important that we reach a full
11	MR. BROWNING: That's a good question.	11	understanding of your perspective. I think as described
12	We did consider the availability of resources, and you	12	in one of slides and I think I mentioned this when I
13	would have to reach the point beyond set of core damage	13	opened, the goal is a realistic estimate of risk
14	before you would escalate from the alert so we, in	14	utilizing the best available information. Because the
15	looking at that, we would stay in an alert class for the	15	consequences of our risk determination are significant
16	success paths that were presented today which would keep	16	here.
17	the resources described.	17	We're looking at a preliminary red
18	MR. WERNER: So essentially you would	18	finding, that constitutes high safety significance,
19	have to do a core uncovery? Is that what you said?	19	that's for Unit 1. Now for Unit 2, a preliminary risk
20	MR. BROWNING: Yes.	20	assessment there was a yellow finding which is
21	MR. DALE JAMES: Yeah, that is correct.	21	substantial risk significance.
22	Our review looked like it would, before you would be	22	And, you know, obviously, dependent on
23	escalating, you would be have to have imminent core	23	the finalization of those risk significance
24	recovery.	24	determinations depends on where you are in the reactor
25	MR. WERNER: Did that answer your	25	oversight process action matrix here and what's the
	Page 202		Page 204
1	question?	1	degree of regulatory oversight, and when you have a red
2	MR. LOVELESS: I thought part of the	2	finding and supplemental inspection 95003 and
3	question was that there was that there was a if	3	independent safety factors, so clearly there's a
4	Unit 2 was going towards a site area emergency and	4	significant resource expenditure by the agency in
5	station blackout, how would that impact overall safety	5	providing increased oversight here. And a number of
6	services?	6	actions that you would end up taking should you find
7	MR. KOWALESKI: Just a clarification.	7	yourself in that particular column of the action.
8	Are you asking if we need to consider both units into a	8	My point in all that is, it's very
9	single significance assessment?	9	important that we do all we can as part of our due
10	MR. LOVELESS: I was trying to clarify	10	diligence and independent assessment to arrive at the
11	Brian's question.	11	most realistic assessment of risk significance, and I'll
12	MR. KENNEDY: Are there scenarios where,	12	come back to that in a minute.
13	you know, in the risk evaluation where personnel	13	I really appreciate the perspective
14	availability would be affected because one of the units	14	provided by Mr. Sullins and Mr. Hathcoat, the Assistant
15	had declared, you know, site area emergency or general	15	Operations Managers for Unit 1 and Unit 2, respectively.
16	emergency where accountability came into play?	16	You were in the control room and I think it was
17	MR. SULLINS: This is Gary Sullins. As	17 18	particularly valuable for us to hear your perspective
18 19	described previously, we looked at it from the	18	there regarding what you were facing, and as we
19 20	prospective of Unit 1, the Unit 1 analysis, he	20	underscored, very important that you look at it in the
20	considered recall that we're dealing with	20	context of what the operators understood to be the plant
21	unavailability of electrical distribution equipment	22	condition at the time and what equipment was available and what decisions you would have made because it is
23	within Unit 1. Our start up transformers remained available, so we did not extrapolate to consider a	23	and what decisions you would have made because it is challenging when you're looking at it over a year after
24	degraded power for Unit 2 or that separate initiating	24	the fact with information and knowledge we have now and
25	event for blackout.	25	try and determine, okay, you're in a station blackout
	even for blackout.		a j and determine, ondy, you're in a station blackout
		I	

	Page 205		Page 207
1	event and you're dealing with an adverse environment	1	So, next step here, I think we have a
2	here and there's the stress factors associated with	2	clear understanding by virtue of what you presented to
3	that.	3	us, the basis for your assumptions and how you
4	And you know, as part of that realistic	4	approached in determining the risk significance. The
5	assessment of risk, with available information	5	next step for us is to consider that fully and then
6	adequately considering those factors that come into play	6	we'll communicate the final risk significance to you via
7	when you find yourself in that particular situation. I	7	a separate correspondence here. I'll offer, if we do
8	was very appreciative of the comment you made,	8	have any questions as we're going through that process
9	Mr. Browning and yourself, Mr. Kowaleski, regarding the	9	we won't hesitate to reach out because it's important
10	consequences of the event here, in recognizing that it	10	that we don't have a gap in information here.
11	was the actual consequences were unacceptable here given	11	So with that, I will close and again
12	the fatality and the injuries that occurred, not	12	thank you for the time and the manner in which you
13	withstanding the focus of this conference certainly is	13	answered our very detailed questions. With that, I'll
14	the risk significance. And I do appreciate the comments	14	close the formal portion of the Regulatory Conference
15	that you shared with us and the actions you're taking	15	and Greg can open it up to entertain any questions from
16	regarding oversight of contractors to insure going	16	those members of the public that might still be on the
17	forward that the behaviors don't translate into a	17	phone may have.
18	problem where you actually are dealing with a	18	Thanks.
19	significant issue from reactor safety context.	19	MR. WERNER: Thank you, Mark.
20	But let me come back to, for just a	20	Operator, can you go ahead and begin to
21	minute, this realistic estimate of risk utilizing the	21	cue up questions for those on the phone?
22	best available information. You heard us with our	22	OPERATOR SYLVIA: Thank you, we would now
23	questions. I think one of things we struggle with here	23	like to open the lines for any questions. If anyone
24	is there is no definitive standard for calculating	24	does have a question, please hit star-one and record
25	recovery actions for shut down conditions.	25	your name when prompted. Again, it's star-one to ask a
	Page 206		Page 208

	rage 200		rage 200
1	You, I think, did provide us clearly with	1	question. One moment to see if we have questions.
2	your perspective regarding methodologies you used and	2	MR. WERNER: I'll just provide a quick
3	why those were appropriate. And you're correct. We did	3	briefing again, we will alternate between members of the
4	not give credit for recovery of the 4160-volt bus or	4	public attending this meeting here in the room, as well
5	inventory control. We're going to go back and look at	5	as those on the bridge. For both of those in the room
6	what you proposed and determine based on our assessment	6	and on the phone bridge, please introduce yourself,
7	whether that's reasonable here.	7	state your affiliation, and then ask your question or
8	I do appreciate the significant time	8	make a comment.
9	margin you've indicated exists here and that provides	9	Questions and comments be limited to
10	some additional, if you will, space to consider	10	three minutes at a time. So we'll start with a member
11	uncertainty there. And I do appreciate the perspective	11	here in the room. Are there any members of the public
12	regarding the comparison of the normal outage	12	that would like to ask a question. If you'll raise your
13	configuration and what's required by the tech specs,	13	hand, I'll come to you with the mic. Anybody?
14	comparing that with the plant condition after the event.	14	All right. We have no questions here in
15	I think we struggle, too, with we have	15	the room. Operator, do you have any questions from
16	definitive guidance when we talk about recovery actions	16	members on the phone bridge?
17	whether they're proceduralized and when there's training	17	OPERATOR SYLVIA: I am showing no
18	here. And when you're talking about Unit 1 here and the	18	questions.
19	different success strategies, you know, the three	19	MR. WERNER: I understand no questions.
20	success paths here that you've presented to us, those	20	We'll just second it one more time. This will be the
21	weren't proceduralized and trained on in the same	21	last chance. Sure no questions? No questions?
22	context of what our guidance would provide of how we	22	Well, that concludes our conference.
23	should treat the manual actions, etc., so we'll need to	23	Again, thank you for your attendance. And as a
24	look at that and determine whether what have you have	24	reminder, members of the public please fill out a public
25	provided us appears reasonable.	25	meeting feedback form. There's some on the table over

52 (Pages 205 to 208)

	Page 209
1	here, up against the wall.
2	And for members of the public on the
3	phone, if you'll go to the public meeting website and
4	look at our announcement, I think there will be a public
5	meeting form that will be automatically populated, I
6	think at midnight tonight, so if you'll go and get that
7	form tomorrow and fill it out and send it to us, we
8	appreciate it.
9	Thank you very much.
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20 21	
21	
22	
24	
25	
	Page 210
1	Page 210
1	THE STATE OF TEXAS)
1 2	
	THE STATE OF TEXAS)
2	THE STATE OF TEXAS) COUNTY OF TARRANT)
2 3	THE STATE OF TEXAS) COUNTY OF TARRANT) This is to certify that I, KATHLEEN MCCURRY, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, reported in shorthand the proceedings at the Nuclear Regulatory Conference meeting
2 3 4 5 6	THE STATE OF TEXAS) COUNTY OF TARRANT) This is to certify that I, KATHLEEN MCCURRY, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, reported in shorthand the proceedings at the Nuclear Regulatory Conference meeting on May 1, 2014 at 1:00 p.m., and that the foregoing 209
2 3 4 5 6 7	THE STATE OF TEXAS) COUNTY OF TARRANT) This is to certify that I, KATHLEEN MCCURRY, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, reported in shorthand the proceedings at the Nuclear Regulatory Conference meeting on May 1, 2014 at 1:00 p.m., and that the foregoing 209 pages contain a full, true and correct transcript to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE STATE OF TEXAS) COUNTY OF TARRANT) This is to certify that I, KATHLEEN MCCURRY, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, reported in shorthand the proceedings at the Nuclear Regulatory Conference meeting on May 1, 2014 at 1:00 p.m., and that the foregoing 209 pages contain a full, true and correct transcript to the best of my ability of said proceedings.
2 3 4 5 6 7	THE STATE OF TEXAS) COUNTY OF TARRANT) This is to certify that I, KATHLEEN MCCURRY, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, reported in shorthand the proceedings at the Nuclear Regulatory Conference meeting on May 1, 2014 at 1:00 p.m., and that the foregoing 209 pages contain a full, true and correct transcript to the best of my ability of said proceedings. Given under my hand and seal of office on this the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE STATE OF TEXAS) COUNTY OF TARRANT) This is to certify that I, KATHLEEN MCCURRY, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, reported in shorthand the proceedings at the Nuclear Regulatory Conference meeting on May 1, 2014 at 1:00 p.m., and that the foregoing 209 pages contain a full, true and correct transcript to the best of my ability of said proceedings.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE STATE OF TEXAS) COUNTY OF TARRANT) This is to certify that I, KATHLEEN MCCURRY, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, reported in shorthand the proceedings at the Nuclear Regulatory Conference meeting on May 1, 2014 at 1:00 p.m., and that the foregoing 209 pages contain a full, true and correct transcript to the best of my ability of said proceedings. Given under my hand and seal of office on this the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE STATE OF TEXAS) COUNTY OF TARRANT) This is to certify that I, KATHLEEN MCCURRY, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, reported in shorthand the proceedings at the Nuclear Regulatory Conference meeting on May 1, 2014 at 1:00 p.m., and that the foregoing 209 pages contain a full, true and correct transcript to the best of my ability of said proceedings. Given under my hand and seal of office on this the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE STATE OF TEXAS) COUNTY OF TARRANT) This is to certify that I, KATHLEEN MCCURRY, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, reported in shorthand the proceedings at the Nuclear Regulatory Conference meeting on May 1, 2014 at 1:00 p.m., and that the foregoing 209 pages contain a full, true and correct transcript to the best of my ability of said proceedings. Given under my hand and seal of office on this the day of, 2014. Kathleen McCurry, Texas CSR 8567
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE STATE OF TEXAS) COUNTY OF TARRANT) This is to certify that I, KATHLEEN MCCURRY, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, reported in shorthand the proceedings at the Nuclear Regulatory Conference meeting on May 1, 2014 at 1:00 p.m., and that the foregoing 209 pages contain a full, true and correct transcript to the best of my ability of said proceedings. Given under my hand and seal of office on this the day of, 2014.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE STATE OF TEXAS) COUNTY OF TARRANT) This is to certify that I, KATHLEEN MCCURRY, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, reported in shorthand the proceedings at the Nuclear Regulatory Conference meeting on May 1, 2014 at 1:00 p.m., and that the foregoing 209 pages contain a full, true and correct transcript to the best of my ability of said proceedings. Given under my hand and seal of office on this the day of, 2014. Kathleen McCurry, Texas CSR 8567
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE STATE OF TEXAS) COUNTY OF TARRANT) This is to certify that I, KATHLEEN MCCURRY, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, reported in shorthand the proceedings at the Nuclear Regulatory Conference meeting on May 1, 2014 at 1:00 p.m., and that the foregoing 209 pages contain a full, true and correct transcript to the best of my ability of said proceedings. Given under my hand and seal of office on this the day of, 2014. Kathleen McCurry, Texas CSR 8567
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE STATE OF TEXAS) COUNTY OF TARRANT) This is to certify that I, KATHLEEN MCCURRY, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, reported in shorthand the proceedings at the Nuclear Regulatory Conference meeting on May 1, 2014 at 1:00 p.m., and that the foregoing 209 pages contain a full, true and correct transcript to the best of my ability of said proceedings. Given under my hand and seal of office on this the day of, 2014. Kathleen McCurry, Texas CSR 8567
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE STATE OF TEXAS) COUNTY OF TARRANT) This is to certify that I, KATHLEEN MCCURRY, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, reported in shorthand the proceedings at the Nuclear Regulatory Conference meeting on May 1, 2014 at 1:00 p.m., and that the foregoing 209 pages contain a full, true and correct transcript to the best of my ability of said proceedings. Given under my hand and seal of office on this the day of, 2014. Kathleen McCurry, Texas CSR 8567
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13 14 15 16 17	THE STATE OF TEXAS) COUNTY OF TARRANT) This is to certify that I, KATHLEEN MCCURRY, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, reported in shorthand the proceedings at the Nuclear Regulatory Conference meeting on May 1, 2014 at 1:00 p.m., and that the foregoing 209 pages contain a full, true and correct transcript to the best of my ability of said proceedings. Given under my hand and seal of office on this the day of, 2014. Kathleen McCurry, Texas CSR 8567
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE STATE OF TEXAS) COUNTY OF TARRANT) This is to certify that I, KATHLEEN MCCURRY, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, reported in shorthand the proceedings at the Nuclear Regulatory Conference meeting on May 1, 2014 at 1:00 p.m., and that the foregoing 209 pages contain a full, true and correct transcript to the best of my ability of said proceedings. Given under my hand and seal of office on this the day of, 2014. Kathleen McCurry, Texas CSR 8567
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE STATE OF TEXAS) COUNTY OF TARRANT) This is to certify that I, KATHLEEN MCCURRY, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, reported in shorthand the proceedings at the Nuclear Regulatory Conference meeting on May 1, 2014 at 1:00 p.m., and that the foregoing 209 pages contain a full, true and correct transcript to the best of my ability of said proceedings. Given under my hand and seal of office on this the day of, 2014. Kathleen McCurry, Texas CSR 8567
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE STATE OF TEXAS) COUNTY OF TARRANT) This is to certify that I, KATHLEEN MCCURRY, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, reported in shorthand the proceedings at the Nuclear Regulatory Conference meeting on May 1, 2014 at 1:00 p.m., and that the foregoing 209 pages contain a full, true and correct transcript to the best of my ability of said proceedings. Given under my hand and seal of office on this the day of, 2014. Kathleen McCurry, Texas CSR 8567
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE STATE OF TEXAS) COUNTY OF TARRANT) This is to certify that I, KATHLEEN MCCURRY, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, reported in shorthand the proceedings at the Nuclear Regulatory Conference meeting on May 1, 2014 at 1:00 p.m., and that the foregoing 209 pages contain a full, true and correct transcript to the best of my ability of said proceedings. Given under my hand and seal of office on this the day of, 2014. Kathleen McCurry, Texas CSR 8567
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE STATE OF TEXAS) COUNTY OF TARRANT) This is to certify that I, KATHLEEN MCCURRY, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, reported in shorthand the proceedings at the Nuclear Regulatory Conference meeting on May 1, 2014 at 1:00 p.m., and that the foregoing 209 pages contain a full, true and correct transcript to the best of my ability of said proceedings. Given under my hand and seal of office on this the day of, 2014. Kathleen McCurry, Texas CSR 8567

				Page 211
	169:17 170:7	87:14 102:7	20.10 10 22.10	162.1 101.6
<u>A</u>	171:13 173:7,15	115:18 118:12,13	30:10,19 32:10 34:19 37:11,25	162:1 181:6 183:5 189:10
a1 39:17 41:1	171.13 175.7,15	· · · · ·	42:14 48:23 49:2	
44:25 48:8 63:3		121:12,14 130:2		addressed 17:9
75:17 158:22	174:14 186:23	130:22,22,23	51:18 53:12	156:5
167:1	187:12,23	138:14 142:11,12	58:14,17 60:18	addresses 185:1,5
a1a3 45:10	acceptable 194:23	143:3,4 162:24	71:16 82:2,7	addressing 117:20
a2 39:17 48:8 63:4	access 38:10 69:23	164:6 173:13,16	91:12 100:23	170:6
63:6 64:6,7	70:1,11,20,24	174:23 175:1,3,7	113:6 123:23	adds 147:14
a201s 64:24	71:22,23 99:8,16	182:12 193:4	126:16 137:10	adequacy 183:15
a3 41:1 44:25	99:21 100:22	195:4 201:1	152:13 168:11	adequate 16:25
61:21 62:2	119:1	203:25 204:7	188:2 195:21	117:25 165:7,19
104:22,23 105:1	accessed 42:13	actions 13:15	196:13 205:11	adequately 11:21
106:4 111:2	accessibility 45:17	14:22 15:6 16:17	actuality 127:15	17:9 108:24
158:22 167:1	accessible 69:21	17:5,7 18:19	152:9	117:20 205:6
a 310410 47:5	accessing 69:3	19:1,4 20:6,21	actuated 156:2	adjourn 7:19
a4 61:22 62:2 63:6	108:6	21:4,5,23 22:10	157:7	adjust 134:2
66:4 111:23	accident 70:23	23:18 71:1 99:4	adapted 147:16	adjusted 170:10
ability 24:14 95:24	accomplish 91:8	99:9 100:6	add 23:3 66:2	174:13 175:21,22
105:20 119:20	accorded 16:13	107:22 132:23	121:10 147:7,8	adjusting 134:1
153:4,6 171:14	account 82:25	137:5,19,21	149:20 183:10	adjustments
210:8	83:2 99:16	138:1 147:10,10	188:20 200:7	173:19
able 6:24 44:11,18	130:18 140:18	151:17 167:13	added 175:2	administrative 6:2
47:7 51:11 52:2	170:22 173:19,24	177:4,9,17	191:19	administrator 2:5
59:21 66:11 68:4	201:1	181:14 182:3,12	addition 12:2 74:7	7:11 8:2 15:16
68:20 71:1,19,22	accountability	184:4,6,12,13	113:13 185:17	adverse 155:15
71:23 77:12	201:9 202:16	188:10 189:1,11	188:18 198:15	205:1
80:25 89:9 90:6	accountable	189:11 190:14	additional 7:10,16	advised 15:12
112:24 114:9	183:13	192:15,19 194:17	7:17 13:18 17:25	advisor 159:12
120:7 188:16	accounted 104:16	194:23 195:1	19:21 20:18	affect 99:4 101:22
192:3 197:1	108:3 170:20,25	204:6 205:15,25	36:21 49:10 50:4	102:3 143:20
192.3 197.1	accounts 107:25	206:16,23	51:25 53:24 58:3	affiliation 208:7
	accuracy 13:12	activated 32:15	58:4 74:21 77:5	afforded 15:23
abnormal 156:10	accurate 15:25	active 22:6 139:25	99:24,25 102:7	60:23
absolutely 41:19	18:2,8 195:18	activities 14:19	108:21 138:1	afternoon 5:2,11
44:2 46:6 81:2	196:20	15:4 20:24 23:21	151:16 155:18	23:2,11 40:24
104:7 167:16	accurately 170:15	24:8 29:20,21	162:6 172:15	45:6 159:15
171:2 172:6	acd 81:21	57:5 79:25 80:2	174:2 175:23	agency 14:11
absorb 77:15	achieve 18:1 134:3	81:13 84:15,16	174.2 175.25	185:25 204:4
abut 159:6	195:18	84:18,23 100:9	185:20 192:19	agenda 6:12,13,15
ac 21:11 27:3	acknowledge	133:19 166:4	195:9 196:18	7:7 19:13,25
28:18 38:21,24	16:17 113:11	177:13,20 181:12	195.9 196.18	ago 135:9 146:11
42:15 61:13 65:5	131:25	177:13,20 181:12	203:3 206:10	agree 132:2 146:5
65:8 89:5,10		191:13,17,18	additionally	147:3,4 170:9
125:22 153:1	acknowledged 101:3	, ,	155:16	ahead 6:20 36:15
158:15,18,19		activity 30:8 89:1		
159:8 160:15	acknowledging	97:17 124:6	address 16:22	50:2 104:24
163:5 164:11,25	115:11	133:16 178:6	17:18 37:4 70:8	140:11 165:14
167:6 168:7	acting 2:2,6 8:4	192:9	78:2 102:5	200:22 207:20
	action 22:15 43:25	actual 23:4,8	105:11 155:16	air 92:13,14
	-	•	•	-

				Page 212
105:17	137:17 155:7	153:11 171:12	24:22 54:14,15	approved 6:1
ait 69:5 159:6	199:20	173:11 178:15	118:7 125:6	22:10
160:9	amp 88:8	185:16	133:6 134:4	approximately
alarms 101:14,19	ample 132:11	answer 5:6 9:23	135:4 145:19	10:8 27:24 34:7
101:24 105:8	134:2	34:10 46:17	149:3,10,14	48:2 64:10 93:22
alert 27:19 201:5	amps 89:14	56:21 76:19	173:22 178:4	93:24 95:5
201:14,15	anal 121:3	77:12 97:2	applies 35:8	144:22 145:4,9
align 32:21 86:15	analysis 18:20,25	102:24 104:11,18	181:13 188:22	april 10:20
142:12	21:1 26:13 30:11	112:24 134:10	apply 22:13 24:24	arching 26:7
alignment 94:5	36:16 94:16	142:17 152:19	119:8 121:9	area 6:9 47:5 48:4
allegation 2:21,24	104:24,25 105:12	157:15 159:10	132:21 133:3,4	48:5 58:10 60:25
alleging 12:15	104.24,25 105.12	174:18 187:11	132:21 135:5,6	62:23 69:6 70:3
allow 13:2,4 19:20	113:1 114:5,10	201:25	142:21 143:9	70:5,6,11,13,20
59:22 154:11	114:24 115:10	answered 77:9	applying 122:9	70:24 71:8,11,24
190:13	114.24 113.10	79:17 102:10	182:5	77:25 80:5 81:18
allowed 35:21 57:7	118:1 121:4,5,7	108:24 207:13	appreciate 7:4	81:21 88:22
68:15 69:7 79:8	123:15 124:13	answering 77:5	13:8 17:24 18:23	169:15 201:7
109:17	125:2 126:3,5	79:13	82:5,13 97:4,13	202:4,15
allowing 70:11	125.2 120.3,5	answers 7:13	108:24 196:25	areas 19:14 20:8
alluded 153:16	136:10 139:5		199:6 203:5	21:3 29:18 60:22
	144:16,20 145:4	anticipated 178:16	204:13 205:14	69:3 197:6
alpha 69:15 92:9 156:3 165:15		anticipating 187:5 antonio 176:18		arena 193:22
	157:10,11,12		206:8,11 209:8	
185:19 193:16	170:25 174:16,21	anybody 208:13	appreciative 205:8	arent 20:23 71:5
194:1	175:12,16,21	anymore 35:1	approach 17:8 35:4 75:18 80:25	78:23
alphas 193:11	185:16 189:9	anyway 39:10		argument 143:6
alternate 27:3 29:12 38:24	193:12 194:16,17	ao1 40:23 aom 152:15	117:24,25 132:5 132:8 148:24	arkansas 2:18 5:13
42:15 49:22	199:25,25 200:2			5:19 8:17 9:2,4
42:13 49:22 57:16,25 63:22	200:4,13,14,16 202:19	apart 88:25 apparent 11:17	169:22,23 170:16 approached	17:23 46:1 47:18 59:20 184:5
65:5 68:16 74:2	analyst 2:8,10 8:10	14:3 17:10 44:16	169:20,23 186:8	200:25
81:21 101:6	•	112:1	207:4	arose 144:14
109:13 117:22	8:12 112:19 129:16 176:11,16			arrive 133:8
	,	appearances 4:4	approaches 117:22	
125:22 134:12 137:1 140:14	analysts 122:5 185:15 188:24	appears 206:25	134:14,17 appropriate 13:6	204:10 arrived 133:6
	185.15 188.24	appendix 5:22 11:17	14:22 19:4,19	149:11
153:1 158:14,17		applicability	21:2 31:24 85:19	
158:19 159:8	analyzed 86:7 anded 125:20			arriving 13:6
160:15 163:5 164:11,25 167:6		116:14 applicable 178:24	142:18 148:16	articulating 170:13
,	announcement 6:5 209:4		152:8 162:13	
168:7 169:17 171:13 173:7 15	209:4 annunciators	application 13:10 124:18 135:23	169:9 172:20 181:5 188:22	asked 77:7,17 99:18 104:21
171:13 173:7,15	105:8		206:3	
173:17,18,22,25		137:8 144:10,10		111:8 129:16,18
174:14 187:12,23	ano 3:2,5,6,9,14	178:10,25 179:17	appropriately	129:19 134:7,7
208:3 alternative 29:7	8:21,23 12:2 14:20 23:12	179:25 180:5,14 192:13	149:3 170:21 183:14	140:15 146:19 159:23 166:17
37:2,15 151:9 alternatives 86:11	35:18 104:17	applications 54:15 148:3 179:6,18	approval 35:14 177:25	167:18 176:25 199:8
	112:16,19 113:24			
altogether 61:3 amount 26:22	115:4 117:17	180:10,25	approvals 53:6	asking 36:23 85:14 107:4 129:13
amount 20:22	145:24 146:7	applied 13:17 21:3	approve 34:11	107.4 129:13

				Page 213
152:5 176:22	assign 123:8	assure 107:2	116:11,12 118:16	112:10,22 114:8
202:8	assist 13:5 118:6	108:23 183:15	118:22 121:12	114:8 121:22
aspect 90:12	assistant 3:5,6	assuring 192:7	124:23 132:25	127:3 142:22,22
109:11 120:5	204:14	attachments 171:6	134:10 137:3	143:19,25 148:12
170:24 193:23	associated 5:21,24	attempt 196:21	141:14 150:10	151:15,22 152:19
199:15	10:16 15:6 24:9	attendance 2:1 3:1	154:12 158:3,14	160:5,23 165:21
aspects 182:19	49:17 53:7 61:24	9:17 208:23	158:16 159:1,3,8	166:13 168:4,6
184:19	65:9,20 70:12	attending 208:4	159:16 160:7	178:5 180:6
assembled 115:14	89:17 101:7,8	attention 73:13	161:3 162:17,19	185:18 192:11
122:8	105:14 114:14	augmented 10:20	162:21 163:3,7	193:11 194:2,8
assemblies 178:2	119:24 120:17	10:24 13:14 16:2	163:16,17 164:6	204:12 205:20
assembly 5:25 6:9	122:16,24 125:12	18:24 160:12	165:8 167:5,13	206:5
10:3,23 11:21	125:18,22 126:9	authorization 54:8	167:15 171:16	backdrop 20:1
12:1,3 177:22	126:13 146:12	authorize 54:3	173:9 174:3	background 14:19
178:9,14,17	147:21 161:22	automatically	187:21 189:2	backup 97:17
183:2,8	166:25 173:18	106:16 154:5,11	197:12 202:23	bamford 2:20
asses 159:22	174:6 177:5,10	154:16 157:23,25	203:14 204:21	barrier 183:10
assess 10:21 13:24	177:21 178:1,18	163:2 209:5	205:5,22	186:25
41:3 44:11 65:19	179:8,15 180:4	aux 62:10 74:11	aware 9:18 68:14	base 105:24 148:8
71:19 102:8	181:12 182:13	88:20 153:21	awhile 71:23	199:5
107:22 110:12	187:14 189:12	157:1 199:22	149:18	based 30:10 34:19
117:25 126:22	190:18 191:8	auxiliary 83:9		78:24 79:3 85:18
158:21 162:7	193:20 200:11,13	availabilities 76:5	B	86:24 99:19
180:23 182:19	205:2	availability 26:25	b 5:22 41:20 92:1	115:1,25 119:23
192:2	assume 120:21	46:2,4 58:24	101:21,22 102:15	121:6,18 126:23
assessed 11:7 14:7	135:20,21 137:13	67:12 153:1,3,8	105:6 106:2,3	136:13,19 152:12
42:14 71:9	145:11 147:21	163:6 171:13	108:15	158:19 162:14
assessing 22:12	167:22 180:18	173:22 189:4	b21 88:23 89:4,11	183:4 194:6
32:16 38:8 78:18	assumed 67:17	201:5,12 202:14	b51 88:19,22 89:4	196:6 206:6
103:7 107:11	77:1 86:20 137:1	available 6:17 7:1	89:8,23 90:2	baseline 38:16
146:9	141:3	7:2 9:22 13:19	b5b 94:8 141:2	basement 199:20
assessment 8:7,10	assumes 137:10	20:12,13,16,17	148:3	basic 46:21
16:5 18:2 24:25	assuming 54:13	20:23 21:1,15	babcock 12:22	basically 38:20
27:18 28:5 47:23	55:25 59:8	22:3 23:6 25:24	back 7:17 25:23	56:16 58:5 63:21
76:25 85:16,19	112:18 118:12	27:6,14,19,23	34:17 35:16 40:9	72:21 73:25
86:2 113:16	134:22 137:17	28:1,12 31:15	40:16,25 41:1	74:12,16 93:8
118:4 132:10	140:23	33:18,22,23 34:3	42:8 44:1,4,5,22	135:22 144:17,20
151:15 173:3	assumption 37:5	36:6 37:4 38:9	45:5,9 48:20	154:10 157:20
186:1 187:18	78:22 86:3 87:4	41:5,10 44:20	50:13 53:1 56:19	159:2,23 160:2
192:9 195:19	114:11 120:24	51:8 53:8,13	57:1,20 61:10,10	179:1 182:18
196:13,21 200:23	136:14 147:19	55:1 57:8,10,14	62:18 64:11 65:5	basis 13:17 16:4
202:9 203:20	assumptions 13:3	86:4 87:1 91:6	65:13 66:10	18:25 25:10
204:10,11 205:5	15:21 16:12	92:13,14 94:25	67:10,24 69:24	28:15 34:3 46:10
206:6	46:10 68:19	97:9,12,20	69:25 71:19,22	46:13 60:20 80:3
assessments 26:11	85:12 114:15,16	103:25 104:6	71:23 72:23 73:9	85:22 86:23
68:15 70:5	207:3	109:5,12,13	74:9,10 75:12,13	122:17 131:8
185:24 191:15	assurance 3:10,12	113:5,20 114:6	83:6 89:8 97:25	144:11 176:23
192:1,6	3:14	114:18 115:8,15	98:2 109:24	184:12 207:3
·		l , , ,	I	

				Page 214
bathrooms 109:25	115:24 120:12	boiloff 96:14	125:19 127:25	56:2 59:25 60:15
batteries 92:22	123:7,22 126:12	book 50:13	134:2 137:18	60:20 62:18 68:6
battery 89:8,17	127:12 140:6	borated 86:3,13,15	154:11,22,23	68:23 75:6 77:9
92:22 93:5	144:25 147:24	89:11,12 90:7	155:3,7 175:11	77:13 78:15
101:21,22 102:1	151:25 152:2,23	93:16,19,25	186:24	79:19 90:13,19
101:21,22 102:1	151:25 152:2,25	94:23 96:11	breakers 42:13,16	95:15 96:24
106:3 165:13	157:18 159:5	139:8	42:19,20 44:14	100:11,23 101:10
bay 10:6,10 45:2	162:5 163:11	boron 95:5,8,8,9	64:15 72:18 74:3	102:9 106:25
48:6 62:23 63:1	168:6 170:5	bothering 130:16	99:15,17,24	102.9 100.23
168:24	174:15 177:8	bottom 40:9	127:24 137:5	143:23 151:13,24
behaviors 205:17	194:19 199:20	125:14 146:10	155:9 159:25	151:25 156:6
belabor 85:10	blacked 111:2	168:8	166:21 167:9	169:13 171:2
belief 189:17	172:21	bought 169:17	174:23,24 175:8	172:17 184:1,21
beliefs 14:12	blackout 32:16	bound 100:6 123:3	174.23,24 175.8	172.17 184.1,21
believable 151:10	36:17 42:2 43:17	123:3 170:24	breaking 19:24	201:11,20 205:9
believe 18:1 19:2	43:22,24 45:8,12	175:18,19	brian 2:18 45:25	bryan 3:12
70:8 103:5 106:9	45:22,24 45:8,12	bounding 25:21	200:24	building 6:6,9 47:4
114:16,22 142:20	72:3 81:10,11,20	144:18 145:5	brians 202:11	61:2,3 62:10,10
142:23 143:15,17	81:24 82:4,16,19	box 40:3,8	bridge 6:24 9:17	87:22 88:10,21
142.25 145.15,17		box 40.3,8 boxes 48:7 145:10	39:12 160:9	92:10,11 93:4
· ·	86:20 87:5,7 92:20 98:19	branch 2:2 5:12		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
159:6,7 183:24		7:23 114:13	176:16 208:5,6 208:16	99:8 100:20
believed 41:2	100:7,9,15,24			123:24 171:4
159:15 160:7	102:4,14,15,21	119:16 120:18	brief 20:3 177:7	178:15,19 199:21
best 113:20 115:11	103:7,17 110:16	123:16 125:13,17	briefing 208:3	199:22
131:19 132:19,25	159:21 162:11	bravo 11:17	briefings 34:1	built 24:17 61:17
133:4 135:7	163:4 164:24	102:22 185:19	briefly 34:10	bullet 96:8 160:19
147:4 148:20	165:2,3,10,12	186:23 193:16	113:23 177:4,19	bullets 83:17
189:17 196:13,21	166:7,18 168:19	194:1	bring 49:22 143:25	bundle 181:24
197:23 203:14	169:16,21 170:1	bravos 193:11	161:5	bus 10:13,16 24:12
205:22 210:8	170:17 202:5,25	break 19:13,17,19	bringing 162:20	34:22 35:5 37:14
better 46:18	204:25	20:19 50:13	brings 89:7	37:16 38:8 40:12
131:20 144:25	blind 106:17	109:20,21 110:2	broad 181:8 185:3	40:16,17 41:12
168:21	blindly 106:18	128:11 149:15,17	broadened 18:21	41:13,15 42:14
beyond 33:13	block 27:7 55:8	151:12,14,14,20	broadly 180:22	42:15,17,23 43:1
102:6 131:12	57:11	151:23 197:4	185:1	44:2 46:14 59:9
147:24 201:5,13	blocks 144:21	198:7	broken 141:6	59:11 60:6 61:8
big 106:4 158:24	bloodgood 2:14	breaker 33:24 35:2	brought 47:16,17	63:18 65:8,9
164:17	198:17 199:12	35:5 36:14 42:16	75:19	71:15 88:19 89:5
biggest 143:5	board 29:1,24	44:13 47:2,15,23	browder 2:23	90:16 92:15
195:6	129:17 191:25	48:2,14,19 53:16	browning 3:2 8:16	101:4,6 104:22
bill 193:14,14	193:25	57:12 58:2,2,19	8:16 17:16,22,23	104:23 105:1,5
bit 20:20 21:8 25:9	body 196:6	58:20,21 59:8,19	22:20,23 25:25	106:17,23 107:3
26:12 36:2,15	boil 25:4,21 26:9	59:19,21,24	26:4 28:11 30:3	107:7,14 110:12
41:16 49:9,14	94:24 98:16,25	60:12 66:25	30:19 31:6,16,20	111:2 137:22,25
50:2 51:14 52:7	99:3	72:14,16 74:2,5	32:1,5 34:17	153:2,4,5,5
53:10 58:12,21	boiling 87:17	83:7,8,12 88:22	35:16,17 37:19	154:2,5,6,15,23
71:15 77:16	98:14,17,20,24	89:18 90:6	43:11 50:10 51:3	155:6,9 160:14
82:24 83:17 96:8	99:7 137:19	106:18 109:16	54:11,11 55:6,10	162:3 166:20

				Page 215
	80.00.00.04.00.5		105 10 106 7	1
167:12,25 168:8	89:20,22,24 90:5	capabilities 39:3	185:10 186:7	challenging 41:9 78:21 131:20
169:2,4,6,7 206:4	92:1 101:6 159:17	capability 22:24 86:21 92:9,10	189:9 192:20	173:15 195:16
buses 20:12 22:1	cables 31:8 48:18	93:6 94:8,11	193:7,8,12 causebased 116:24	204:23
23:6 29:17 34:14	49:1,13 63:2	96:16 110:21	119:5	chance 111:4
39:5 44:7 47:6	64:16 80:4 90:3	160:8 163:14,21	caused 10:10	127:8 208:21
53:17 57:7 58:7	99:15 100:14	174:5	36:19 61:24	change 30:12 31:3
58:7 61:6 62:11	108:5 168:7,8	capable 31:1 41:13	101:17 142:14	126:22 136:18
62:12,13 80:18	calculate 25:20	42:24 47:3 49:24	169:7 172:12	120.22 150.18
82:18 90:14	126:8 135:18	51:1 52:19 58:25	causes 186:5	changed 31:11
102:10 108:1	147:11	157:20 158:1	causing 10:3	35:4 55:15
137:6 139:1	calculated 135:22	163:24 164:13	caution 169:9	190:16
144:7 157:22	146:2 174:9	capacities 95:20	170:6	changes 53:1
162:20 164:2	175:17	capacitor 187:14	cautions 169:13	191:10
165:23 169:25	calculating 132:23	capacity 95:16,22	cautions 109.13 cautious 167:24	changing 33:1
170:3,7 171:5,14	205:24	97:8 164:9	cavity 93:15,16,19	characterization
170:3,7 171:3,14	calculation 11:23	capture 126:3	96:4	83:16 84:11
business 21:21	11:24 115:22	184:18	ccdp 146:16	characterize
97:22 198:25	178:7	captured 199:10	174:16,22	170:15
businesses 24:11	calculations 25:18	captures 184:21	cdf 146:15,16	characterized 9:10
busted 168:14,23	140:23 176:24	care 84:25	ce 156:18	123:20
bwst 86:16 93:22	178:10 179:16	careful 37:8 43:5	center 72:17 88:20	charger 89:8,17
94:9,11,23 96:3	180:18 181:22	carlo 175:25	centers 27:13	93:5 106:2
96:4,7,11,24	190:18	carried 183:14	88:12,24	chargers 92:22
140:14,16,17	calculator 115:17	cascades 39:20	central 109:24,24	charging 161:8
bypass 62:16	116:14,15,16,19	case 9:13 13:11	certain 24:24	chart 123:8
155:17	117:19 118:5	52:15 74:9 79:5	84:12 199:19	chartered 10:21
bypassing 62:5	119:6,8 122:12	96:14 105:24,25	certainly 15:17	check 134:3 169:4
	124:18,19 125:3	106:1 121:8	70:12 96:10	176:15
C	125:15 126:4	137:1 142:23	118:14 122:11,14	checking 133:21
c 5:1 74:2	128:15,16 137:7	162:19 168:19	122:15 143:19	checks 84:24 192:4
cabinet 10:18	147:1,20 149:1	174:8	164:5 171:7	chief 2:2,21 5:12
cable 45:2 47:1,11	calculators 128:11	cases 21:2 78:8	205:13	7:23 8:18
48:3 49:10,11,14	call 5:8 39:17 41:9	cast 183:22 184:15	certificate 4:6	choice 90:20
49:16,17,18,22	87:13 98:23	184:17	certified 210:4	160:22
50:5,10,17,20	112:22 131:11	categories 181:8	certify 210:3	choose 85:7
51:7,9,11,13	148:3 156:7,25	caucus 7:15 197:6	cetera 147:23	chose 27:16 29:16
55:18,18 58:6,13	165:20 166:13	197:11 203:2	187:24	33:7,15,16
58:18,24 59:2,2	182:17	causal 18:20	challenge 18:6	119:15
59:3,4 60:11,23	called 28:6 141:10	186:13,17	34:20,22 35:6	chug 135:22
63:5,9 64:6,6,10	157:3	cause 14:21,25	79:8 156:15	circ 31:7 50:25
64:24 65:1 66:12	calling 57:2 59:13	18:21 21:5 37:12	196:9,11,20,24	79:25 134:1
66:16,18 67:12	campbell 2:21	37:13 101:14,19	challenged 54:24	148:10
68:15 69:20 70:1	canal 25:3 93:15	133:18 142:8,9	114:22,23	circle 2:7 8:6,6
72:7,14,21,23	97:8 115:3	155:8 174:25	challenges 33:12	30:13,13 31:5,19
73:7,8 79:25	cant 59:10 97:24	177:11,15,20	79:5 90:22 149:8	32:8 35:23,24
80:17,23 82:20	160:10 174:18	182:25 183:8,16	156:13 161:21	36:11 45:16,16
83:11 88:18,18	190:13 192:8	184:3,10,11	162:1,6 170:13	49:4 50:23,23
	I	l · ·	Í É	·

				Page 216
51:6 53:2 56:7,8	101:13 118:8	combustion 12:23	commonly 27:8	137:6 156:11
56:14,24 57:1	126:24 135:15	come 7:17 22:15	communicate	161:24
73:11,13,14,18	156:18 196:15	34:23 49:8 51:10	15:24 16:4 54:12	complication
73:21 81:8,8	207:2	55:19 70:19	54:20 90:21	156:4
103:11 105:24	cleared 36:4 69:22	112:10 113:19	107:9 183:21	complications
106:9 107:20	clearly 16:3 38:5	121:1 122:25	207:6	100:7 155:18
110:22,22 112:8	68:18 107:18	123:1 128:12	communicated	172:15
112:12 142:15	131:25 132:6	129:20 130:10	12:5 16:1	component 11:24
145:13,21 164:8	133:5,11 177:24	131:5,15 132:5	communicating	55:14 141:25
164:8 166:3,3,10	195:15 204:3	141:7 144:8	29:9 183:18	components 12:24
176:3	206:1	149:8 151:15,22	comparable 68:8	16:7 31:10,11
circuit 47:12,14	clock 27:24	156:4 168:8,10	comparative 151:2	computer 178:8
133:22	close 53:16 69:10	181:17 204:12	compare 38:2	concept 52:12,13
circuitry 165:16	106:18 135:13	205:6,20 208:13	57:20 118:17	75:14 79:23 85:5
circulating 49:13	137:5,18 146:3	comes 39:6,6 79:1	compared 12:20	87:10 92:23
circumstances	154:11 198:25	122:22 155:6	comparing 98:12	143:24 144:3,6
10:22 32:12	207:11,14	184:24 199:3	206:14	concepts 75:21
131:5,7 162:6	closed 35:2 69:6	comfortable 51:24	comparison 58:16	80:15 144:12
169:12	closer 184:1	coming 26:17	206:12	conceptual 74:24
civil 180:3	closest 6:3	48:18 140:8	compelled 80:15	conceptually 84:9
clarification 25:7	closing 7:19 21:6	152:22,24 155:9	competing 141:16	139:3
73:22 84:6 87:12	148:15 195:9	163:16,22 184:2	complement 194:7	concern 50:2 87:8
98:11 104:2	197:20 203:3	184:25	complete 34:11	110:24
110:15 118:3	closure 142:10	commence 97:17	55:2 65:23 66:11	concerned 107:22
202:7	197:23	comment 6:22	83:23 84:1,3,6	concerning 9:24
clarified 136:8	code 179:15	46:8 85:10	84:17,21 100:4	concerns 96:15
clarify 36:5 46:7	186:11,17	131:23 143:24	114:3 178:14	100:21
50:24 68:25	codes 178:24	148:14,16 200:7	182:7 193:7	conclude 117:18
110:23 124:17	186:10	205:8 208:8	194:5 197:8	151:17
161:15 202:10	coding 185:21	comments 6:25	completed 10:24	concluded 138:13
clarifying 154:21	cognitive 115:21	7:20 9:20,23	35:14 53:24	concludes 17:11
clarity 193:15	116:3,15,20	21:6 97:13	77:11 83:20	146:18 176:6
clark 2:6 8:3,3	118:11,14 128:6	176:19 195:10,12	166:5 178:6	189:6 203:1
59:6,6,15,17	140:24	205:14 208:9	183:17 189:11	208:22
83:3,3,13 171:22	collapse 10:23	commission 5:12	190:14 192:21	conclusion 15:20
171:23 172:1,4	collapsed 10:3	5:16 9:19 129:10	completely 12:21	16:22 79:16
172:22	collectively 148:10	193:10 197:3	60:4 62:10,14,16	129:21,21 133:9
class 71:14 201:15	color 11:9,10	commissions 14:8	64:18 79:7 135:2	138:19 146:5
classifications	111:17	commitment 18:10	140:4 141:21	171:9
70:16	colored 39:23	196:1	completes 53:2	conclusions 85:22
classified 87:2	colors 11:11	committed 190:7	completing 30:2	133:11 149:3
classify 11:11	column 122:21,24	committee 194:12	completion 194:25	condensate 72:11
classroom 162:24	145:2 204:7	common 10:9 21:5	complex 29:23	72:13 74:6
clean 19:20 94:9	combination 127:7	89:1 142:8,9	80:12 119:14	125:19,23
94:12	163:25 186:19	145:19 177:14	128:24	condition 18:21
clear 18:5 20:2	combinations	185:10 186:5,7	compliance 179:15	27:19 29:15
31:13 33:23	145:14	186:13 192:20	complicate 155:24	32:16 33:18 36:4
42:11 77:6 95:15	combine 188:23,24	193:7	complicated 84:23	36:18 38:8 42:2
		1	1	

				Page 217
43:22 45:8,12	9:12,14,15,22,25	106:7 181:12	contemplated	contributor 61:13
51:22 61:19	12:5,9 13:1,20	191:4,5 195:21	94:16	101:2
65:19 70:16	14:4,11,13 15:20	195:22,25 200:1	contend 148:10,12	control 22:7 23:21
76:15 93:14 99:7	17:4 133:5	203:15 205:10,11	content 148.10,12 content 13:11	25:24 28:13
102:1 105:4	195:11 196:3	consider 46:15	context 15:19	41:21 42:22,25
102.1 105.4	197:5,9,21	62:1 103:15,23	68:13 74:23	43:10,12,14
107:19 108:1	205:13 207:14	104:3 110:18	75:25 76:17	59:22 63:18,19
110:12 115:2	208:22 210:5	113:10 117:5	124:15 148:23	63:20,21,24
137:10 150:19	confidence 109:3	118:15 119:22	186:7 200:9,9	72:16 83:7,9
157:10 150:19	136:17 171:20	156:11 161:9	204:20 205:19	,
,				86:2 88:20,20,24
157:3,25 158:6,9	confident 167:12	201:12 202:8,23	206:22	102:18,20 103:15
158:12 159:21	configuration 20:5	206:10 207:5	contingencies	103:16,20,24
162:8,11,18	52:24 106:1	considerable 118:7	20:10,18 21:18	104:6 106:15,24
163:4 164:24	111:5 152:13	considerably	29:3,25 30:14,16	108:15 111:11,22
165:7 166:12,18	154:9,10 157:20	57:22	37:20,23 54:19	116:4 138:21
166:24 167:4	157:24 166:21	consideration 82:1	56:11 61:17 62:1	144:19 145:7
185:19 186:16	189:4 195:16	87:20,23 95:12	107:13 138:25	152:15 155:17,17
187:21 188:1	206:13	considered 46:13	contingency 24:19	155:20 157:4
194:1 204:21	configurations	54:6 74:21 75:3	28:19 30:6,20	159:11 160:13
206:14	19:5	103:11 104:12	50:16 52:1 55:25	161:14 162:25
conditional 143:13	confirm 45:10	113:15 115:14,19	62:7 67:14,17	164:7 165:15,15
174:9	147:20	117:22 122:18	68:21 76:5 80:16	165:20 166:9
conditions 24:22	confirmed 158:23	167:14 172:4	80:23 96:13	167:17 171:17
24:24 25:12	163:8 164:14	202:20	107:17 139:7	173:12 204:16
32:24 33:1,17	confused 46:2	considering 14:25	141:12	206:5
34:19 37:1 76:4	confusing 48:25	56:10 75:9 82:20	continue 35:22	controlled 54:21
81:11,19 82:3,3	confusion 121:11	85:20 165:9	79:11	106:19,22,24
86:25 100:10,23	connect 20:16	205:6	continued 20:11	controlling 42:1
101:16 103:7,12	21:15 47:6 60:6	considers 86:2	continuing 82:18	controls 63:21
114:25 116:13	72:6,13 92:2,3	consistent 109:10	continuously	190:17
129:3 131:22	188:16	132:9	51:25	conversation
137:14 149:22	connected 22:1	constitute 156:3	contract 179:10	129:23
151:3,4 155:15	31:11 37:15	156:14	184:19 185:1,7	convinced 129:24
161:13 167:8	102:12 108:14	constituted 11:16	191:13 192:20,25	cool 171:24 172:2
172:18 185:10,13	connecting 60:11	constitutes 161:24	192:25 194:15	coolant 28:23
193:17,18 205:25	72:8	203:18	195:7	161:8
conduct 14:4	connection 42:12	constructed	contracted 118:5	cooling 27:11
conducted 11:2	66:24 72:4 107:5	178:15	contractor 189:13	32:24 33:11
12:6 14:20	123:24 144:9	construction 24:6	191:9,11 192:23	87:21 92:8,8
conducting 187:18	connections 67:1	29:20 90:12	193:21 194:12	97:7 171:24
conductors 49:1	connectivity 116:7	123:23 178:5	contractors 16:23	coordinate 23:17
65:3	consequence	constructions	17:1,6 181:1,3	coordination 2:21
conduit 20:13	104:25 180:10	124:23	189:23 190:2	coordinator 24:7
91:21	181:14 183:3	constructive 17:19	191:23,23 205:16	coordinators
cones 66:19	181.14 185.5	contact 91:7	contradicting	23:19
confer 38:8	190:5,23 191:12	contain 210:7	70:22	copies 125:11
conference 1:9	190:3,23 191:12	contd 3:1	contributed 17:3	-
5:15 6:16 7:19		contemplate 41:15	contributing 17:3	copy 117:1 120:8 123:14,15
5.15 0.10 /.19	consequences 18:7	contemplate 41.13	contributing 1/3:4	123.14,13

				Page 218
core 23:10 25:4,21	197:5	crystal 18:5	141:18 158:15	127:4,12,16
26:10 28:9 68:22	county 210:1	csr 1:25 210:13	166:21 169:5	138:15 139:15,22
87:17 98:13,16	couple 6:2 12:17	cubicle 64:24 72:9	dampers 92:12	140:25 154:21,25
98:17,20,24,25	20:7 66:1 71:5	168:4	danger 70:17	159:4 160:11
98:25 99:7 113:6	71:17 120:6	cubicles 169:4	dapas 2:5 7:11,18	davids 116:1 117:6
113:8 143:13	130:21 134:17	cue 116:5 118:18	8:1,1 15:15 26:7	119:11
174:9 175:23	141:13 154:20	207:21	29:6 31:23 32:2	day 18:12 23:20,22
189:16 195:14	168:22 176:17	cues 116:5 118:15	36:24 44:8,9,15	24:22 25:2 26:5
196:14 201:13,19	199:13 203:4	curious 186:20	46:8 50:14 55:21	27:9,16,21 32:15
201:23	course 30:12 39:4	current 173:11	55:21 56:4 60:8	32:17 33:9 34:6
corporate 191:14	65:2 95:13,21	174:13,17	60:8,14,16 65:6	36:8 53:24 68:8
correct 29:12,13	122:16 200:8	currently 13:19	65:18 67:2,2,10	70:6 78:17
51:2 56:3 60:13	cover 13:13 16:20	24:2 25:12 26:15	68:13 74:19,20	104:23 114:7
67:4 76:22 82:12	83:2 177:3	114:12 142:2	75:25 76:23	115:15 117:23
83:20 85:1 93:20	covered 83:5 177:8	189:12	77:11,14 80:14	131:18 136:21,24
93:21 94:4,6,14	craft 27:23 31:9	cut 27:18 28:16	80:14 82:5,13	152:15 159:13
96:21,22 98:15	55:20 57:5 79:23	114:15 173:2	85:9 100:25,25	169:24 171:7,17
99:1 100:11	124:5	cutting 55:18	103:20,23 104:2	172:25 176:21
101:10 102:2	create 96:25		104:5,8 107:24	195:22 210:10
121:2 126:17	155:18	D	107:25 108:13	days 10:8 23:7,8
135:11 136:7,15	created 100:8	d 5:1	121:13 122:4,12	23:22 25:5 27:11
136:16 139:14	154:3 196:19	d06 102:1	122:16 131:23	33:22 35:3 36:6
146:17 162:4	credible 144:12	daily 25:20	132:14 135:10	36:10 47:8 53:13
167:7 172:3	credit 13:17 21:3	dale 3:8 9:3 180:15	136:23 142:17,24	57:11 71:5 80:13
175:5 180:20	22:10,15 68:15	190:16 201:21	146:14 148:14	84:19 97:9 98:13
192:17 201:21	76:24 85:19 99:9	damage 10:4,11	151:13,19 161:20	99:21 108:9
206:3 210:7	117:14 138:14	28:10 40:15,25	166:22 167:11	109:4,17 120:18
corrected 189:3	141:3 148:2,9	41:11 42:12,14	170:11 176:15	121:11 130:23
correcting 134:1	152:6 153:12	42:15,18 43:1	177:2 180:15,15	137:3,4 167:8
corrections 177:5	157:13 171:11	44:1,12 47:12	180:21 182:10	dc 58:20 63:20
corrective 14:22	173:15 201:2	58:10 61:20,21	184:18 186:4,18	64:2 83:7,11,12
15:6 16:17 18:19	206:4	62:11 65:8,20	187:10,17 188:4	89:9 92:12,15
151:17 177:17	credited 85:14	66:23 70:2,2	188:11,25 192:12	93:3 102:5,11,12
182:12 184:4	150:7 174:22,25	76:11 81:3 98:25	192:16 197:15,15	102:15,22,25
188:10 189:1	crediting 19:1 22:9	133:18 140:6	198:4 200:7	103:3 105:2,3,5
correctly 96:20	22:15	143:14 158:21	203:4	105:7,9 106:2,18
139:13 167:20	crew 117:14 163:9	159:14,17,24	data 131:14	107:15 108:14
187:15	criteria 35:12,18	164:12 166:25	date 13:21 194:7	110:18,19,24
corrects 190:4	criterion 5:23	169:5,6,7 174:9	210:13	111:11,22 112:4
correspondence	11:18	175:24 189:16	dated 12:8 16:3	165:15,16
207:7	critical 173:1	195:14 196:14	dave 90:13 129:15	deal 147:25 201:9
coughing 163:23	178:18	201:13	david 2:10 3:4	dealing 124:1
194:20	cross 47:6 58:6	damaged 15:7	8:11,20 24:1	161:13,21 202:20
couldnt 45:19	102:11 108:14	40:2 41:2,8	38:12 54:2 62:18	205:1,18
69:16 72:9 73:3	145:10 153:4,6	42:20 45:22 47:5	69:2 70:7,18	deals 182:20
count 99:5	163:14,18,22	63:16 64:13 70:4	87:12 88:3 91:24	dealt 70:14 177:6
counter 6:15	164:1 171:4,14	76:9,10 80:4	109:18 113:4,15	debate 136:20
counterparts	173:8 174:5	104:3 107:3,3	118:9 119:18	163:11
	1		1	

				1 age 219
decay 32:19,23	120:3 121:5	109:11	determ 124:16	127:18 140:21
33:10,14 86:5,14	170:2	deputy 2:16	determination	145:19 191:3
94:25 96:20	defines 191:1	derived 18:19	9:11 12:11,16	developmenttype
150:5,7,9,17	defining 23:24	113:24	13:4,7,10 14:15	152:4
158:14 186:23	120:21	describe 38:12	14:16 15:22,25	deviation 134:24
199:22	definitely 45:13	94:6 96:20	26:8 44:13,17	135:21 136:15
decent 141:4	142:22	120:13 177:9,14	46:12 172:24	deviations 130:18
decided 37:22	definition 156:6	described 67:13	197:19 203:15	devices 59:10
117:23 142:25	161:23	92:6 119:5	determinations	dhr 114:14,15
152:11,12	definitive 115:9	147:22 201:17	14:11 203:24	diagnose 156:8
decision 14:4,15	132:22 147:5	202:18 203:11	determine 7:15	166:7
35:8 44:21 61:5	205:24 206:16	describes 37:5	44:18 65:20 71:9	diagnosed 162:13
67:5 78:4,13	degrade 20:11	52:7 183:8	76:11 85:18	172:18
115:21 116:3,25	degraded 24:20	design 12:23 34:12	118:16 119:1	diagnosing 153:18
118:25 120:9,22	160:15 202:24	35:11 41:14	132:19,25 145:11	diagnosis 155:19
123:20 129:7	degree 37:14 132:1	79:23 80:15	148:24 149:2	155:20
137:15 147:4	136:17 139:2	83:18,20,25 84:1	167:4 193:1	diagram 34:9 88:6
148:13 183:9	187:20 204:1	115:23,24 117:5	204:25 206:6,24	152:23
decisionmaking	delay 99:16 100:3	117:10,10 118:13	determined 11:8	diagrams 83:6
118:25	delayed 71:16,22	124:2 125:25	11:16,19 14:5,19	dialog 38:9
decisions 34:19	delaying 87:14	126:10 127:18	16:24 115:13	dialoging 196:5
67:21 78:17 79:3	deliverable 180:24	130:24 131:5	117:23 120:4	dictated 32:11
123:16 129:6	demarcation	145:19 152:4	124:17 125:5	162:5
204:22	118:10	157:19 178:1,25	129:1 143:13	didnt 45:21 62:2
deck 10:5	demonstrate 30:4	179:16 181:10,21	175:17	83:4,22 99:23
declaration 71:15	demonstrated 57:2	182:7 190:21	determining 18:2	102:11 104:9
161:7	57:3,18 59:7	191:13	29:4 81:5 190:23	107:9 114:3
declare 201:7	109:15 192:9	designated 48:5	207:4	117:20 118:3
declared 10:18	demonstrates	designations	develop 115:5	120:20 121:9
54:23 158:17	66:11	111:17	117:9 124:4	128:10 135:5
160:19,23 202:15	department 3:9	designed 5:25	129:22 130:1	138:2,6 139:9
deemed 116:16	141:10,11	11:21 19:9 40:1	198:19	142:1 144:5,13
125:2	depas 15:16	154:16	developed 21:18	147:14 157:6,10
deenergized 63:4	depend 189:23	designs 12:22 16:6	28:19 30:21	158:24 159:14
168:19 169:18,22	depended 103:1	83:22,24 84:2,3	31:21,21 33:16	161:17 176:3
deenergizing	dependence 190:1	84:11	118:23 119:3	180:4 183:9
170:2	dependencies	desired 76:14	124:12,14,23	188:1
default 200:13	138:18,20	80:25	125:1 129:25	diesel 10:15 25:1
defeats 74:4	dependency	detail 55:6 76:22	139:1,10 145:24	27:3,5 28:7,9,16
defense 32:13	104:15 125:21	127:12 177:8,9	182:16	28:17 29:14 30:1
109:11	dependent 41:8	198:18	developing 20:10	33:12 34:21,24
deficiencies 11:22	203:22	detailed 45:18	20:23 70:19	35:1,19,24 37:6
deficiency 12:14	depending 52:13	52:20 86:14	development	37:13 38:24 39:5
17:9	90:18 163:15,25	178:7,11 179:4	13:19 21:24	42:15 43:24
define 52:11,13	depends 203:24	179:16 203:9	23:17 115:20,23	45:22 51:22 52:1
121:21 123:3	depleted 92:23	207:13	115:24 117:6,10	53:19,22 57:7
155:13	depletion 165:13	details 94:6 179:11	118:13 124:2	58:4 61:14 62:8
defined 72:18	depth 32:13	200:4	125:25,25 126:10	62:12 63:22 67:8

				Page 220
74:15 75:9,10	82:17,20,24 85:4	64:23 72:11	135:17,25 136:1	106:9 107:20
77:2 78:22 98:19	98:12 100:15	106:3	202:21	129:9,11 131:14
101:3,14,17,18	115:14 117:25	discovered 35:3	disturbing 190:12	133:18 135:3
102:5,6,19 103:2	130:8,9 131:4,13	discuss 9:14 13:15	diverse 109:13	136:21 140:5
102:5,0,19 105:2	133:4,9 134:14	14:1 17:21 20:7	division 2:4,6,10	141:15 143:10
104:5,9,10,12,15	134:17,19 135:13	21:17 23:7 31:6	2:12,14,16 7:25	146:23 147:2
105:6,15,19,23	140:7 151:1,6	66:1 113:23	8:4,7 105:3,4	148:7,7,8 156:25
106:16,24 107:3	152:2,22 155:7	132:11	document 184:24	164:6 171:11
107:14 108:15,17	169:21,23 174:17	discussed 9:24	193:10 194:13	174:8,12 175:9
108:19 110:16,18	196:16 206:19	13:13 14:7 20:14	documentation	176:11,21 188:4
110:19,25,25	differentiate 75:1	33:15 37:20	53:6 134:8 178:1	188:19,24 189:18
111:1,3,3,5,6,11	differentiation	76:22 109:5	178:11 179:15	189:25 205:17
111:14,15,18,18	121:17	117:6 135:8	190:18,21 195:3	207:10
111:23,24,25	differently 131:6	138:20 183:23	documented 12:7	door 6:3 64:7,9,24
112:4,5 150:4,21	140:6	190:17	26:2 57:13 178:7	89:23,23 109:25
150:24 153:1	difficult 51:10	discussing 5:17	179:5 183:15	197:11,12
154:15,18 155:2	diligence 204:10	75:7 86:10,12	193:10	doors 6:7,8 90:4
158:8,15,18,19	direct 43:11 58:11	148:4 184:22	documenting	dots 188:16
159:8 160:15	60:23 62:15 94:7	discussion 17:12	199:7	dotted 40:5
163:5,16 164:11	101:19	19:16,18 20:3,20	documents 56:16	double 138:9
164:20,21,25	directed 103:18	22:9,19 28:4	182:22 185:22	doubt 107:20
167:6 168:7	152:20	36:25 37:25 65:7	doesnt 39:14 40:4	dra 2:7,9
170:7 171:13	direction 6:11	77:12 112:14	78:12 91:3	draw 43:6
172:19 174:14	45:14 89:3	113:4,14 132:15	103:20 140:7	drawings 5:23
186:23 187:12,21	130:11 162:22	140:16 144:1	155:8 193:22	11:18
187:23,25 189:2	165:4 166:8	146:1 166:23	198:10	drive 79:15
diesel2 111:23	directions 52:14	173:6 176:13	doing 30:9 41:16	driven 20:22 78:25
diesels 21:20,25	directly 23:16	187:20,23 198:11	42:24 43:5 53:4	79:14 86:9
36:8,9,13,17,20	60:11 61:22 62:5	198:12	55:17 59:5 67:14	114:15 136:13
37:22 40:9 61:18	62:5 88:19 94:18	discussions 35:10	68:11 82:10	139:16 162:12
82:17 93:2 97:25	94:21 95:6	115:25 136:19	92:17 100:8	163:18 165:11
106:14 107:10	104:11 122:25	139:25 170:21	107:4 134:13,15	drop 5:18 10:7,9
159:1 162:10	147:11 177:6	176:8 188:12	135:6 143:25	14:23 15:4,16
difference 39:8	director 2:4,6,16	197:13 203:9	147:5 182:8	23:20 26:25 27:9
60:9 74:2 150:9	3:8 7:24 8:4 9:3	dispatched 167:2	191:23	30:15 40:2,21
150:18,22 152:7	54:9 78:18,18	distinct 195:13	dominant 27:18	61:22 70:10
195:13	165:4 191:21	distinction 29:7	28:16 173:2	86:25 88:16,21
differences 12:16	disagree 16:12	43:7 82:14	dominate 127:14	89:21 115:1
12:21 66:9	disassembled	101:13 195:20	dominated 145:18	116:6 117:9
153:11 171:12	178:17	196:12,15	dont 25:19 32:5	146:13 177:19
different 12:15,18	discern 44:23	distinguish 26:14	35:1 36:19 44:2	183:2 185:12
12:22,24 16:5,7	discipline 203:6	distributed 6:13 123:6	49:20 52:20	186:24 199:17
16:13 19:22 20:20 26:9 34:23	disciplined 151:21 disciplines 78:7,9	distributing	56:22 61:6 70:21 79:13 85:10 92:2	200:17 203:7 dropped 61:19
20:20 20:9 34:23 39:3 40:19 55:20	disconnect 64:6	168:15	92:7 93:6 101:1	dropped 61:19 88:11,15 129:12
56:19 61:5 64:20	72:13 88:5,9,11	distribution 27:8	101:21,23 102:9	drove 107:15
64:21,21 78:7	88:18 90:1 102:1	27:13 38:15	101.21,23 102.9	174:21
79:22 81:25 82:6	disconnected	61:25 134:21	105:3,4,5,7,9	drp 2:3
17.22 01.23 02.0	uisconnecteu	01.20 104.21	103.3, 7, 3, 7, 7	urp 2.5

				Page 221
due 71:17 165:13	202:21	energizing 41:15	59:20 121:20	escalating 201:23
165:15 204:9	electrically 80:6	43:16 44:7	123:9 131:25	essence 130:16
	electricians 27:23	energy 87:22	178:20 192:7,16	essentially 99:25
E	67:25 68:1 71:10	enforcement 2:22	193:16 197:11	150:7 201:18
e 2:2 5:1,1	84:20 91:12	2:23 14:8,15	entergys 16:22	establish 18:8 22:6
e06 144:21	element 108:21	engage 16:11 32:4	entergyspecific	29:11 80:17 96:5
e6 146:12	116:17 117:5,25	44:3 85:17	194:16	97:6 107:5 165:8
eals 201:1	124:10 125:16	engineer 2:14 93:9	entering 195:11	195:13
earlier 19:13 20:14	144:1	112:21	enterprise 185:3	established 23:9
65:8 68:20 85:10	elements 115:19	engineering 3:4	entertain 207:15	82:8 98:3 135:7
88:3 89:13	125:5 126:11	8:21 12:23 23:19	entire 69:5 73:10	establishing 32:17
100:12 109:5	128:12	23:23 24:2,5,6,8	123:15 143:11	103:16
115:25 119:13	elevating 195:2	24:10 27:25	192:13,18 193:16	estimate 25:20,21
129:14 135:1	elevation 64:8	35:11 51:23	194:14	26:5 37:11,18
138:20 139:15	eliminated 58:1,22	52:11,11,24 53:1	entry 71:19 160:13	100:1 113:20
140:15 158:16	99:23	53:10 54:9,22	environment	115:11 128:19
early 66:3 69:4	embedded 116:21	84:15 85:3,5	53:11 82:24	132:16 133:1
easily 42:13 44:23	emergency 3:7 6:5	91:11 95:3,23	100:16 119:23	135:8 144:18,23
61:20 68:1 70:5	9:1 10:14 21:25	99:14 116:7	205:1	145:3 148:20
72:19	23:15,17 25:1	117:9 119:14,18	environmental	175:16,23 189:16
easter 195:24	27:5,17 28:7,8	123:21,22 124:24	81:19	189:17 195:14
edg 103:18,18	33:12 34:3,21	164:15 178:7,20	environments	198:5 203:13
effect 96:14 117:13	35:12,19 39:4	180:3 181:8,9,21	100:17	205:21
117:13 181:9	53:20 54:3,25	181:22 182:1,6,6	envision 61:21	estimated 26:15
effective 191:10	70:16 71:14	182:7 190:22	eof 78:16 107:4	57:19 91:9 113:8
efficient 60:7	78:17,18 109:6	191:14,18 193:19	eop 162:13 164:23	estimates 25:25
effort 75:22 76:13	112:15,17,19	193:20,22	172:20	149:9
134:23 185:9	137:16,16 150:4	engineeringrelat	epris 115:17	estimating 198:2
187:8	151:7 154:15	191:17	equipment 19:9	et 147:23 187:24
efforts 60:24	156:2,10,25	engineers 68:2	20:22 24:25	evacuation 6:6
125:18,21	157:2,7,14 161:6	84:16 93:8	27:10 30:17 31:5	evaluate 17:7
efw 162:12 165:11	164:23 201:8,8	112:25 124:3	32:11,19 43:3,5	179:24
either 38:25 53:16	202:4,15,16	enhance 177:12	68:16,17 69:17	evaluated 29:2,24
57:7 86:16 97:25	employees 14:10	enhancements	71:11 76:4,10,11	86:23 120:23
127:17 145:10	18:15 189:20	177:11 179:9	80:1,23 147:11	183:15 188:21
160:16 180:12	endc114 182:14	ensure 15:24 16:10	147:12 148:5	evaluating 29:15
elaborate 74:19	ended 82:10	16:18,25 17:8	150:10 152:9	123:21
electric 32:22	171:15 199:22	36:4 76:13 108:1	158:13 169:10,16	evaluation 14:21
163:18	energize 43:23	179:14 181:3	181:10 185:4	15:1 124:8
electrical 10:11,17	106:23 137:6	183:13 190:8	189:4 196:11	133:10 134:12
15:9 29:22 33:1	158:5	191:5	202:21 204:21	146:21 148:11
33:20 38:15	energized 33:24	ensuring 67:12	ero 27:20	179:12 182:5
46:21 61:23,24	39:24 43:3 47:8	180:12	error 115:22	186:3,13 187:3,6
66:21 78:9,11 70:1 0 10 86:4	47:9 53:15 57:12	entark 24:3 47:18	116:17 133:25	192:20 193:7,9
79:1,9,10 86:4	69:17 71:11 73:8	entergy 3:3,11,13	186:19	202:13
108:17 111:4	73:10 107:18	5:16 6:21 7:12	errors 133:17,19	evaluations 131:5
112:6 133:20 152:21 164:15	108:11 167:5	8:15 9:13,19	190:4	179:5 186:17
1)/:/1 10417	168:13 169:15	18:12 47:18	escalate 201:14	evaporating 95:8

				Page 222
evening 24:7	events 185:17	expect 13:21 69:18	extra 170:6	62:24 131:13
evenly 123:6	186:15,18,25	expectations 32:6	extrapolate 202:23	142:3 150:8
event 5:17,20 6:4	187:5 200:15	38:5,6	extrapolating 82:9	174:24,25 175:10
10:19 11:8,12	203:7	expected 167:14	extreme 25:13	failed 11:22 12:2
12:13 13:16	everybody 26:21	expedited 58:16	eyes 196:7	24:25 35:20,24
14:21 15:2,17	38:16 157:9	59:12		35:25 36:9,17
17:3 18:3,7,9,11	164:5 165:1	expeditiously	F	62:12,13 68:17
18:13 19:3 20:6	evidence 146:6	197:19	face 149:8	79:7 110:25
20:10 21:10,19	evident 85:9	expend 78:2,19	faced 40:7 170:13	111:3 112:6
23:9,20 24:7,20	evolution 165:6	expended 76:13	facility 5:19 97:5	130:25 131:1
24:22 25:14,16	evolutions 17:21	expenditure 204:4	178:14	failing 111:6
27:9,16 28:20	180:11	experience 24:4,6	facing 204:18	131:15,22
29:2,3,25 32:15	exact 25:23 49:20	92:19 119:19	fact 44:19 50:25	fails 103:6 105:15
32:17 33:9 34:2	58:13	149:7 184:24	67:22 75:2 81:2	105:16 111:14,15
36:13,13 37:21	exactly 91:11	expert 115:14	93:18 97:4 100:8	111:18 128:2,3
38:2 39:23 40:11	127:5	120:22 122:2,8	101:21 107:25	142:3 143:4,4
42:22 43:8,9	examination 45:18	120:22 122:2,8	109:12 113:9,10	failure 5:24 11:19
46:20 47:19	178:20	expertise 179:24	114:17 117:15	37:5,13 38:3
48:17 62:9 67:8	examined 178:18	180:2,3,4,12,13	120:18 121:11	61:12,14 62:8
69:5 70:10 73:10	example 55:12	180:22 181:16	127:13 137:2,4	67:8 77:2 105:14
75:5,11,20 76:8	151:21 156:15	182:4 185:15	163:6 167:5	105:15,20,21
81:3 86:23,25	186:6	190:23	173:24 183:22	111:1 113:11
88:13 90:25 91:1	examples 181:24	experts 118:5,6	189:19 204:24	120:2 122:22
98:18 99:17	186:22	expiration 210:13	factfinding 10:25	120:2 122:22
102:25 113:25	excess 95:22	explain 31:25 83:1	factor 46:15 67:22	131:12 132:3,17
114:13,19 117:24	exclusive 70:22	88:3 96:7 100:12	82:16 97:6	131.12 132.3,17 134:25 135:19
117:24 119:10,16	excuse 89:12	144:24	108:21 109:4	136:6,10 137:9
120:9 125:13	execute 31:13 98:5	explaining 80:20	115:11 124:10	140:4,19 142:8,9
126:6 128:24	163:12	118:10 149:10	125:25 126:1,8	146:6 148:19
120:0 120:24	execution 116:1	explore 83:16	126:10 141:16	156:3 170:10
,		102:20	143:9 144:17	173:11 174:14
130:14 131:8,10 132:21 138:13	124:6,8,10,11,21 128:7 140:24	exploring 102:14	145:19 173:23	183:1 186:24
132.21 138.13	exercise 37:2 93:9	explosion 10:12,17	186:7 201:10	183.1 180.24
140:22 141:5	122:17 193:1	71:16	factored 65:22	failures 32:11
140.22 141.5	exercised 60:17	exposed 103:8	78:3 85:15 99:9	61:18,24 129:10
145:24 146:13	203:6	expressions 14:10	101:8 106:13	,
	exist 30:14 170:14	expressions 14.10 expressly 148:1	170:23 199:24	140:20 142:8,11
150:10 151:2,18 152:16 153:15	exist 30.14 170.14 existed 32:24 37:2	expressiv 148.1 extend 169:10	factoring 33:4	142:14,14 186:19 fair 120:24 161:20
	97:8 149:22	extended 87:6	67:11	
157:12,13 161:2 161:21 162:2	97:8 149:22 187:22 188:1	extended 87:6 extensive 14:20	factors 12:17	171:2 fall 10:4,6
161:21 162:2 169:24 171:8,17	existing 54:10	37:9 61:20	16:14 46:13	familiar 24:13
,	0	183:19 187:23	117:10 119:24	178:24 200:3
183:3,23 184:3,4	117:13 148:23		146:1,9 204:3	far 31:7 41:12
185:2,12 188:8	194:22	203:9	205:2,6	
188:13 189:2,5	exists 6:7 48:1	extensively 10:4 extent 18:21 65:19	facts 10:21 13:3	51:16 64:25
189:19 191:9	110:21 122:9	76:11 167:4	15:21 16:11 79:3	74:24 85:4 89:22 107:22 122:24
195:15 199:15	170:17 206:9	169:5	196:22	
200:10,11 202:25	exit 12:6	external 185:24	fail 36:20 40:10	126:16 129:22
205:1,10 206:14	expanding 19:1	External 185:24		155:16 183:18

				Page 223
100.0		100.15.10		
199:2	164:11,16	199:17,18	79:4,9	115:6 117:11
fashion 52:3	feel 6:15 80:15	first 6:2 17:19	focus 20:15 21:10	165:22 166:1
fast 152:18 153:20	85:13 132:17	21:13 25:10	82:21,23 164:21	174:1 205:17
154:3,7	135:7 142:17	38:14 46:19	205:13	found 114:25
fatal 133:17	143:12 149:2	57:24 59:7 70:6	focused 67:20	120:9 179:23
fatality 189:20	feet 10:6 48:2 49:2	83:17,18 87:19	184:3 186:5	193:4,17
205:12	49:2 59:2,2,3,4	94:23 97:16 98:2	focusing 19:15	four 21:11 41:21
fatalitys 190:10	64:10 65:1,2	106:20,23 112:7	77:25 154:19	54:22 84:19 87:1
fault 35:25 36:4	66:16 89:24	116:2 119:1,3	189:3	87:5 93:22 96:3
104:22,25 111:2	93:22 96:3,12	131:9 135:5	focussed 28:5	97:11 120:15
112:6 125:8	150:1,14	190:10 194:3	folks 48:11 176:11	131:1 159:2
126:3,8 127:2	fell 40:6 48:6	199:14	197:11,16 199:5	171:15
128:13,19 140:10	felt 66:22 115:4	five 32:13 38:20	follow 38:19 43:23	fourth 62:4
140:12,13 141:23	138:5 173:18	41:21 84:10,14	94:22 95:14	fractions 129:4
143:7 145:16	184:8	84:18 142:3	100:25 159:20,24	frankly 75:2 188:4
146:6 154:21	fence 70:3	151:22 159:2	192:11	free 6:15
199:23	field 40:24 41:23	171:16 198:1	followed 27:12	frequency 130:14
faulty 101:4	45:6 52:16 54:21	203:8	33:11 167:17	131:8,11,21
fears 195:11	124:5,22 160:24	fiveminute 84:15	182:16	150:25 189:16
feature 59:9	fieldwork 55:16	151:20	following 5:5 9:21	fresh 95:3
february 11:2 12:7	figure 40:1,4 56:18	fix 24:3,10	11:15 14:13 15:2	friday 199:1,1
fed 38:22 88:13	91:11	fleet 3:12 21:5	18:3,9 19:3 20:6	front 6:7,23
89:4	files 128:15	121:4,4 123:9,9	20:7 23:22 37:5	125:11 167:23
feed 39:5 44:5 57:8	fill 7:4 93:19	123:12 179:7	65:7 115:16	168:6,24 169:4
66:3,5 74:9,10	208:24 209:7	182:8 185:16	followup 11:2	fuel 12:19 22:4,5,6
75:12 86:2,8	final 12:11 13:6	189:10 190:15,20	13:14 16:2 19:21	22:21,22,25 25:3
88:23 89:11 92:9	14:11,16 15:25	191:8 192:13,18	25:18 69:14 99:4	27:11 32:23
95:25 96:5,9,19	78:13 133:15	193:6,16 195:5	147:19 192:12	33:10 86:16,19
108:2 155:17,23	138:11 174:4	fleetwide 192:14	198:13,14	87:17,20 89:4,10
156:2,3,19,20,23	207:6	flexibility 29:18,21	foot 49:9 93:23	92:8,8 94:20
156:24,24,25	finalization 203:23	58:3 60:2,5,21	force 28:22 86:10	95:1,2,3,22 97:8
157:1,3,4,6,7,11	finally 177:14	61:4	111:23	105:18 115:2
157:12,14 160:23	178:22	flip 32:6	ford 3:12 46:17	150:15
162:12 164:3	find 137:8 204:6	flood 93:16 200:16	foregoing 210:6	fueling 27:21
165:8 173:3	205:7	flooded 22:4 25:3	form 18:6 30:15	full 15:23 23:8
192:10	finding 11:12,16	33:19 93:15	34:2 188:20	71:11 76:11
feedback 7:1,4	203:18,20 204:2	115:3 150:14,20	194:17 208:25	77:12 85:21
52:24 90:20	findings 5:21 9:9	flooding 10:10	209:5,7	108:18 109:16
196:6,24 208:25	11:4 12:12,25	76:9 186:24	formal 35:14 56:23	114:10 203:10
feeder 42:16	13:12 14:2,6	199:15 200:9,13	56:24,25 207:14	210:7
125:19 168:7	fine 64:15 112:12	200:14	formally 34:11	fully 16:11 30:21
feeders 168:9	finish 49:22 50:24	floor 43:2 69:18	197:21	41:5 65:10 76:14
feeding 75:13	57:1 60:24	71:17 155:6,8	forms 7:1,5	85:12 158:21
106:2 162:16	finished 84:4	167:21,22 168:1	forth 56:20	159:15 163:24
165:11	fire 10:9 15:8 76:9	168:3,6,22	fortuitous 51:7	164:13 183:14
feeds 39:18 40:25	141:1,3,4,10,11	flow 28:23 94:1	forward 17:7,8	207:5
44:25 63:6 89:9	141:12,12,14,18	120:2	35:22 44:6 45:4	function 27:11
158:22 160:3	141:24 168:14,23	flowchart 52:6	52:20 109:8	33:10 35:20

Transcript of Proceedings May 1, 2014

Page 224 159:14 167:9,10 41:14 43:22 generator 27:3 126:21 130:23 19:25 21:9,17 44:18 54:24 28:9,17 38:24 131:4 133:20,23 23:7 24:4,9 170:12 187:5 59:21 78:20 52:2 53:19 60:3 138:14 141:9 26:16,21 29:10 194:21,22 199:1 82:22 88:1 62:8 63:22 74:15 143:8.11 144:3 30:4,25 31:1,7 201:11 32:4 34:20,21 gravity 86:2,8 92:9 118:24 149:7 75:10,10 78:2 149:24 164:18 81:21 150:16,21 35:16 38:18 42:6 95:25 96:5,8,19 152:10 158:19 173:6 187:21,25 164:1 153:1 154:15 189:17 191:1 43:23 44:16 grav 144:21 functional 40:13 155:2 156:20 205:11 210:9 46:19,23 48:19 great 55:6 151:22 103:9.21 172:21 158:15,18,20 gives 62:22 89:8 50:21 51:15 greater 5:21 9:11 functionality 41:7 92:16 134:24 160:15 163:5.25 55:10,15 56:5,18 11:5 96:12 41:9 164:11.25 168:7 163:21 165:12 56:25 57:19,21 120:15,21 178:16 **functioning** 43:6 169:18 170:8 **giving** 60:2 157:13 63:8,8 64:5 green 5:21 9:11 **functions** 32:14,22 171:14 181:24 **go** 6:7,8,19,23 22:8 67:13 69:18 71:8 11:5,12,12,13 59:23 78:19,25 186:23 31:24 38:15 39:3 71:8 76:3,7,13 39:19 63:9 64:23 79:15 116:10 generators 10:15 46:23 52:6 61:10 77:17,24 78:1,6 69:20 72:7 118:18,21 25:1 27:5 28:7 69:25 71:1,3 79:9 80:19 81:13 102:25 103:4,8 **further** 16:9 19:1,9 28:16 29:14 93:13 95:6 98:3 83:6 87:16,18 153:5,22 154:15 33:12 34:21,24 93:3 97:5 102:18 34:14 85:15 99:3 101:5 154:17 155:2 132:12 177:12 35:19 39:5 51:23 106:10,17,18 106:4 109:20 158:4.7 189:7 53:23 57:8 61:14 113:1 114:8,8 111:21,22 112:1 greg 2:2 5:9 15:15 **future** 29:21 179:5 62:13 78:23 115:6 117:10 16:2,5 39:13 118:20 119:1 194:3,17 150:4 163:19 121:22 127:3 120:6 124:7 197:2 199:4 165:9,11 129:7 134:9 125:7 127:14 207:15 G gentleman 129:24 137:18 138:7.8 129:3.4.5.6 gregory 5:11 7:23 **g** 5:1 **geoff** 160:12 161:4 140:11 142:22,22 130:8 132:6 9:7 gallons 22:5 93:22 getting 30:18 46:2 143:2,19 145:9 ground 28:4 132:1 137:20 138:11 93:25 94:2 95:16 50:1 67:10 70:20 148:12 149:19,23 140:9 143:21,24 group 112:25 95:17 84:25 87:22 152:19 156:7,9 148:15 152:1,3,5 130:10 191:14 **gantry** 11:23 102:23 104:20 157:5 159:22 153:18 158:22 192:22.24 **gap** 207:10 134:16,18 137:22 160:4 162:9 159:18 160:19 groups 130:8 gary 3:6 8:22 163:9 166:2 163:9,11 165:14 166:2 168:1,16 **guard** 6:4 22:20 23:7,11 167:23 172:24 165:18 166:20 169:3,8 170:5,11 guess 71:2 109:2 25:25 85:25 111:16 121:13.15 176:7 179:11 168:9 169:3.17 172:25 177:3 89:13 110:14 180:24 187:5 170:12 171:23,24 184:6 187:18 127:4 128:6 113:4,14 116:1 199:7 175:10 180:9 189:10 193:7.15 137:21 138:8 117:6 119:11 give 14:18 22:14 193:2,23 194:2,8 193:17,18,25 156:6 173:14 129:15 134:14 32:4 62:21 76:17 194:14 197:10 194:2,3,14 195:5 174:11 139:15.22 202:17 83:12 87:15 94:2 198:15,18 200:22 197:3,4,5,7,10 guidance 86:15 **garys** 35:3 112:9 165:1,3 206:5 207:20 202:4 205:16 117:8 121:15 gate 54:25 127:6 166:8 168:21 209:3.6 206:5 207:8 122:9 123:7,9,10 127:10 128:3 good 5:2,10 19:24 176:23 185:20 goal 14:15 115:10 123:12.14 124:4 141:25 142:1,6,6 186:6,21 191:8 198:5 203:13 23:2,11 45:8 132:24 147:25 142:18,19,21 192:10 206:4 goes 39:11 78:25 47:20 77:18 99:6 148:6,17,23 143:1,4,6,17 given 29:14 33:4 110:10 123:7 101:19 109:22 149:5 158:4 geared 147:16 65:7 68:7 86:19 130:11 147:24 117:20 129:14.16 163:2 179:10.21 general 48:14,23 87:4 93:7 98:15 134:7 137:24 188:23 206:16,22 157:4 62:23 76:1 185:2 guidances 166:7 99:2 103:10 going 7:7 9:7 17:7 138:10 140:9 201:8 202:15 111:7 116:13 17:8,17,18 19:13 149:10 153:17 guides 121:23

Transcript of Proceedings May 1, 2014

Page 225 guiding 121:5 hundredamp 122:14,19 123:2 108:10 12:3 guvs 69:10 107:16 123:18 124:1.9 hear 6:24 17:5 hold 84:5 120:7 89:18 114:8 129:15,19 126:18 127:2,11 59:10 74:22 **holder** 23:14 hydrant 142:10,16 129:24 153:16 127:21 128:4.8 146:21 155:4 hook 64:5 66:15 Ι 165:22 197:11 128:10,18 129:9 192:8 204:17 72:23 74:11,12 **id** 15:13 17:4 25:9 129:13 134:5 heard 76:1 107:24 hooked 47:1 74:6 Η 26:17 68:14 72:1 132:22 167:1 **hooking** 72:22 135:5,11,16 **h** 41:20 74:22 97:15 136:3.7.11.25 176:17 184:14 hope 133:13 hadnt 154:9 112:9 121:22 hopefully 30:3 137:24 139:14,22 187:22 205:22 half 34:7 53:24 123:13 132:14 hearing 50:7 69:10 37:19 46:7 55:11 140:11 141:2 58:17,18 66:16 152:14 161:5 142:4,7,20 143:2 82:14 87:16 132:11 192:3 95:4 105:7,7,8,8 170:22 143:19 144:15 133:2 167:11 **host** 5:8 idea 45:8 109:21 159:23 145:1.16.22 heat 32:19.23 hour 120:15 203:8 **ideas** 131:16 146:16 172:23 33:10,14 86:5,14 166:15,19,19 **halfway** 55:17 identification 5:20 174:18 175:14,22 92:21 94:25 hours 25:4,5,8,8 hall 112:21 116:24 182:4 176:2,5 200:5,12 96:21 150:5,7,17 64:14 65:16 117:3 174:20 identified 9:10 hasnt 181:4 156:15 158:14 71:17,21 75:11 175:8 11:1.4 12:14 hathcoat 3:5 8:24 186:23 199:23 84:16 91:9.23 hand 154:9 163:1 51:17 66:3 181:4 98:15 100:3 8:24 40:22,22 heavy 11:23 15:10 164:7 178:10 183:1 186:14 41:19 43:14 15:12 78:10 109:21 120:15,16 200:19 208:13 194:19 44:14,23 45:19 held 9:14 112:20 120:21 121:1,6,8 210:9 identifies 52:11 46:6 63:19 71:13 **hell** 199:4 130:21 134:22,24 handling 177:6,23 identify 11:22 71:13 152:14,17 help 18:1 38:19 135:20,21 136:14 179:3 180:2,2,19 115:8 191:3 68:25 133:13 154:25 155:14 136:20 141:13 identifying 194:21 190:15 165:18 169:2 156:1,21 157:2 136:25 191:15 **hands** 147:3 194:23 157:15,18 159:10 **helping** 194:13 198:1 203:8 **happen** 21:21 ier 184:2,6,11,18 hep 115:22 117:19 160:17.21 161:11 **hra** 115:17 116:14 154:23 190:13 **ill** 5:8 17:12 25:22 161:19 162:4 heres 47:25 77:2 116:15,16,19 196:12 34:10 42:3 43:21 164:10 166:6.11 hes 119:18 117:19 118:1,4 **happened** 20:2,5 46:6 50:24 52:6 167:7,16 168:20 hesitant 90:8 119:5,7 120:5 25:16 29:3 30:12 64:9 77:12,15 171:3.25 172:6 168:2 121:3,4,5,7 91:1 93:18 85:11 88:24 172:10 175:5 hesitate 207:9 122:12 124:17,19 104:23 108:6 102:24 116:22 204:14 hev 45:3 84:5 125:3.15 126:4 140:5 154:22 122:5 124:16 havent 38:5 41:12 159:17 166:12 128:11 129:9 169:14 189:22 127:11 133:1.8 71:9 83:19 103:9 high 11:9 59:16.20 137:7.7 140:23 happening 194:9 136:25 139:22 121:18 188:6 92:20 123:5 146:25 147:19 **happens** 106:4 152:19 154:13 196:18 136:17 145:6 149:1 111:18 129:2 168:20 171:3 head 12:19 150:1 **hratype** 114:24 164:18 180:10 130:7 190:8 174:19 177:7 150:14,20 181:14 183:2 human 26:13 hard 48:7 50:7 186:21 193:5 header 10:10 190:23 191:4,12 27:22 31:16 125:11 197:18,20 204:11 141:15 199:17 194:21 203:18 115:18.22 116:17 harris 3:7 9:1,1 207:7,13 208:2 **headers** 141:6 **highend** 122:23 121:14 147:12 208:13 70:7 104:14,15 186:19 headquarter 14:14 highlighted 139:25 105:10,11 106:6 illuminate 85:15 headquarters 8:8 hire 181:16 **hundred** 64:10 112:13,15 116:22 illustrated 66:7 8:10 25:8 30:14 hit 32:5 173:1 65:1.2 94:2 117:4 118:14 97:19 48:11 50:6 69:9 207:24 130:7,7 132:3 illustrates 93:12 119:7 120:17,25 98:8 197:6 **hoisting** 5:25 10:2 153:15 154:14 121:3,22 122:11 97:10 98:4 health 19:6,10 10:22 11:20,25 184:15

				Page 226
im 5:11,12 7:23,24	impacts 102:20	177:5 191:25	156:22 157:6	injury 18:15
8:1,3,3,6,9,11,11	108:15	194:15	159:17	inpo 183:19 184:6
8:13,21,22,22,24	imperative 115:4	improves 181:19	indications 38:9	input 44:20 110:12
9:3,7 23:11 24:2	implement 20:24	inboard 92:11	101:19,23	183:19
24:2 26:16 38:18	31:17,22 33:20	inches 88:25	individual 118:4	inputs 143:16
41:14 48:12 50:1	37:23 54:18	incident 68:12	183:12	ins 9:17
56:25 59:8 61:6	65:21 67:17 68:9	include 28:2 99:13	individually 67:20	insert 175:15,15
61:7 63:8 64:4	68:21 79:23	99:23 138:6	individuals 180:1	175:23 176:4
65:6 68:14 71:8	83:18,21 84:19	177:18 179:1	industry 115:8	inside 10:17 40:3
71:10 75:1 77:15	90:22 91:10	181:14 200:15	183:21,23,24	59:21 61:2,4
79:13 84:8 87:12	126:17 192:3	included 18:13	184:7,16,24	insight 138:5
90:8 92:25 93:9	193:5	105:22 126:25	185:5 190:1,9	insights 17:25
96:7 98:23	implementation	175:12 178:6,8	194:14,17	18:23 147:8,14
102:19 104:2	51:15,18 52:4	183:7 185:11	industrywide	147:17 151:16
106:25 107:2,13	55:4 56:9 84:17	includes 31:16	184:11	177:16 185:20
110:5 111:16	124:12	91:10	influence 28:9	194:6
114:13 118:12	implemented	including 13:11	132:20	inspect 163:12
120:6 125:7	14:21 33:21	15:4 21:5	inform 13:20	inspected 42:8
127:4,9 128:22	55:22 80:7 81:23	incorporated	information 7:17	inspecting 99:16
131:18,20 132:10	84:25 106:13	139:19,21	13:5,9,18,22,23	inspection 10:21
133:24 135:3	107:16 189:1	incorrectly 11:24	13:24 15:24	10:24,25 11:4,15
137:17,20 156:17	implementing	increase 138:2	17:25 38:6 44:19	12:7,10,12 13:12
166:6 167:11,23	22:14 68:7 78:16	173:23	45:5 79:15	13:14 14:19 16:3
169:14 170:4	100:6 107:12	increased 195:18	113:21 114:5,9	16:21 18:24
172:25 176:22	195:5	204:5	114:10 123:11	160:12 204:2
177:3 184:5,6	importance 16:10	independent 17:10	147:2 151:16	inspector 2:12,18
185:8 196:1,7,9	25:13 36:24	64:18 80:7 85:18	176:22,25 183:21	8:14 200:25
200:3,4,5	184:10	91:2 125:20	187:6 196:18,18	inspectors 11:4
imbedded 116:20	important 14:3	140:4 141:20	196:23 197:8	15:3
immediate 20:1	15:19 16:14 20:4	178:23 179:19	198:16,21 199:5	install 47:7 52:19
53:18,22 54:7	26:20 29:6 32:25	180:18 181:15,17	200:15,22 203:14	58:19 91:23
172:13 193:2	33:2 37:7 46:9	204:3,10	204:24 205:5,22	installation 23:4
immediately 20:2	51:16 64:17	independently	207:10	48:23 52:17 53:6
31:15 40:20	68:18 80:5	16:24 113:24	informs 14:2	53:12 54:21
61:12 70:9,14,23	109:11 184:8	149:2 153:9	inhouse 180:23	55:14 58:14 82:2
107:11,12 167:20	203:10 204:9,19	180:23 188:21	initial 24:21,23	85:3 130:24
imminent 201:23	207:9	index 4:1	26:11 52:13	installations 51:18
impact 12:24 16:7	importantly	indicate 74:20	102:1 162:2	51:19 53:9 109:9
18:16 37:13	112:21	indicated 16:5	192:22 194:19	130:24
63:15 65:9 99:21	imposing 184:6	56:1 82:19	initially 19:14,15	installed 23:6
105:23 106:5	impression 46:11	132:16 159:7	99:17 158:17	46:20 48:24 49:7
107:21,22 162:2	improve 181:25	160:2,14 173:9	160:19,22	53:12,14 57:2,20
187:22 194:20	194:24 195:6	206:9	initiated 185:9	57:25 58:14,17
195:6 200:2,10	improved 177:24	indicating 47:9	192:20	59:3,19 64:19
200:16,23 202:5	192:7	55:9	initiating 202:24	66:10,14 68:16
impacted 47:12	improvement 3:9	indication 40:14	initiative 177:15	80:13,22 99:20
61:1 88:16 201:6	9:4	92:18 103:13	injure 189:20	126:25 148:5
impactful 18:13	improvements	105:8 155:24	injuries 205:12	installing 52:23
impuctiul 10.15		105.0 155.27	injuites 200.12	

May 1, 201 Page 227

				Fage 227
55:12 57:9,18	22:3,4,7 28:13	92:16 109:2	job 31:15 49:15,16	113:18 133:17
instance 178:13	79:8,10,11 86:2	130:4 194:18	117:20 149:10	keyword 185:21
183:1	87:7 95:1,9 97:9	items 6:2 11:1,3	153:17 170:12	186:5,11
instituted 146:8	138:12,17,21	78:4 181:15	194:21,22 195:18	keywords 186:10
instructions 5:23	144:19 145:7	iv 2:5 7:25 8:2,5	joe 8:18 19:13 23:3	186:17
11:18 33:25	150:6 206:5	8:12,14	28:24 31:12	kind 14:18 19:25
52:16,21 55:11	inverter 89:10	ive 24:3 50:13	58:23 100:12	24:13 30:1,23
55:13,19 124:5	invoke 54:25	71:10 78:9	110:11 181:7	38:15 44:24
124:14 125:1,2	invoked 53:20	107:24 112:19	195:21 196:1	47:13 52:7 53:2
instrument 89:10	82:7	147:9 159:11	john 3:5,10 8:24	91:20 132:9
92:12,14	involve 28:17	180:16 188:16	40:22 43:11	146:24 147:5
insurance 25:18	80:16 86:8	190:9,12	71:13 131:24	151:1,25 159:19
insure 5:24 11:20	involved 16:23	1)0.),12	132:14 152:14	163:10 169:10
80:25 113:19	17:2 28:2 29:11	J	154:20 167:12	190:11
174:2 205:16	35:8 54:6 57:23	james 3:8 9:3,3	170:14 173:6,8	kits 49:17 66:19
intact 47:14	75:4 76:3 81:14	76:19 77:4 177:3	joined 176:16	knew 41:23 43:8
108:11	133:16 182:21	180:20 182:11	joseph 3:3	43:10 60:24
intake 49:14	186:19 190:9	185:8 186:9,21	judge 194:8	75:21 80:1 95:18
integrity 133:21	involves 28:7 54:6	187:16 188:3	judgment 95:23	107:9,10 116:6
intend 84:6 142:1	54:8 72:6 86:13	189:6 193:14,14	122:8,17 123:1	137:3
intended 85:2	87:21 88:17	201:21	123:21,23	know 16:15 20:2
152:10 168:15	involving 5:18	jason 112:21	july 11:2	30:17 36:19 37:9
intending 18:6	28:22	116:22 124:13	jump 125:7	37:11 40:12
intent 50:14	isnt 26:13 123:21	144:19 145:23	jumper 89:24 90:5	41:20 42:1,5,21
197:18	147:5	174:19 200:12	90:14,17	42:23 43:7,16
interaction 117:14	isolate 141:12	jeff 2:6,7,8 8:3,6,9	jumpering 144:7	44:19 45:1,7,10
intercom 6:5	142:15	25:7,17 30:13	june 14:17	45:21,21 46:14
interested 76:21	isolated 41:22,23	35:23 40:18	justify 133:11	48:7 49:20 56:18
76:21 86:20	42:9 44:5,12,25	45:16 50:7,23		67:20 69:20
170:22 201:4	45:3,10 140:10	56:8 59:6 61:11	K	70:15 79:13 80:5
interesting 109:22	160:3,5 165:22	73:14 81:8 83:3	kathleen 1:25	84:13 91:19
147:17	isolation 92:12	83:15 84:5 93:13	210:3,13	98:11 99:17,18
interlock 74:4	issue 14:16 44:6	101:20 105:10	keep 81:9 169:1	101:1,15 102:9
intermediate	113:17 117:21	110:22 116:18	201:16	102:16,18,21
120:14 121:21	119:24 155:8	126:15 136:7	keeping 93:2	103:14 105:1,4
internal 123:12	159:25 161:17	138:25 140:15	kennedy 2:4 7:24	107:3,7,8,8,23
170:20 186:1	164:16 166:14	147:8,22 156:17	7:24 55:3 84:5	108:17 114:7
187:20 197:13	170:6 181:4	164:8 166:3	85:6 99:12 100:5	117:7 121:19
interviewed 42:1	189:3 193:10	167:19 171:23	100:22 109:19	123:15 124:3
interviews 159:6	205:19	199:11,14,16	146:19 147:18	129:19 131:19
186:3	issues 9:14 14:1	200:5	160:18,25 176:7	132:12,20 134:9
introduce 6:19 7:9	70:22 99:21	jeffs 67:10 170:12	176:18 188:7	140:6,8,9 142:2
152:14 208:6	153:23 158:11	jeremy 3:2 8:16	198:9,24 199:3	143:3 145:23
introduction 7:7	173:18,25 186:14	17:16,22 35:17	199:13 200:19	146:19,23 148:17
introductions 7:22	186:25 190:1,2	54:11 74:22 77:4	201:7 202:12	149:6 156:25
intrusion 70:12	192:21,23,25	101:13 143:23	key 28:5 32:13,21	159:5,24 160:2,9
invalidate 138:9	itd 64:25 72:17	151:24 170:16	44:8,9 59:23	160:10 164:11,23
inventory 20:9	item 22:2 23:3	183:22 194:11	97:20 109:2	165:9 169:7
•	l		l	

Page 228 170:24 171:20 **land** 107:6 length 49:2,20,24 **lines** 5:4 39:23,24 91:1 174:1 187:12,18 landed 48:17 58:25 59:1 82:21 110:6 180:16 location 48:1.14 64:20 89:25 90:4 188:12,12 195:24 language 179:11 198:9 199:18.19 207:23 196:5.17 199:4 196:7 leonard 2:12 8:13 **lineup** 108:18 locations 55:20 lock 154:10 157:25 202:13,15 203:22 large 147:1 150:6 77:20 91:15 **link** 40:7 205:4 206:19 180:2 185:3 155:10 157:15 linked 53:3 173:10 **listed** 50:19 **knowing** 43:25 **largest** 61:13 lessons 14:25 **lockout** 101:15,17 45:1 102:16 89:16 178:3 183:18,20 listen 5:4 6:5 21:9 102:19 104:22 listening 48:11 110:25 112:6 **lasting** 18:16 105:1,2,13 183:24 190:16 knowledge 38:16 lastly 109:15 111:25 154:1.3 191:8 132:15 43:12 45:21 late 172:24 **letter** 13:14 14:16 **little** 14:18 20:20 161:12 162:7 111:7 204:24 latent 187:21 16:1,20 21:8 24:4 25:9 172:11 known 22:11.13 level 96:3,4 183:9 188:1 26:12 36:2.15 **lockouts** 102:17,17 43:8,12 45:3 laughter 90:10 183:12 185:7 40:3 41:16 48:24 log 57:13 71:18 kowaleski 3:3 8:18 **law** 194:13 189:21 195:3.17 49:9 50:2,8 160:13 lay 29:18 60:21 levels 191:21 logic 133:25 134:1 8:18 17:13,16 51:14 52:7 53:10 23:2,3 28:24,24 laving 99:15 leverage 181:1 62:21 71:15 **logical** 132:8 layout 46:21 47:25 liability 170:25 logs 56:14 160:14 29:13 31:12,12 74:23 76:17 **license** 23:14 london 27:8 88:2 33:3 34:8 36:5 77:16 82:24 62:23 42:11 49:19 lead 35:10 107:6 112:20 83:16 96:7 88:13 92:4 56:12,21 58:23 160:9 licensee 7:12 11:22 111:17 115:24 141:11 58:23 62:3,9 leader 2:7 8:7 16:25 176:23 120:12 121:11 long 57:21 65:23 licensees 9:12 63:10 66:23 67:7 **leads** 149:15 123:7,22 126:12 91:17 120:14,17 189:24 11:20 127:12 131:6 67:24 68:24 81:2 120:21 121:16,21 81:15 82:12 83:1 **leakage** 186:25 **life** 18:14 134:23 137:11.20 140:5 144:25 95:7 99:19 leaking 95:7 lift 11:23 14:23 147:24 151:25 166:17 longer 25:9 33:5 learned 14:25 110:10,11 118:2 15:6 16:24 17:2 153:10 154:13 122:1 126:24 104:8 178:3 177:21 178:2,4 157:18 159:5 36:2,12 60:4 130:12 135:12 183:19,20,24 183:1 162:5 163:11 94:19 143:15 149:19 190:16 191:8 **lifter** 181:23 168:6 170:5 **longterm** 60:1,5 155:5 170:9 learnings 181:2 **lifting** 15:12 51:4 174:15 186:6 61:7 172:8,13 181:6,7 189:11 194:6 177:7 load 12:3 15:10,12 **longtime** 87:21 184:23 189:8 leave 7:15 61:9 **lifts** 15:10 190:18 27:12 41:7 72:17 **look** 7:6 17:12.19 192:14,17 194:11 63:17 69:1 light 33:17 88:12 89:16,18 26:18 34:17 198:22.25 200:21 126:16 128:21 **lighting** 100:22 166:25 175:9 43:21 45:9 52:9 138:24 176:10 202:7 205:9 likewise 26:19 178:11.13.16 57:11 58:15.25 kriss 2:4 7:24 197:4 27:19 180:2.2 183:7 69:24 78:5 81:6 190:18 99:19 limit 96:23 157:22 81:15 97:22 **leaving** 46:11 led 12:13 120:1 limitation 193:11 **loading** 158:2 100:13 105:12,14 **kv** 146:7 160:12 194:15 163:10 105:15 113:5,6 L loads 62:2 89:15 **left** 6:4.8 63:14 limitations 70:10 114:8.12 116:11 labeled 91:25 66:14 110:1 117:12 147:20,21 89:19 106:22 118:17,20,21,22 122:21 limited 69:8 208:9 164:14 120:8 121:22 125:10 126:16 lack 147:22.22 140:21 145:2 **line** 27:9 39:8,9,10 local 27:7 83:8,10 123:2 125:8 lacked 179:24 176:20 39:12 40:5 88:2 141:10 165:14 127:11 128:16 lady 6:19 88:14 92:4 lefthand 88:6 locally 42:5 130:4,16 133:15 lag 53:10 leg 120:17 134:23 108:13 110:4,6 **located** 6:3,14 47:3 133:16 134:19.25 laid 60:22 148:1

144:8

62:25 88:9,21

163:1

135:13 137:4

				1 age 227
138:2 140:12	53:19 172:12	183:3	193:20,23 195:2	61:3
142:7 143:16	loss 10:7,12 18:14	lower 96:4 123:3	manager 2:20 3:5	mcc 140:9
145:1 148:17,22	26:25 28:7,8	145:8 175:18	3:6,7,12,14 8:23	mccann 3:10
149:1,23 150:13	43:17 58:4 79:12		8:25 9:2 23:12	131:24,24
150:23 151:15	86:5,14 87:7	M	23:15,17 35:11	mccurry 1:25
160:4 165:21	96:20 101:14	m 110:2,2 151:23	45:7 54:8 93:10	210:3,13
166:13 174:7	114:16 150:25	151:23 160:14	112:15,17 159:12	mckenney 3:4 8:20
180:7,9,22 181:2	156:15 157:11,12	198:7,8 210:6	160:1 166:12	8:20 24:1,1
182:5 185:13	161:7,8 162:8,17	macro 135:16	182:19,20 191:20	38:12,14 39:16
188:6,12,21	173:3	magnitude 145:5	managers 23:13	40:14 46:19
193:15,18 204:19	lost 21:19,19 28:17	149:21 151:5	191:21 204:15	47:17,24 48:12
206:5,24 209:4	36:7 37:22 60:3	main 7:8 10:10	manifest 188:1	49:5,12,21 50:12
looked 68:6 92:24	94:25 101:3	15:8 63:15 74:11	manner 13:23	50:18 51:2,9
99:22 100:13	104:10 108:16	76:9 113:3 134:5	55:23 60:7 97:20	54:5 55:7 56:15
113:16 114:20	111:22,22 116:6	141:13 153:7	106:24 152:8	56:25 59:12,16
115:21,23 116:14	162:10,19 171:23	156:3,20,24	207:12	59:18 60:13
124:2,11 133:24	172:14,19	157:4 168:14,23	mans 18:14	61:15 62:21
124:2,11 135:24 134:20 135:15	lot 36:12 37:3 46:7	191:22	mans 18:14 manual 165:14	63:12 64:1,4
		maintain 89:9	206:23	· · · · · ·
138:13,16 145:23	49:3,16,24 50:20	95:4		65:12,25 66:8
173:2,4,7 179:20	52:18,20 75:22	maintenance	manually 158:1,4	69:24 71:25 72:12 17 10 22
179:22 188:14	76:7 78:5,8	23:19 80:3 109:8	175:11	73:12,17,19,23
193:12 201:22	81:13 82:2 84:23	164:15 187:14	marc 2:5 7:11,18	76:17 77:18,22
202:18	84:24,25 90:22	191:20 193:21,24	8:1 15:13,16	78:7 79:21 83:10
looking 32:13 33:5	119:13,18 130:18	major 43:20 70:2	44:9 55:21 60:8	83:21,25 84:7
37:3 42:6 44:4	137:17 138:15	191:11 192:25	67:2 74:20 76:21	85:2 88:4 89:16
44:17,22 51:25	146:19 147:17	makeup 20:9	80:14 100:25	90:16,24 91:18
60:4,6 67:3 71:3	164:4 166:23	28:23 62:15	107:25 180:15	92:3,6 100:19
74:7,9 105:16,18	167:25 189:14	86:17,19 87:1	197:15	108:7 127:15,16
107:21 117:12,18	191:12 203:9	92:6 93:5 94:8,9	march 5:18 10:1	127:23 154:20,21
119:9 120:10	lots 39:3	,	12:8 16:3 188:9	155:1 166:16
122:20 125:13	loveless 2:10 8:11	94:10,20,23	margin 33:18	168:3,18
128:22,23 131:6	8:11 47:15 54:2	95:20 96:24,25	37:21 81:17 95:4	mckenneys 98:3
131:21 132:14,16	54:2 69:1,2,13	109:14 141:18	100:3,4 109:3	mean 14:5 32:12
135:19 138:4,4	71:2 87:11,12,24	179:21,23 180:12	130:17 206:9	33:23 73:11
138:15 144:15	89:14 91:24,24	making 22:3 34:18	mark 203:2 207:19	90:11 94:13 96:8
151:9 177:20	118:9,9 119:4	44:17,21 66:19	material 61:2	132:1 134:22
180:17 182:2	127:3,4 128:5,9	78:4 82:15	177:6,23 178:8	135:19 136:5,10
185:17,18,23	128:14,21 129:11	115:21 116:3	179:3 180:19	145:3,8 158:24
186:4,11,12,15	130:3 131:10	136:23 147:19	190:15	meaning 84:12
186:15 187:2	135:1,14,25	183:10	materials 30:7	means 54:20
193:8,25 194:12	137:13 140:25,25	man 199:14	31:9,13 75:23	109:14 155:15
200:8 201:15	141:5,17 144:24	manage 112:4	matrix 191:2,3	meant 22:22
203:17 204:23	146:24 159:4,4	managed 193:13	203:25	measured 36:3
looks 58:8 137:25	160:8 174:11	management 17:1	matter 14:12	measures 148:3
141:1 181:11	175:2,6,13,20,25	52:6 177:10	55:18 140:7	measuring 133:21
182:17	202:2,10	179:8,22 180:9	163:7 173:9	mechanical 78:9
loop 72:23	low 122:23 123:5	182:15,23 183:12	matters 9:24	140:20 186:19
lose 21:24 52:1	144:17 145:5	190:20 193:15,19	maximum 60:2	mechanics 78:10
	I	I	I	

Page 230 mechanisms 79:7 movement 10:1 116:19,21 147:1 mitigation 81:10 173:3.11.16.17 medium 121:17 mic 69:11 200:20 183:4,6,11 173:19 174:5,7,8 **moving** 44:6 117:4 meet 38:6 208:13 191:15 174:13,17 175:3 119:9 mitman 2:8 8:9.9 meeting 7:3,3 9:18 microphone 6:22 188:14 **multiple** 51:13,21 9:20 14:1 92:24 25:6,7 26:11 **modeled** 47:22 62:16 94:9 97:25 6:23 **middle** 102:21 197:14 208:4,25 34:5,13 40:11,18 97:21 128:2 128:24 159:12 209:3,5 210:5 144:22 40:18 41:11 129:8 133:23 190:11 191:7 midnight 209:6 megger 166:20 42:21 49:8 50:1 140:12,17 152:6 **mute** 39:15 migrated 199:21 50:9 61:9,11,16 modeling 54:13 **muted** 39:14 167:3 **meggers** 167:9 migration 154:1 62:7 63:17,24 75:7 82:8 104:16 **mutual** 136:21 **member** 133:14 mike 2:14 198:17 64:2 83:15,15,23 104:17 127:5 mutually 70:21 199:7,11 128:25 131:17 208:10 84:2,8 93:13,13 Ν members 7:20 **miller** 160:12 93:24 94:12,15 178:9 **n** 5:1 9:16,21,23 191:7 161:4 95:18,21 96:2,19 models 130:1 **n2**92:14 197:16,22 207:16 mind 44:15 45:1 101:20,20 102:2 moderate 120:2 name 24:1 112:14 102:13 104:19,20 208:3,11,16,24 48:10 81:9 139:3 modes 12:18 207:25 209:2 169:14 195:12 110:13 111:13,15 **modification** 35:9 names 6:20 8:20 **memory** 131:12 111:21 116:18,19 52:5 53:7 54:4 196:16 naturalcirc 172:1 **mention** 90:13 88:1 119:15 mindset 34:23 117:1 120:6,19 nature 13:21 30:11 modifications 15:9 91:15 169:21 170:17 121:2,18,24 87:23 119:22 mentioned 16:20 minimizing 19:6 122:20 123:13,19 33:25 34:12 179:6 28:12 33:3 41:20 minimum 168:17 124:7 126:15,15 116:12 117:16 **near** 66:6 73:15 91:16 minor 64:12 65:13 118:23 119:2 128:1 136:5,9 nearest 6:7 119:18 157:23 65:15,20 66:17 138:24,25 139:17 179:14 necessarily 91:22 72:15 74:4 modified 190:20 158:25 164:3,23 140:2 141:23 necessary 6:6 187:11 203:12 191:24 142:5 147:7,8,24 modifying 146:2 62:15 65:21 mold 194:13 met 35:11,18,21 **minus** 102:22 156:17,17,22 106:16 140:20 38:5 137:16 minute 88:25 94:2 157:9 167:19,19 **moment** 50:22 179:18,24 191:7 95:16.17 165:6 168:11,25 170:1 63:9 64:9 101:12 need 7:16 22:6 metering 31:2 204:12 205:21 188:18 199:16,16 118:10 127:4 24:14 31:2,4 208:1 **method** 22:15 **minutes** 84:10,14 200:18 37:8 38:6 41:6 114:2,24 134:21 84:18 94:3 **mitt** 199:14 monte 175:25 51:17 52:11,20 135:8 140:3 130:22 135:9 mixing 95:2,12 month 185:9 187:9 53:18,22 61:12 146:8,22,25 146:11 151:22 96:15 **months** 84:3 71:7 76:12.15 147:5,9,13 153:25 161:12 **mod** 35:12,19 185:11 77:6,15 78:5,23 methodologies 165:3 166:5 36:14,19 92:15 **morning** 47:19 85:14,21 87:2 22:14 113:16 172:14 198:3,6 124:25 motor 88:19,20,23 95:5,16 96:10 132:24 206:2 **mode** 5:4 77:15 move 6:22,23 208:10 101:5 105:6 mismatch 155:24 19:12,15,22 21:7 methodology 86:10 122:2 137:12 95:12 115:5,20 **missed** 60:19 **model** 83:2 114:1 22:18 61:1 62:19 139:4 142:15 126:2.6 146:20 missing 87:12 114:2.3.12 127:1 72:1 85:24 144:14 148:17,22 misunderstood 147:16 148:8 129:9,12 130:21 105:22 116:18 149:1 151:12 125:8 140:11 149:11 196:19.23 104:4 131:12 140:23 158:24 159:21 196:24 mitigate 13:16 143:7,10,11 152:18,18 165:22 170:19,20 171:7 methodologys mitigated 19:2 145:24.25 146:2 166:1 171:3 188:6 193:2 191:6 146:4 148:8 172:23.25 176:12 133:12 197:8 202:8 mitigating 181:14 moved 45:4 127:19 methods 74:8 86:7 153:11.12.13 206:23 93:6 115:15,16 194:23,25 171:11,12,12 127:24

				Page 231
needed 29:19 30:8	noon 45:20	nuked 188:17	octoberseptember	80:3 130:20
31:13 34:2 37:2	normal 24:11	number 48:10	174:15	onset 70:9
37:12 41:3 45:15	30:22 39:6 48:1	67:19 93:1,2,5	offer 9:11 68:14	onsite 12:6 21:16
56:10 60:25 61:1	66:3 81:12,12	97:3 138:7 147:1	76:24 85:6,11	47:16 107:5
66:22 73:21	93:15 94:5	157:22 198:16	132:14 133:1,8	114:18 123:24
75:24 94:19	108:17 130:18	204:5	149:13 207:7	op 177:18
118:23 119:2	134:21 135:17	numbers 26:17	offered 16:21	open 9:15 196:23
138:1 154:13	149:21,24,25	50:13 123:11	office 8:2 210:9	197:21 207:15,23
158:1,5 164:1	150:11 151:3	128:6 133:24	officer 8:19	opened 42:8
171:19 173:5,19	153:20 156:9,19	134:18 143:21	offline 107:15,15	106:22 110:6
179:12 181:25	156:21,24 157:11	149:11	offsite 10:8,12	203:13
needs 46:14 53:1	166:7 169:11,12	numeric 125:14	20:11,16 21:16	opening 7:9,11 9:7
196:19	172:4,7,8,18		21:19 22:1 23:5	15:14 17:11,14
neutral 49:2	206:12	0	23:9 29:16 30:2	17:17 195:12
never 144:14	normally 30:16	o 5:1	33:7 38:22 40:7	operability 110:17
168:15 190:8	91:17 93:16	objective 18:1	43:18 61:12 66:5	operable 103:12
195:17 196:12	132:9 188:20,23	28:14 113:18	97:18 107:5,10	103:15,24 110:18
new 13:5 15:24	north 6:10 11:25	133:5 194:5	116:7 123:24	164:21
132:1 175:2	note 13:25 14:4	196:3,17	132:18 137:2	operate 175:11
nice 73:6	16:20 19:8 27:6	objectives 152:20	150:3,12,16,22	operated 27:4
night 34:2 120:8	86:18 125:20,24	observation 9:16	150:24,25 151:7	33:12,13 106:14
137:4	126:9	78:15 192:10	152:22,23 154:18	operating 8:19
nobodys 69:18	noted 173:5	observe 15:11	152.22,25 154.18	16:16 33:25
nodes 28:5	notes 56:22	observed 15:3,5	163:17 164:19	59:19 82:24 83:8
noise 39:12	notice 7:3 144:21	obtained 114:3	oftentimes 53:10	83:10 111:11
nomenclature	noticed 45:24	obviously 18:14	okay 34:14 38:11	112:20 117:13
55:15	notification 10:18	21:6 50:3 76:8	39:25 50:9 70:1	156:10,10 163:9
nominal 94:1	nrc 6:21 7:9,10,13	121:8 162:18	83:13 84:10	172:9 184:24
131:13,15 173:24	7:15,25 8:2 9:22	203:22	85:24 87:24 88:4	operation 32:20
non 62:12 191:17	11:7,11,15 12:7	occ 52:10	98:10 101:25	33:5 68:3 103:17
nonborated 94:13	12:10,14 13:3,21	occur 74:23 157:8	104:22 111:20	110:16
94:16	13:22 14:5,10,14	162:7 165:2	112:13 122:19	operational 12:18
nonconservative	15:3 21:10 39:14	183:9 188:8	123:18 128:18	29:20 60:2,5,21
142:21	77:1 85:12 114:4	191:13	139:2 151:24	operations 3:5,6
nonfunctional	114:23 115:5	occurred 5:18 14:6	159:20 165:13	5:17 8:23,25
40:15 41:10	138:12 146:4	18:3 70:10 71:16	167:11 168:16	23:12,19 27:25
nonpermanently	153:11,12 171:11	81:3,4 82:11	172:22 173:5	28:1 33:19,22
148:5	171:12 173:3	130:13,14,15	175:13 176:14	59:22 83:9 109:8
nonproceduraliz	174:8 197:4	131:7 153:15	177:3 182:10	133:14 134:4
147:10	nrcs 9:8 143:10	172:10,11,16	200:12,18 204:25	173:10 204:15
nonrisk 176:12	nrr 2:7,9,20 8:7,10	184:4 185:10	once 7:14 27:4	operative 104:13
nonvital 27:1,10	nuclear 1:9 2:19	186:12 188:14	52:12 99:7	operator 5:2 20:23
39:1,2,7,9,17	5:11,13,14,16,19	190:10 195:22	110:24 137:14	38:9 70:11,24
40:6 41:1 48:8	8:17 9:2,4,18	205:12	165:2,6 178:5	84:14 102:7
72:11 75:17	17:23 18:8 46:1	occurring 75:11	ones 30:10 50:5	106:12,15 110:3
88:12,23 103:2	184:16 185:4	100:18 180:11	72:8 77:5 169:4	110:5,9 116:4
152:25 154:8	197:3 200:25	occurs 128:24	ongoing 182:5	137:5,19,21
163:24	210:5	oclock 45:23	online 6:17 7:2	137.3,19,21
100121				10011112011

				Page 232
143:3,3 165:4,14	100:4 152:22	202:5	painted 21:8	168:18 174:3
174:1,23 175:1,3	order 31:21 55:11	overarching 46:8	panel 18:12 148:10	178:10,13,25
175:10 207:20,22	55:13,19 75:9	148:18	paper 53:24	179:22 180:4,10
208:15,17	93:11 124:14	overestimation	papers 91:19	182:19,25 186:11
operators 10:18	140:17 141:15	126:13	paperwork 54:23	201:4 204:7
19:4 25:14 26:19	145:4 149:21	overhead 5:24	parallel 48:25 49:3	205:7
34:1 35:2 40:15	151:5 197:25	10:2 11:20 46:22	53:5,11 55:5	particularly 15:19
40:19 41:6 42:25	ordering 75:23	47:24 62:22 64:9	57:17 59:5 65:3	179:10 181:20
44:10,16,20 45:1	orders 34:2 137:4	64:22 89:20	66:21 67:9,19	186:9 204:17
76:3 84:20 95:18	139:6	overlap 187:25	68:5 72:25 73:16	party 180:14,17
152:7 155:25	organization 23:16	overlapping 71:12	80:8 97:14,19	181:17
156:12,15,23	27:17 78:16	override 157:4,5	107:13 108:5,5	passive 86:8 97:7
159:7 161:1,3	109:7 183:13	oversee 191:15	109:12 131:4	path 28:22 33:16
162:23 163:2	193:24	oversight 16:23	parameter 126:14	53:11,21 55:4,5
166:24 167:2,14	organizational	17:1,6 23:21	parameters 19:22	57:24 58:1,16
169:16 170:13	191:10	177:13 181:5,19	part 5:22 11:17	59:13 60:10,15
171:6 172:17	organizations	182:21 184:19	13:2 17:4 21:20	60:17,18,23
195:16 196:10	23:24	185:1,7 186:6	29:22 36:16	62:15,19,20
204:20	originally 174:20	187:4,4,7 189:13	47:23 56:6,17	64:18,19 65:10
opinion 146:23	outage 25:2 27:21	190:3,12 191:1,4	99:22 105:21	66:15 67:3,4
opinions 14:10	30:24 51:5,7	191:9,11,19,22	108:9 118:12	69:2 72:1,2,4,24
opportunity 5:6	63:5 68:8 81:12	193:13 194:12,15	125:2 182:11	72:25 75:3 83:6
9:12 15:23 16:10	81:12 90:15,18	194:25 195:2,7	183:6 185:23	85:25 86:12,22
17:24 32:4 60:24	90:18 91:16,17	203:25 204:1,5	186:2 187:3	87:14,15 88:17
85:17 103:10	92:1 109:10	205:16	196:4 200:14,17	91:2 97:14,15
132:11 176:9,13	130:15 144:2	oversights 182:13	202:2 204:9	98:12,23,24 99:5
196:25 197:17	149:24,25 150:2	overspeed 186:22	205:4	108:8 127:17
opposed 37:23	150:11 151:3	188:2,7	participant 5:4	129:7 130:11,25
opposite 48:20	188:15 206:12	overview 21:8	183:25	139:18,19 153:1
73:1 81:24 89:3	outages 24:12,12	22:18 153:14	participants 7:8	153:3 163:4
150:9	89:2,5,6 90:17	overwhelming	184:16	174:3
ops 52:10 53:15	90:25 91:21	146:6	participate 129:17	paths 20:9 21:18
optimum 33:20	117:18 119:19	owe 134:8	participated	24:16,19 28:12
option 12:5 49:23	outcome 14:3	P	183:22	28:15,19 29:1,8
50:16 55:14,17	76:14 151:11	p 5:1 110:2,2	participating	29:19 37:3 47:22
57:6 58:22 59:1	outdated 146:25	p 5.1 110.2,2 151:23,23 156:14	193:24 194:11	53:5 54:25 56:1
59:5,5,7,12 62:3	outline 197:18	160:14 198:7,8	particular 13:13	57:16 61:17 65:4
62:4 72:10 73:2	outlined 113:15	210:6	36:12 49:15,23	65:24 67:4,23
75:12 130:25	output 42:12,19	p40 92:8	51:6 58:22 69:2	68:5 73:15 74:21
131:1,1	44:13 66:25	p66 86:15 94:20	72:10 88:5	75:8 76:12,25
options 27:15	72:14 122:1	poo 80.13 94.20 package 109:16	105:25 113:17	77:7 79:22 80:5
29:23,24 31:14	outside 60:25 61:3	178:7	116:17 117:19	80:11 81:10,10
38:17 49:23 50:3	66:24 134:9 168:22 185:15 25	page 4:3 48:10	119:16 120:5,18	83:19 85:13
51:13,21 52:1	168:23 185:15,25	58:5 62:22 64:22	125:9,16 126:14	97:11,14,14,19
55:3,5 56:19 59:1 62:16 68:2	197:13 overall 85:16	67:25 89:21	127:16 128:20 130:2 135:23	98:16 101:7 107:1 109:2 13
73:6 76:6,20	105:14 143:20	pages 210:7	130:2 135:25	107:1 109:2,13 113:14 126:19
87:8 98:1,13	146:15 153:9	paint 19:25 38:1	140:18 155:5	129:1,4,4,22
07.0 70.1,15	170.13 133.7		170.10 155.5	127.1,7,7,22

				Page 233
131:4 132:3	195:23	131:9 132:1	mlaaga 5.7 6.22	12.12 19 61.12
131:4 132:5 138:23 145:14,15		137:5,12 144:3	please 5:7 6:22 13:15,20,25	42:12,18 64:13 64:20 66:24
158.25 145.14,15	personally 18:16 18:17 107:2	,	39:15 50:7 61:11	123:17 173:1
201:16 206:20	139:17 184:14	173:10 183:4,16 190:3,8,25 191:5	69:11 85:23	policy 14:8
			117:2 123:14	- •
pathways 128:24 128:25	personnel 6:21 12:2 14:20 15:18	191:13,16	152:18 155:13	pool 22:4,21,25 27:11 32:24
		placed 53:20		
patience 203:6	17:2 27:25,25	places 39:3 168:15	207:24 208:6,24	33:11 86:17,19
patiently 197:17	28:1 33:1 43:4	placing 35:12	plug 135:22	87:17,20 89:4
pattern 128:20	79:23 80:1 186:3	plan 23:17 30:9	plus 58:25 65:4	92:8,8 94:21
paying 73:13	201:4 202:13	33:19 67:17	69:15 93:23	95:1,2,22
pdg 103:12	perspective 41:20	107:12 118:17	100:9	poor 90:19 119:23
peer 192:4	41:25 51:24	150:2,11 164:19	podium 6:23	160:22
peers 184:9	92:25 97:7	183:4,6,14 191:5	point 17:12 19:3	populated 209:5
people 6:24 18:11	105:12 119:14	planned 119:2	19:20,24 26:13	portable 74:15
30:7 42:22 56:22	133:14 134:4	planning 3:7 9:2	28:25 36:7,8	141:8
84:24 109:9	138:5 144:11	30:10 31:24	38:4,18 41:2,4,5	portion 47:12,13
130:8 169:1	165:1 170:15	52:14,15 53:2	41:17 45:7 47:8	88:6 115:21
190:6	203:7,11 204:13	68:7,11 77:2	47:10 51:3,16	116:15,16 117:19
percent 12:20 95:4	204:17 206:2,11	112:16,17,19	52:12 53:15	118:11,15 119:7
132:4 153:15	peter 2:20	plans 24:19 28:19	55:21 60:14 63:5	124:21 126:3,4
178:16	phase 38:11 49:1	30:6 52:1 67:14	66:3,5,17 69:6	207:14
perfectly 112:12	70:25	68:21 80:16,23	70:2 71:2,24	portions 10:5
perform 12:3	phone 5:7 6:24	97:17 107:17	73:1 81:17 85:11	141:17
79:24 114:24	9:17 39:12,14,15	183:11,16	87:11 93:14	position 13:2,11
124:6 126:4	98:7 160:11	plant 16:18 20:5	95:23 97:15	35:13 51:24
143:4 152:9	161:4,16 176:20	24:23 32:14,18	101:17 103:13	112:18
179:12,19 185:9	197:16 207:17,21	32:25 33:1 34:19	109:20 110:15	positioning 60:1
190:24	208:6,16 209:3	39:6 43:4 48:3	113:3 118:3,25	possible 171:16
performance 3:8	photograph 48:13	48:20 54:8 74:14	127:13,19 128:19	possibly 19:1,20
9:4 12:14 17:9	88:24 90:1	75:20 76:4 77:24	129:1 137:17,19	21:24
190:2 192:4,21	photographs	78:1 80:25 81:4	137:24 139:20	post 46:20 88:12
performed 14:24	65:14	82:3 105:7	140:2 144:22	95:19 116:6
16:18 19:9 90:14	physical 46:22	107:12,19 116:8	145:3,20 148:18	117:8 156:19
112:23 117:17	62:23 64:20	116:10 131:19,19	149:16,20,23	161:14
144:16,20 175:15	physically 64:14	140:8 150:19	153:24 154:3,7	posted 25:23
177:21 178:12,20	98:4 163:7	151:2 152:13	154:12,19 155:14	postevent 149:22
178:23 185:14,25	pick 194:2	153:23 155:21	155:21 159:2,16	posttrip 153:17
200:16	picked 111:4	156:19 181:10,10	159:19 160:24	155:12 161:23
performing 41:14	picture 18:8 20:3	185:4,11 189:3	161:9,18,25	172:11
51:5 167:25	29:14 38:1 46:24	189:21 190:5,11	163:9,15 164:17	postulated 32:10
175:14 185:15	66:7 68:25 164:5	195:15 204:20	164:18 165:12,18	152:13
period 37:9 94:20	168:21	206:14	165:24 175:16,23	potential 40:25
159:9 161:6	piece 18:13 60:3	plants 5:14 8:19	178:21 193:19	44:1 189:16
permanent 65:16	192:22	19:5 20:1 93:14	194:9 201:13	200:23
-	place 19:5 35:15	19:5 20:1 95:14	204:8	potentially 9:9
perseverance 203:5	73:4 87:16,18	play 34:24 141:7	204:8 pointed 68:19	11:5 67:22
	,	187:4 202:16	-	
person 78:12	112:7 117:8,8 124:4 127:17,19	205:6	pointing 82:5 points 17:18 40:17	power 5:14 10:8 10:13,15 12:21
personal 56:16,22	124.4 127.17,19	203.0	Points 17.10 40:17	10.13,13 12:21

				Page 234
15:3 20:8,10,11	158:6,10,13	37:20	147:12	180:7 181:11
20:17 21:11,14	159:1,2 161:17	presented 13:20	probability 28:9	182:6,14,15,20
21:16,16,19 22:1	162:6,9,14,18,19	25:19 80:12	105:13,20 106:8	190:20
23:4,9 24:11,14	162:20 163:16,17	92:23 106:20	108:16 113:11	procedures 5:23
24:17,20 27:7,7	163:22 164:20	126:20 201:16	115:22 116:17	11:18 15:10
27:9,12,15 28:13	167:6 169:24	206:20 207:2	120:2 122:21	30:18 31:19,20
28:18,22 29:11	170:3,4 171:16	preserve 92:17	131:21 132:2,17	43:17,17,18
29:16 30:22,25	171:19 173:5	president 3:2,3,10	132:20 134:24	96:21 110:19,20
31:4 32:22 33:8	202:24	8:17 17:23 35:18	135:18,18 136:6	117:7 123:12
33:17 34:15	powered 35:5	press 5:7	136:10 137:9	124:20 139:20,21
36:18,22 37:15	75:19 153:22	pressure 141:14	143:14 148:18	141:19 147:22
38:13,21,25 39:6	158:7	presumably	170:10 174:10,14	148:7 157:22
39:21 40:8,9	powering 92:15	174:17	175:18,24 183:3	171:19 173:10
43:18 45:14	ppm 95:5	pretty 30:12 52:19	188:13	179:7 188:23
53:16 55:24	pra 112:21,25	74:1 99:18	probable 101:14	190:15
56:10 57:4 61:6	114:10 129:16	144:12 171:10	probably 26:20	proceed 6:10
61:8,12,13 62:5	152:6	172:25 173:21	31:23 85:7 121:9	85:23 112:11
62:15 63:18,20	practice 119:20	prevent 87:6 98:25	131:18 137:21	149:17 195:5
63:25 66:5 68:16	130:19	preventative	138:8 149:5,7	proceedings 4:5
71:7 73:5 74:13	preclude 194:9	187:13	198:3	210:5,8
74:18 79:1 80:17	predict 98:20	previous 46:25	problem 29:25	process 9:9 12:10
80:20 81:25 82:8	106:21	58:24 112:18	30:1 97:18 98:1	22:10 29:11 34:8
82:18 83:7,12	preliminarily 5:21	113:4	101:16,18 102:19	34:11 35:7,8,9
86:4,8 88:2,14	11:8,16	previously 25:9,24	103:13 127:23	35:21 51:15 52:5
89:2,4,5 90:7	preliminary 12:4	112:20 139:20	155:23 156:13,23	52:6,15 54:5,14
92:5,7,12,21	13:4 15:22 16:4	202:18	205:18	54:15 55:1,5,19
93:4,7 97:18	26:8 203:17,19	primarily 189:12	problems 61:23	55:22,24 56:9
101:6 102:6,11	premise 16:15	primary 13:25	169:1	74:25 78:4,25
102:12,15,22,25	130:12	74:8 75:8 82:21	procedural 45:14	79:1,14 124:3,25
103:3,15,16,21	prepare 30:23	94:17 184:5	158:4 162:22	139:9 146:21
103:24 104:6	prepared 30:18	principles 121:5	163:2 166:7	148:11 182:8
105:2,3,5,7,9	preparing 18:4	printed 6:13	179:2	187:19 190:3,8
106:24 107:10	prescribed 86:6	prior 15:2 23:9	proceduralized	195:4 203:25
108:2,14,15,18	95:13	30:15 36:22	96:25 164:4	207:8
110:18,20,24	presence 192:7	54:12	171:6 206:17,21	processes 9:11
111:12,21,22,22	present 13:5 18:12	priorities 32:11,17	procedurally	30:21 52:8,22
112:4 113:7,8,12	86:1 145:23	32:21 34:18,20	20:22 96:12	54:10 67:13
114:12,16,18	196:14,17	86:24 92:25 93:8	152:20 166:8	139:15 181:2
116:7 123:25	presentation 5:5	93:10 97:6 109:7	procedure 43:23	194:8
126:25 132:18	7:12,14 17:17	152:11 162:5	86:6,14 94:8,25	produce 190:5
133:22 137:2,11	19:14 21:4 24:16	prioritize 118:21	103:17,18 115:18	products 180:24
137:12,22,25	27:14 30:4 50:19	priority 34:25 60:3	121:14 122:13	profile 153:10
139:1,8,11	80:10 109:1	79:2,10 92:20	156:9,10,11	program 2:14
149:24 150:3,3,4	113:22 116:1	97:16 98:2 141:9	159:21 163:12	175:15 176:4
150:12,15,21,22	117:7 119:12	162:16 164:18	165:19 172:9,18	180:19
150:24,25 151:7	121:10 146:18	probabilistic	177:6,11,23,23	progress 136:23
152:21,22,24	176:6	132:10	177:24 179:3,4	189:12 192:19
153:15 154:4,17	presentations	probabilities 130:6	179:13,14,20	193:6

				Page 255
nuchihit 00.9	52.14 52.1 16	nulling 52.10	190.21 101.4 12	155:11 157:16
prohibit 99:8 project 2:20	52:14 53:1,16 68:2 73:2,6	pulling 52:19 66:12,18	189:21 191:4,13 191:16 195:15	159:10,19 160:10
177:10 179:8,21	74:22 89:15	pullto 154:9	196:10,11 199:19	161:2 163:8
179:23 180:9,11	94:10 96:15 97:9	-	putting 30:17	165:25 167:23
,		pulltolock 106:15 157:19	59:21 75:22	105:25 107:25 171:22 174:19
181:20,22 182:1	110:11 113:2,23		94:16 127:9	
182:6,15,18,20	121:12,15 122:2	pump 31:7 49:13		180:16,21 187:10
182:22 190:19,24	124:5 132:25	50:25 72:11,13	190:7,25	187:17,19,24
191:1,2,20	146:4 151:17	74:6 79:25 86:13	pyle 3:14	192:12 201:11
193:14,19,20,23	177:15 194:25	86:15,18 89:4,10	Q	202:1,3,11
194:22	196:22 198:4,20	89:12,12,13 90:7	qualified 57:5	207:24 208:1,7
projected 146:4	200:21,23 206:1	92:8,8 94:1	79:24	208:12
projectrelated	206:22 208:2	125:19,23 134:2	qualitative 120:2	questioning 76:2
193:8,9	provided 18:24	139:8 140:1	122:21,23	142:18
projects 2:2,4,11	22:24 23:21 25:3	141:2,4 157:7	quality 180:23	questions 7:16,18
2:15,17 7:25	27:20,22 29:20	162:12 163:19,23	198:10,12	7:20 9:20,23
182:21 190:22	34:1 55:23 57:6	165:11 186:23	quantification	19:21 25:10
191:12,24 192:23	58:2 59:8 74:18	199:23	125:7,15 126:7	39:24 46:10,18
193:13	94:19 103:3	pumps 62:16		54:1 62:20 68:13
prompt 93:4	111:12 114:1,9	86:10 140:20	127:9	72:1 76:1 77:16
prompted 207:25	148:20 153:12	141:9,14 142:9	quantified 145:24	82:15 85:14,21
promptly 33:10	173:2,7 174:16	161:8 171:24	quantify 125:9	87:10 97:3 98:6
proof 91:19	179:16 183:20	pure 148:2	126:21 128:19	99:11,18 104:21
properly 16:18	196:18 204:14	purge 92:11,11	143:7	108:19,24 109:18
27:4	206:25	purpose 13:1,25	quantitative	110:15 112:23,25
propose 93:11	provides 27:15	86:21 136:22	122:24	120:7,11 129:13
109:19 198:17	94:20 126:12	pursue 43:16	quarters 54:22	129:14,15,16,18
proposed 30:10	206:9	50:15 68:1,4	question 5:6,8	133:2 134:7,11
77:8 206:6	providing 52:24	75:2 76:5 97:19	6:22,25 7:13	146:20 149:14
proposing 22:11	108:18 177:24	97:25 138:22	25:6,11 26:8	152:19 156:4
prorated 99:25	191:22 195:3	152:12 162:20	32:2,3,7,9 36:23	176:11,21,22,24
prospective 202:19	200:22 203:7	pursued 29:8,10	38:7 41:22 42:5	189:7 195:9
protect 32:25 35:1	204:5	42:4,9 45:11,14	42:23,24 44:15	197:7,18,20,22
116:9,9 118:19	pruett 2:16	67:8 127:16	47:20 49:4 50:15	197:24 198:12,14
118:24	public 7:3,21 9:15	131:3 162:14	56:7 58:24 59:7	199:14 203:2,10
protecting 32:22	9:16,21,24 19:7	pursuing 67:18,23	60:9 67:11 70:8	205:23 207:8,13
32:23,23 62:11	19:11 197:16,22	75:15 87:8 107:1	73:14 77:10,21	207:15,21,23
169:15	207:16 208:4,11	152:6	79:14,18 83:4	208:1,9,14,15,18
protection 33:19	208:24,24 209:2	purview 134:9	91:14 97:2 98:8	208:19,21,21
59:14 141:25	209:3,4	put 19:17 36:10	99:6 101:1	queues 44:24
150:2,11	publicly 6:17	48:1,15 53:25	102:10,24 104:4	quick 111:6 112:3
protective 59:10	puddles 168:22	70:3 78:20 90:8	104:12,19 106:11	112:5 120:8,20
protects 190:4	pull 113:1 126:5	108:7,8 120:13	106:25 108:14,25	153:14 188:18
proven 43:25	128:16 129:5,6	124:3 126:10	110:17,23 111:8	208:2
provide 13:2 17:6	157:25 159:17	133:22 135:23	111:11 112:9	quickly 7:6 30:12
17:13 24:11	163:1 173:10	144:3 146:25	120:25 121:13,24	32:18 145:22
25:18 26:4 28:15	175:10	147:3 172:20	123:19 128:5	172:25 187:11
28:22 29:17 38:5	pulled 45:2 126:12	180:8 181:7	138:10 140:15	quiet 155:3
38:25 39:20	159:18	183:4,16 187:13	143:22 144:3,13	quite 49:14 58:12
			l	1

				Page 236
58:21 75:1	176:11 203:24	56:1	126:8,10,25	190:16 198:10,11
102:23 106:9	205:19	recirc 86:13,15	128:20 129:12	reflected 193:2
152:2,23 153:2	read 121:19 135:1	90:7	130:2 132:23	reflecting 98:23
177:8 188:4	readily 25:19	recognition 67:18	133:18 134:23	reflective 97:21
190:12 199:20	44:16 186:12	70:15	138:12,14,21	refocus 151:25
quizzing 129:15	ready 12:19 22:18	recognize 22:6,9	140:18,22 142:12	refuel 90:17
quorum 85:8	110:7 176:7	24:18 87:7	143:8 144:19	refueled 12:20
quote 36:7	real 37:25 60:20	104:10 196:5	145:2 146:1,9	refueling 30:23,24
4	113:23 138:14	recognized 116:8	147:12 148:18	51:4 144:2
R	145:22 195:23,25	116:10	150:8 152:21	refuelling 25:2
r 5:1	realistic 37:18	recognizing	153:7,19 155:19	89:6
rachel 2:23	81:6,7 113:20	133:25 205:10	155:20 156:8,12	refurbished 178:4
rack 183:2	114:17 132:16	recommendation	156:16 161:22,23	reg 155:23 156:3
radiological	133:1 151:10	187:13	162:14 173:14,16	156:14,23
100:21	189:15 203:13	reconfiguration	201:1,24 205:25	regard 151:21
raise 208:12	204:11 205:4,21	72:16	206:4,16	regarding 15:22
ran 47:3 48:3	realistically 36:25	reconfigurations	red 11:9,13,14	17:5 26:9 38:7
64:24 83:11,12	really 20:15,23	74:5	39:19,23 40:5	97:13 110:15
168:4 175:22	41:8 46:12 50:19	reconstruct 37:1	73:8 89:5,9	121:16 139:25
176:4	75:22 76:15	record 6:20 207:24	92:12 103:1	187:24 199:14
randomly 136:1	85:21 96:17	records 56:8,13	111:12,16 153:4	204:18 205:9,16
range 13:16 123:5	109:22 117:20	recover 21:14	153:22 154:5,18	206:2,12
123:5 130:7	127:7 129:20	27:12 33:6 38:13	158:6 163:20	regardless 143:5
144:20 146:12	134:12 138:9	71:4 98:19	203:17 204:1	region 2:5 7:25 8:2
rate 79:11 94:1	143:20 159:14	106:24 114:17	rediagnose 165:3	8:4,12,14
raychem 55:12,12	161:17 162:24	119:10 148:19	rediagnosed	regional 2:5 7:11
rcs 86:17 94:18,21	164:21 168:24	173:11	162:15 172:17,20	8:1 14:13 15:16
94:24 95:6	174:12 176:12	recoverable 26:1	redirecting 55:18	regular 80:3
109:14	203:5 204:13	recovered 33:9	reduce 195:7	regulatory 1:9 3:8
reach 14:14	reason 59:18 60:16	recoveries 20:16	reduces 153:9	3:10,12,14 5:12
170:21 197:19,23	73:3 91:5 111:25	127:6,6 138:17	reducing 19:10	5:15,16 9:4,8,12
201:13 203:10	149:5 155:1	145:13	redundancy 68:17	9:19 11:6 12:5,9
207:9	reasonable 52:3	recovering 28:18	redundant 158:13	197:3,21 204:1
reached 46:12	122:18 133:16,24	93:1	reenergize 62:2	207:14 210:5
99:7	134:15,16 146:8	recovery 20:8,21	170:7	reinforce 182:12
react 80:15	148:24 149:4,9	21:11,23 23:8,10	reenergized 34:7	related 12:17 14:1
reactor 2:2,4,6,10	149:21 151:4,10	23:18,25 24:17	166:20	14:6 15:10 97:3
2:11,13,15,16	195:14 206:7,25	28:12,13 29:18	refer 27:8 34:8	106:11 110:17
7:25 8:4,12,14	reasonably 97:23	33:7,16,20,21	reference 71:24	187:10 191:18
10:9 12:19,22	reasons 35:25	35:10 36:2 37:3	145:10 148:15	relating 114:11
15:18 22:25	reassembled	43:20 60:1,5,22	referenced 16:2,21	relation 70:15,19
28:23 87:22	178:19	60:24 61:7 66:6	referred 88:2	105:23 113:17
92:10,11 93:3	recall 67:24 188:5	70:20,25 75:19	referring 70:9	134:18 138:12,16
95:2 99:8 149:25	202:20	77:25 98:21	101:25	144:16
150:14 153:16,18	recalling 187:14	102:6 106:14	refill 96:6	relationship 91:3
155:19,20 156:7	receive 9:23 13:22	117:24 124:22	refine 37:10	190:11
156:8,12 157:3,5	13:22 196:24	125:9,12,13,18	refining 52:25	relative 14:12
161:8 171:23	received 15:11	125:21,22,23	reflect 67:18 82:10	89:25 90:4 97:11
			l	

Page 237 182:1 72:9 74:3 134:22 120:20 133:10 151:6 179:2.2 111:6 relatively 146:3 135:20 190:21 restating 146:10 176:25 177:18,20 197:25 repaired 16:19 **requires** 150:16,16 restoration 60:18 177:25 178:23 **relav** 42:6 45:9 64:14 67:1 73:4 180:13 75:17 106:19.22 179:19 180:18 160:4 165:20 repairing 15:7 requiring 183:10 140:17 185:10 186:2 166:2,13,17 66:20 researched 146:7 restorations 88:12 199:25 201:22 167:2 restore 29:15.21 **reviewed** 15:6 28:4 **repairs** 65:13,15 **resident** 2:12,18 relaying 31:2 65:16,20,22 46:1 200:25 45:14 60:11 114:1 115:7 66:18 103:18 110:24 116:13 182:22 62:11 **resource** 31:17 **relays** 99:24 repetitive 91:20 41:18 117:12 112:3,4 113:7 **reviews** 14:20 released 194:14 rephrase 40:19 189:24 204:4 132:18 141:14 34:12 181:15 **replace** 49:13 **revised** 179:7 relevant 13:9 resources 21:1 restored 10:15 180:7 151:7 27:23 30:7 31:9 55:23 57:4 80:20 reliability 2:8 26:13 54:7 replacement 14:24 68:4 75:23 78:2 113:8 137:2 revisit 142:22 15:5 79:25 115:18 121:14 78:19,20 79:2 139:11 143:20 147:13 150:23.24 replacing 49:17 109:4 116:11 restoring 36:22 revolutionary 187:25 95:9 118:7,22 129:5 56:10 86:21 146:22 reliably 33:11,13 **report** 12:8 13:12 138:22 139:4 92:21 113:12 richard 3:7 9:1 171:18 185:16 137:25 104:14 105:10 relied 122:7 13:15 16:3.21 reloaded 95:3 18:24 23:16 28:6 201:12,17 restrict 70:24 110:10 112:15 reluctance 169:3,9 40:23 41:23 **respect** 99:14 restricted 69:4 right 6:8 17:22 170:14 193:10 179:10,21 180:3 114:4 19:17 24:2 32:4 reluctant 198:4 reported 1:23 186:13 187:3,6 restrictions 69:19 35:23 36:11,14 rely 62:2 86:9 92:7 respective 57:8 37:15 39:8.17 210:4 restrooms 6:3 92:12 93:6 reporter 210:4 respectively 48:14 49:10 51:6 **result** 10:14 18:18 relying 67:21 reporters 4:6 204:15 26:24 76:9,14 53:5,8 55:8 80:16,22 96:14 **reports** 185:20 respond 27:15 77:1 101:4 61:15 63:14.14 remained 73:9 186:1,16 193:18 52:2 106:12 133:15 154:1 64:6 66:13 67:4 202:22 194:1 139:23 152:8 162:2 180:11 67:19 70:3 76:8 **remains** 108:19 repowered 27:4 174:19 181:4 195:15 77:15,17,24 78:8 remarks 7:10,11 represent 14:11 responding 24:23 resulted 5:20 10:7 78:11 81:1 82:7 7:19 9:7 15:14 represented 151:5 75:4 77:6 67:15 195:17 82:9,11 84:4 response 10:16 17:11.14.17 request 7:4 resulting 10:12 85:7 87:16 91:20 189:6 203:3 requested 9:13 20:1 23:15 27:17 128:19 95:11 99:3 101:8 199:5 **remember** 96:20 28:20 29:2 32:10 **results** 12:4 16:6 106:6 107:20 122:22 167:20 requests 198:16 76:8 81:6,7 82:7 26:16 113:2.23 108:9,18 110:7 **remind** 24:15 199:10 106:12 109:5,7 114:2 125:15 111:13 122:22.24 **reminder** 6:18,20 123:11 124:9 **require** 30:17 130:9 153:17 127:14 133:7 14:9 48:9 208:24 150:2,5 156:9 155:12,25 161:14 134:16 143:9,12 125:7,8,17 127:8 **remote** 88:10 180:8 169:11 189:9 143:21 144:17 127:9,13 128:4 200:11 145:25 175:17 129:25.25 130:1 200:20 **required** 66:14 responsibilities remotely 91:1 95:19 96:12 184:11 187:9 130:1,5 132:1 removal 15:4 97:11 149:23 109:10 retain 56:8 136:3,11 140:13 32:19,23 33:10 150:19 151:3,4 responsibility 5:13 rethinking 132:7 141:1 142:4 33:14 86:5.14 206:13 183:12 return 15:3 145:21 146:15 94:25 96:21 requirement 183:7 responsible 111:5 **review** 11:3 13:23 147:2 148:9 requirements 11:6 15:9 17:10 34:11 158:14 199:23 restart 16:19 149:6 151:19 repair 15:4 23:18 15:12 150:13,15 109:25 110:8 85:18 114:5 157:2 160:17,22

Job No. 18996 Nuclear Regulatory Conference with Entergy Operations, Inc. Transcript of Proceedings May 1, 2014

				Page 238
161 10 160 2	•1 . 101 11	105 16 00 140 0	177 11 00	20.0.40.5.41.12
161:19 162:3	risks 181:11 194:22	105:16,20 140:8	saw 177:11,22 179:8 182:24	39:8 40:5 41:13
163:11 166:10	road 188:19	running 36:13 51:22 53:5 66:21		48:7,14,17,18,24 52:10 55:11
167:1,21,23 168:19 170:16	roads 6:10	78:23,24 80:17	saying 37:9,9 48:10 76:25	58:17 64:17,23
176:2,14 188:2	robinson 41:20	82:17 88:18	104:2 121:1	66:15 69:19 70:7
192:13 200:5	robust 181:11	107:10 108:4	135:2 166:4,6	71:12 72:20
208:14	190:3,7	164:20	says 55:1 148:6,9	73:13,25 81:16
rigor 195:3	rocket 84:22	runs 49:3 63:5	149:6 160:19	89:25 90:4 93:3
rigorous 18:20	role 23:15,16,23	80:17,24	169:17	100:2 102:17
133:10	85:11 142:24	ruptured 10:9	scenario 61:11	105:11 120:20
ris 148:1	187:4	141:13	74:25 82:17	121:23 123:11,13
risk 2:8 8:7,9,10	rolls 78:13 105:19		102:13 106:21	125:10,18 135:23
9:9 11:7,11,13	room 7:15 23:21	S	142:3 162:14	140:13,21 141:15
11:14 12:15,17	25:24 41:21	s 5:1	165:10	142:25 145:2
12:25 15:25 16:4	42:22,25 43:2,10	s28 88:6 90:1	scenarios 201:9	149:14 169:14
16:7 17:19,20	43:12,14 63:20	safe 16:19 60:6	202:12	180:16 185:20
18:2,9,25 19:2,6	63:21 90:2	167:22	scheduled 49:12	197:7 198:9
19:10 22:12	102:18,21 116:5	safeguard 80:18	50:25 79:24	208:1
24:25 26:8 27:18	152:15 155:20	safeguards 82:18	scheme 72:16,18	seeing 190:1,2
28:5 30:10 33:6	159:11 160:13	safely 14:24 71:20	science 84:22	197:25
36:16 37:4 47:22	161:14 162:25	110:12 167:6	scope 29:2 30:5,6	seeking 133:2
56:2 68:14 71:3	164:7 165:20	safety 2:6,13 8:4	30:24 38:1 48:23	seemeng 177:2
76:24 84:12,13	166:9 167:17	11:9,10 14:2	52:12,13,25	seen 25:9 68:22
84:22 85:16 86:1	171:17 173:12	15:18 18:9 19:6	58:21 68:6 73:25	82:4 147:9
87:13 97:7	197:4,10,12,14	19:10 20:12,17	99:23 185:7	192:23
104:24 105:15,23	204:16 208:4,5	23:6 29:17 32:13	scoped 57:17	segue 77:18
109:23 112:17,19	208:11,15	32:22 33:2,2	74:22 76:14,18	select 192:22
113:15,20 118:4	root 14:21,25	35:20 39:5 43:22	83:25 87:2 139:2	selected 115:16
122:5 126:13	37:12 177:11,19	54:7,24 58:7	scoping 91:10	192:24
127:13 129:16	182:25 183:8,16	59:9 61:6 62:11	screen 6:12 7:6	selections 128:16
132:10,17 133:1	rotor 14:24	62:12,13 78:19 78:20,24 79:14	38:18 125:11	selfevident 116:5
139:12 146:9,12	roughly 71:21	80:25 81:5 82:22	screening 120:3	send 45:9 128:14
148:9 149:9,11	route 58:11 63:2	116:9 118:21,24	sda 42:1	155:25 165:14,20
149:21,21 151:5	72:21	119:23 158:13	sdp 148:2	166:5,13 209:7
151:15 153:10	routed 58:10 80:4	163:25 165:23	seal 78:3 210:9	sending 71:10
174:9,22 176:8	100:14,14	185:4 189:14	seals 78:10 79:6,6	senior 2:8,10,12,14
176:10,16 183:4	routes 29:12 routing 68:15	192:4 202:5	searches 185:21 186:5	2:18,23 3:3,12
183:6,11 185:3 187:18 189:21	89:21 99:24	203:18 204:3	second 25:11 66:5	8:12,14 23:14 46:1 176:10
191:1,3,14,18	101:6	205:19	84:4 109:4 163:4	182:22 185:6
195:7,14,18	rp 188:19	safetyrelated	184:23 208:20	191:21 200:25
196:13,21 199:8	rules 188:19 192:4	10:16 19:9 61:8	section 21:8,13	sense 134:15,18
199:24,25 200:2	192:5,11	152:9 196:11	38:11 42:3 88:15	sensitive 26:14
200:3 202:13	run 31:1 48:25	safetys 118:18	127:18 141:13	106:1
203:13,15,19,21	50:5,20 58:5	salient 55:21	189:10	sensitivity 144:16
203:23 204:11	64:7,25 72:24	161:25	sections 21:12	175:16,21
205:5,14,21	89:2,22,24 90:5	sampled 136:1	security 94:8	sent 44:3
207:4,6	90:17 91:20,21	sanity 134:3	see 27:14 34:14	separate 19:14
,	- 1			•

				Page 239
62:10 200:14	sharp 115:17	41:5,24 42:9,19	similarities 82:3	six 64:14 65:15
202:24 207:7	117:24 120:3,8	43:15 44:1,5	simple 57:22 79:22	71:21 86:6 87:1
separately 200:8	120:20,20 121:15	47:4 48:3 59:16	79:23 80:15	93:6
sequence 28:6	120.20,20 121.13	59:20 62:25	83:17,18 84:9,11	sixhour 165:12
94:22 103:5	,		, , ,	sized 11:24
	122:20,22,25 123:2 126:1,6	63:13,14,16,23	84:12,13 85:4,6	
sequences 24:24	,	69:8,13,22 71:14	90:9,11 97:20	skill 189:24 192:1
28:8 173:5	140:22 146:20,24	91:4,8 102:25	119:13,15,16	192:6
sequentially 80:9	148:25	103:1,4 122:6	134:20,25 136:4	skills 31:17 192:3
131:2	shed 175:9	125:10,17 140:13	164:6 173:9,12	skipping 36:15
seriously 18:10,17	sheet 182:17,17	141:1,22 153:22	simplification	slide 32:6 34:18
seriousness 18:11	shift 8:23,25 20:19	153:22 154:5,8	57:25	46:25 48:12,13
serve 23:14 136:21	23:12,13 26:16	154:15,17,18	simply 18:7 20:25	48:22 54:12,13
served 14:22 23:23	40:23 45:7 54:8	155:2 158:15,23	114:17 131:21	58:5,8 61:10
serves 86:19	67:25 68:1,2,3	159:25 163:17,17	135:16 137:6	62:22 63:17 64:4
service 23:7 35:13	82:23 91:13,23	163:20 164:13	140:7 145:4	64:23 69:24,25
35:15 36:10	152:14 159:11,12	167:1 171:9	146:10 173:21	72:2,20 73:9
53:21,25 108:8	160:1 166:12	sides 146:22	175:15	74:20 77:19
150:9	shifted 30:8 60:4	signed 16:2	simulation 176:1	79:22 83:15 85:2
services 191:22	shipped 74:16	significance 9:10	simulator 162:23	86:1 88:4 90:8
202:6	178:17	9:15 11:5,7,9,10	single 194:19	92:16 95:24
session 5:6	short 25:22 93:10	11:12,14,14	202:9	97:10 98:8
set 19:22 27:18	120:13 121:17,21	12:11,15,17,25	sink 92:21	114:21 120:7
28:16 94:7	141:15 197:25	13:4,6,10 14:2	sir 31:6 32:1,5	135:1 136:8
123:15 131:4,10	shorter 26:12	14:14,16 15:22	34:16 68:23 96:1	149:15 155:11
135:17 141:24	49:24 50:20	16:8,13 17:20,20	99:1 108:4 110:5	185:8
151:20 181:13	60:17 82:21	18:6 37:4 81:5	155:14 157:16	slides 54:20 61:10
201:13	shorthand 210:4,4	109:23 112:18	166:6 167:16	66:1,8 68:20
sets 92:9 114:15	shorting 60:15	172:24 184:2,9	187:16 188:3	93:12 132:15
173:2 189:24	shortly 124:8	189:15,19 196:5	sit 134:8	203:12
setting 86:24	shouldnt 44:6	196:7 202:9	site 3:2 8:16 11:15	slightly 36:6 95:5
109:7 130:13	142:19	203:18,21,23	17:23 21:4 31:8	slow 168:16
131:8	show 37:21 40:1	204:11 205:14	31:14,15 35:17	169:11
seven 27:21 48:25	46:21 57:21 63:8	207:4,6	49:11,15 50:11	small 10:12,17
49:1 65:3,3	64:9 65:7,14	significant 9:9	51:1,7,13 75:10	105:21 155:7
185:12,17 186:14	80:9 88:24	15:17 97:6 101:2	80:1,1 138:22	168:4
186:20	131:14	105:23 106:7,8	141:3 158:7	snake 73:2
severed 20:14	showed 72:7 75:10	112:14 151:11	162:18 177:4	solution 95:9
199:17	showing 47:25	156:13 185:19	178:17 182:23	126:16,16
severity 13:16	48:22 88:5	192:23,25 203:15	185:25 189:9	somebody 39:14
shaded 40:3,4	208:17	204:4 205:19	191:20 192:2,5	somewhat 114:4
shape 18:5 30:15	shown 73:8	206:8	201:7 202:4,15	123:6 140:7
share 17:25 18:18	shows 39:8 174:16	significantly 68:9	sites 191:24	146:25 156:11
18:22 197:1	shut 12:18 33:19	68:10 69:4 82:6	sitting 18:12	sooner 198:21
shared 15:21	34:24 156:23	143:22	situation 12:13	sorry 200:4
16:11,14 38:23	199:18 205:25	similar 30:5,11	39:22 49:25	sound 71:9
38:25 41:6	shutdown 95:4	31:10,10 100:17	61:21 80:22	sounds 188:25
205:15	115:2 150:2,11	144:10 179:6	111:24 114:25	source 21:16,16
sharing 187:9	side 6:9,15 7:2	186:25	168:12 205:7	27:10,12 30:2
5141115 101.7	5.40 0.7,10 7.2	100.20	100.12 200.7	27.10,12 30.2

				Page 240
31:4 34:3 37:16	183:11 185:6	staff 2:22 9:22	192:21	10:4,7,9 14:23
57:3 63:18,19,24	187:2,7 190:17	14:14 15:11	starter 74:13	14:24 15:5,6,16
74:13 86:19 93:2	191:11 193:12	16:22 25:18	starting 102:5	16:23 17:2 23:20
93:15 97:1,18	specification	27:16 33:22	106:15 110:19	26:24 27:9 30:15
102:6 108:19	177:25 190:21	44:10 67:19,21	163:10 193:5	36:8 40:2,6,20
140:9,14 142:12	specified 179:4	68:3 75:4 85:12	startup 23:5 27:2	48:6,16 51:4
143:16 162:12	182:14	87:9 107:8	27:2 38:13,21,23	61:19,22 62:24
165:8	specifies 123:4	117:14 153:17	46:24 47:1,25	63:15 70:10
sources 27:1 38:20	specs 150:19	165:20 167:24	48:15 57:3 58:6	86:25 88:10,15
64:21 81:25 87:1	206:13	180:13	58:9 60:14 74:9	88:16,21 89:21
87:6 92:7 94:9	speed 187:12	staged 31:5,14	75:18,19 81:18	115:1 116:6
94:10,13,13	spend 115:24	stamped 155:20	83:11 97:18 98:1	117:8 129:12
103:2 171:16,19	118:10 119:12	standard 30:15	100:15 108:7,11	146:13 177:7,19
south 47:4 48:3	spent 22:4,21,25	43:18 115:9	113:7 125:12	178:4 179:23
88:9 89:22	27:11 32:23	132:22 134:24	134:23 152:24	183:2 186:24
192:16	33:10 86:16,19	135:21 136:14	153:21,25 154:2	199:17 200:17
southern 8:19	87:17,20 89:4,10	171:6 177:18	154:3,4,4 155:3	203:7
121:4	92:7,8 94:20	185:12 205:24	157:19,20 158:2	status 32:14 40:12
space 84:12,13,23	95:1,2,22 119:12	standards 6:1	158:3,10 161:12	118:16
194:1 206:10	138:15	115:7 122:9	162:7,9,17,20	stay 201:15
spare 88:22 90:6	splice 55:12,13	133:21 137:16	164:3,9 171:13	stays 95:8
spatially 80:6	64:10 72:21	182:13	172:11 174:24,25	steam 78:2 99:3
speak 6:18 25:15	spliced 47:11	standby 141:11	175:9	155:17 156:20
34:5 50:8 69:10	100:14	standing 5:3	state 111:7 122:23	162:12 163:19,19
116:22	splices 49:5,6 66:6	standpoint 15:18	208:7 210:1	163:23,24 165:8
speaker 50:6 69:9	66:12,16 99:25	42:7 85:3	stated 65:15	165:10,11
98:7,11,22 99:2	100:18	starone 5:7 207:24	146:11 195:12	step 12:10 55:7
99:10 160:11	splicing 80:24	207:25	statement 101:11	76:24 169:17
161:4,16 172:3	108:5	starr 116:7	statements 14:9	207:1,5
176:20 185:6	split 44:24 129:4	start 7:22 24:21	stating 35:3	stephanie 3:14
speakers 136:12	splits 120:11	29:16 36:7 38:17	station 6:4 18:16	198:18 199:6,12
speaks 147:11	spoke 19:13 22:21	39:7 52:15,16	19:4 36:17 43:17	steps 124:11
spec 150:13 151:3	sponsor 184:5	55:4 63:21 98:14	43:24 51:23	140:24 142:13
151:6	spot 58:14 72:22	98:17 102:16	57:13 58:3 59:23	stepup 74:17
special 179:25	72:23	103:6 104:9	71:4 72:3 75:13	stop 152:18
181:23	sros 159:12,23	105:6,16 107:1	81:9,11,20,23	storage 86:3 89:12
specialist 2:23	160:6 165:25	110:20,24 111:23	82:4,16,19 86:20	93:17,19
specialty 181:20	stability 164:19	111:24,25 112:5	87:4 92:19 98:19	straight 52:19 91:6
specific 30:19	stabilize 71:6	135:4 139:5	100:7,9 102:4,14	109:8 173:25
112:24 121:23	stabilized 32:18	152:1 164:25	102:14,21 103:17	strategically 19:17
144:9 171:10,18	155:21	165:4 202:22	110:16 141:11	strategies 23:24
171:18 175:6	stabilizing 153:18	208:10	162:11 164:24	43:21 46:18
180:19 185:2,17	stable 19:5 29:15	started 10:15	169:16 170:17	106:13 130:1
186:14 189:24	33:4,17 43:15	49:15 98:25	202:5 204:25	152:21 153:8
190:23 199:10	53:22 75:16	103:2 107:11,12	stationperformed	191:16 206:19
specifically 11:22	87:18 153:23	112:5,13 113:25	20:24	strategy 47:23
148:2 152:21	154:6,17,19	135:3 139:3	statistical 134:21	70:20 86:6 94:7
166:17 180:7,8	158:5,9,12 167:8	154:16 155:2	stator 5:19 10:2,3	94:19 140:1
,		I	Í	1

Transcript of Proceedings May 1, 2014

Page 241 strengthening 111:14,20 112:8 systematic 115:18 72:24 73:15 92:6 190:17 74:21 75:3.8 133:13 139:24 sure 18:5 22:3 systems 12:24 15:9 stress 66:19 81:13 76:25 77:7 79:22 141:8,20 145:18 26:16 42:8 44:4 16:7 39:20 119:23 205:2 80:5.11 81:10 200:3 202:17.17 53:3 56:5 60:9 105:16 117:13 structural 33:2 204:14 83:6,19 85:13,25 65:6,10 76:20 158:13 86:12,22 87:14 summarize 28:14 77:13,16 79:20 70:2 Т structurally 71:9 87:15 88:17 79:21 109:1 82:15 108:10 table 7:2,9 29:5 structure 11:25 97:11,14,14,15 summary 7:10 111:10 118:2.8 31:3 34:25 58:15 15:7 24:16 27:20 **summer** 194:6 98:12,13,16,23 127:9 128:18 122:6 144:13 49:14 109:6 98:24 99:5 101:7 sunday 195:24 129:2 132:10 208:25 190:25 191:4 107:1 109:2,3,15 sunil 98:7 176:18 135:2 157:7 tail 136:2 structured 124:20 176:20 113:14 126:19,19 160:5 166:14 take 7:20 18:10,17 supervise 23:13 124:20 181:13 129:1,22 132:3 169:2 176:9.10 19:18 21:25 struggle 128:22,23 134:3 135:18,24 supervising 3:4 182:4 188:15 30:16,25 34:15 supervision 192:1 131:16 205:23 139:18,19 145:14 192:11 196:4,20 34:25 38:17 supervisor 8:21 199:8,10 208:21 206:15 145:14 151:11 57:21 65:23 stuff 52:18 78:3 152:3 174:3 24:3 42:1 159:11 surface 105:17 77:15 84:16.23 109:22,23 201:16 206:19.20 supervisors 192:8 surprised 41:14 88:22 91:9,17 subject 16:20 supervisory 16:25 successful 90:23 96:7 99:15 101:12 supplemental 17:2 surrounding 10:22 132:6 133:9 124:12 137:22 109:20,21 114:9 subjective 37:10 successfully 108:2 192:1 204:2 175:16 177:20 120:8 127:8 123:6 159:20 158:11 supplied 96:23 **suspect** 104:3 129:23 134:13 subjectivity 160:6 succession 22:23 158:6 163:19 switch 88:5 90:2 137:11 142:13 subsequent 14:23 suction 86:16 154:9 163:1 **supplies** 68:16 149:16 151:14,19 15:3,5 26:9 35:3 sufficiency 188:20 149:24 150:3,4 164:7 162:25 165:14 49:23 162:1 sufficient 50:17 150:15,21 159:2 switchgear 10:11 166:18,19 174:2 subsequently 10:5 27:1,3 36:1,3 67:12 68:4 80:8 supply 23:5 25:10 177:17 184:7 11:1 89:19 100:2 42:15 58:20 45:18 48:4,8,21 189:18 194:24 substantial 11:10 127:25 138:22 86:16 89:4 57:4 62:6.24 196:21 197:3 27:22 81:16 suggest 166:1 105:17 139:1,7 63:3,6,7,11,13,15 taken 9:21 13:15 100:4 109:4 suggesting 170:5 150:3,12,22 65:5 66:4,20,24 17:6,8 21:5 130:17 150:8 sullins 3:6 8:22,22 151:7 156:19 69:6 72:9,12 58:11 97:21 203:21 22:20.21 23:11 158:20 73:3 81:21 99:16 110:2 121:10 substantially 23:12 24:15 supplying 92:14 101:15,16 103:8 151:23 170:6 157:21 163:24 151:1 25:17 26:3,6,24 105:13,21 106:4 173:13 177:10 substantiate 24:18 32:9 34:10.16 164:14 111:19 152:25 182:3 198:7 succeed 96:6 35:7 38:7 47:20 **support** 23:24 158:7 168:13.24 takes 91:22 165:1 27:20,22,24 28:1 switching 152:1 success 20:9 21:17 66:2 85:24,25 165:2 32:19 54:23 68:3 switchvard 74:14 24:16,19 28:15 87:19,25 92:5 talk 19:23 21:4 sylvia 5:2,10 110:5 28:18,21 29:1,8 93:21 94:5,14,18 87:9.25 105:16 22:2 24:8 28:21 110:9 207:22 47:22 55:25 57:3 95:11.19 96:1.10 107:15 109:6 42:3 43:21 46:6 57:16,18,24 58:1 96:22 97:2 98:10 158:25 181:22 208:17 46:20 47:21 58:16 59:13 98:18 99:1,6,11 182:1 190:22 system 15:8 27:13 50:21 51:14 62:4 60:10 61:17 101:12,25 102:3 191:20,22 28:23 38:16 83:17 113:2,14 62:19.20 64:18 102:23 103:14.22 supporting 23:23 61:23.25 62:17 116:2 120:12 104:1,7,11,18 64:3 92:11 94:17 109:7 153:24 64:19 65:9,23 124:7,10 138:11 66:15 67:3,3,4 106:11 108:23 164:22 107:16 155:17 152:5,20,25 69:2 72:1,2,4,24 110:14,14 111:10 supports 27:10 157:4 199:18

				Page 242
153:8,10 154:13	69:14 84:16	49:7 58:18 66:12	60:13 61:5,16	91:7 97:17 98:1
157:18 162:5	115:14 117:9	66:16	62:7 63:6 65:2	100:2,3 101:7
164:4 193:5	118:5,16,20	terms 29:4 37:10	65:21 66:25	102:22 104:22
206:16	119:18,24 120:22	103:7 124:19	71:24 73:23	111:3 121:23
talked 34:18 41:12	122:2,8 124:16	136:24 151:10	76:15 77:18 79:4	127:7 132:22
57:11,17 72:4	124:17,22,24	189:15 191:18	80:21,24 82:12	133:21,25 134:2
89:13 91:12	133:14 160:9,13	192:8	85:4 87:19 88:9	147:16 150:8
95:24 99:13	179:22,22 180:1	terribly 51:9	93:17 94:14	152:6 153:12
119:10 139:15	180:12 185:14	test 12:3 167:3,9	95:11 96:22,22	155:5 159:17
143:9 145:25	187:11	183:7	99:1,6 100:11,12	160:2 166:14,23
153:2 157:21	teams 84:20 130:9	tested 5:25 11:21	103:19 108:2	169:5,6,8 170:5
158:16 159:5,11	180:9	33:24 46:14 47:9	111:8 112:12	175:11 180:25
160:7 164:12	tech 42:6 150:13	53:14 178:14	113:9 118:19	181:23 192:7
166:16 171:4,10	150:19 151:3,6	testing 29:21	119:15 121:6	193:2 195:8,12
184:19 189:8,14	206:13	34:14 37:14	122:21 124:9	195:25 196:15,16
190:14,19 195:21	technical 28:15	41:13,16 52:23	129:7 130:15	204:3 205:2
199:2 200:12,17	83:4 102:24	58:20 66:21	131:16 132:12	206:17 208:25
200:22	109:1 159:12	101:5 108:8	135:11 136:3,7	theyre 43:5 52:23
talking 20:21	technicians 44:3	133:20 167:25	136:11 137:24	52:24 73:1 79:22
21:10 23:4 28:11	166:5 167:3	178:11	140:3 141:25	84:9,22 129:5,6
30:20 36:15 38:4	techs 45:9 160:4	testings 53:9	142:4 143:5	131:18 143:18
38:17 45:6 46:3	165:20 166:2,17	texas 210:1,13	144:10 148:9,10	168:1 191:6
46:4 47:21 51:10	tell 121:20	tfc 23:15,18	148:11 150:6,22	195:23,23 206:17
51:12 53:13	telling 71:8 107:13	th 69:14	151:6 157:2	theyve 117:17
54:16 57:6 66:9	temp 35:19 36:14	thank 5:3,10 8:15	161:1,19 162:4	thing 35:24 38:14
68:10 69:3,14	36:19 124:25	9:6 15:15 17:15	163:10 165:7,9	40:4 46:19 50:18
70:18 71:5 76:20	temporary 5:25	17:24 23:1 32:9	165:24 167:7	57:15 87:23
81:9 91:25	10:2,22 11:20,25	39:15 69:12	168:14 170:11	116:2 128:22
102:16 103:5	12:3 24:11 30:22	73:12 83:13	171:2 172:15	129:25 130:5
112:17 114:13	34:12 35:9 47:2	99:10 104:1	173:14 175:12	131:19 133:18
117:16 119:13	47:15 48:2,13,18	110:13 131:24	176:2,5 182:2	134:5 138:11
121:16 130:5,21	51:17 52:5 53:7	154:25 172:22	188:5,15 192:17	140:22 145:7
130:22 138:7	54:3 58:2,2,19	182:10 207:12,19	194:12,14 195:4	158:24 163:22
141:24 152:1,3,4	58:20,21 60:12	207:22 208:23	201:11 203:19	164:17
159:6 161:1	72:14 83:7 88:1	209:9	206:7	things 24:13 30:23
163:6 168:12	89:2 92:1,15	thanks 145:21	theirselves 7:9	47:13 57:16
196:1,2 200:5	118:23 177:21	152:17 177:2	theme 76:1	77:23 78:1,5
206:18	178:1 183:1	188:17 189:5	thered 89:19	82:16 97:5
talks 147:9 185:3 tank 86:3 93:17,19	tenminute 109:21 term 33:6	203:4 207:18 thatd 199:1	theres 13:9 19:21 21:11 38:20,21	114:21,23 138:7 138:16 142:3
targeted 186:20	terminate 90:3	thats 19:15 20:15	38:22,24 39:10	158:16 142:5
targeted 180:20 tarrant 210:1	terminated 64:16	21:20 26:21 29:6	41:8,11 43:1	132:24,18 108:10
tarrant 210.1 task 91:20 182:6	80:24	29:13 36:23,23	44:1,14 49:1,3,5	205:23
tasks 43:18 194:21	termination 40:17	37:7 38:10 40:3	52:25 56:21	think 20:4 22:17
team 2:7 8:6 10:21	42:18 49:16	43:20 46:21 48:5	58:21 61:19,21	22:18,21 26:22
10:24 11:2 13:14	64:13 66:17,19	48:7 50:21 51:2	62:19 63:5 64:8	29:6 31:23 32:3
16:3 18:24 24:10	112:14 127:19	51:15,24 53:9,13	70:21 76:7 81:13	32:3 36:24 39:16
35:10,12 53:20	terminations 49:6	54:9,19 56:3	82:1,24 86:4	40:19 44:8,9,10
22.13,12 20.20				

Page 243 tindell 2:18 45:25 46:1,3,9,17 176:17 202:2 98:14 100:4 206:17 50:14 70:21 74:5 thoughts 17:5 101:2,8 102:25 45:25 200:24,24 trains 32:18 33:5 76:1,21 77:4,14 203:5 106:12,20 109:3 **titled** 11:23 33:13 164:9 82:14 84:12 thousand 59:4 112:2 113:6.6.8 **tlc** 56:14 transcribed 6:16 threat 54:7 114:18 115:24 today 5:17 13:1 transcript 1:7 85:11,19 97:1 three 21:17 26:25 210:7 100:5 101:2 119:12,13,25 14:7,12 17:5 104:20 108:13 28:17,18,25 121:12 124:21 30:20 42:21 43:7 transcription 6:19 transfer 22:22 113:3.18 119:11 55:25 65:3,4 127:25 128:23 43:9 77:12 83:20 122:4,6,14 74:8 75:6,7,8 129:2 130:17,24 92:24 99:13,13 25:3 94:1,24 124:19 130:16 76:22,23 77:5,7 133:23 134:2,22 113:2 114:9 97:8 115:3 139:8 132:2,5 136:21 77:7 80:11 86:8 135:20 136:1 140:15 146:1 153:20 154:8 184:22 197:1 136:23 139:3,9 93:5 126:3 137:3,17,20 158:10 174:25 131:17 138:25 139:17 140:2,15 138:15 141:4 200:17 201:16 transferred 154:4 142:24 143:18,18 141:8 150:4 149:8 150:8 todays 5:5 157:23 146:5,24 147:2,4 152:22 153:7 153:24 154:13 tomorrow 209:7 transformer 23:5 148:16,22 149:9 206:19 208:10 158:6 159:9 tonight 209:6 38:22,23 46:25 160:3,20 161:20 thrown 140:19 160:25 161:2,6 tool 147:4 182:18 47:2,3 48:1,15 161:25 164:5 tie 58:6 63:22 164:1,22 165:2,8 tools 22:11,13 48:16,19 58:6,9 125:5 129:25 167:1,24 168:16 64:11,20 66:3,4 165:19 167:17 59:11,14,15,20 169:8,9 170:12 73:1,4 103:10 173:13 174:2 top 22:5 40:8 52:9 60:14 74:10,13 170:14,19 176:14 106:17 153:4,6 176:13 178:21 79:1 89:21 91:6 74:17 83:11 98:2 176:21,22,24 157:25 163:2,13 189:2,4 190:10 125:24 126:12 108:9,12 153:21 177:8 184:25 163:14,18,22 194:3 198:10 136:12 143:2,4 153:21 154:22 164:1,25 165:5 199:18.19 204:21 158:2,3 162:9 188:5,16 195:6 168:10 transformers 27:2 198:11,13,18,20 166:8 171:4.14 206:8 207:12 total 58:25 59:1 198:24 199:1,11 173:8 174:5 208:10,20 39:7 74:11 75:16 185:12 201:3 203:1,11 **tied** 47:5 57:6 timeframe 23:10 touch 199:5 202:22 203:12 204:16 58:13 65:4 91:6 36:6 51:10,12 tower 11:25 transient 157:11 205:23 206:1.15 102:11 154:5,16 65:18 91:9 121:7 track 62:19 157:13 207:1 209:4,6 tieing 165:23 121:16 174:15 train 10:6,10 transition 56:19 time 5:4,7 7:13,17 thinking 21:21 timeframes 188:5 39:19,19 45:2 72:19 165:16 34:6 61:7,7 71:6 17:24 23:8 25:4 **timeline** 46:16 48:6 57:9 62:23 176:8 106:25 129:14 25:4,14,15,21,21 65:22 68:19.24 63:1 89:5 90:18 transitioned 56:17 139:6,12 26:9,9,22,23 99:12 107:25 101:21,22 102:15 translate 205:17 **third** 62:3 180:14 31:21 33:17 34:4 108:3 110:11 102:22 103:8 translated 55:13 180:17 181:17 36:9,12 37:9,11 113:5 105:6,6 106:2,2 transporting 10:3 thirdparty 178:22 37:18 40:11 **timelines** 37:8 38:4 106:3 108:14.15 travel 29:19 181:15 42:22 43:8,9,10 67:11 81:16 111:12,16,16,18 treat 103:9 206:23 43:13,15 44:2,3 82:10 130:17,20 128:2 148:7 tree 21:10 114:1 **thorough** 18:20 179:12 45:3,11,17,20 **timely** 13:23 150:6.8.9.17 114:13,19 117:24 153:4.5 157:12 thoroughly 121:19 50:7 60:21 65:21 times 25:11.12.19 117:24 119:10.16 140:10 67:16,23 71:3 25:20,22,23 158:4 168:23 120:9,9 123:16 **trained** 43:18 26:12,20 41:21 123:20 125:8,24 **thought** 19:19,23 75:16.20 77:16 25:14,15 26:19 77:24 80:8 81:16 57:19 65:2,4 109:9 110:20 126:3,6,8,11 29:10 42:25 83:5 81:22 85:4 86:23 71:4 117:17 162:23 206:21 127:2 128:13.19 119:17 130:7,9 85:9 104:3 87:3,15 88:2 training 15:11 132:21 138:13 112:10 131:18 91:10 93:4 94:20 191:7 31:17 119:20 140:12,13,23 144:4 161:3 97:10,12,20 98:5 **timing** 97:3 137:22 147:22 171:18 141:23 143:8,10

145:17,24 157:13165:15 178:15,19118:19 138:19122:7 127:540:23 41:1,2157:13199:21unacceptable 81:3130:3,4 133:3,541:7,20,24,2trend 185:21turbines 100:1381:4 195:22134:6 135:1442:3,9,10,13186:10,11turn 5:8 15:13205:11139:13 142:2542:19 43:15tried 22:1217:13 107:6unaffected 27:4148:25,25 161:2244:13,25 45:trigger 78:25121:19164:12166:22,25 168:1146:2,3,4,5,7trip 10:9 153:16tweaking 132:6unavailability168:25 170:2,1962:25 63:1,2155:24 156:2,819:14 20:14 25:9unavailable 40:6188:25 196:469:6,8,13,22156:12,19 157:327:2 29:14 32:1841:10 62:14208:1970:11 71:14157:5,6 161:8,1433:4,13 36:1774:10 158:18understanding72:12,12,12	25 3,16 44:5 4,4 47:4 20,21 2,7
157:13199:21unacceptable 81:3130:3,4 133:3,541:7,20,24,2trend 185:21turbines 100:1381:4 195:22134:6 135:1442:3,9,10,13186:10,11turn 5:8 15:13205:11139:13 142:2542:19 43:15tried 22:1217:13 107:6unaffected 27:4148:25,25 161:2244:13,25 45:trigger 78:25121:19164:12166:22,25 168:1146:2,3,4,5,7trip 10:9 153:16tweaking 132:6unavailability168:25 170:2,1962:25 63:1,2155:24 156:2,819:14 20:14 25:9unavailable 40:6188:25 196:469:6,8,13,22156:12,19 157:327:2 29:14 32:1841:10 62:14208:1970:11 71:14	25 3,16 44:5 4,4 47:4 20,21 2,7
trend 185:21turbines 100:1381:4 195:22134:6 135:1442:3,9,10,13186:10,11turn 5:8 15:13205:11139:13 142:2542:19 43:15tried 22:1217:13 107:6unaffected 27:4148:25,25 161:2244:13,25 45:trigger 78:25121:19164:12166:22,25 168:1146:2,3,4,5,7trip 10:9 153:16tweaking 132:6unavailability168:25 170:2,1962:25 63:1,2153:19 155:19,20two 5:21 11:4173:23 202:21174:12 184:9,1263:23 64:1,2155:24 156:2,819:14 20:14 25:9unavailable 40:6188:25 196:469:6,8,13,22156:12,19 157:327:2 29:14 32:1841:10 62:14208:1970:11 71:14	9,16 44:5 4,4 47:4 20,21 2,7
186:10,11 tried 22:12turn 5:8 15:13 17:13 107:6205:11 unaffected 27:4139:13 142:25 148:25,25 161:2242:19 43:15 44:13,25 45:trigger 78:25 trip 10:9 153:16121:19 tweaking 132:6164:12 unavailability166:22,25 168:11 168:25 170:2,1946:2,3,4,5,7 62:25 63:1,2153:19 155:19,20 155:24 156:2,8two 5:21 11:4 19:14 20:14 25:9173:23 202:21 unavailable 40:6174:12 184:9,12 188:25 196:463:23 64:1,2 69:6,8,13,22156:12,19 157:327:2 29:14 32:1841:10 62:14208:1970:11 71:14	44:5 4,4 47:4 20,21 2,7
tried 22:1217:13 107:6unaffected 27:4148:25,25 161:2244:13,25 45:trigger 78:25121:19164:12166:22,25 168:1146:2,3,4,5,7trip 10:9 153:16tweaking 132:6unavailability168:25 170:2,1962:25 63:1,2153:19 155:19,20two 5:21 11:4173:23 202:21174:12 184:9,1263:23 64:1,2155:24 156:2,819:14 20:14 25:9unavailable 40:6188:25 196:469:6,8,13,22156:12,19 157:327:2 29:14 32:1841:10 62:14208:1970:11 71:14	24,4 47:4 20,21 2,7
trigger 78:25121:19164:12166:22,25 168:1146:2,3,4,5,7trip 10:9 153:16tweaking 132:6unavailability168:25 170:2,1962:25 63:1,2153:19 155:19,20two 5:21 11:4173:23 202:21174:12 184:9,1263:23 64:1,2155:24 156:2,819:14 20:14 25:9unavailable 40:6188:25 196:469:6,8,13,22156:12,19 157:327:2 29:14 32:1841:10 62:14208:1970:11 71:14	47:4 20,21 2,7
trip10:9153:16tweaking132:6unavailability168:25170:2,1962:2563:1,2153:19155:19,20two5:2111:4173:23202:21174:12184:9,1263:2364:1,2155:24156:2,819:1420:1425:9unavailable40:6188:25196:469:6,8,13,22156:12,19157:327:229:1432:1841:1062:14208:1970:1171:14	20,21 2,7
153:19155:19,20two 5:2111:4173:23202:21174:12184:9,1263:2364:1,2155:24156:2,819:1420:1425:9unavailable40:6188:25196:469:6,8,13,22156:12,19157:327:229:1432:1841:1062:14208:1970:1171:14	2,7
155:24 156:2,819:14 20:14 25:9unavailable 40:6188:25 196:469:6,8,13,22156:12,19 157:327:2 29:14 32:1841:10 62:14208:1970:11 71:14	
156:12,19 157:3 27:2 29:14 32:18 41:10 62:14 208:19 70:11 71:14	
	74:9
$(1)^{(2)}$ $(1)^{(3)}$ $(1)^{(4)}$ $(1)^{(3)}$ $(1)^{(4)}$ $(1)^{(3)}$ $(1)^$	/4:9
172:13 186:22 44:14 47:6 48:6 160:16,20,23 15:21 16:11,15 74:11 81:20,	·
187:12 188:2,7 50:4 54:20 59:1 161:3 174:21 37:12,17 46:9 100:24 104:3	
triple 138:961:10 62:19 67:5uncertainties69:5 76:2,10112:20 146:3	
trouble 69:10 67:23 69:3 78:22 85:20 78:24 83:19 85:1 151:15 152:2	
102:4 111:17 83:17 86:9 89:25 uncertainty 85:21 90:19 152:7,12 153	
troy 2:1690:3 92:6 93:2170:24 206:1193:17,20 94:4153:14,20,24	
truck 141:3109:21 125:20unclear 24:396:2 98:15154:19 156:3	
true 127:21 161:16 127:5,24 128:12 172:15 137:15 155:22 158:12,15,20	
210:7 131:1 137:1 uncomplicated 156:18 159:14 158:23,25 15	59:6
try 36:25 37:10 143:16 144:7 153:16 155:12,13 170:23 176:23 159:7,18,25	
70:24 96:5,6,6 150:3,3,15 155:15 156:7 184:10 203:11 160:1,3,13,1	6
102:24 129:11 154:24 174:21 161:10,15,23,24 207:2 161:7,17,22	
136:25 151:20 181:8 185:18,24 172:14 understands 164:12,13,16	5,19
152:17 168:21 188:24 193:8 uncover 36:7 157:10 164:21 165:2	22
193:1 204:25 196:16 198:13,14 uncovered 68:22 understood 56:5 167:6 171:9,	,17
trying 18:7 44:21 tying 66:10 88:19 uncovery 25:5,22 107:19 166:24 172:5 174:7,	,10
54:12,19 75:1 type 79:24 89:1 26:10 98:13 204:20 175:17 177:2	23
84:8 90:21 115:9 117:15 113:6,9 201:19 underway 177:15 178:5 201:2,	,2
100:12 102:20 133:19 179:4,15 undamaged 63:11 unfortunately 202:4,19,19,	,22
107:2,8,21 179:17,24 181:17 63:13 69:21 131:14 202:24 203:	19,19
108:20 127:4 185:15 186:13 underplaying unidentified 172:3 204:15,15 20)6:18
132:7,13,25 types 131:22 196:7,9 unintelligible units 152:1 15	7:21
134:13 147:11 typical 81:11,12 underscored 156:7 202:8,14	
149:8 169:14 90:24 121:7 204:19 unique 12:13 unnecessarily	
170:6,24 188:14 typically 84:13 underscores 16:9 117:16 196:10	
195:13 202:10 90:22 121:6 understand 20:4 unit 5:19 8:23,24 unnecessary	
tsc 29:25 32:14 129:11 130:20 21:14 25:12 32:2 10:2,5,7,8,11,12 196:10	
51:20 52:10 144:8 44:11,21 46:12 10:14,17 11:9,11 unprecedente	d
78:16 92:25 93:9 49:10 50:15 56:4 12:16,18,20 15:17	
93:10 97:24 U 59:17 60:9 65:11 14:23 15:5,7,8,8 unprocedural	ized
uhhuh 157:17 b 67:3,16 68:18 b 16:6,6 17:19,20 b 148:4	
131:15 ultimate 29:18 76:16 80:19 19:15,16,18,23 unresolved 11	:1.3
tse 24:7 107:4 65:8 92:21 93:2 82:15,22 83:13 20:8,19,20,22 untrained 147	
tuned 167:9 115:10 143:16 84:21 85:12 86:1 21:7 22:8,19 unusual 10:19	
turbine 10:5 15:7 186:23 101:4 108:20 23:12,13,14 28:2 upper 88:6 12	
47:4 61:2,3 ultimately 16:12 111:10 112:9 28:3 38:23,25 144:18 175:	
47.4 01.2,5 30:2 33:7 115:16 111:10 112.5 20:5 30:23,25 144:10 175.5 88:10 100:19 30:2 33:7 115:16 114:2 120:10,25 39:1,1,2,2 40:17 upstream 59:15	

				Page 245
urgency 52:14	valve 142:10	170:21	85:10 98:2 107:7	168:21 169:1,6,7
92:16	155:23 156:3,14	views 13:8 14:9	107:8 108:23	173:3 199:17,18
usages 128:17	155:23 150:3,14	133:4	113:13,18,19	199:20,22
usages 128.17 use 18:25 28:22	valves 165:16	violation 7:10 11:6	115:23 116:2	waterford 5:13
34:3 40:20 50:11		11:17,19 12:15	113.23 110.2	waterioru 3.13 way 18:5 21:20
	vantage 193:19	,	,	•
53:9,13 55:1,20	variation 72:3 73:24	14:3,5,6	146:21 148:14 149:16 152:17,20	29:16,17 30:14 35:20 39:6 40:19
63:9 64:19 67:5 86:12 88:1 04:22		violations 5:22	,	
86:13 88:1 94:23	variations 91:7	virtue 207:2	152:23 153:8	53:23 74:12
95:23 103:18	various 46:13	visible 41:11 42:13	154:7,12 164:6	126:21 128:1
114:10,24 116:21	82:16 125:5	164:12	164:17 166:12	132:8,9 135:13
121:6 127:17	vein 85:20 133:2	visibly 70:4	173:1 176:9	137:20 142:2
142:25 146:22	vending 193:1	vital 10:13,16 27:1	189:18 197:11,13	151:9 169:23
148:4,20 149:6	vendor 11:23	27:3 38:21 39:1	199:9 203:2	ways 131:13
152:23 159:22	179:16 180:18	39:2,9 40:7 41:1	wanted 16:19 18:4	weaknesses 177:22
163:15 181:1,1,3	181:20 182:13,20	44:7 47:6 48:4	19:3 28:25 38:14	web 183:22 184:15
182:18	187:13 190:4,24	48:20 53:17 57:4	56:5 61:2 65:10	184:17
useful 38:10	191:13	57:7 58:7 61:13	66:2 67:16 79:19	website 209:3
uses 11:11	vendors 178:14	63:3,6 66:4 93:1	84:20 95:15	wed 49:24,25 52:2
usually 91:22	180:25 181:1,8	140:3 153:4	96:17 118:7	66:17 71:23
181:20	181:21	154:6,18 158:7	165:24 188:15	72:15,18,22
utility 189:25	venting 87:23	162:19 170:2,7	warehouse 30:17	74:10,12 97:1
utilize 171:19	verification 180:17	171:5,14	wasnt 45:22 77:13	128:15 131:3,3
192:2	verifications 192:4	vitals 39:18	88:15 90:25 91:5	166:11 168:19
utilized 114:4	verified 179:13	vivian 2:21	117:8 127:17	week 33:11 198:22
utilizing 186:3	verify 166:20	volt 20:8 21:11	146:25 168:21,24	weeks 23:22
203:14 205:21	verifying 76:3	24:17	173:25 175:3	106:14
	84:24	voltage 154:14	watch 79:11 112:1	weerakkody 98:8
V	versus 60:12 75:3	volts 43:2 168:13	water 10:11 22:5	welcome 5:3,15
v 5:23 11:18	80:23 118:12	vulnerabilities	31:7 43:2 49:13	welds 178:18
valid 32:3	119:13 122:8	200:9	50:25 69:17	went 63:3 103:2
validate 194:24	150:24 161:24	vulnerability	70:12 71:11,17	104:9 107:14
validation 195:4	200:14	155:6	86:3,13,15 89:11	108:10 115:20
valuable 139:18	vessel 12:19		89:12 90:7 93:16	123:23 135:19
204:17	149:25 150:1,14	W	93:16,18,19 94:1	145:4 156:24
value 96:12 120:4	150:20	wait 107:9 176:25	94:3,9,12,13,16	178:5 179:13,13
122:5,6 125:14	viability 24:18	waited 34:6 35:14	94:23 96:3,3,4	180:6,6 193:11
126:22 128:12	viable 76:12,25	53:23	96:11 105:17	201:5
131:13,15 137:8	98:4	waiting 34:6	134:2 139:8	werner 2:2 5:9,10
138:3 140:1	vice 3:2,3,10 8:16	197:17	140:14,17 141:1	5:11 7:23 8:15
143:8 144:18	17:23 35:17	walked 129:23	141:4,12,14,18	9:6,7 39:13,13
145:3,3,5,8,8,11	vicinity 168:14	walking 20:25	142:12 143:17	48:9 110:3,7
146:3,3,12	169:6	wall 62:25 168:23	150:1,6 154:1	197:2,2 198:2
173:24 174:6,6	view 16:9 33:6	209:1	155:8,17 156:2	199:11 201:3,18
values 120:3,13	37:7 44:10,12	wallflowers 32:8	156:19,20,24,24	201:25 203:1
122:23,25 123:8	46:22 47:25	want 43:6 51:14	156:25 157:1,3,4	207:19 208:2,19
128:9 135:23	62:22 64:9,22	52:2 57:15 62:21	157:7,11,12,14	west 63:13
144:21 174:12	89:20 148:20	79:21 80:18,21	167:21,22 168:1	weve 19:17 28:4
176:4	149:10,20,23	80:21 83:16	168:3,5,13,15,16	29:14 33:15 35:3
			,-,-,,,10	

				Page 246
27.20 46.11 59.1	205.12	www.m.g. 125.2	106.2 6 120.10	21.7 22.8 10
37:20 46:11 58:1 69:16,17 75:14	205:13	wrong 135:3	106:2,6 120:10 121:1,16,24	21:7 22:8,19 23:12,13 24:3
77:11 89:2 90:20	wondering 160:18 199:23	X	121:1,16,24 124:7 125:13	23:12,13 24:3 28:2 38:21 39:1
97:3,21,21 99:13	wont 96:6 119:12	x 149:6	124:7 125:13 127:5 128:25	28:2 38:21 39:1 39:1 40:17,24
101:15 102:18,19	143:20 164:4		127:3 128:23	41:1,7,24 42:9
101.13 102.18,19	207:9	Y	129.2,13 130.8	42:13,19 44:5,13
104:12 109:3,20	word 85:7	y 149:6	137:20 138:7	44:25 45:4,6,23
123:10,10 125:4	words 90:20	yall 197:12	144:15 170:17	44.23 43.4,0,23
125:10,10 125:4	160:22	yalls 7:14	180:17,24 204:23	40:2,5,24 47:1,4 47:25 48:16 57:3
123.5 120.2,2	work 31:8,10	vard 47:3 48:15	204:25 205:1,15	58:6,9 64:19
132:5 135:7	36:21 42:15 51:5	88:14 94:10	204:25 205:1,15 206:3,18	,
		yeah 17:16 29:13	,	67:3 69:6,15 72:12 24 72:15
140:16,17,19	52:5 55:11,19	49:5 59:16 62:3	youve 17:5,7 44:18	72:12,24 73:15
141:24 142:8	68:7,8 69:14	63:12 90:16 98:7	67:13 76:1 77:1	73:17,18,19,19
143:9,12 145:25	80:2,3,9 81:17	117:3 122:4	82:19 85:13	74:9 81:18 83:6
149:17 156:4	81:19,20 84:10	160:2,21 166:16	94:15,16 105:2	83:19 97:14,15
168:14 171:4,10	84:21 90:21,24	186:21 201:21	106:3 123:20	97:18 100:24
177:8,10 182:3,4	99:14 100:17	year 5:18 14:17	128:1,25 134:7	103:2,6 104:10
183:19 188:12	103:16 119:23	84:3 204:23	137:19 141:23	104:15 108:7,11
189:17 191:4,7,9	123:23 124:14	years 24:4,5	142:9 149:1,9	111:1,3,15,18,24
191:19,25 192:20	139:6 147:6	119:19 185:18,24	151:6 189:1	112:20 113:7
192:21,23,25	154:23 162:3	190:10 193:8	203:6 206:9,20	115:12,17 120:8
193:1,9 194:2,7	167:25 168:2,8	yellow 11:10,13	Z	120:20,20 121:15
194:20 197:25	181:8,9,18,22	203:20	$\frac{\mathbf{z}}{\mathbf{z} 149:6}$	121:19,20 123:3
199:2,10 203:8,9	185:7 199:6	yep 165:21	zero 71:3 87:6	125:12 126:1
whats 6:12 26:15	workers 192:11	yesterday 184:25	Zero /1:5 8/:0	134:23 140:22
32:14 63:18	working 20:18	youd 6:14 61:11	0	144:18 145:5,9
65:18 76:3 84:24	23:18 26:22	93:25 101:3	0 115:12 123:3,4	145:12,12 146:7
91:25 93:3 97:20	51:21 52:21	144:4	144:18 145:5,9	146:13,20 148:19
102:18 112:1	78:10 100:16	youll 27:14 52:9,9	145:12,12 146:7	152:7 153:24
130:16 131:14	105:9 168:12	81:16 96:5,6	148:19 173:23	154:19 158:20,23
137:18 149:23	worry 140:5	99:2 111:24	00 210:6	159:6,18,25
150:19 169:5	worth 84:10 94:3	114:9 125:10,18	000 22:5 43:2 49:9	160:3,14 164:13
174:17 203:25	185:24 193:8	125:19,24 140:13	93:25 168:13	164:21 165:22
206:13	wouldnt 36:1	140:21 144:21	000volt 41:15	173:23 174:9
white 11:13	48:10 72:25 74:3	145:1,2 208:12	01 123:4	201:2 202:19,19
widely 147:15,15	91:22 103:13	209:3,6	03 120:4	202:22 203:19
147:16	104:5 105:25	young 18:14	063 120.4 0e2 143:8	204:15 206:18
wilcox 12:22	106:17 111:25	young 18.14 youre 21:9 36:17	0e3 137:9	210:6,6
willoughby 2:12	126:22 138:9	46:3 48:10 53:11	0e4 173:12 174:6	10 11:1 144:17
8:13,13 77:20,21	155:24 161:9	55:10,25 56:4	0e5 174:16,22	145:9
77:23 78:12	162:18 169:11	61:17 67:3,13,18	063174.10,22	100 12:20 95:16
79:17 91:14,15	174:1	69:3 70:8 71:5,7	1	1015 198:2,5
155:10,11,22	wrapping 187:8	76:20,21 77:2	1 1:11 5:19 8:23	10cfr 5:22 11:17
157:17	writing 139:6	80:16,19,22 82:5	10:2,5,7,11 11:9	10minute 149:16
winding 60:12	written 56:12	80:10,19,22 82:5 82:14,18 91:25	12:18 14:23 15:5	10th 11:3 12:7
wish 6:21	110:11 124:4	95:7,8,9 98:12	15:7,8 16:6	14:17
wit 13:24	125:1,2 142:2	101:25 105:16,17	17:19 19:15,18	115 25:5,8
withstanding	148:2 163:13	101.23 103:10,17	1,.1, 1,.10,10	119 177:23
		1	I	

				Page 247
12 12:8 25:4,8	153:10,14 154:4	2a12a9 71:15	160:14,23 190:9	152:25 153:2,5,5
91:23 98:15	154:4,15 155:3	2a2 73:7,9 152:24	195:24	167:25 171:5
100:3 210:13	156:18 157:19,20	154:8 157:20,23	300 22:5	206:4
125 178:16	158:3,8,10,12,15	158:1,2,5,10	31 72:2 73:9	43 95:24
13 71:18 160:23	158:20,25 159:7	163:23 170:4	109:23 110:2	44 98:9 151:23
1300 161:2	160:1,13 161:7	173:7,9	210:13	45 27:23 67:25,25
14 66:17	161:17,22 162:9	2a211 163:1	31st 5:18 10:1	46 110:2
15 165:3,6 166:5	162:17,20 164:3	2a3 153:4 154:5	188:9	48 75:11
185:11	164:9,12,16,19	163:14 170:3,4	32 72:20	480volt 27:7,13
150 183:24	167:6 171:9,13	171:5 173:8	35 77:19 83:15	28:22 39:20 62:5
150amp 89:18	171:17 172:5,11	174:4	36 86:1	62:15 74:17,18
15th 11:2	173:11 174:6,7	2a4 153:5 154:15	38 88:4	86:9 88:8,18,20
17 48:12 173:23	174:10,24,25	163:15 170:3,4	3e06 175:19	89:7 91:8 92:5
18 48:13 88:25	175:9,17 201:2	171:5 173:8	4	92:17 102:10
19 28:6 48:22	202:4,24 203:19	174:4	4 23:7,7,8 25:5	103:1 139:8
1a1 61:20	204:15	2a9 40:12,12,16,20	4 23:7,7,8 25:5 33:22,22 36:1,6	4day 36:1
1a2 61:20	20 91:9 134:24	40:25 41:1,12,13	36:9 41:15 43:2	4hour 121:7
1e2 128:20 135:10	135:21 136:20	43:1,16,23 44:1	47:8,8 49:9	4kv 145:2,13,16
2	200 89:24 184:2,15	44:4 45:22 62:24	53:13,13 57:11	4th 22:2 28:21
$\frac{2}{24:48:2410:8,12}$	200815 148:1	63:18 65:13	57:11 80:13,13	5
10:14,17 11:11	2013 10:1,20,25	66:20 71:19 72:9	83:19 85:25 97:9	5 4:5 143:13
12:20 15:8 16:6	12:8	72:22 73:3,7	98:13,13 99:20	175:19 198:7
17:20 19:16,23	2014 1:11 11:3	125:18,22 153:2	99:20 108:9,9	50 5:22 11:17 48:2
20:8,19,20,22	12:7,8 210:6,10	158:18,19,21	109:3,17 120:15	49:2 95:16
28:3 38:23,23,25	2015 210:13	159:15 164:16,18	120:18,21 121:1	114:21 127:8,8
39:2,2 40:23	209 210:6	165:21 166:14,24	121:6,8,11 137:3	500 49:2 59:3
41:2,5,7,20,25	20hour 136:14	167:1,4,19,23	137:3,4 143:8	51 89:24 90:5
42:3,10,16 43:15	21 89:25 90:5	168:24 174:21	146:3,14 151:23	51 89.24 90.5 52 151:23
45:4 46:3,4,7	96:12	187:23	151:23 168:13	525ton 10:4
62:22,25 63:1,20	210 4:6	2a901 64:11,13	40 27:24 68:2	55 198:7
63:21,23 64:1,2	21feet 96:23	66:18 2-004 72-0	93:25 94:3	5e06 143:13
64:7,18 66:15	23 150:1,14	2a904 73:9	400 95:5	5th 10:20
67:4 69:8,13,15	24 12:8 16:3 58:5 61:10	2alpha9 160:14	409 73:2	5th 10.20
69:22 70:11		2p7 165:15	41 109:24	6
71:14 72:1,5,12	2450 59:2 25 58:8 198:8	3	4160 20:8 21:11	6 10:8 24:5 165:18
72:12,25 73:15	25 38:8 198:8 2500 59:2	3 57:16 59:3 72:2	24:17 39:19	198:8
73:19,20,24	2500 59:2 27 24:4,4 62:22	72:25 73:17,18	57:16 109:13	60 27:25 68:3
75:18,19 79:10	69:25	73:19,20,24 80:6	139:1	134:22 135:20
80:6 81:20 83:19	28 49:5 64:4	83:19 97:15	4160volt 28:13,18	136:14
97:14 102:5,6	29 64:23 69:25	100:15 109:23,24	29:1 33:16 47:2	600 88:8 89:14
103:12 110:16,25	29 04.23 09.23 295 27:23	110:2,2 127:7	49:7,18 55:24	63 136:5
111:3,5,6,11,14	293 27:23 2a1 72:12 73:11,12	128:20 135:10	62:6,14,17 65:8	6900volt 172:12
111:23,25 112:5	154:2,5 163:23	153:21 154:1,2,3	80:17 82:8 86:8	6e3 134:25 136:9
112:5 127:6	167:20,21,21	161:12 162:7	91:2,3 92:7 93:1	
134:25 136:5,9	168:22 169:1	174:16,22 175:18	93:7 114:11	7
137:9 151:15	170:4	30 10:6 40:24 45:6	126:9 138:16,21	7 25:2 195:24
152:2,2,7,12,24	2a113 154:2	66:8 71:18 93:24	144:19 146:7	700 66:16 93:22

75 155:11			
8 8 23:8 25:5 36:6,9			
97:9 109:3,17			
120:18 121:11			
137:4 173:12			
8567 210:13			
8e06 146:3,14			
8e6 174:9			
9			
9 67:25 93:22			
90 153:25 161:12			
172:14			
901 74:2,3 95003 204:2			
95005 204:2 97 185:8			
9e07 175:18			
9th 10:25 198:22			
198:24			
		l	