

7/14/93

JLR

TV6

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS

----- X
In the Matter of: :
INVESTIGATIVE INTERVIEW OF :
THOMAS V. GREENE, JR. (CLOSED) :
----- X

101 Marietta Street
Atlanta, Georgia

Tuesday, July 6, 1993

The above-entitled proceedings commenced, pursuant
to notice, at 12:56 p.m.

EXHIBIT 47

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.
Court Reporters
1612 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 293-3950

1-51 (PDR)

TV6

9408310172 940815
PDR ADOCK 05000424
G PDR

9408310172

RL

- 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

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

LARRY L. ROBINSON, Investigator

On behalf of Mr. Greene:

RICHARD W. HENDRIX, ESQ.

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.
 Court Reporters
 1612 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
 Washington, D.C. 20006
 (202) 293-3950

TV 6

TV6

P R O C E E D I N G S

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

[12:56 p.m.]

MR. ROBINSON: For the record, this is an interview of Mr. Thomas V. Greene. The interview is being conducted at the offices of the NRC, Regional II, Atlanta, Georgia. The date is July 6, 1993. And the time is 12:56 p.m.

Present at the interview are Mr. Greene; his counsel, Mr. Richard Hendrix and NRC OI Investigator Larry L. Robinson. This interview is being transcribed by a court reporter.

And the nature of the interview pertains to the completeness and accuracy of the information that was provided by Georgia Power to the NRC regarding the diesel testing that was conducted immediately subsequent to the site area emergency of March 20th, 1990.

Mr. Greene, do you have any objections to being sworn to your testimony here today?

MR. GREENE: I do not.

MR. ROBINSON: Please stand and raise your right hand.

MR. GREENE: [Complying]

[Witness sworn by Mr. Robinson.]

Whereupon,

THOMAS V. GREENE, JR.,

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.
Court Reporters
1612 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 293-3950

TV6

TV6

1 was called as a witness herein and, having been first duly
2 sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

3 EXAMINATION

4 BY MR. ROBINSON:

5 Q Would you please state your full name and spell it
6 for the record, please?

7 A Thomas Victor Greene, Jr. Greene is G-r-e-e-n-e
8 [spelling].

9 Q And what is your current job title, Mr. Greene?

10 A My current job title is manager of engineering and
11 licensing for the Vogtle Project. And that's with Southern
12 Nuclear Corporation.

13 Q You're employed by Southern Nuclear Corporation?

14 A Yes; I am.

15 Q And back at the time of the Vogtle site area
16 emergency in March of 1990, what was your job title at that
17 time?

18 A At that time my job title was assistant -- we
19 changed titles several times -- assistant general manager of
20 support.

21 Q For Plant Vogtle?

22 A For Plant Vogtle.

23 Q And who was your employer at that time?

24 A Georgia Power Company.

25 Q And could you briefly give us a synopsis of your

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.
Court Reporters
1612 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 293-3950

TV6

TV6

1 career in the nuclear industry if you could?

2 A Yes; I can. I came with Georgia Power Company in
3 June of 1970. I worked at a fossil plant until April of
4 1971. At that time I went to Plant Hatch as an instrument
5 and controls supervisor. Went through training. Went
6 through the start-up of two units there.

7 I received an SRO license at Plant Hatch in 1975.
8 I progressed to technical supervisor to assistant plant
9 manager to deputy general manager at Plant Hatch witnessing
10 two start-ups, many refueling outages and general operation
11 of the boiling water reactor.

12 In September of 1986, I left Plant Hatch and came
13 to Plant Vogtle as the plant manager. I was responsible for
14 the Unit One start-up, the start-up test program and the
15 operation of the plant immediately following receipt of an
16 operating license.

17 I stayed in that job until September of 1987. At
18 that time I rotated with another gentleman and assumed the
19 responsibility of plant support manager with responsibility
20 mainly focused on the Unit 2 start-up, preparing the plant
21 for a start-up test program.

22 In 1989, about the time we were getting our
23 operating license I went to senior reactor operator school.
24 And I stayed in school or some function of that school --
25 some of it was not all class -- but some function of that

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.
Court Reporters
1612 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 293-3950

TVU

TWB

1 school until approximately the first week in May of 1990.

2 At that time I reassumed my duties as plant
3 support manager or assistant general manager of support and
4 maintained that position until September of 1991.

5 In September of 1991, I went to the Southern
6 Nuclear Corporation in Birmingham, who also provides support
7 to Plant Vogtle for a project staff and assumed the
8 responsibilities of manager of engineering and licensing for
9 the plant.

10 I filled in in the absence of a general manager in
11 the office for the last couple of years. And so I've had
12 varied duties, not just associated with a particular
13 project, but also with the company and the Southern Company
14 in many ways.

15 Q So you immediately report to Mr. Shipman today?

16 A As of today I do; yes.

17 Q And when he returned to Birmingham from Plant
18 Vogtle as the general manager of Plant Vogtle, that's when
19 you assumed the reporting position to him?

20 A Yes.

21 Q You were kind of acting in that capacity until --

22

23 A Yes; I was.

24 Q -- his return?

25 A Yes; I was.

TWB

Tvb

1 Q And you were in SRO school at the time of the
2 March 20th, 1990, site area emergency up until about the
3 first week in May of that year; is that correct?

4 A I had already received my license and was on a
5 shift assignment prior to going back to my regular duties.
6 So I had my SRO license, but it was a continuation of the
7 training program that I was in to get some shift experience.
8 So I did not return to my regular duties until the first
9 week in May of '90.

10 Q Okay. So you were on shift in a training
11 capacity at Vogtle during the period of the site area
12 emergency until the 1st of May.

13 A That is correct.

14 Q As part of your responsibilities during that
15 period of training, were you involved in any of the
16 preparation of documents, licensing documents, LER's, et
17 cetera, that were -- that were going out between March 20th
18 and May of 1990?

19 A No; I wasn't.

20 Q I see. Were you involved at all in the diesel
21 testing during that period?

22 A My involvement at that time as a -- my title or
23 the job I served in that time was an outage shift
24 coordinator. And my job at that time was simply to take the
25 -- and coordinate the work activities and the schedules

Tvu

TVU

1 along with the other outage work just as I would have done
2 for any piece of test equipment that was being tested.

3 I did not personally get involved in developing of
4 the tests. Simply looking at what the test involved, how
5 they had to be run and what they had to be coordinated with
6 to run correctly.

7 Q As part of those activities, did you develop any
8 pieces of information or paper that you gave to Mr. Bockhold
9 describing the testing that was going on?

10 A No; I didn't.

11 Q When you returned to your position as assistant
12 general manager for plant support in May you reported to Mr.
13 Bockhold; is that correct?

14 A Yes; I did.

15 Q And who were your immediate subordinates in the
16 chain of command at that time?

17 A After the turnover was complete and I resumed my
18 duties around May 11th, I had all of the same
19 responsibilities that Mr. Mosbaugh had. Mr. Mosbaugh then
20 was reporting to George Bockhold directly.

21 In that responsibility would be the admin manager,
22 the security manager, the technical manager, engineering
23 support manager, training manager as well. Basically those
24 people, the support staff.

25 Q So Mr. Mosbaugh was acting in your capacity while

TVU

TWU

1 you were in SRO training?

2 A That is correct.

3 Q And what was his job under you before you went to
4 SRO training?

5 A Going back and reviewing I transferred over to the
6 other side in the fall of '87. So for the year and a half
7 that I had responsibility for the plant support side, what
8 we did is we had an assistant plant support manager
9 reporting to the plant support manager, which was Allen
10 Mosbaugh. His responsibilities involved the day-to-day
11 technical support of the operating unit.

12 The start-up unit was not under his
13 responsibilities, but the day-to-day operation of the -- of
14 the operating unit was.

15 Q So Mosbaugh was essentially a deputy to you or an
16 assistant to you at that point?

17 A Yes. He was an assistant to me. He was really in
18 a lined ^{TWU} responsibility, but he was called an assistant plant
19 support manager.

20 Q While you were in your training capacity on shift
21 between March 20th and April -- or May 11th when you
22 returned, you may have already mentioned some of the outage
23 activities that you were connected with. Could you briefly
24 describe any other outage responsibilities you would have
25 had at that time?

TWU

TUV

1 A My basic responsibilities would be to take the
2 schedule and do what I called looking ahead for the next
3 three days, focusing on what's going on today, the basic
4 status of the work that's in progress today, what needs to
5 be undergoing preparation for tomorrow, the day after and
6 the following day.

7 So we constantly were looking ahead trying to make
8 sure that activities will be ready to be started on time,
9 that we understood the problems that were coming up with the
10 current activities. So I would really have a focus of
11 trying to make the outage schedule go smoothly.

12 Q Were you working with Barney Beasley in this
13 capacity?

14 A Yes; I was. Barney and I worked the same job. I
15 had day shift. When I wasn't there, he was. So one of us
16 was always there on the day shift. We had -- we had some
17 overlapping periods for turnover of usually about a day,
18 then I would be off while he was on duty.

19 Q And at the same time you would be doing some shift
20 work in a training capacity basically.

21 A This is primarily what we were doing. It was
22 considered an opportunity to get on shift, get to work with
23 the other people that I would not normally work with in my
24 primary duties, and to use my SRO experience on shift to
25 help the outage.

TUV

TV6

1 Q I asked you this generally before, but I'm going
2 to go through some specific questions now regarding an oral
3 presentation that was made to the NRC on April 9th, and a
4 corresponding letter that was issued on the same day to NRC.

5 Let's talk about the oral presentation first.
6 Were you involved at all in the preparations or the review
7 of this April 9th, 1990, oral presentation to NRC?

8 A No; I wasn't.

9 Q Were you involved at all in the preparation or
10 review of the corresponding April 9th, 1990, letter from Mr.
11 Hairston to the NRC?

12 A No; I wasn't.

13 Q Were you involved in the preparation or review of
14 the April 19th, 1990, Licensee Event Report that pertained
15 to the site area emergency that was submitted to NRC?

16 A No; I wasn't.

17 Q Were you involved in the preparation and/or review
18 of the June 29th, 1990, revision to this LER to include the
19 cover letter to this revision?

20 A My recollection of that period of time when we
21 were going through transition was that I was -- had seen it
22 in some draft stages. I don't frankly remember at what time
23 that occurred, to what detail we went. But I do basically
24 remember seeing it in a draft stage for the June 29th LER
25 revision.

TV6

TV6

1 Q Would this have been in your capacity as assistant
2 general manager of plant support or in a Plant Review Board
3 capacity, or can you recall?

4 A Yes. I can recall that part. After the
5 completion of the transition on May 11th with Allen, I
6 assumed my regular duties, which means that I was now a
7 member of the PRB. As a member of the PRB, I would get the
8 same licensing documents or any other documents that would
9 come in advance of the meeting to all the members for review
10 -- for review and comment. So I saw it at the stages of
11 Plant Review Board member involvement.

12 Q And was there as much PRB involvement with the
13 cover letters to this LER as there was with shall we say
14 the LER itself, the revision?

15 A My recollection is that if the cover letter was
16 reviewed by me it would have been attached to the LER. I
17 don't remember if it was attached or not attached.

18 Q I'll show you a copy of the June 29th revision to
19 that LER and its corresponding cover letter and just let you
20 review it and see if you recognize it and recall it.

21 A Your question is about the cover letter?

22 Q My questions will be about the cover letter. But
23 I want you to look at the entire package, not only the cover
24 letter but the LER itself, and just refresh your memory if
25 you were involved in the review of that document.

TV6

TV6

TV6

1 A [Long pause] / WITNESS READING DOCUMENT
2 It was standard practice to put cover letters on
3 these documents. I don't specifically remember if it was on
4 the document when I reviewed or not. But it would have been
5 normal practice to see it.

6 Q Do you recall a situation, Mr. Greene, regarding
7 this revision to the LER and its development where the
8 revision had been approved by the PRB soon after you had
9 returned to your official position as assistant general
10 manager for plant support that -- that the -- the revision -
11 - there was a revision to that LER that was PRB approved at
12 that time?

13 A Can you be specific about the time frame you're
14 talking about?

15 Q Well, in the mid-May.

16 A Mid-May?

17 Q Mid-May time frame. Mid to late May time frame.

18 A Let me talk a little bit about how Mr. Mosbaugh
19 and I did our turnover.

20 Q Okay.

21 A I returned to my office on the 7th of May. And we
22 used that week to sit down together and go over the status
23 of different things. I essentially followed him around that
24 week.

25 I remember going to -- I think I went to a PRB

TV6

1 meeting that week, probably in the Thursday time frame,
2 which would be around the 10th of May. I was not in there
3 in any official capacity as a consultant, a guest or any of
4 that. I just basically was following him around.

5 And I can remember him making some statements or
6 expressing some concerns about the accuracy of the diesel
7 starts. And that is my remembrance of statements he has
8 made about it.

9 Q Do you recall whether at that point in time there
10 was a version of the LER revision that was ready for
11 corporate approval?

12 A Again, I did not personally see it, because he was
13 handling the materials. But I remember him talking about
14 something. And I think it was in that meeting that I heard
15 it.

16 Q Was there ever any discussion between you and Mr.
17 Mosbaugh or you and anyone else at the plant about why that
18 revision to the LER was not put out until late June, June
19 29th of 1990?

20 A No. Other than we were just going through and
21 checking records, there was no specific reason that I knew
22 of that there was any delay.

23 Q Were you aware that the safety engineering
24 analysis review group was conducting an audit of diesel
25 starts during the June time frame?

TV6

1 A I can remember that. My recollection is it was
2 more around the August time frame when the OSI investigation
3 occurred. I understand from other people that it was
4 earlier than that. But that was not my recollection.

5 Q I think there probably was some additional record
6 checking during the OSI investigation too. But there was an
7 audit that was conducted by Mr. Frederick and Mr. Mosley,
8 SAER regarding diesel record keeping practices.

9 A Okay.

10 Q From your earlier statement, is it safe to say
11 that you don't have a specific recollection of a connection
12 between that audit and the issuance of the Rev. to the LER?

13 A No. I don't remember that. But let me just say
14 that it was not unusual for us to have our quality assurance
15 group to perform audits like this, the base line, to go back
16 and check things.

17 So it really -- I really had no reason to think
18 this was anything very unusual to do. They did many of
19 those for us, and many of their audits are oriented toward
20 that anyway. So it doesn't stick in my mind as something
21 special that was going on.

22 Q Okay. I'm going to quote from the last sentence
23 of the ~~cover~~ ^{FIRST PARAGRAPH OF THE LER} letter to this LER. And I'm going to ask you
24 to comment on it if you had any involvement in the
25 construction of this language or if you were involved in any

TV6

TV6
1 discussions on this particular aspect.

2 I quote, "The difference is attributed to diesel
3 start record keeping practices and the definition of the end
4 of the test program." And I'll quote the sentence just
5 prior to that and read both of them in context. "The number
6 of successful starts included in the original LER included
7 some of the starts that were part of the test program. The
8 difference is attributed to diesel start record keeping
9 practices and the definition of the end of the test
10 program."

11 And I'll let you read the cover letter in its full
12 context.

13 A [Pause] ^{TV6} WITNESS READING DOCUMENT

14 During this period of time because I did not have
15 personal contact with the event and had not personally
16 reviewed the logs at that time, I was very dependent on
17 people who had been there. And I can say that I am sure
18 that I would probably have seen this cover letter with these
19 words on it but would probably not have commented with any
20 significance simply because I did not have prior knowledge
21 of how the test program was set up at the time.

22 Q Do you recall at all Mr. Mosbaugh coming to you
23 with a concern that diesel record keeping practices didn't
24 have anything to do with the errors in data on April 19th
25 and April 9th?

TW

1 A Since that was three years ago, I really do not
2 have a recollection of a conversation that we had on it. I
3 would say that the very things that he's talking about were
4 responsibilities that he had to record keeping. Concerns
5 that he may have raised were clearly under his
6 responsibility in my absence.

7 So I would hope that if you had concerns like that
8 he had voiced them elsewhere as well as taken actions on a
9 part of his own supervision.

10 Q But you don't recall him coming to you with a
11 concern?

12 A I don't recall him coming to me with a concern.
13 He may have, but I certainly don't recall that right now.

14 Q At that point in time back on June 29th or that
15 time prior to the issuance of that LER, were you, Mr.
16 Greene, personally aware of what diesel records had been
17 researched to obtain the data for the earlier LER in the
18 April 9th letter?

19 A Your question is related to what did I know in the
20 June time frame?

21 Q Right.

22 A I was aware that things had been kept in the
23 operator logs and that we also had some logs that were kept
24 by the system engineer. I was not clear on where all the
25 counts were made from, whether it was from both sets of

TW

TV6

1 logs, one set or the other.

2 Q I see. At that point in time --

3 A At that point in time.

4 Q At that point in time, did you know who had gone
5 to retrieve that data?

6 A No; I did not.

7 Q Do you know that today?

8 A I understand that was Jimmy Paul Cash. Again, he
9 has not told me that. But I understand from hearsay that
10 that's the case.

11 Q From your knowledge today, do you know what
12 records Jimmy Paul Cash researched in order to obtain his
13 successful start count?

14 A I can only tell you my thought on it. Again, I
15 haven't had any direct interaction with Jimmy Paul or anyone
16 else that did the count work.

17 What my understand^{ing} was is he was asked to go to
18 the operator logs and count the starts, and he went to the
19 operator logs and counted the starts. I do not know what he
20 looked at the logs in particular to count a start. But I do
21 know that he went to the operator logs to look. I don't
22 believe that he looked at the system engineer's log at that
23 time.

24 Q To your knowledge today, Mr. Greene, do you know
25 what the findings were of the audit -- of the June 29th

TV6

TV6
1 audit of the diesel record keeping practices were?

2 A No; I don't. I did not see the audit. The audit
3 was being run I think at the request of possibly Ken McCoy
4 or some other people. And it was a special type of audit.
5 So I just -- I did not see it. Now, I may have been on
6 distribution. I just simply don't remember seeing it.

7 Q Do you recall why this special type of audit was
8 being conducted?

9 A Again, it didn't register in my mind as anything
10 unusual other than to make sure that the records were
11 accurate. The only reason that I could possibly guess that
12 we would do it is to make sure that the records -- that the
13 records -- that what we turned in to the NRC was accurate.

14 Q So if I were to ask you what diesel start record
15 keeping practices had to do with the difference in data as
16 described in this cover letter you wouldn't know?

17 A If you're asking me what was my knowledge in June
18 of '90 --

19 Q Yeah. What was your knowledge back then? And you
20 can answer that and then with your knowledge right now you
21 can explain it.

22 A Okay. Well, as of June of '90, there -- we were
23 still sorting out -- at least I was still sorting out
24 exactly what records were used. I learned as we moved
25 toward the OSI audits more about what the record keeping was

TV6
1 as we went through the summer.

2 But because I had not been personally involved in
3 it and a great deal of time had been spent on this by other
4 people I did not see a need for me to personally go and
5 reinvestigate everything they did. I needed to put my time
6 and energy on getting back up to speed. We were getting
7 ready for an absence of Skip Kitchens during the summer, and
8 I was going to have to assume full responsibility for the
9 plant.

10 So my attention was not on going back and checking
11 everything everybody did while I was gone, but to make sure
12 I understood basically where we were and what needed to be
13 done.

14 Q And Skip Kitchens was that time -- what was his
15 job?

16 A Skip was the general manager of oper -- excuse me
17 -- the assistant general manager of operations at that time.

18 Q So you were -- or someone was going to have to do
19 his functions while he was gone during the summer? You were
20 getting ready for that?

21 A Yes.

22 Q Okay. To your knowledge today, what effect did
23 the diesel start record keeping practices have on the
24 difference in data between the April 19th LER and this Rev.
25 to the LER?

TV6

1 A There are -- my understanding of our record system
2 is that there are two basic sources of information that we
3 would have used in putting an LER like this together. One
4 is the control room operator logs.

5 The operator is responsible for basically ~~log and~~ ^{logging}
6 manipulations and evolutions of the plant, starting and
7 stopping of equipment, changing plant modes, abnormal
8 conditions that are observed. That is all put in the logs.
9 And it's an ongoing chronological log that the operator adds
10 to.

11 When we run surveillance^s, ^{TV6} we also initiate data
12 sheets. And as the case with the diesel generator, data
13 sheets were initiated which the system engineer would use in
14 constructing his logs.

15 Each run of the diesel was to be -- to have what
16 I'll call a completed data sheet in which the operator
17 reviewed the log and wrote down some basic information for
18 the system engineer and sent the sheet to the system
19 engineer.

20 Q Whether this run was a surveillance run or not.

21 A That part I'm not clear about.

22 Q Okay.

23 A All right. I know he would do it on a
24 surveillance run.

25 Q Okay.

Conduc
Add Cont
TV6

TV6

TV6

1 A Let's say that somebody said, "I want the diesel
2 run today at 4:00 and I don't want to take credit for it for
3 our surveillance," I'm not sure whether that would be done
4 in that case.

5 Q Okay.

6 A But if it was for an official surveillance run, he
7 would do that for sure.

8 Q All right.

9 A The system engineer then took this information.
10 And it was his trigger to look at trending for the diesel.
11 He would say -- he would look at how many failures have
12 occurred over the last 100 starts for the tech spec
13 compliance, and he would determine what the frequency of
14 testing had to be for the diesel. So he used it to trend,
15 not only to start and stop, but also used it to trend
16 particular parameters he was monitoring, for example, ~~his~~ ^{its}
17 oil pressure increasing or decreasing from run to run.

TV6

18 So those are the types of things that he would do
19 with it. Those are the two basic sources of information
20 that I'm aware of. And much of the confusion as I
21 understand it today had to do with -- with whether the
22 diesel logs that the engineer was keeping were complete for
23 what was done in the control room and whether there was some
24 -- some of the information was run together between
25 surveillance, which the system engineer would watch, and

TV6

1 non-surveillance, which might be just some special tests
2 that are being run for a test program. And that it was not
3 run under the same procedures all the time. Run under
4 special testing versus a surveillance test. And that that
5 is a source of a lot of confusion as to what were those
6 start tests.

7 Q If Jimmy Paul Cash just went to the operations
8 logs to obtain his data, the preparation of those diesel
9 test data sheets and the subsequent review and updating them
10 wouldn't have had any effect on his obtaining the data that
11 he obtained; would it?

12 A If the control room operator logged every start,
13 and it wasn't a case where he sent maybe a sheet to the
14 system engineer, but didn't put it in his control room log,
15 you know, there are chances where he may have missed
16 something. But if he just used the control room log and
17 read down the log provided that the operator gave him enough
18 information to know whether it was satisfactory,
19 unsatisfactory, was it being run for surveillance, was it
20 being run for test program, then the log should have enough
21 information in it to do a count.

22 Again, we're talking about human beings dealing
23 with these logs. And they're not 100 percent. I would have
24 to look at the logs line by line, you know, to say whether I
25 was satisfied that was adequate information.

TVW
1 Q To your knowledge today, Mr. Greene, was Jimmy
2 Paul Cash concerned about any type of a test program when he
3 went to obtain the starts from the operations logs?

4 A I have had no contact with Jimmy on that matter.
5 He and I have never talked about the log work that he did.
6 I certainly could not tell you what he was concerned or not
7 concerned about.

8 Q Have you talked to Mr. Bockhold in any way about
9 Mr. Bockhold's instructions to Mr. Cash on this data?

10 A I have not. Again, those things occurred before I
11 came back. And my concern was on moving forward with what
12 we had to work with.

13 Q And you haven't had any conversations with either
14 Mr. Cash or Mr. Bockhold subsequent to that time up to this
15 date?

16 A Not talking about the information pulled together
17 for the diesel counts. No.

18 Q So I guess the answer is you have no knowledge of
19 whether or not Jimmy Paul Cash was thinking about starting
20 his count after a test program or not back on March --

21 A I do not.

22 Q -- or April 6th, 7th or 8th when he went to get
23 the data?

24 A No. The information that I have is drawing
25 conclusions from pieces of information that we discussed at

7/16

1 different times. It does not come from directly asking
2 Jimmy or George what did you think about this or what were
3 you doing.

4 Q Before we leave the LER obviously if you were in
5 contact with Mr. Mosbaugh during any period of time between
6 the March and September time frame of 1990, you stood a
7 chance of having some of your conversations put on tape.
8 There was a conversation on tape -- and I'll ask you if you
9 recall it -- we can play the tape -- where you ended up
10 calling Harry Majors, who I believe was the author of the
11 cover letter.

12 A Okay.

13 Q And Mr. Mosbaugh had expressed some concerns about
14 diesel record keeping practices and their effect on the
15 data. And evidently you wanted to get it from the horse's
16 mouth and called Harry Majors. Do you recall that happening
17 at all?

18 A I do not. But if you play the tape, that might
19 help me.

20 MR. ROBINSON: Let the record reflect that we're
21 playing Tape Number 187 starting at the beginning of Side B.

22 MR. HENDRIX: What is the date of that, Larry?

23 MR. ROBINSON: The date of that tape -- that tape
24 was June 29th, 1990, which is the same date as the date of
25 the LER revision.

7/16

- TV³
- 1 [Portion of NRC Tape #187, Side B played.]
- 2 BY MR. ROBINSON:
- 3 Q Let me ask, do you recognize that voice?
- 4 A That voice I recognize. But the ones in the
- 5 background I don't.
- 6 Q You didn't recognize any of the voices up to that
- 7 point?
- 8 A No. I might have been one of those voices, but
- 9 I'm having a hard time hearing anything.
- 10 Q And whose voice was that?
- 11 A That last one was Allen Mosbaugh's.
- 12 [Portion of NRC Tape #187, Side B played.]
- 13 BY MR. ROBINSON:
- 14 Q Do you recognize that voice?
- 15 A It sounds like mine. But to be honest with you,
- 16 it's so garbled in the background I can't really tell.
- 17 Q Okay. I'll tell you that it has been identified
- 18 by Mosbaugh who recalled that conversation as being your
- 19 voice right there.
- 20 A Uh-huh [affirmative]. Did he keep any kind of a
- 21 written logs, or was it just his memory?
- 22 Q It was his recollection in listening to the tapes.
- 23 A Okay. So it's just based on the same thing we're
- 24 hearing.
- 25 Q [Nods head affirmatively.]

TV6

1 [Portion of NRC Tape #187, Side B played.]
2 BY MR. ROBINSON:
3 Q Let me ask, do you recognize that voice?
4 A That voice I recognize. But the ones in the
5 background I don't.
6 Q You didn't recognize any of the voices up to that
7 point?
8 A No. I might have been one of those voices, but
9 I'm having a hard time hearing anything.
10 Q And whose voice was that?
11 A That last one was Allen Mosbaugh's.
12 [Portion of NRC Tape #187, Side B played.]
13 BY MR. ROBINSON:
14 Q Do you recognize that voice?
15 A It sounds like mine. But to be honest with you,
16 it's so garbled in the background I can't really tell.
17 Q Okay. I'll tell you that it has been identified
18 by Mosbaugh who recalled that conversation as being your
19 voice right there.
20 A Uh-huh [affirmative]. Did he keep any kind of a
21 written logs, or was it just his memory?
22 Q It was his recollection in listening to the tapes.
23 A Okay. So it's just based on the same thing we're
24 hearing.
25 Q [Nods head affirmatively.]

TV6

1 Plus his presence in the conversation as well as
2 reviewing the tapes.

3 A Okay.

4 [Portion of NRC Tape #187, Side B played.]

5 BY MR. ROBINSON:

6 Q Do you recognize that voice?

7 A That sounds like Tom Webb, but I couldn't swear to
8 it.

9 Q That was identified as Mr. Webb by Mosbaugh.

10 [Portion of NRC Tape #187, Side B played.]

11 BY MR. ROBINSON:

12 Q Do you recognize that voice?

13 A I'm pretty sure that's me.

14 Q Okay.

15 [Portion of NRC Tape #187, Side B played.]

16 BY MR. ROBINSON:

17 Q I realize that there are some inaudible portions
18 to that statement. Do you recognize who was talking there?

19 A No. Play it some more and I might.

20 [Portion of NRC Tape #187, Side B played.]

21 THE WITNESS: I can't pin that voice down.

22 BY MR. ROBINSON:

23 Q It's been identified by Mr. Mosbaugh as being Mr.
24 Frederick. So if you --

25 A Okay. It sounds like George.

TV6

1 [Portion of NRC Tape #187, Side B played.]

2 BY MR. ROBINSON:

3 Q Do you remember that statement?

4 A No.

5 Q "Here I am with a unit down, and you hand me this
6 hot potato."

7 A No.

8 [Portion of NRC Tape #187, Side B played.]

9 BY MR. ROBINSON:

10 Q Do you recognize that voice?

11 A Play it some more.

12 [Portion of NRC Tape #187, Side B played.]

13 THE WITNESS: Harry Majors.

14 [Portion of NRC Tape #187, Side B played.]

15 BY MR. ROBINSON:

16 Q Were you aware of the problem with the previous
17 LER at that time?

18 A I don't remember the conversation. I mean I have
19 no doubt it occurred. But I do not remember the
20 conversation. So other than what's being said on tape, I
21 can't confirm or deny what's there. I just don't remember.

22 Q You don't remember at that time a problem with the
23 previous LER? Well, let me ask you -- let me ask it this
24 way: What to your knowledge was the reason that this
25 revision to the LER was being put out?

TV6

706

1 A What I remember in going to the PRB is that we
2 wanted to make sure that we had the latest count information
3 in the LER. And Allen had raised some concerns about its
4 accuracy. And I know we were going back and checking
5 records.

6 Whether George did that or the Reg. people did
7 that, I just did not remember who was doing that. And so we
8 were simply trying to give the NRC the latest information we
9 had available. We wanted them to know what we knew about
10 it.

11 And to my knowledge there was no time clock on the
12 LER, because we had met the 30 day requirement. But if
13 there was any additional information to be had that's what
14 this update should do. So we were processing the update and
15 getting the latest information we had, including things like
16 the miscount that he made mention of.

17 Q And from listening to the tape you've become aware
18 that obviously the cover letter was going to talk about a
19 different basis than the body of the LER.

20 A Right.

21 Q And the cover letter from reading it was going to
22 give a reason for the difference?

23 A Uh-huh [affirmative].

24 Q Okay.

25 [Portion of NRC Tape #187, Side B played.]

706

1 BY MR. ROBINSON:

2 Q Did you ever have any conversations with Mr.
3 Majors about -- about that -- Ken McCoy --

4 A What you're hearing is as much as I would know
5 about that. I mean I generally did not deal directly with
6 Harry on things. His name was on here, so I must have
7 called him to get a clarification.

8 [Portion of NRC Tape #187, Side B played.]

9 BY MR. ROBINSON:

10 Q Did you understand that last little interchange?
11 Did you recognize your voice as saying the word
12 "discrepancy" versus --

13 A Difference?

14 Q Right. Right.

15 A Yes. Yes; I did.

16 Q Again, you don't recollect anything about this
17 conversation other than what we're hearing on the tape?

18 A No. I didn't even remember until you played it.
19 And I still -- I mean I know who's in the room based on who
20 I'm hearing. But beyond that it was a conversation I might
21 have had six or seven times a day.

22 Q Okay.

23 [Portion of NRC Tape #187, Side B played.]

24 BY MR. ROBINSON:

25 Q I think at that point in time -- I can play it

1 again -- that you indicated you've got to step out of the
2 room for a moment.

3 A Uh-huh [affirmative]. I think I heard that. I
4 don't know who said it, but I heard it.

5 [Portion of NRC Tape #187, Side B played.]

6 THE WITNESS: That sounds like me.

7 BY MR. ROBINSON:

8 Q Do you recognize that as you?

9 A No. Play it a little more.

10 [Portion of NRC Tape #187, Side B played.]

11 THE WITNESS: Sounds like me.

12 BY MR. ROBINSON:

13 Q All right. Do you have any indication from any
14 source to this date, Mr. Greene, that the end of the
15 comprehensive test program was not considered by Mr.
16 Bockhold in his presentation of the count on April 9th? Do
17 you understand the question?

18 A No; I don't.

19 Q Do you have any indication to this date that when
20 Mr. Bockhold sent Mr. Cash to get the diesel counts on April
21 6th, 7th or 8th in preparation for this presentation that
22 the thought of starting that count subsequent to some test
23 program never entered his mind?

24 A I cannot speak for that, because I've never
25 discussed that with either one of them.

TWO
1 Q And you've never -- you don't have any indication
2 of that?

3 A No; I don't. No one's ever discussed that with
4 me.

5 Q Okay.

6 MR. ROBINSON: It's now 2:07 p.m. Before I get
7 into the August 30th letter we're going to take a ten minute
8 break. Why don't we reconvene here at 2:20. And we're off
9 the record.

10 [Brief recess]

11 MR. ROBINSON: It's now 2:15 and we're back on the
12 record.

13 BY MR. ROBINSON:

14 Q Just a final couple of things about the June 29th
15 LER, Mr. Greene. I recognize that you do not recall the
16 conversation that we just heard on the tape. But from your
17 listening to that conversation, do you -- do you deny that
18 it was your idea to change the word "discrepancy" to
19 "difference" in the last sentence of the first paragraph of
20 the cover letter to the revision to the LER?

21 A Mr. Robinson, I still don't recollect the
22 conversation, though parts of it do sound familiar to me. I
23 am having a hard time hearing much of the statements on
24 there.

25 And the only thing I would say to you is I'm sure

TUG

1 I had some involvement in the final draft of this around
2 specific words. And that's all I would really say about it
3 is -- is I don't say I didn't or I did. I just flat don't
4 remember. And I can see where I would be involved if there
5 was a concern raised about particular wording. I would get
6 on the phone and try to work out a difference or a
7 resolution to it if somebody had some comments they wanted
8 to make.

9 Q Well, all I'm saying is I noticed from listening
10 to that portion of the tape that the draft that you had in
11 front of you at that time or the group had must have said
12 the discrepancy is attributed to diesel start record keeping
13 practices. And someone who has been identified by Mr.
14 Mosbaugh as being you indicated that using the word
15 "discrepancy", you know, means a mistake or an error, why
16 don't we just use the word "difference". And Harry Majors
17 didn't have any -- he didn't see that there would be any
18 problem in changing the word "discrepancy" to "difference".
19 That's all I was trying to establish.

20 A Again, just based on what information that's on
21 the tape my recollection hasn't come back enough that I
22 would say that I can remember that conversation. I have no
23 doubt that it occurred. Even Allen Mosbaugh apparently
24 agreed that the word "difference" was a better word to use
25 than "discrepancy".

TUG

TV⁶

1 So I don't -- I don't know what you're trying to
2 drive at about the word "discrepancy" versus the word
3 "difference".

4 Q Well, I may not be trying to drive at anything.
5 I'm just trying to get an affirmation from the review of the
6 tape that -- that it appeared to be you that decided to
7 change the word "discrepancy" to "difference". I may not be
8 driving at anything.

9 MR. HENDRIX: Well, now, you said it was he that
10 decided. I thought at the end of the tape they said that
11 they would submit it back to the PRB.

12 MR. ROBINSON: The PRB -- it was his idea that --
13 that made the change. I'm sorry. The final decision was
14 not his alone.

15 MR. HENDRIX: Right.

16 MR. ROBINSON: It was PRB approved.

17 MR. HENDRIX: He may have discussed it and he
18 might have been the first one to bring it up, but in terms
19 of the decision --

20 MR. ROBINSON: Okay.

21 MR. HENDRIX: -- I think it's clear that that was
22 discussed later.

23 BY MR. ROBINSON:

24 Q And it's your testimony here today, Mr. Greene,
25 that to the best of your knowledge today that the two

TV⁶

TV

1 reasons given in this sentence, the diesel start record
2 keeping practices and the definition of the end of the test
3 program, were accurate and real reasons for the difference
4 in the numbers between the LER and the revision to the LER
5 as far as you thought.

6 A My recollection today with what I've heard over
7 the last three years that's consistent.

8 Q I'm now going to show you a copy of a letter dated
9 August 30th, 1990, addressed to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
10 Commission captioned Vogtle Electric Generating Plant,
11 Clarification of Response to Confirmation of Action Letter.
12 It's a two-page letter with three pages of tables of diesel
13 starts attached signed C.K. McCoy for W.G. Hairston, III.

14 Take a look at it and see if you recall that
15 letter.

16 A [Long pause] ^{TV} WITNESS READING DOCUMENT
17 I remember reviewing the letter.

18 Q Did you play any part in preparing that letter or
19 drafting it in any way?

20 A That letter to my knowledge was drafted as we
21 draft all of our regulatory documents. Our regulatory staff
22 puts the facts together and writes the report and then gives
23 it to us for review.

24 Q I'm going to quote from the third paragraph of
25 this letter. And it's something that's kind of puzzled me

TV

1 throughout these interviews. And maybe you can clarify it
2 for me, Mr. Greene.

3 Quote: "The confusion in the April 9th letter and
4 the original LER appear to be the result of two factors.
5 First, there was a confusion in the distinction between a
6 successful start and a valid test. Second, an error was
7 made by the individual who performed the count of DG starts
8 for the NRC April 9th letter."

9 My first question is: Is the confusion that we're
10 talking about between the April 9th letter and the original
11 LER referring to the same thing as the difference that we
12 were talking about in the June 29th revision to the LER?
13 And I'll let you look at both of those again. And I'll tell
14 you why I'm asking that. The reasons -- the reasons for the
15 confusion in the August 30th letter --

16 A Uh-huh [affirmative].

17 Q -- appear to be different than the reasons for the
18 difference in the June 29th LER. And I'm just wondering if
19 you could shed some light on that point.

20 A This letter -- to the best of my memory at the
21 time this letter was written when the NRC came out and said
22 they don't believe that the April 9th letter was corrected
23 properly. And I believe that was done at the OSI, during
24 the OSI investigation. And we put this together in response
25 to that comment.

TW

1 So our efforts in this letter to my knowledge was
2 simply to recount -- our understanding as of August 30th of
3 how we believed the counts were done. I can't relate
4 difference and confusion together in any way in these
5 letters.

6 That's the best that I remember why we did this.
7 To my knowledge there was no regulatory requirement to put
8 this together. It was simply in response to answering an
9 NRC question.

10 Q Up to before the August 30th letter was issued, to
11 your knowledge was there any other document other than the
12 cover letter to the June ~~20th~~^{29th} LER Rev. that was trying to
13 explain the confusion or difference in the diesel start
14 counts?

15 A The LER's before the first of May I did not have
16 any involvement in putting together and issuing them. So
17 the June LER is the only one that I had any involvement in.
18 And, again, I reviewing ~~ing~~^{ed} it as a PRB member at the time.

19 If there is any other letters in between that we
20 sent out officially to the NRC or in any other way I'm not
21 aware of it. These are the ones that I remember.

22 Q So in answer to my original question I thought you
23 said that in the OSI the NRC wasn't satisfied or needed
24 another explanation regarding the difference in the counts,
25 and that was the reason for the August 30th letter.

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.
Court Reporters
1612 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 293-3950

TW

TV6
1 A Right.

2 Q Okay.

3 A They were looking for additional explanation. And
4 to my knowledge there's nothing other than the June LER with
5 the cover sheet that I saw and this letter. So I cannot
6 tell you why they felt they needed that.

7 Q Okay. And you may have answered this already, but
8 bear with me. The reasons that are given in the June 29th
9 LER, namely diesel start record keeping practices and the
10 definition of the end of the test program, do those reasons
11 relate to the confusion that you were talking about in the
12 August 30th letter at all?

13 A I'll have to give you my recollection at the time.
14 At the time when we put this together, we knew that we did
15 not define the test program starts well, and it was easy for
16 someone to read a log and someone else to read the same log
17 and get a difference.

18 Q Okay.

19 A So we put this in here, because we simply felt
20 that we had mixed some terms together, and people were
21 confused by the terms we used. They had started relating
22 valid and successful together. When we said successful,
23 they -- they read that to mean valid.

24 So I think the NRC -- and I'm having to just tell
25 you what I think was in their minds -- is they were confused

1 about what was successful. And so we went back and defined
2 a little better in here where valid and success came
3 together. And that created -- in my opinion, that created a
4 lot of confusion when they were trying to do the counts and
5 why we had -- every time we went back we got different
6 answers.

7 And I think -- I'm not sure, but I believe this is
8 probably out of the QA audit. Could go back and check it.

9 MR. ROBINSON: For the record, he's referring to
10 Table 1 --

11 THE WITNESS: Right.

12 MR. ROBINSON: -- attached to the August 30th
13 letter.

14 THE WITNESS: And this was the base line
15 information we finally put together, reconstructed it with
16 some kind of definitions. And until we did that we were
17 constantly getting different answers. So --

18 BY MR. ROBINSON:

19 Q In -- go ahead.

20 A Go ahead. I'm through.

21 Q In the course of conducting your PRB, were you the
22 chairman of the PRB at any time between May and August of
23 1990; do you recall?

24 A Well, my role is a vice chairman --

25 Q I see.

TV

1 A -- in the absence of Skip Kitchens who was out for
2 part of this period in the July/August time frame going
3 through some senior management training at another site. I
4 filled those roles, so I would have been acting in the
5 capacity of a PRB chairman during part of that time.

6 I'm pretty sure that there are meetings that we
7 ran during that period that I could pull minutes out and see
8 where I was probably listed as the vice chairman in the
9 absence of the chairman.

10 Q Is it routine or unusual for Mr. Bockhold to
11 preside over a PRB meeting?

12 A Mr. Bockhold, to my knowledge, has never presided
13 over a PRB meeting.

14 Q Is it -- okay.

15 A He may come in to speak but does not preside over
16 the meeting.

17 Q I see. Do you recall in your final approval
18 process in the PRB for this particular letter Mr. Bockhold
19 being intimately involved in the -- in the wording of that
20 letter? And I'm referring to the August 30th letter.

21 A Before it would be sent off, it would have been
22 sent off under cover letter signed by him. I believe he was
23 on the site at the time, so he would have had final -- final
24 review of it before it went to the corporate office. That's
25 what I do remember.

TV

TV6

1 Q Do you recall him actively participating in a PRB
2 meeting that was looking at the final wording of that
3 letter?

4 A I remember him coming to one or two PRB meetings.
5 Again, the time frame I'm not sure about, whether it was
6 related to this or not. So I know he's come to PRB meetings
7 where there might be a dissenting opinion and he wanted to
8 hear more about it or to explain his position on it to the
9 PRB members.

10 I don't remember whether he came to a PRB meeting
11 with this in it or not to be honest with you.

12 Q I'm going to show you a fax copy of a -- of a
13 draft of this August 30th letter, which apparently has the
14 notations from Mr. Bockhold. It's dated August 28th to PRB,
15 "Please review and recommend approval or provide comments
16 today," signed G. Bockhold.

17 And I'll ask you if that appears to you to be Mr.
18 Bockhold's handwriting on that draft.

19 A It does appear to be his handwriting.

20 Q I'll direct your attention specifically to the --
21 to the last two sentences in this draft. And I'll quote
22 the last two sentences in that, "DG 1-B had problems on
23 start numbers 132 and 134 as indicated on Table 2 attached
24 to this letter," period. "Furthermore, there were more
25 starts conducted than the number reported."

TV6

TVB
1 I'll show you where this was contained in the
2 draft.

3 A I can hardly read this draft.

4 Q Right. But I think you can make it out.

5 A Show me where you read from, please.

6 Q From right there, that word "in".

7 A Okay.

8 Q And you're doing what I was just going to ask you
9 to do. You were comparing the final version of the letter,
10 which I will say is -- does not contain those last two
11 sentences.

12 A Well, that probably is true if you just read the
13 cover letter. But I was looking at the tables, and success
14 clearly had been marked no on 132 and 134.

15 Q Right.

16 A So I'm not sure what you expect to be in the cover
17 letter that wasn't already in the table.

18 Q Well, I was just going to ask you, do you recall
19 why those two sentences were taken out of the draft?

20 A No; I don't. Just reading it, it does not appear
21 to me that one draft or the other lacks information. The
22 information that's in this final draft appears to be the
23 same. It's just not highlighted in the cover letter.

24 Q Right. It's just not flagged in the cover letter.
25 Do you remember Mr. Bockhold making any comments like that

TV6
1 when those two sentences were taken out, comments to the
2 effect, well, it's in the table so why flag it in the cover
3 letter?

4 A Is that what this note says? I can't read it.

5 Q Well, no, that's not what that note says to my
6 knowledge.

7 A Were those his words?

8 Q We have a tape that indicates those words. I was
9 just wondering if you were --

10 A I don't remember.

11 Q You don't remember that?

12 A I don't remember. I don't have any recollection
13 of specifically why we removed those words.

14 Q And I'll also point to the first sentence in the
15 third paragraph where the sentence starts off the confusion
16 --

17 A Uh-huh [affirmative].

18 Q -- in the April, 9th letter -- and I'll show you
19 the draft where that word was apparently changed from
20 "errors" to "confusion". Do you recall either you or Mr.
21 Bockhold making that change to that letter?

22 A No.

23 Q I'll just ask you straight out, Mr. Greene, is it
24 your philosophy not to include words in documents that would
25 indicate problems or inaccuracies that are -- in documents

76
1 that would be sent to the NRC? Are you concerned with
2 making those words seem shall we say less problematic?

3 A Mr. Robinson, my philosophy is to tell the truth,
4 period. Now when putting LER's together or other documents
5 together, we have to keep in mind that certain data bases
6 kept certain parts of the information and certain data bases
7 don't catch all of it. For example, in an LER what's said
8 on the first sheet is repeated again in the next several
9 sheets. We only have so many lines to put things in.

10 It's been our practice to put the truth in the
11 letters, but be concise about what we're going to say. So
12 if we saw information in tables and we're repeating it again
13 up here, if we thought it was redundant or repetitive, we
14 would tend to take those and say we've already said that in
15 the document. And it's obviously in the document for
16 anybody who goes down the table.

17 So unless the purpose of the letter was to point
18 out that particular problem, I think the letter conveyed
19 what it was supposed to do. And that is please find
20 attached all of the data that we have and explain as a
21 result of the comments from the NRC explain basically why we
22 were submitting this letter. And that's what the cover
23 sheet really should have in it.

24 I don't believe there was any effort on the part
25 of anyone to exclude information, mislead the NRC as you've

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.
Court Reporters
1612 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 293-3950

76

1 indicated.

2 Q Or to flag the NRC's attention to certain aspects
3 of the table.

4 A If we took any LER and read it, I believe you
5 would find that it's basically please find attached. The
6 details are there. The NRC has a very knowledgeable staff.
7 They read those just as we read them. And we try to give
8 them the facts just as we know them. They can draw their
9 conclusions just as easily as we draw ours.

10 Q To your knowledge -- and I know you weren't
11 involved in the preparation or drafting of either the April
12 9th letter or the April 19th LER -- but from your knowledge
13 today from any conversations that you've had about those
14 documents today, do you have any indication that in the
15 preparation of those two documents there was any confusion
16 between a successful start and a valid test or a valid
17 start?

18 A Based on what I know today and many of the
19 conversations that I have had, what was apparent to me is
20 when the counts were done the individual doing the counts
21 did not view it as recording valid tests. So they most
22 likely took credit for everything that was in the log books.

23 When we reported it against valid tests, we
24 clearly would get different numbers, because the valid test
25 has a different definition. More things are done during a

1 valid test than would be done during these start tests that
2 were being done. So they would not have been included if we
3 had just talked valid tests.

4 Q And I recognize that we went to the valid test
5 terminology in the Rev. to the LER. And my question
6 pertained not to that document but to the April 19th and
7 April 9th letter.

8 A Uh-huh [affirmative].

9 Q So in recognizing that you did not play a part in
10 drafting those, I was just asking if you had any knowledge
11 that at that point in time there was any confusion between a
12 successful start and a valid test.

13 A My recollection of myself on April 19th in that
14 point of time when that was being done is I had no contact
15 with the people involved. I was on shift and carrying out
16 my shift activities. These were being prepared and sent --

17 I do not know what conversations occurred between them. I
18 have not heard since any specific conversations about how to
19 gather the data.

20 We only drew certain conclusions later on that
21 they looked at the logs and gathered certain information
22 from logs in a certain way. And that all of the reports
23 that we've put together since the time I came back had been
24 oriented towards making sure that everybody understood how
25 they did those counts and why there could be some confusion

1 between one count way and another count way.

2 Q To this day with your current knowledge -- and I'm
3 referring now to the second reason, what mistake did the
4 individual make -- went to get the counts?

5 A I only have to surmise what I believe the answer
6 to that is. I don't know for a fact. But I believe that he
7 simply counted things in the logs or missed something in the
8 log because it was on another data sheet in another log. I
9 don't know that for a fact. But based on what you -- what
10 we've talked about and listened to on QA audits, what I knew
11 about from the October -- excuse me, the August time frame,
12 that would have to be my conclusion. But, again, I do not
13 know that for a fact.

14 Q So it's your testimony here today that when you as
15 vice chairman or chairman of the PRB played your part in the
16 approval of those two reasons as to why the -- the confusion
17 existed that those two reasons were true and accurate and
18 valid?

19 A I would not -- if I were in the PRB meeting this
20 occurred on -- and, again, I would have to refer to the
21 minutes to be sure of that. But if I were, I would not have
22 agreed with this if I did not believe it was accurate and
23 correct.

24 Q I don't have any other questions. Do you have any
25 other clarifying comments that you want to make before we

1 close this interview, Mr. Greene?

2 A I have a couple of statements that I would like to
3 make.

4 First of all, in coming back from being absent for
5 almost a little over a year a lot of my duties circulated
6 around getting back up to speed. Skip Kitchens was
7 scheduled to go off to the some senior management training
8 in early July time frame. So I knew in that period of time
9 I had about two months to get up to speed and get familiar
10 with what he's doing and what had changed in the plant over
11 the last year. So a great deal of my attention and time
12 went to those things.

13 Mr. Mosbaugh, most of the problems that have been
14 brought up that I've heard on the tapes today and from past
15 experience, simply was bringing up problems that were
16 directly under his responsibility to correct. He in many
17 cases failed to correct problems and simply tried to push
18 them off on other people..

19 And I just want for the record everyone to
20 understand that many of the things that Allen Mosbaugh has
21 brought to our attention today is simply things he was
22 personally responsible to correct, had full control of to
23 get corrected but failed to do so.

24 The last thing I'd like to say is that I'm glad I
25 live in a country where an individual can have a complaint

TVU

1 and be heard out in an atmosphere just as we're in today.
2 But I think you, the NRC, have the responsibility to bring
3 this thing to a timely conclusion. It has dragged on and
4 on. It is time for you to wrap this up and draw any
5 conclusions you're going to draw.

6 There are a lot of people who are affected by this
7 outside of Mr. Mosbaugh. We want you to get the truth, but
8 then we want you to get finished with it as well. We have
9 jobs that we're responsible for, family lives that are
10 affected by a meeting such as this. And we're willing to do
11 that, but we need this drawn to a conclusion. And I think
12 that's the responsibility you have.

13 Q And rest assured it will be, Mr. Greene.

14 One other question. You're talking about Mr.
15 Mosbaugh's control over the final language or statements
16 that are issued under Mr. Hairston's signature. To what
17 extent does Mr. Mosbaugh have control over documents that
18 are changed at corporate for a final copy and are not
19 reviewed by a PRB?

20 A To my knowledge, George Hairston has never made a
21 change to a document that was sent from the site without
22 them having the opportunity to review it for any comments.
23 As far as count numbers and things like that changing, I
24 know that he was never sent anything like that out and just
25 change it. He would have gone back to the site and said,

700

1 "Are you sure about these? I think we ought to use this
2 instead."

3 But then he would have gone back and said, "Now I
4 want the PRB to review this and make sure it's right."
5 Those would have been his final words on any statement like
6 that.

7 Q And would your comments be the same for Mr. McCoy
8 and Mr. Shipman?

9 A They would. They would. I have worked with a lot
10 of different people. And all three of those gentlemen are
11 the highest integrity of gentlemen I've ever worked with.
12 They would never, ever change anything to hide information
13 from the NRC or to mislead the NRC. Just as they will
14 present the facts just as you and I would present a letter
15 to try to summarize the story and make sure that the
16 information is correct in the story, which is what the cover
17 letters do, but not to mislead the NRC.

18 Q Thank you. Do you have any other comments before
19 we close the interview?

20 A No.

21 Q Appreciate your attendance here today.

22 MR. ROBINSON: It is now 2:46 and this interview
23 is completed. Thank you, sir.

24 [Whereupon, at 2:46 p.m., the above-entitled
25 interview was concluded.]

Thomas V. Green J. 9/22/93

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.
Court Reporters
1612 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 293-3950

700

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the attached proceedings
before the United States Nuclear Regulatory
Commission
in the matter of:

NAME OF PROCEEDING: Interview of Thomas Greene

DOCKET NUMBER:

PLACE OF PROCEEDING: Atlanta, GA

were held as herein appears, and that this is the
original transcript thereof for the file of the
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission taken
by me and thereafter reduced to typewriting by me
or under the direction of the court reporting
company, and that the transcript is a true and
accurate record of the foregoing proceedings.

Ellen Thompson
Official Reporter
Ann Riley & Associates, Ltd.

EXHIBIT 47

51 - 51