$$
\text { GPC.II - } 109
$$

## DOCKETED

Transcript of Selected Portion of Audiotape No. 90 , May 2, 1990, Tape \#3, Side A, transcribed by Teresa A. Irons, Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public, on June 29, 1992.


Tape No. 90 , Side A, Beginning of Tape
[Walking sounds] (Inaudible.)
MOSBAUGH: Those are the validated
lists. Ken Stokes compiled one on the A diesel as well.

There's (inaudible) include additional
information (inaudible).
BOCKHOLD: You need to change the
LER.
MOSBAUGH: We're working on that.
MOSBAUGH: People are working on that.
We're going to have to decide what to say.
BOCKHOLD: We need to get some
appropriate words.
MOSBAUGH: We can either change the
number or we can change the statement of completion or success or whatever.

You could keep the words the same and change the number or you could change what you were claiming.

BOCKHOLD: Do we have to change the other letter; do you know? The other letter?

MOSBAUGH: The other letter is .- the other letter has a problem, but it's a different problem than the LER because we
claimed different things.
In the LER, we claimed $X$ starts after completion of the test program, and in the other letter, we claimed total starts without failures or problems.

BOCKHOLD: So the first letter may be okay?

MOSBAUGH: No. The first letter has a problem too.

BOCKHOLD: Incorrect number?
MOSBAUGH: [Yes] incorrect number.
(Background page announcement.) Again, you got the same
problem. You can either change the number or you can change the claim.

BOCKHOLD: Maybe we should try to on the other letter to work in the correction into the 15th letter. That would probably be the best and appropriate way.

MOSBAUGH: I don't know.
BOCKHOLD: Okay.
MOSBAUGH: I'll let Rick figure out what words they think are for the LER and maybe we can use the same words in the correction of the other letter.

And if you want to use that through the

15 th letter, we can just use the same set of words.

You're better off if you stick to one phrasiality what is next.

BOCKHOLD: I agree. I agree.
MOSBAUGH: And each time you phrase it
some different way --
BOCKHOLD: I agree.
MOSBAUGH: -- then you got to make sure
that that information is equally accurate.
BOCKHOLD: Okay.
MOSBAUGH: All right.
(Inaudible voices.)
(Walking sounds.)
(Background sounds, whistling, walking
sounds.) [PAGE ANNOUNCEMENT]
MOSBAUGH: (Inaudible) you're working
on the revised LER; right?
WEBB: Yeah.
MOSBAUGH: I just talked to George. I gave him the list and told him they were validated. Okay. The same lists you have. (Phone ringing)

And he said when they get the words for the revision to the LER and he said something
about he wanted to work in -- he asked about the previous letter, and I told him I thought it was equally incorrect, though in a different way because it makes a different claim. And
he said that he'd like to work that correction into the May 15th letter.

So who's working the May 15 th letter? (inaudible).

WEBB: If you mind -- come on. I'll show you something over here. Couple words I got. (Inaudible).

WEBB: Let me show you what we've got so far, make sure its going -- saying the right things.
(Long pause. Someone yawns.)
WEBB: What I wanted to do --
MOSBAUGH: In fact -- and the other thing I suggested to George was that we ought to use the same phraseology in all of these.

There's no point in making different claims in different ways, and you know, the more ways you state it, the more we can't link it together.

WEBB: The approach that I took there was that leave what was there, there, and clarify it and add more onto it. More than

18 starts without any failures or problems is true, then we also have those problems on $1 B$ afterwards -- (inaudible). We had problems, and we can state that afterwards.

MOSBAUGH: All right. (Inaudible) now you can't say this, Tom.

WEBB: How come?
MOSBAUGH: Well, you're going -- you're just adding more technical details and conclusions, that six other tests, what would -- would have been bypassed? I don't know that. Unless I had the root cause on each one of those, I wouldn't know that.

WEBB: Well, you (inaudible). MOSBADGH: These failures to start were because there was inadequate fuel in the lines. Okay. (Phone ringirg)

WEBB: (Inaudible.)
MOSBAUGH: This trip -- thie trip on
jacket water pressure, turbo lube oil
pressure. I don't know -- you know, I would need to verify that. (Inaudible).

WEBB: I thought all these were
bypassed in the emergency start --
MOSBAUGH: Well, certainly not having
enough fuel (inauditle). (Laughter.). WEBB: (Inaudible.) That's his problem.
(Background voices)
MOSBAUGH: Well, this trip on high lube
oil temperature -- high lube oil temperature, that may be a valid emergency trip.

I just wouldn't -- I wouldn't throw
more -- I wouldn't throw that in because unless you know . . . .

WEBB: Are you suggesting that we scratch that and start over, scratch out those, that sentence (inaudible).

MOSBAUGH: I -- I just got done.
ODOM: (Inaudible.)
MOSBAUGH: I just got done -- I gave George those lists, okay.

ODOM: Uh-huh.
MOSBAUGH: Yeah, I told them they were now validated. Okay. (Inaudible).

ODOM: (Inaudible.)
MOSbAUGH: Yeah. And, uh, told him that you were working on the revision to the LER.

ODOM: Okay.
MOSBAUGH: He then asked about the
letter. And I told him that I thought the letter was incorrect also.

ODOM: Um . . .
MOSBAUGH: Okay. But in a different way because it made a different claim. Okay.

He then suggested that we -- that we address the correction of it in our May 15 th submittal.

ODOM: Correction of both these or correction of one?

MOSBAUGH: of the letter.
ODOM: The LER (inaudible).
MOSBAUGH: The LER is separate. Okay.
ODOM: Okay. I gotcha. You want to be sure -- (Laughter.)

MOSBAUGH: And I suggested to him that we make the same slaim rather than trying to make one claim relative to starts since the test program and the other starts without problems or failures -- you know, let's get --

ODOM: Let's make this in the same (Inaudible).

MOSBAUGH: The same --

ODOM: (Thaudible) letters, same standard (inaudible). I agree. MOSBAUGH: Yeah, okay. ODOM: Now we got to -- (inaudible). MOSEAUGH: And Tom here has he added another one, and you know, you got more -- it's just more justification that you're going to have to support, you know, saying, well, they would have been bypassed in the emergency mode. Well --

WEBB: You were saying that the two failures were because of no fuel in the lines? Is that what you --

MOSBAUGH: Those first ones were inadequate fuel in their lines.

ODOM: Okay. (Inaudible).
MOSBAUGH: So I wouldn't -- I wouldn't do further justification. I would just -- Excuse me.

ODOM: (Inaudible)
MOSBAUGH: I would just get the data and say, say as much as you can about what you got and not try to cloak it or cloud it or add contingencies, but to -- you know, let's say that the diesel, you know, you
might want to just use the LER. . . I like the LER words. The LER words aren't bad. The diesel was subjected to a -- you know, was -- a comprehensive test program was done, and subsequent to that, you know, there had been X successful starts without problems -ODOM: Right.

MOSBAUGH: -- you know. And just put whatever the right number is. ODOM: (Inaudible). It would be three.

MOSBAUGH: No. I think it's about eleven, wasn't too many--. ODOM: Oh, was it (Inaudible). MOSBAUGH: Yeah, you could say (inaudible) -- you could use the words "since it was declared operable" or "since the undervoltage test" or "since the surveillance was performed" -been performed X times. You know, whatever the --

ODOM: Right.
MOSBAUGH: -- whatever the measure is. Unfortunately, it's not going to be 18, you know, but it may be eight to ten.

ODOM: Okay. I agree with that. I want them both to say the same thing.

