

CHAIRMAN Resource

From: Tom Gurdziel <tgurdziel@twcny.rr.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 19, 2018 11:22 PM
To: awilks@thestate.com
Cc: tmoore@postandcourier.com; abrown@postandcourier.com; anu@goinfo.com; qainfo@nsr.go.jp; 'Ed Stronski'; Bridget Frymire; techols@psc.state.ga.us; CHAIRMAN Resource; Screnci, Diane; Lyon, Jill:(NMP); Holden, Tammy L:(GenCo-Nuc); press@framatome.com
Subject: [External_Sender] Evaluating the Thoroughness of the SCANA Investigating Committee
Attachments: Pennsylvania PWR.jpg

Hello Avery,

Let me say first that I initially disliked the idea of forming this investigating committee because I felt it would be another source of delay. However, I don't feel that way now because I believe the SCANA company, or even maybe the SCE&G company, probably is an accountable individual in the eyes of the law. So it wouldn't matter if they found a lot of people who didn't do the right things or if they didn't find any, what matters is whether or not a judge finds that the company is at fault (or not). And this should be totally separate from the delivery of the investigating committee results, whenever that may be.

Actually, I am writing tonight to tell you of one way to determine the thoroughness of the SCANA investigating committee. You couldn't afford to build a big nuclear plant (in the old days) without, at some point during the (heavy) civil construction part, instituting an "engineering design freeze." The reason, explained to me by a company, (Niagara Mohawk Power Corp.), nuclear division vice president is that the plant cost, even in those days, was considered so high that the plant owner might just as well make changes to get what they (thought) they really wanted. Well, at least by the 1970s, it was obvious that this was extremely costly. The remedy used was for the plant owner to tell the design engineer that, after a certain date picked by the owner, the engineering design was to be frozen. In other words, the owner no longer would keep accepting, (and paying for), changes, not only requested by the owner, but all those "improvements" suggested by the design engineering organization.

I first heard about this strategy while working on what I call the "Pennsylvania job," (a picture of which is attached). I did not, at that time, realize its importance.

Well, tonight as I am reading the article "Delivering Successful Projects" by the Chairman of the Managing Board and Chief Executive Officer of Framatome, Bernard Fontana, in the May-June 2018 issue of "Nuclear Plant Journal," on page 21, I see mentioned that 30 years ago "we learned that when we have a well-designed, frozen design" "we can be successful."

The point here is this, a freeze on design was used 30 years ago. (In my case, since it was probably 1973 when I heard of the freeze, that would be 45 years ago). If the SCANA investigating committee discovers the heavy construction strategy of a design freeze, then they can look for the date SCE&G declared a V.C. Summer design freeze, OR, that they did not and should have.

Thank you,

Tom Gurdziel



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.

www.avast.com

Three Mile Island
Unit 2 Containment



1973 or 1974

