

S-17

Staff II-17

DOCKETED
USNRC

In the matter of Georgia Power Co. et al., Vogtle Units 1 & 2

Staff Applicant Intervenor Other

Identified Received Rejected

Reporter KHW

Date 7/20/95

Witness Mosbaugh

Staff Exhibit II-17 (revised)

Tape 258, Side B

95 JUL 27 P4:48

1 Horton: We've seen it vary -- see we get these things and
2 you'll see Kenny change them sometimes or mark
3 them sometimes (inaudible). I don't know if the
4 procedure has sufficient guidance to make extremely
5 clear. If there is some common understanding by the
6 operator--

7

8 McCoy: See, the whole issue on this thing is we use the
9 term "successful starts." Apparently--

10

11 Bockhold: You know, what we -- we have resolved at this point
12 that we made a mistake in the count. Okay? And
13 that's what Pete Taylor believes, but it was, er,
14 believes it wasn't an intentional mistake, it was
15 simply a mistake made in counting. Okay? He
16 believes that the Rev. 1 numbers are correct. The
17 only issue then is Rev. 0 LER to Rev. 1 LER, okay,
18 why didn't you go back and why doesn't the cover
19 letter address specifically 12 sequential successful
20 starts. If the cover letter addresses that or if
21 the LER addresses that, all the issues go away.

22

23 McCoy: No. That's not what I heard last night.

24

25 Bockhold: That's what I heard last night.

26

27 McCoy: You're hear it again this morning. We need to be --
28 we really need to be prepared to address this. This
29 is a fundamental issue. Whether we -- whether we
30 have to submit another letter that defines this or
31 not, I think that's going to come out in this
32 session. But the one issue that is hanging in there
33 is this one regarding whether what was in the
34 presentation was accurately presented and whether --
35 if there was an error, is there a rational kind of
36 basis for the error or was it an intentional error.
37 That's the underlying issue of this.

38

39 Bockhold: That's the underlying issue, but they basically
40 resolved that underlying issue to their
41 satisfaction. Okay. The issue that they didn't
42 resolve to their satisfaction was why the revision
43 to the LER and that cover letter that sent it, why
44 it did not address 12 sequential starts. And if it
45 would address that, it would be completely resolved.
46 That was their point last night and we spent a lot
47 of time on this point. That was their point. Okay.
48 And -- but if those diesel failures were not diesel
49 failures that would have shut the engine down, okay,
50 then 19 could be still correct. But I believe

1 because of numerous people looked at it that one of
2 those failures or more broke the sequentialness of
3 it and we didn't pick that up in our original
4 counting of it, okay, and the focus after, in their
5 mind, is sequential diesel starts.
6

7 Horton:

George, I just looked at the sheet. I understand
8 why it's performed the way it is. I think there's
9 a couple different things going on that -- I'll work
10 with George.