

16385

RELATED CORRESPONDENCE

UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001



OFFICE OF THE  
GENERAL COUNSEL

DOCKETED  
USNRC

'95 FEB 23 P3:10

February 22, 1995

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
DOCKETING & SERVICE  
BRANCH

By Facsimile

Michael D. Kohn, Esq.  
Kohn, Kohn and Colapinto, P.C.  
517 Florida Avenue, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20001

John Lamberski, Esq.  
Troutman Sanders  
NationsBank Building, Suite 5200  
600 Peachtree Street, N. E.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

In the Matter of  
Georgia Power Company, et al.  
(Vogtle Electric Generating Station, Units 1 and 2)  
Docket Nos: 50-424-OLA-3 and 50-425-OLA-3

Gentlemen:

In an Memorandum and Order (Schedule for Phase II), the Board set March 23, 1995, as the deadline for reaching agreements on transcripts of tapes. The Staff proposes that the parties reach agreement on the text of the following partial transcripts of tapes that the NRC believes is relevant to its case:

- Tape #41, Tr. 40-51 (OI Exhibit 66)
- Tape #160, Tr. 24 (OI Exhibit 97)
- Tape #184, Tr. 35-45 (OI Exhibit 60) (NRC Smooth, Tr. 15-22)

Except for the transcript of Tape 184, the enclosed pages are from the OI Exhibits that contained notations by Allen Mosbaugh. NRC revisions are handwritten, in print, on the enclosed transcript excerpts.

Sincerely,

Mitzi A. Young  
Counsel for NRC Staff

Enclosures as stated

cc w/o enclosures: Service List

9503030180 950222  
PDR ADOCK 05000424  
T PDR

D507

1 (inaudible)?

2 VOICE: Eight a.m.

3 VOICE: (Inaudible).

4 *GB* VOICE: Whatever yesterday's mode  
5 1 projection is <sup>the same</sup> (inaudible).

6 VOICE: But (inaudible) Saturday  
7 night at eight o'clock.

8 *Padre* VOICE: We were showing three  
9 o'clock Tuesday (inaudible) yesterday.

10 *GB* VOICE: Three o'clock Tuesday.  
11 ~~(Inaudible)~~. ~~Mostly we're (inaudible)~~. ~~Mode 3 will come quickly~~  
12 That's my projection.

13 VOICE: Mode 2 (inaudible).

14 VOICE: Okay. (Inaudible) mode 4.

15 *GB* VOICE: (Inaudible). <sup>Tomorrow</sup> afternoon

16 VOICE: . Okay. (Inaudible) we  
17 don't need to worry about (inaudible).

18 VOICE: (Inaudible) engineers  
19 (inaudible).

20 VOICE: (Inaudible).

21 VOICE: I'm leaving, I just  
22 (inaudible).

23 *GB* VOICE: <sup>Ok my nickle</sup> (Inaudible).

24 *GB* VOICE: <sup>let me</sup> (Inaudible) read a  
25 paragraph. <sup>GC</sup> ~~(Inaudible)~~ has reviewed air

1 quality of the diesel generator focusing on  
2 ~~the~~ <sup>the 1A diesel</sup> ~~(inaudible)~~ <sup>air system including</sup> dewpoint control and has  
3 concluded that air quality is satisfactory.

4 Initial reports of higher than  
5 expected dewpoints later <sup>attributed to faulty instrumentation</sup> ~~(inaudible)~~.

6 That specific <sup>surface</sup> test was in reference  
7 to the March 29, March 30, and March 31 work  
8 order associated with the instruments that we  
9 later determined was bad, and we got to  
10 <sup>VC Summer instrument</sup> ~~(inaudible) some of them~~ and we figured out  
11 how to work the <sup>EB&G</sup> ~~(inaudible)~~ instrumentation.

12 This was confirmed by an internal  
13 inspection of one <sup>air receiver</sup> ~~(inaudible)~~ on April 6,  
14 1990. <sup>we</sup> ~~(inaudible)~~ looked in there and found a  
15 light <sup>film</sup> ~~(inaudible)~~ of oil and we found some  
16 minor corrosion on <sup>some surfaces</sup> ~~(inaudible)~~ also. <sup>we told the</sup>  
17 <sup>NRC that.</sup> We periodically <sup>we</sup> placed in a control  
18 air filters were done in March, 1990. From  
19 all reports that I've heard on that is that  
20 those air filters were always clean. Even in  
21 the previous outage they were very clean and  
22 practically brand new.

23 We showed no indication of corrosion  
24 and air receiver and daily air receiver <sup>blow</sup> ~~(inaudible)~~  
25 <sup>which</sup> ~~(inaudible)~~ showed no indication of corrosion

1 and daily air receiver blow down with no  
2 significant water discharge.

3 We believe, although Schwartzwalder<sup>e</sup>  
4 is checking, is ever since we started up  
5 we've been doing daily air receiver blowdowns  
6 as part of operations. *Mike Horton*

7 Further, I guess, (~~inaudible~~) when  
8 the air quality came up, spoke to the Cooper  
9 people. And the (~~inaudible~~)<sup>(Cooper</sup> reaction  
10 (~~inaudible~~)<sup>was get</sup> if you do these daily blowdowns,  
11 and you don't have a air receiver full of  
12 water, because of the (~~inaudible~~)<sup>these are</sup> marine  
13 engines and because you have a pressure  
14 reduction going to the controls, you really  
15 don't have to worry about air quality.

16 They used the word that was used  
17 *You used some words that were given by you guys, at that time was given*  
(~~inaudible~~) you know, air quality (~~inaudible~~).  
18 That was the flavor that came to me, okay.

19 We've done I guess some additional  
20 research. We have (~~inaudible~~)<sup>just during the</sup> '88 time frame-  
21 -well, we had the (~~inaudible~~)<sup>PM</sup> program <sup>problems on</sup>  
22 working out the (~~inaudible~~)<sup>PM</sup> program for  
23 (~~inaudible~~)<sup>problems</sup>.

24 The '88 time frame from like 5/10/88  
25 to 5/2/89, somewhere in that time frame,

1 approximately a year ago, the year before  
 2 that, we may have had one or more of the  
 3 dryers out of service for several months,  
 4 okay, and that's indicated here.

5 We probably were not doing good PM's  
 6 on checking dryer quality at that particular  
 7 ~~(inaudible)~~, okay.

8 <sup>would</sup> ~~was~~ I guess my question to the group is  
 9 ~~was~~ that ~~→~~ <sup>attract</sup> ~~(inaudible)~~ the statement that we  
 10 made in our letter at all?

11 Is the other facts, the fact that  
 12 <sup>hey we</sup> ~~(inaudible)~~ blow down the air dryer, the fact  
 13 ~~that we don't~~ <sup>we looked</sup> ~~(inaudible)~~ the air dryer, the  
 14 fact that essentially a year or approximately  
 15 a year before the <sup>even had</sup> ~~(inaudible)~~, you know, we  
 16 did have <sup>good downpoint</sup> ~~(inaudible)~~ <sup>would that leave this statement</sup> ~~did not fully~~ ~~(inaudible)~~  
 17 <sup>A whole and good</sup> ~~statement of (inaudible)~~.

18 <sup>Archie</sup> VOICE: The question I need to <sup>until you</sup>  
 19 answer first, <sup>the danger is we were taken for the</sup> ~~(inaudible)~~, the ~~(inaudible)~~ <sup>was it</sup>  
 20 you know, the right way. <sup>you have</sup> ~~(inaudible)~~  
 21 seventeen, twelve, twenty-two, <sup>These are good</sup> ~~you have~~  
 22 ~~(inaudible)~~ numbers.

23 Remember, ~~(inaudible)~~.

24 <sup>Am</sup> VOICE: That's theoretically not  
 25 possible.



1           GB VOICE:       I mean, what we've got to  
2 basically say is our PM program before, I  
3 don't know --

4           *my* VOICE:       June, July, '89; right?

5           GB VOICE:       Yeah, somewhere --

6           *karrot* VOICE:     (Inaudible) '89.

7           GB VOICE:       Yeah, somewhere in that  
8 time frame our PM program was suspect. Okay,  
9 the readings were suspect. You know, that  
10 doesn't mean that you did have good air, but  
11 it doesn't mean that you didn't have good air.  
12 We don't know if we had good air or bad air,  
13 okay.

14                        But in the meantime we did pull the  
15 filter, okay, and we had been doing the  
16 blowdowns and all of that implies that the  
17 air, although it may not, <sup>during this period of time</sup> demonstrate  
18 ~~(inaudible)~~ the best quality, was  
19 satisfactory.

20           *Kodony* VOICE:    (Inaudible) you can't say  
21 that we have a bad air and <sup>during the period</sup> ~~(inaudible)~~ because  
22 anytime you've got a minor corrosion, you can  
23 see anytime (inaudible).

24           GB VOICE:       You know, I guess I would  
25 tend to believe that we had good air based

1 upon two things; one, pulling the air filter  
 2 and inspecting it, which was <sup>essentially</sup> (inaudible) new.  
 3 We didn't see any buildups of <sup>air things</sup> (inaudible).

4 The second thing I guess I would  
 5 tend to believe, you know, two hundred and  
 6 fifty pounds <sup>air</sup> (inaudible) or thereabouts and  
 7 kind of room temperature, okay, and your  
 8 dryer (inaudible) an expansion process, even  
 9 if you didn't have a dryer, it goes through an  
 10 expansion process, the <sup>control air</sup> (inaudible) in my  
 11 opinion. *At least I think that's correct.*

12 You know, so some two hundred and  
 13 fifty pounds or two hundred and ten pounds  
 14 (inaudible) sixty pounds (inaudible) dry air.

15 So I would then conclude, if my  
 16 logic is correct, I would conclude that  
 17 <sup>our statement here is made on</sup> (inaudible) ~~my~~ air quality is still a valid  
 18 <sup>statement, right.</sup> (inaudible).

19 VOICE: - - (Inaudible). - - *Material False SI*

20 <sup>George</sup> VOICE: Yes. You know,  
 21 <sup>we resounded in</sup> (inaudible) ~~we agree~~ (inaudible) ~~in~~ this  
 22 generic letter and stated what our air  
 23 quality was.

24 <sup>We did</sup> (Inaudible) states that our air  
 25 <sup>the maximum constant acceptance criteria for the air start</sup> quality (inaudible) Vogel ~~(inaudible)~~ system.

1 <sup>now</sup> ~~It's~~ been established <sup>at</sup> that fifty degrees  
 2 <sup>° F at system pressure FSA</sup> (inaudible) <sup>see FSR table at</sup> at this compressor (inaudible).

3 That's what we said our requirements are.

4 Dewpoint criteria was established  
 5 based on a design capability (inaudible) <sup>of the air start system</sup> and a  
 6 minimum diesel generator (inaudible) <sup>room design temperature.</sup>

7 So basically we said that our  
 8 criteria is fifty degrees <sup>F at system pressure.</sup> (inaudible).

9 **GB** VOICE: Yeah, <sup>That's what we said in the FSA</sup> (inaudible).

10 **GB** VOICE: <sup>We sometimes will not meet that and we have to</sup> demonstrate it <sup>Or when we didn't have a good PM program</sup> periodically. 7  
m.  
6

11 My question really focuses on  
 12 <sup>recent George Heintz</sup> this (inaudible) letter and how long -- you  
 13 know, I believe from what I've heard from all  
 14 the experts that Item 4 here is still valid.

15 I mean, we believe that we've had  
 16 satisfactory quality air going to the control  
 17 system.

18 <sup>Robert</sup> VOICE: Yes, I think that because  
 19 the <sup>dryer... the filter</sup> (inaudible).

20 **GB** VOICE: Given the fact that you  
 21 have an expansion process <sup>makes the air drier.</sup> in the dryer.

22 **AW** VOICE: Again, George, I say, you  
 23 know, it depends on what you're going to call  
 24 satisfactory.

25 If you're going to say satisfactory



1 is what we said in response to the generic  
2 letter, I'm not sure that we can show that  
3 we've met that criteria.

4 The problem is that you can't tell  
5 what any of these numbers are because the way  
6 the PM's done, you just can't tell.

7 You know, there's a number down  
8 here, but there's no calculation. <sup>They</sup> You're  
9 doing the measurements at atmospheric  
10 pressure, yet they need to be corrected back  
11 to a system pressure, you know, and we're  
12 getting high numbers.

13 *Horton* VOICE: <sup>There's no documented evidence to prove</sup> ~~that (inaudible) is true~~  
~~based on (inaudible)~~ <sup>to the point of that</sup> ~~that (inaudible) is true~~  
<sup>is just saying nothing to back that.</sup>

14 *GB* VOICE: <sup>observation (inaudible)</sup> We've made engineering  
15 judgments, okay, on this particular statement.  
16 I would go ahead and --

17 *A.M.* VOICE: You know, we're saying if  
18 there's <sup>no</sup> internal corrosion that we're  
19 observing, therefore air quality is met and  
20 that may or may not be <sup>relatable</sup> ~~the (inaudible)~~.

21 *Kalony* VOICE: <sup>The air because was good</sup> (Inaudible) you can see  
22 the <sup>wedge filter you can see</sup> (inaudible).

23 *Sloper* VOICE: <sup>I guess I don't meet the specific</sup> (Inaudible) based on our  
24 judgment when we pull it down three times a  
25

1 day and operations says based on what we've  
 2 seen <sup>on the filter and everything else</sup> (inaudible), no corrosion, we have to say  
 3 <sup>it's acceptable</sup> (inaudible) — <sup>but it doesn't in fact meet the number</sup> →  
 4 (inaudible).

4 <sup>Hooker</sup> VOICE: I <sup>think the</sup> <sup>concern is the lack of</sup> <sup>(inaudible)</sup> <sup>Renovation.</sup>

5 <sup>Alz</sup> VOICE: <sup>The IIT team has made</sup> <sup>(inaudible)</sup> a recent

6 requests, George, for all these work orders,  
 7 okay. They've asked for all these --

8 <sup>GB</sup> VOICE: I think at ten o'clock  
 9 I'll talk to <sup>IIT team</sup> ~~(inaudible)~~ about going back on  
 10 our past work orders in our PM program in '88  
 11 was not as good as our PM program has been in  
 12 the past year, basically, in '89 going to '90,  
 13 and we'll provide that information, <sup>It's still</sup> ~~so~~ our  
 14 engineering judgment that we had satisfactory  
 15 air quality. I think that's --

16 <sup>Burns</sup> VOICE: . The expansion of air from  
 17 receiver pressure to eighty pounds is going to  
 18 result in about an eighty degree depression of  
 19 dewpoint -- pardon me, thirty degree  
 20 depression at dewpoint.

21 VOICE: (Inaudible).

22 VOICE: Yeah.

23 VOICE: Yeah.

24 VOICE: So the receiver --

25 <sup>PHB</sup> VOICE: The absolute worst case

1 would be water laying in the bottom of the  
2 tank on a hot day, you'd have had, what, a  
3 ninety degree dewpoint or so.

4 *Am* VOICE: Okay. The other thing  
5 that happens with a system like that is  
6 normally your receiver temperature is elevated  
7 when your compressors are operating because of  
8 the heat, but a ninety or a hundred would be a  
9 good number.

10 *PHB* VOICE: But <sup>*we start with*</sup> (inaudible) for such a  
11 long time.

12 VOICE: That would only be a short  
13 period of <sup>*in effect*</sup> ~~(inaudible)~~.

14 VOICE: Yeah.

15 *Am* VOICE: I think that's probably a  
16 good <sup>*starting*</sup> (inaudible) point.

17 *PHB* VOICE: You get about thirty  
18 degree depression of a dewpoint <sup>*for that expansion*</sup> ~~(inaudible)~~ so  
19 whatever we <sup>*theorize*</sup> (inaudible) the maximum receiver  
20 was, we're sure we had thirty degrees lower  
21 than <sup>*at the construct 3*</sup> ~~(inaudible)~~.

22 *GB* VOICE: <sup>*If you say*</sup> (Inaudible) ninety degrees  
23 in that room and that room would never,  
24 actually never rapidly fall to sixty degrees.

25 *PHB* VOICE: The ISA standard was

1 twenty -- how many degrees below room  
2 temperature?

3 *Stu* VOICE: Eighteen degrees.

4 *PAB* VOICE: Eighteen degrees. So we  
5 always are going thirty, which is more than  
6 eighteen.

7 *GB* VOICE: Okay. So we believed that  
8 we had good air quality and a poor PM program  
9 in '88 and we fixed that.

10 *PAB* VOICE: The PM program needs some  
11 minor tuning up now.

12 *Kochery* VOICE: (Inaudible) needs to be  
13 done now.

14 VOICE: Oh, yeah, I agree.

15 VOICE: (Inaudible).

16 *GB* VOICE: . Oh, yeah, we flapped  
17 around with the fact that we got a, you know,  
18 on the 29th or so we got a <sup>*Crummy*</sup> ~~phony~~ reading and  
19 nobody knew about it until <sup>*Mitt Hunt*</sup> (inaudible) picked  
20 it up.

21 *Am* VOICE: George, we had a bad  
22 reading today. Sixty degrees <sup>*of*</sup> (inaudible) on  
23 the two <sup>*A diesel*</sup> (inaudible) ~~sewpoints~~

24 *GB* VOICE: <sup>*The 2A diesel*</sup> (Inaudible) I think we're  
25 working on the problem; isn't that right?

1 *States* VOICE: *They left the dryers off* 51  
 2 *following both* think (inaudible) *both dryers off.* I  
 3 VOICE: (Inaudible).  
 4 *Hoster* VOICE: *Have'n't* I think we got *any* good  
 5 readings and ~~(inaudible)~~.  
 6 GB VOICE: Not on 2A, 2B.  
 7 *Krinsky* VOICE: 2A (inaudible) *was high*  
 8 GB VOICE: *They're trying to drain down the tanks*  
 9 operations and we *should be bleeding that tank down*  
 10 *Krinsky* VOICE: *Cott's going to do that today.*  
 11 GB VOICE: Okay. When I heard about  
 12 it, and I heard about it yesterday or so or  
 13 the day before yesterday -- actually, I heard  
 14 about it just before the meeting *with the NAC* (inaudible).  
 15 He mentioned there was a possibility  
 16 and they finally took the reading and I got  
 17 the information just before they finally took  
 18 the reading (inaudible) *that is effective* and I think it was  
 19 sixty degrees at that point.  
 20 *I thought I told ship*  
 21 operations to go ahead and (inaudible) *start the bleed, fuel,*  
 22 *OK'd on* the tank to  
 23 improvement, the PM currently says to use a  
 24 pressure regulator *regulator or* (inaudible) instrument and  
 25 the instrument manual says that you should not



1 <sup>Am</sup> VOICE: How many different people are we going to  
2 have ~~doing these?~~ <sup>GENERATE THE NUMBERS?</sup> *Probably Houston says he's going to write his own.*

3 VOICE: [Inaudible] ~~nightmare~~. <sup>My guy</sup> [Inaudible] hasn't  
4 finished yet.

5 <sup>Am</sup> VOICE: No. You can't change history.

6 VOICE: [Laughs.]

7 <sup>Fredrick's</sup> VOICE: We're just trying to solve it.

8 ~~Am~~ VOICE: Solve history?

9 <sup>Fredrick's</sup> VOICE: Okay.

10 <sup>Fredrick's</sup> VOICE: I'm supposed to not only come up with a  
11 number; I'm supposed to come up with why the discrepancy  
12 exists.

13 <sup>Am</sup> VOICE: hnh.

14 <sup>Fredrick's</sup> VOICE: I don't know if I can do that.

15 <sup>Am</sup> VOICE: You can't do that without George's input.

16 <sup>Fredrick's</sup> VOICE: [Inaudible] <sup>Not</sup> I have to go get it, I have to  
17 <sup>Am</sup> ~~Okay.~~ <sup>go get it.</sup>

18 ~~VOICE: Okay.~~ <sup>You have to talk to George & Jimmy Paul (cash).</sup>

18 ~~VOICE: [Inaudible.]~~

19 ~~VOICE: Okay.~~

20 <sup>Fredrick's</sup> VOICE: But the number I was -- I was supposedly  
21 investigating changed yesterday.

22 <sup>Am</sup> VOICE: Well, yeah. They <sup>REVED</sup> ~~reverted~~ the LER again.

23 VOICE: I thought we <sup>revid it</sup> [inaudible] on our end.

24 VOICE: How could they have revid the numbers?  
24 [Inaudible.] <sup>they don't</sup>

25 <sup>Fredrick's</sup> VOICE: ~~I don't think they ever had the numbers.~~

1 Bockhold: I prefer "appear."

2 Horton: Sounds like we don't know.

3 Greene: What we need to do is just be factual.

4 Voice: What are the facts?

5 Voice: (inaudible)

6 Voice: We'll do it now.

7 Voice: That's what we said.

8 Voice: (inaudible)

9 Voice: (inaudible)

10 Bockhold: Actually, maybe the first section should be the  
11 confusion. The April 9th letter and the original LER  
12 appeared to be the results of two facts. First, there  
13 was confusion in distinction between successful start  
14 and a valid start, and in truth, that was an NRC  
15 confusion. They thought we were telling them something  
16 different than what we were telling them.

Aufdenkampe: (inaudible)

18 Bockhold: You know, and really the second thing is ~~that~~ we screwed  
19 up in our count.

20 Voice: (inaudible) Okay.

21 Voice: (inaudible) Yeah.

22 Voice: Or this second thing...  
What's a valid start?

23 <sup>Greene</sup> Voice: My definition?

24 Voice: Yeah.

25 Greene: I know what valid test is.

26 Bockhold: Okay, so we're going to say the confusion --

27 Voice: (inaudible)

28 Voice: (inaudible)

29 Voice: You're right.

30 Horton: A valid test is a defined term.

31 Voice: A valid successful test (inaudible) is a defined term.

1 Horton: A valid successful start is not a *defined term*.

2 Bockhold: Why don't we say valid test?

3 Voice: (inaudible) *You can't link those two words there.*

4 Voice: (inaudible)

5 Bockhold: Confusion in the April 9th letter in the original LER  
6 appeared to be <sup>the</sup> ~~resulted in~~ <sup>of</sup> two factors. First, there was  
7 confusion in the distinction between a successful start  
8 and a valid test.

9 Voice: That's much better. I like that paragraph.

10 Greene: How did you change those words so far?

11 Bockhold: I just said -- I changed the -- instead of the errors, I  
12 said the confusion in the April 9th letter and the  
13 original LER appear to result in two factors. So I  
14 changed the term, errors to confusion, and then I said,  
15 first it was confusion <sup>and</sup> distinction between  
16 successful starts ~~and~~ a valid test. ~~Okay, and then~~ I  
17 left everything else the same. *in*

18 Voice: (inaudible)

19 Voice: (inaudible) *The second sentence, in other words, also refers to the  
confusion.*

20 Bockhold: You've got confusion twice.

21 Voice: (inaudible) *We refer to confusion twice.*

22 Voice: No. We didn't know (inaudible).

23 Bockhold: ~~But I mean, English-wise, it's better to mix up the~~  
24 ~~words, and to be technically correct. Say you're an~~  
25 ~~engineer and you use the same term over again. Good. You~~  
26 *would picture* ~~thing you're~~ *an engineer and not an English major.*

27 Fredericks: <sup>you would</sup> ~~Do you want to take error out of the last sentence?~~ <sup>and</sup> Say,  
28 "Second, confusion?"

29 Bockhold: No, I'm willing to accept <sup>that that...</sup> ~~this~~ <sup>error,</sup> That ~~is fine~~ error is  
30 fine. You know, we say error in the first paragraph and  
31 we say error here.

32 Horton: You might want to change that because (inaudible) --  
<sup>to start</sup>

33 Voice: (inaudible) *in the middle sentence -- the last sentence in quotes*  
"successful start" (inaudible) in 108.

Bockhold: There is no such thing as valid, successful start from  
108?

36 Voice: (inaudible)

1 Bockhold: Okay, so it's a valid, successful start <sup>and</sup> that's <sup>has</sup> an important comment.

3 Voice: (inaudible)

4 Bockhold: <sup>How did</sup> ~~Not if~~ somebody put that <sup>in</sup> quotations <sup>and its not in</sup> (inaudible) 108?

5 Voice: (inaudible)

6 Voice: We need to (inaudible).

7 Bockhold: You read 108.

8 Voice: How could -- you know, how could you put it in quotations, ~~like~~ if you're not quoting or something?

9

10 Voice: (inaudible)

11 Aufdenkampe: Those three words were in here a lot.

12 Voice: What, valid <sup>successful</sup> --

13 Voice: They start together.

14 Voice: (inaudible)

15 Voice: (inaudible)

16 Voice: Now, let's go to the last paragraph.

17 Voice: Last paragraph.

18 Voice: Last <sup>sentence</sup> (inaudible) last paragraph <sup>on the first page.</sup>

19 Fredericks: Well, we talk about this initial count <sup>(inaudible)</sup> -- <sup>of diesel generator</sup>

20 <sup>it implies</sup> ~~and then while~~ they were recounted. I would say that we

21 could change that last sentence to say: second, <sup>An error</sup>

22 was made by the individual who performed the count of

23 <sup>diesel</sup> ~~these two generator starts~~ before April 9th,

24 ~~Voice:~~ Or whatever.

25 Voice: I take it --

26 Fredericks: I wouldn't say initial, and ~~that was the final~~ <sup>I would define the date you're talk about.</sup>

27 <sup>Aufdenkampe</sup> Voice: I do think ~~the~~ initial's <sup>right because it was the first time</sup> (inaudible) ~~they were counted.~~

28 ~~Aufdenkampe:~~ They have been counted many times since then.

29 ~~Voice:~~ <sup>(inaudible)</sup> It implies they were counted more than once.

30 <sup>Greene</sup> Voice: Why not make a reference to the presentation here?

31 Voice: Yeah, that's what I'm talking about.

1 <sup>Greene</sup> Voice: I think we're <sup>need</sup> going to <sup>make</sup> be making a -- let's clarify  
2 something. Let's make a reference to what presentation  
3 <sup>the heck were</sup> (inaudible) about there.  
4 Voice: <sup>talking</sup> The April 9th letter.  
5 <sup>Greene</sup> Voice: What did you call the <sup>diesel testing</sup> (inaudible)?  
6 Voice: (inaudible)  
7 Bockhold: Okay, second, the error was made by the individual who  
8 performed the count of diesel starts for --  
9 Voice: (inaudible) the April 9th letter --  
10 Bockhold: (continuing) -- let's just say, for -- <sup>the</sup> how about NRC  
11 presentation. ~~Put~~ NRC, April 9th presentation.  
12 Voice: <sup>For the</sup> (inaudible)  
13 Voice: (inaudible)  
14 Voice: For the April 9th letter.  
15 Voice: Okay.  
16 Voice: You can put --  
17 Bockhold: The April 9th letter that's fine.  
18 Aufdenkampe: Okay, now that we've changed valid starts to valid  
19 tests, would you say that there was confusion between  
20 successful starts and valid tests?  
21 Voice: Well, it doesn't --  
22 <sup>Aufdenkampe</sup> Voice: Change that sentence.  
23 Voice: Which one? The one he (inaudible)?  
24 <sup>Aufdenkampe:</sup> It changes that sentence.  
25 <sup>Greene</sup> Voice: (inaudible) We don't know that part. Our letter --  
26 <sup>our data didn't have to do with starts. It had to do with running.</sup> (inaudible)  
27 Bockhold: Well, we used start in the presentation.  
28 Voice: Yeah, we used start.  
29 Bockhold: So that's why this is a start <sup>due to</sup> was considered successful,  
30 and the diesel was started and either ran, and we  
31 intentionally shut down while testing <sup>table</sup> was in progress,  
32 as identified on the attached paper. We've made an  
33 engineering value judgment about each one of these and  
we should defend our position.



1 Voice: (inaudible)

2 Voice: I don't have any problems.

3 ~~Greene~~ Voice: George, I don't know where you're at.

4 Voice: I was on <sup>the third sentence</sup> (inaudible).

5 Voice: (inaudible)

6 Bockhold: Well, let's -- I don't have any issues. Who has issues  
7 on this last paragraph on the first page?

8 Voice: (inaudible)

9 Voice: Second is the word? <sup>start</sup>

10 Voice: First.

11 Voice: First, there was confusion in the <sup>distinction between a</sup> (inaudible) successful  
12 start in a valid test.

13 (inaudible) <sup>and</sup> And you changed start to test?

14 Voice: Okay.

15 Voice: Now, I want to change that <sup>sentence</sup> (inaudible). <sup>to say there was</sup> There seems to  
16 ~~be a little~~ confusion between (inaudible) valid test.  
17 ~~(inaudible)~~. <sup>a successful start and</sup>

18 Voice: <sup>You're talking about the</sup> (inaudible) valid part again.

19 Voice: Yeah.

20 Voice: I don't know, but --

21 Voice: ~~I'll assist~~ Valid test

22 Voice: (inaudible)

23 Aufdenkampe: Well, was Jimmy confused <sup>about</sup> without successful starts and  
24 valid tests?

25 Bockhold: No.

26 Aufdenkampe: Then, that sentence is in error.

27 Voice: Okay, no. That sentence is not in error, and maybe that  
28 sentence should go someplace else.

29 Voice: (inaudible)

30 Voice: (inaudible)

1 Bockhold: Everybody else, you know, everybody else, the more we  
: got in to it, the more everybody got confused. On that  
3 date, Jimmy wasn't confused. He thought he had counted  
4 successful starts.

5 Aufdenkampe: (inaudible) I'll withdraw the comment.

6 Fredericks: (inaudible). We aren't necessarily referring to  
7 confusion by the counters. Everybody was confused.

8 Voice: Well, general.

9 Bockhold: <sup>There</sup> It was general confusion.

10 Voice: (inaudible) We were making the counts for one purpose,  
11 and they were using their standard nomenclature when  
12 they were reading our letter.

13 Voice: (inaudible)

14 Bockhold: And we, ourselves, asked. When we tried to count it the  
15 second time, we were confused about what was counted the  
16 first time. Everybody was confused after the first  
17 count. First count ~~were these, and~~ only one person did  
18 it. <sub>was easy</sub>

Greene: Are we through with that first page?

20 Voice: I think so.

21 Greene: Let's go to the second page.

22 Voice: Okay.

23 Voice: (inaudible)

24 (laughing)

25 Greene: Number 14 on the last line.

26 Voice: Are we now on the last paragraph?

27 Voice: Yes.

28 <sup>Greene</sup> Voice: We're on the second page.

29 Fredericks: The first sentence. The purpose of this letter is to  
30 correct the figures related to the number of diesel  
31 generator starts reported to the --" Ah, -- that's the  
32 opening line of the letter.

Fredericks: We did a lot of starts.

1 Voice: In the April 9th letter we talked about successful  
starts, sequential starts, or whatever else we had.  
3 Think that clarification in there --

4 Voice: I'm getting lost (inaudible) the information -- I don't  
5 think so. Bill's got a good point. We're gonna take --

6 Greene: What's that?

7 Voice: ~~The legal defense.~~ Delete the sentence

8 Greene: You know, that's a great sentence ~~(inaudible)~~ if  
9 that's the opening line <sup>opening line of</sup> in the whole letter.

10 Voice: Yeah. That should be the first sentence.

11 Voice: Yeah, that could be a little bit long.

12 Voice: That's kind of where the future is.

13 Voice: Why do you say great (inaudible)?

14 Bockhold: Wait a second. We're starting <sup>to</sup> in English <sup>this</sup> right now,  
15 okay?

16 Fredericks: I agree with Tom, George, <sup>It's at the</sup> end of the letter and <sup>we state</sup> ~~rethink~~  
the purpose.

18 Bockhold: Well, you're starting to do, you know, you're starting  
19 to rewrite the whole letter at this point.

20 Voice: (inaudible)

21 Bockhold: Actually, the purpose of this letter is to correct the,  
22 you know, determine the figures, numbers related, really  
23 <sup>you know, with</sup> (inaudible) English <sup>ing</sup> ~~in here~~ it.

24 Greene: Why don't we say this: This letter corrects the figures  
25 <sup>related to</sup> ~~and the latest~~ of the number of diesel generator starts,  
26 reported in the letter of April 9th, or the April 9th  
27 letter.

28 Bockhold: I think what we're doing is working on English. You  
29 know, the standard English context of writing a good  
30 letter is you put the purpose in paragraph one, then you  
31 put the facts, and then you put the summary in the last  
32 paragraph. That's, you know, 101 standard best way to  
33 write a letter. And yeah, we can restart, rewrite this  
34 letter from scratch <sup>if you want</sup> ~~if you want~~. But I don't believe  
35 that has anything to do upon the goodness or badness of  
36 this letter, or whether it's factually correct or not.  
? You know, that's just another way -- that's better  
- syntax, maybe in --

39 Voice: Whether or not --

1 Voice: We're not being graded on syntax at this point. We're  
 2 getting graded on ~~accidents~~ <sup>accuracy</sup> for crying out loud.

3 Greene: What if the methods are --

4 Voice: I want to go over this.

5 Bockhold: That was my ~~side~~ <sup>Green:</sup> comment, and if Birmingham likes this  
 6 letter written this way, I don't -- that's what we  
 7 should do. Well, let me ask the PRB a question. Do you  
 8 believe that that sentence distracts from the message  
 9 *we're delivering* ~~(inaudible)?~~

10 Coursey: I don't think it matters one way or not - really.

11 Greene: I would be confusing the issue if I didn't get --

12 Voice: (inaudible)

13 Voice: (inaudible)

14 Voice: It doesn't confuse what we're ~~talking~~ <sup>trying to tell</sup> (inaudible).

15 Voice: (inaudible)

16 Bockhold: I think you need that sentence there, or you need to  
 17 rewrite the whole letter, if you put a new paragraph in.

18 Greene: You understand, of course, that if it gets English --

19 Voice: Well, if Birmingham --

20 Bockhold: Yeah, if you get ~~some~~ <sup>ed</sup> re-English<sup>ed</sup> it needs to come back  
 21 to the PRB. I ain't gonna sign this one out without you  
 22 recommending unanimously.

23 Voice: (inaudible)

24 Voice: (inaudible)

25 Greene: All right, let's go to the second sentence. <sup>Any questions on the second?</sup> Have we  
 26 gone then, gone back to ~~(inaudible) verify~~ -- <sup>The third?</sup>  
 27 *and verified those numbers based on all*  
 28 *of our comments?*

27 Voice: (inaudible)

28 Voice: (inaudible)

29 Voice: (inaudible) post maintenance starts.

30 Voice: No, we don't agree with that line.

31 Voice: I'd like to exclude four.

32 Bockhold: Why don't we say there were so many start attempts,  
 33 count them all, and then (inaudible) why exclude any?