

A-122

GPC Exh. II-122

DOCKETED
ASAP TR.

INT. EXH. 48
TAPE NO. 253
DATE: 8-15-90

'95 JUL 27 P4:36

1
2
3
4
5
6 MCCOY: (inaudible) the meeting. We're trying
7 to go through what our positions are. We need to do this by five
8 o'clock, because we're going to give these positions to the NRC,
9 so they can have their team meeting in the meeting, and go over
10 all these divisions and be sure they're consistent with what they
11 think the concerns are. And then, tomorrow morning, George and I
12 are going to meet with the team leader from the NRC to see if we
13 can resolve any misunderstandings -- that might exist or where we
14 are at fault, the purposes on not hitting the targets. So with
15 that kind of background, George why don't you take over.

16 BOCKHOLD: Before I go to the specifics, I do have
17 one general thing for everybody. There's still some concern from
18 some members of the team that if we are speculating about
19 something, just say we're speculating. I think we all have to be
20 careful about that. If we're not speculating, we should say it
21 more as a positive fact, (inaudible) I'd like to pass that on to
22 help your goal. You know, they know when we're speculating, and
23 they know when we're sure about our fact, okay? The next thing I
24 would like to do is just start through the list. We have a
25 package put together, and it's crossed out with diesel record
26 start failures, it's Pete Taylor, George Frederick. George
27 Frederick has provided a new page report. Does everybody have
28 copies?

(no response)

BOCKHOLD: Okay.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
Docket No. 50-424/425-OLA-3 EXHIBIT NO. GPC II-122
In the matter of Georgia Power Co. et al., Vogtle Units 1 & 2
 Staff Applicant Intervenor Other
 Identified Received Rejected Reporter KHW
Date 7/17/95 Witness Mosbaugh

9508140150 950717
PDR ADOCK 05000424
T PDR

1 MCCOY: One thing I noticed on this is that you
2 did not put a revision number or anything on these and you can't
3 tell, you know, each time it got revised. And I would suggest
4 that we all go through right now and just mark the current
5 package we have as Rev. 1.

6 BOCKHOLD: Well, I put time and date.

7 MCCOY: You have time and date?

8 BOCKHOLD: Right here.

9 McCoy: Let's all go through and put it on every
10 one of these. The time and date is 1500 (inaudible).

11 BOCKHOLD: Okay, so we're going to read --
12 everybody's going to George Frederick's item. We're going to go
13 ahead and comment if we've got any questions or issues. Why
14 don't we ask Teresa to come down, and get a new package, that
15 corporate doesn't have, and fax it to them right away?

16 MCCOY: Bill, we're not sure you have the latest
17 package up there, but we're going to fax you a complete copy.
18 It's the latest.

19 SHIPMAN: We're sure we don't, Ken.

20 MCCOY: Okay, so we'll do it. We can't wait
21 until you get that, but we'll just send it over to you.

22 SHIPMAN: Understand.

23 BOCKHOLD: On the second page, of George's item.
24 I'm not sure what the word "immediate" means. I want to say
25 after notification of the residents and NRC Region II, the
26 revised IER was prepared.

1 VOICE: (inaudible).
2 VOICE: (inaudible).
3 BAILEY: Don't you remember we wrote that letter
4 on the way back?
5 MCCOY: Yeah, that's right. It has the same
6 date.
7 BAILEY: Yes.
8 BOCKHOLD: Mike Horton. Your item two, is there a
9 reason for why we have not always reported.
10 HORTON: I'm sure there is. Uh, I don't what
11 that reason is. Uh, this goes back to the late 87-88
12 (inaudible).
13 BOCKHOLD: Why don't you add a sentence that
14 summarizes (inaudible).
15 MULTIPLE VOICES: (inaudible).
16 BOCKHOLD: Well, maybe you need to see the
17 documentation Mike. And Mike and Rick (inaudible) very clear
18 (inaudible) screwed up.
19 VOICE: (inaudible).
20 BOCKHOLD: Well, that's right. We screwed up and
21 we got a fairly massive effort to figure out what was all those
22 failures.
23 VOICE: (inaudible).
24 VOICE: (inaudible) originally we denied the
25 violation.
26 MULTIPLE VOICES: (inaudible)

1 BOCKHOLD: You can read the document, basically, if
2 something new comes out. You can read the documentation
3 (inaudible), and if something new comes out, then you can
4 (inaudible) to say we're guilty and you can prepare a special
5 report -- This is violation number 1 (inaudible). Do we want to
6 add Stew Ebneter in here? You notified Brockman right, Ken.

7 MCCOY: Bill Shipman.

8 BOCKHOLD: Okay, Bill Shipman notified Brockman.
9 You want to add Stew Ebneter - you have never interviewed?

10 MCCOY: Bill?

11 SHIPMAN: Yes, sir.

12 MCCOY: What we're talking about is that there's
13 a statement in here that says, "Therefore, when Vogtle Management
14 was aware of the problem in the LER 9006 rev zero, NRC Region II
15 was notified including the Chief of Reactor Projects, Ken
16 Brockman. (Inaudible) Well, anyway, I think we should put in
17 here that Stew Ebneter was notified also.

18 SHIPMAN: George Hairston called Stew according to
19 George.

20 MCCOY: Yeah.

21 BOCKHOLD: So why don't, want to put the names and
22 not the, the titles? Including Ken Brockman and Stew Ebneter.

23 VOICE: And George, you all talked to the
24 resident.

25 BOCKHOLD: I talked to the resident. I talked to
26 the resident.

1 MCCOY: That's the next paragraph. It's after
2 "notification of the resident and Region II" -- The revised LER
3 was prepared.

4 BOCKHOLD: Why don't you say, George Frederick, why
5 don't you say including the residents, Ken Brockman and Stew
6 Ebneter?" I think I notified Ron Aiello, but I can't remember at
7 this point. It was one of the residents.

8 VOICE: (inaudible).

9 BOCKHOLD: "Including the NRC residents, Ken
10 Brockman." Why don't you say including the NRC residents, and
11 NRC Region II, Ken Brockman and Stew Ebneter. Why don't you just
12 move the sentence up. After notification of the NRC the revised
13 LER was prepared.

14 MCCOY: The only thing that I would think on
15 that is that I'm not sure that the revised LER wasn't in some
16 form of preparation-revision. I think what brought it to our
17 attention was the fact that the LER had numbers on it that were
18 different than the original version.

19 VOICE: (inaudible).

20 BOCKHOLD: We struggled through about four or five
21 different revs. The LER's were different.

22 MCCOY: We might want to say instead of "the
23 revised LER was prepared", "The revised LER was submitted."
24 (inaudible). On this paragraph two, we're going to have to make
25 that (inaudible). One thing on these papers is we're going to
26 have to be clear (inaudible).

1 BOCKHOLD: Well, item (inaudible).
2 VOICE: (inaudible).
3 BOCKHOLD: (inaudible) Company's position on the
4 NRC issue -- "After thorough review --"
5 MCCOY: (inaudible) The issue about the diesels
6 and the letters and all that, that's not in here at all.
7 FREDERICK: That's what worries me, (inaudible). I
8 started work on some of this, for instance, there's an open
9 question on, who prepared the slides for the 4/9 presentation;
10 who prepared them and who approved them?
11 BOCKHOLD: The slides, I did.
12 FREDERICK: Both?
13 BOCKHOLD: I worked with Jimmy Paul Cash and Ken
14 Burr. The three of us worked on it. I might have put the
15 bullets down and then got Ken Burr to make sure that the, uh,
16 organized sequence was correct.
17 FREDERICK: Uh, the second question was who prepared
18 and who approved the confirmatory action letter?
19 MCCOY: Jim Bailey, did you hear that question?
20 BAILEY: We prepared it here and it was approved
21 by Hairston.
22 MCCOY: I guess we would say that I prepared
23 that. I worked with you on the preparation, right?
24 BAILEY: Correct.

1 MCCOY: So why don't we say that Ken McCoy and
2 Jim Bailey prepared the letter which was signed by George
3 Hairston in Birmingham.

4 FREDERICK: On the initial LER 90-06, Rev 0, who
5 prepared that? Who approved it, and who reviewed it on the PRB?
6 I can get the PRB membership from various meetings. There's
7 gonna be quite a few. I can also get who prepared it from the
8 NSAC staff. I think who approved it is obvious it goes out under
9 Mr. Hairston's signature.

10 MCCOY: That's right. We have a blue sheet with
11 every LER. It has the review up there. We can look at that and
12 see who reviewed that one. I know, well I'm not sure about that
13 one.

14 FREDERICK: Jim, is Jim Bailey there?

15 BAILEY: Yes.

16 FREDERICK: Jim, I'll call you after the meeting and
17 get the particulars on that blue sheet to answer that question.

18 FREDERICK: The next question that I have that
19 involves corporate is: Who prepared the cover letter for LER
20 9006 rev one? That's the transmittal letter that Mr. Hairston
21 signed. He wants to know what the attempt of that paragraph was
22 meant to do in clarifying the LER 9006 rev 0. He's not sure it
23 actually did anything to clarify the diesel start that was
24 described in the original LER.

1 FREDERICK: So, I need to talk to, and I think it's
2 Harry Majors, but -- and he may be out of town, and I may have to
3 talk to Jack Stringfellow.

4 MCCOY: Why don't you all go ahead and pull that
5 piece of correspondence? Do you have a copy of it down here?

6 VOICE: (inaudible).

7 MCCOY: Okay, so after the meeting, George will
8 give you a call. You all see if you can figure out what the
9 question is and what the answer is.

10 FREDERICK: Here's the last one for you, Jim. Our
11 records show that the LER 9006 rev 0, that went before the Plant
12 Review Board on the 18th of April, did not say anything about
13 subsequent to a test program. After George's approval between
14 the 18th and the 19th when it was transmitted, there was a change
15 made, and the words, "subsequent to the test program," were
16 included. The number of diesel starts was changed to coincide
17 with the number of starts in the April 9th letter. He wants to
18 know who put the words "subsequent to the test program" in here.
19 Initially I've been told it happened in the telephone
20 conversation between two groups. One in corporate and one on the
21 plant site.

22 BOCKHOLD: Ken McCoy if you remember I believe it
23 happened between a group in your office and me. And we had some
24 discussions about it, and given the fact that I thought the
25 slides that I made the presentation with were correct, uh, and I
26 guess thinking more about it, because we talked to Pete Taylor

1 about it some. I thought that, you know -- I thought our
2 discussion that these were clarifying words and my initial
3 thought was they were no material change to the facts and they
4 were basically correct and that's why I agreed with it -- the
5 change that was initiated in corporate --

6 VOICE: (inaudible).

7 MCCOY: Bill does that sound like your
8 recollections.

9 SHIPMAN: Yes, sir.

10 MCCOY: All right, let's get that down in
11 writing here for George. That's my recollection too. In general
12 terms, I don't remember the specific words but I do remember the
13 discussion.

14 SHIPMAN: There was a lot of word engineering that
15 went into that response.

16 MCCOY: Okay, now that response was prepared
17 after we did the QA audit and had all that information?

18 BOCKHOLD: No, No, No. Let me bring you up to the
19 sequence of events.

20 MCCOY: Okay.

21 BOCKHOLD: Let me bring everybody up to the
22 sequence of events because it now involves corporate. Bill, can
23 you hear me?

24 SHIPMAN: Yes.

25 BOCKHOLD: Okay, the sequence of events: On the
26 weekend, me, Jimmy Paul, and Ken Burr and George Frederick, and

1 some others worked on transparencies that we were going to use in
2 our conference that occurred on Monday. Okay. Basically, Jimmy
3 Paul came up with the number of starts and Ken Burr and I came up
4 with the sequence. We put it together into general terms, so we
5 could discuss that. From that point on, then we went to the
6 conference with the NRC. We presented the slide. We really
7 didn't talk about the number of starts in the conference at all
8 because we got sidetracked with a bunch of other issues. On the
9 airplane ride back, you, being corporate, and Ken McCoy, and
10 George Hairston and whoever revised the letter and sent it out
11 that evening. It was dated the 9th. It was Monday evening.
12 Something like 10 days later, the 19th, okay, on the 18th, the
13 PRB came to me with a minor revision, took the numbers up from 18
14 and 19, respectively to a total of 20. I okayed that, and that
15 went to corporate. On the 20th, because of the number going up,
16 I think we felt that it would be better to keep the LER
17 consistent with the presentation. We lowered the number to 18
18 because of again, word engineering. We didn't want to have 18
19 and 19 and break the diesels a part. And then there was some
20 discussion about the preceding sentence, about the comprehensive
21 testing of the engine logic, and ...

22 MCCOY: One thing that I would like to add to
23 that. As I recall, the words were at least 18 --

24 BOCKHOLD: At least, the words say --

25 MCCOY: When the thing was brought up, to 20, it
26 didn't change the accuracy of what was in there...

1 BOCKHOLD: That's correct.

2 MCCOY: Was the reasoning.

3 BOCKHOLD: Any why I think we came up with 20, and

4 I'm only guessing at this point, and George is supposed to find

5 out. But why I think it was 20 was that we probably had within

6 that week, we had another diesel start. In one case we probably

7 had two, and one engine we had another diesel start. But I don't

8 remember why the PRB had 20; do you remember, John?

9 AUFDENKAMPE: Yeah, it was Tom, Tom Webb wrote the LER

10 and what he did was take the numbers from the April 9 letter and

11 worked from April 9th forward and added the rest of them on to

12 that.

13 BOCKHOLD: Well, that corresponds with why I would

14 guess 20 would be okay, because, you know, we had another engine

15 start --

16 AUFDENKAMPE: But then there were some questions in

17 the PRB about whether 20 was an accurate number or not, if that's

18 where it came from. Then the question was whether 18 and 19 was

19 accurate. That's when we had a phone call Friday night with you

20 and Alan and me and Bill Shipman and, I think, Paul Rushton and

21 Jim Bailey. We talked on Friday night trying to iron out the

22 LER. The discussion was what was meant by, where we got the

23 numbers in the April 9th letter.

24 BOCKHOLD: Okay, so you were -- I don't remember,

25 you know, that all those people were in on it.

26 MCCOY: Yeah.

1 BOCKHOLD: So everybody then agreed on at least 18?
2
3 VOICE: Nope.
4 BOCKHOLD: Given the facts, if the transparency had
5 been correct.
6 AUFDENKAMPE: Everybody agreed that based on what you
7 identified as the starting point for counting that the 18 and 19
8 were correct.
9 BOCKHOLD: Okay, George, did you hear that?
10 FREDERICK: Part of it.
11 BOCKHOLD: What John just said.
12 AUFDENKAMPE: You told everybody, well everybody
13 there, that the 18 and 19 were based on completion of the
14 comprehensive test program.
15 BOCKHOLD: Associated with the logic.
16 AUFDENKAMPE: I don't recall that.
17 BOCKHOLD: Yeah well, that's basically what the
18 transparency said.
19 AUFDENKAMPE: Based on that issue, or based on that
20 statement everybody agreed that 18 and 19 (inaudible).
21 FREDERICK: Okay.
22 BOCKHOLD: Friday evening phone call with John, and
23 Alan, and who else and Bill Shipman.
24 AUFDENKAMPE: Bill Shipman, Jim Bailey, Bailey was
25 (inaudible).

1 BOCKHOLD: That was the phone call. Okay, so the
2 trail of fact is that I believed the transparency to be correct.
3 And then Tom Webb added some numbers on, but that appeared, in my
4 mind, appeared to be confusing. And there was some discussion,
5 that John went on about it, okay, that then we got at least 18
6 because the transparency's correct. And the other words got in
7 here on what the completion of the test program was, in my mind,
8 that was associated with the logic and the control testing which
9 really didn't involve diesel starts at all. It involved the air
10 system.

11 MCCOY: (inaudible).

12 MCCOY: (inaudible).

13 SHIPMAN: Yeah, the way this thing originally came
14 up was when the LER came up with I think, it was 21 and 22, or
15 something like that. George Hairston asked a question, "Well, we
16 went to Atlanta, and we told them 18 and 19, and now the number's
17 21 and 22. Are we sure that the number's right? You know, we
18 had this conference call that John's talking about to try to make
19 sure the number was right. Coming out of that phone call, as I
20 recall it, the decision was that we would be completely safe if
21 we said, "greater than 18."

22 AUFDENKAMPE: Given what we identified as the starting
23 point for that count.

24 BOCKHOLD: Right.

25 FREDERICK: What -- where the confusion factors,
26 Bill, was when we threw in the starting point. That's what has

1 kind of thrown a monkey in the wrench, or the wrench in the
2 monkey, whatever you want to call it.

3 SHIPMAN: How about a monkey wrench in the works?

4 FREDERICK: Yeah. What happened was when we decided
5 to define the starting point, we fuzzed the whole picture up.

6 BOCKHOLD: Yeah, I think, you know, hindsight is
7 20/20. It would have been best to leave the first little part of
8 that phrase out completely.

9 DOMBY: Let me ask a question.

10 FREDERICK: That's what he's asking. Where did that
11 come from?

12 DOMBY: That Friday night meeting, does anybody
13 disagree with John's recollection about who were the participants
14 on that phone call?

15 AUFDENKAMPE: I know it was definitely me and Alan,
16 and George, and Bill Shipman.

17 VOICE: (inaudible).

18 AUFDENKAMPE: Bill, do you remember who else was there
19 with you on that Friday phone call?

20 SHIPMAN: No, I don't remember, but I know there
21 were several of us. Louis just said he was involved, and Paul,
22 and Jim, and Jack were involved. This was one of those, "We've
23 got to get this thing right so George will sign it out," last
24 minute exercises.

25 VOICE: (inaudible).

1 SHIPMAN: We had practically everybody up here and
2 practically everybody down there that was available on the phone
3 call.

4 FREDERICK: Well, I think I can describe that one.

5 BOCKHOLD: Okay.

6 FREDERICK: I can talk to Jim Bailey after the
7 meeting on the other one.

8 MCCOY: Okay.

9 MCCOY: Is there anything else that we need on
10 this?

11 BOCKHOLD: (inaudible) We'll talk about that after
12 the meeting.

13 MCCOY: Okay. Let's go on to the next one.

14 BOCKHOLD: One comment that Jim had. He's not
15 going to make it by 5:00.

16 MCCOY: Well, we're going to have to give him
17 what we got.

18 BOCKHOLD: Okay, we'll just give them what we got
19 at 5:00.

20 SWARTZWELDER: What we've reviewed by 5:00?

21 MCCOY: We're going to give them what we got.

22 SWARTZWELDER: We're going to have a lot of comments
23 (inaudible).

24 MCCOY: The problem is they're going to have an
25 exit on Friday and they have got to decide and we got to decide
26 whether we understand their issues and they understand our

1 positions, and get that all resolved tomorrow. Now, the NRC is
2 meeting at 5:00. We won't have another team meeting probably
3 until tomorrow afternoon and so we've got to be sure we
4 understand the team members' concern and what we've written down
5 as the NRC issue, fully expresses their concern, uh, for one
6 thing, and they need, each of their people need to know what
7 facts we have and what information we have at this point. We can
8 continue to work after that. I guess the exposure on this
9 (inaudible) is that (inaudible conversation).

10 BOCKHOLD: This LER, about (inaudible) -- so it's
11 not (inaudible). It doesn't coordinate with anything, so we're
12 not going to give him that one.

13

14 [pendlant1] H:\wpdocs\tlp\license.pro\tapes.int\original.512\253-ex48