I-MOSBA-48 8-15-40, (OSI INSP)

DOCKETED
USNRC

'95 JUL 27 P4:38

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

TAPE NO. 253, SIDE 1

VOICE: (Laughing.)

VOICE: You (inaudible) out on the venture?

VOICE: I don't care. That was very entertaining.

VOICE: (Inaudible).

VOICE: No, it's not out there today.

VOICE: (Inaudible).

VOICE: Yeah, it has been painted now.

VOICE: Yes, it has.

VOICE: (Inaudible) waste of taken care of; get rid of that problem.

VOICE: The question is: Where is the computer?

VOICE: Yeah, that's the other question. I think that's the one that disappeared.

VOICE: Yeah.

VOICE: That's all there is.

VOICE: I found just one (inaudible).

VOICE: What's that?

VOICE: My wife made up fresh.

VOICE: Oh.

VOICE: That's where it just came from.

VOICE: Got a lump problem or?

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION Int. II-48
Docket No. 50-424/425-OLA-3 EXHIBIT NO.
In the matter of Georgia Power Co. et al., Vogtle Units 1 & 2
☐ Staff ☐ Applicant ☑ Intervenor ☐ Other
☑ Identified ☑ Received ☐ Rejected Reporter KHW
Date 7/18/95 Witness Mosbaugh

Off. II-48

TAPE 253, PAGE 5, LINE 3 THROUGH PAGE 21, LINE 21

McCoy: (inaudible) the meeting. We're trying to go through what our positions are. We need to do this by five o'clock, ~~so~~ we're going to give these positions to the NRC, so they can have their team meeting in the meeting, and go over all these divisions and be sure ~~their system is~~ what they think the concerns are. Tomorrow morning, George and I are going to meet with the team leader from the NRC to see if we can resolve any misunderstandings -- ~~to see~~ where we are at fault, the ~~cross~~ purposes ~~are~~ on not hitting the targets, so with that kind of background, George, ~~and I (inaudible)~~.

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

(no response)

~~Voice~~: BOCKHOLD: Okay.

McCoy: One thing I noticed on this is that you did not put a revision number or anything on these each time it got revised. AND I WOULD SUGGEST THAT WE ALL GO THROUGH RIGHT NOW AND JUST MARK THE CURRENT PACKAGE WE HAVE AS REV 1.

Bockhold: Well, I put time and date.

McCoy: You have time and date?

Bockhold: Right here.

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

Bockhold: Okay, so we're going to read -- everybody's going to George Frederick's item. We're going to go ahead and comment if we've got any questions. Why don't we ~~have~~ ASK Teresa come down, and get a new package, that corporate doesn't have, and fax it to them right away?

AND THEN,

THEY'RE CONSISTANT WITH

BECAUSE

THAT MIGHT EXIST

WHY DON'T YOU TAKE OVER.

IF

WE SHOULD

PAS

AND YOU CAN'T TELL, YOU KNOW,

OR ISSUES

TO

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

Shipman: We're sure we don't, KEN.

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

~~Voice~~: SHIPMAN ~~okay~~. UNDERSTAND. I WANT TO SAY AFTE

Bockhold: On the second page, ~~there's~~ OF George's item. I'm not sure what THE WORD "immediate" means. ~~Let's say a item~~ notification of the residents AND NRC REGION II. The revised LER was prepared.

Voice: (inaudible)

Voice: (inaudible)

Bailey: Don't you remember we wrote that letter on the way back?

McCoy: Yeah, that's right. It has the same ~~day~~ DATE.

Bailey: Yes.

Bockhold: Mike Horton. Your item two, is there a reason for why we have not always reported. GOES BACK TO THE LATE 87-88 (INAUDIBLE)

Horton: I'm sure there is. UH, I DON'T WHAT THAT REASON IS. UH, THIS

Bockhold: WHY DON'T YOU ADD A SENTENCE THAT SUMMARIZES (inaudible)

MULTIPLE VOICES: (INAUDIBLE)

~~Bockhold/ ??????~~

~~Kurtzenkamper~~: BOCKHOLD: Well, maybe you need to see the documentation Mike. And Mike and Rick (inaudible) very clear~~ly to~~ screwed up. (INAUDIBLE)

Voice: (inaudible)

Bockhold: Well, that's right. We screwed up and we got a fairly massive effort to figure out what was all those failures.

Voice: (inaudible)

Voice: (inaudible) ORIGINALLY WE DENIED THE VIOLATION (INAUDIBLE)

Multiple Voices

Bockhold: You can read the document, basically, if something new comes out. You can read the documentation ~~quietly~~, and if something new comes out, then you can ~~rediscover~~ -- This is violation number 1 ~~for sure~~. Do we want to add Stu Ebneter in here? You notified Brockman right, Ken. (INAUDIBLE)

(INAUDIBLE)

(INAUDIBLE) TO SAY WE'RE GUILTY AND YOU CAN PREPARE A SPECIAL REPORT

McCoy: Bill Shipman.

Bockhold: Okay, Bill Shipman notified Brockman ~~right now~~. You want to add - you have never interviewed? STEW EBNETER

McCoy: Bill?

Shipman: Yes, sir.

McCoy: What we're talking about is that there's a ZERO, statement in here that says, "Therefore, when Vogtle Management was aware of the problem in the LER 9006 rev, NRC Region II was notified including the Chief of Reactor Projects, Ken Brockman.

(inaudible)

Well, anyway, I think we should put in here that ~~Stu~~ STEW Ebneter was notified ~~(inaudible) was going for that,~~ also.

Shipman: George Hairston called Stu according to George.

McCOY: YEAH.

Bockhold: So why don't, want to put the names ~~in~~ AND not the, the titles? Including Ken Brockman and Stu Ebneter.

Voice: And George, you all talked to the resident.

Bockhold: I talked to the resident. I TALKED TO THE RESIDENT.

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

Bockhold: Why don't you say, George, FREDERICK, WHY DON'T YOU SAY ~~started (inaudible) to say,~~ "~~excluding~~ INCLUDING the residents, Ken Brockman and Stu Ebneter?" I think I notified Ron Aiello, but I can't remember. IT WAS One of the residents. AT THIS POINT.

Voice: (inaudible)

Bockhold: "Including the NRC residents, Ken Brockman." WHY DON'T YOU Why don't you say including the NRC residents, and NRC Region II, Ken Brockman and Stu Ebneter. ~~You want to~~ just move the sentence up. After notification of the NRC the revised LER was prepared.

McCoy: THAT The only thing I WOULD think on ~~this~~ THAT IS THAT I'M not sure THAT the revised LER wasn't in some form of ~~after notification and the NRC to revise preparation on revision~~ PREPERATION-REVISION. I think ~~that~~ what brought it to our attention was the LER ~~that~~ had numbers on it that ~~was~~ WERE different than the original VERSION. ~~thing.~~ THE FACT THAT

WE MIGHT WANT TO SAY INSTEAD OF "THE REVISED LER WAS PREPARED," "THE REVISED LER WAS SUBMITTED."

Voice: (inaudible)

Bockhold: We struggled through about four or five different revs. The LERs ~~are~~ WERE different.

McCoy: (inaudible). On this paragraph two, we're going to have to ~~==~~ MAKE THAT (INAUDIBLE). ONE THING ON THESE PAPERS IS WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO BE CLEAR (INAUDIBLE).

Bockhold: Well, item == (INAUDIBLE)

Voice: (inaudible)

Bockhold: (INAUDIBLE) Company's position on the NRC issue -- "After thorough review --"

~~Voice~~: McCOY: (inaudible) THE ISSUE ABOUT THE DIESELS AND THE LETTERS AND ALL THAT, THAT'S NOT IN HERE AT ALL.

Fredericks: That's what worries me, ~~who prepared slides for April 6~~ (inaudible). [SEE INSERT 1]

McCoy: Jim Bailey, did you ~~mean~~ HEAR that QUESTION?

Bailey: We prepared it here, ~~audit~~ AND IT was approved by Hairston.

McCoy: I guess we would say that I prepared that. I worked with you on the preparation, right?

~~Voice~~: BAILEY: ~~Okay.~~ CORRECT.

McCoy: So why don't we say that KEN ~~Tom~~ McCoy and Jim Bailey prepared the letter which was signed by ~~==~~ GEORGE HAIRSTON IN BIRMINGHAM.

Fredericks: On the initial LER 90-06, IT REV 0, who prepared that? Who approved ~~this~~ IT, and who reviewed on the PRB? I can get the PRB membership from various meetings. There's gonna be quite a few. I can also get who prepared it from the NSAC staff. I think ~~you~~ approved it is obvious it ~~does~~ GOES out under Hairston's signature. Mr. WHO

McCoy: That's right. We have a blue sheet with EVERY LER, ~~we use up there.~~ IT HAS THE REVIEW UP THERE. WE CAN LOOK AT THAT AND SEE WHO REVIEWED THAT ONE. I KNOW, WELL I'M NOT SURE ABOUT THAT O

[INSERT]

Fredericks: The next question that I have that involves corporate is: Who prepared the cover letter for ~~LER~~ 9006 rev one? That's the transmittal letter that Mr. Hairston signed. He wan[illegible] to know what the attempt of that paragraph ~~which (inaudible) is~~ WAS MEANT TO DO IN clarifying the LER ~~9006~~ rev 0. He's not sure ~~he~~ IT actually did anything to clarify the diesel start that was described in the original LER.

FREDERICK: JIM, IS JIM BAILEY THERE?

BAILEY: Yes.

FREDERICK: JIM, I'LL CALL YOU AFTER THE MEETING AND GET THE PARTICULARS ON THAT BLUE SHEET TO ANSWER THAT QUESTION.

INSERT 1

Frederick: I started work on some of this, for instance, there's an open question on, who prepared the slides for the 4/9 presentation; who prepared them and who proofed them?

Bockhold: The slides, I did.

Frederick: Both?

Bockhold: I worked with Jimmy Paul Cash and Ken Burr. The three of us worked on it. I might have put the bullets down and then got Ken Burr to make sure that the, uh, organized sequence was correct.

Frederick: Uh, the second question was who prepared and who approved the confirmatory action letter?

Fredericks: ~~Well~~, So, I need to talk to, and I think it's Harry Majors, but -- and he may be out of town, and I may have to talk to Jack Stringfellow.

McCoy: Why don't you all go ahead and pull that piece of correspondence? Do you have a copy of ~~that~~? IT DOWN HERE?

Voice: (inaudible)

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

Fredericks: Here's the last one for you Jim. Our records show that the LER9006 rev 0, ~~(inaudible)~~ THAT WENT BEFORE THE PLANT REVIEW BOARD on the 18th of April, did not say anything about subsequent a test program. After George's approval between the 18th and the 19th ~~with the transmittal~~ WHEN IT WAS TRANSMITTED, there was a change made, and the words, "subsequent to the test program," were included. The number of diesel starts was changed to coincide with the number of starts in the April 9th ~~list~~ LETTER. ~~We~~ wants to know who put the words, "subsequent to the test program" in here. Initially I've been told it happened in the telephone conversation between two groups. One ~~is~~ IN corporate and one on the plant ~~side~~ SITE.

Bockhold: Ken McCoy if you remember I believe it happened between a group in your office and me. And we had some discussions about it, and given the fact ~~they~~ THAT I thought the slides that I made the presentation ~~was~~ correct, ~~And I am~~ UH, AND I GUESS thinking more about it, because we talked to Pete Taylor about it some. I thought that, you know -- I thought our discussion that ~~we had was~~ clarifying words and my initial thought was ~~there~~ were no material change to the facts and they were basically correct and that's why I agreed with it. The change that was initiated in corporate -- THESE WERE THEY

Voice: (inaudible)

McCoy: Bill does that sound like your recollections.

Shipman: Yes, sir.

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

Shipman: There was a lot of word engineering that went into that response.

McCoy: Okay, now that response was prepared after we did the QA audit and did all that information/? HAD

Bockhold: No, No, No.

~~Voice:~~ ~~No, no, no.~~

Bockhold: Let me bring you up to THE sequence of events.

~~Voice~~: McCoy: Okay.

Bockhold: Let me bring everybody up to THE sequenCE of events because it now involves corporate. Bill, can you hear me?

~~Voice~~: SHIPMAN: Yes.

Bockhold: Okay, the sequence of events: On the THE weekend, me, Jimmy Paul, and Ken Burr and George Fredericks, and some others worked on transparencies that we were going to use in our conference that occurred on Monday. OKAY. Basically, Jimmy Paul came up with ~~a~~ numbering of starts and Ken Burr and I came up with the sequence. We put it together into general terms, ~~when~~ we could discuss that. SO From that point on, then we went to the conference with the NRC. We presented the slide. We really didn't talk IN about the number of starts at the conference at all. We got sidetracked with a bunch of other issues. On the airplane ride back, you being ~~the~~ corporate, and Ken BECAUSE McCoy, and George Hairston and whoever revised the letter and sent it out that evening. It was dated the 9th. It was Monday evening. Something like 10 days later, the 19th, okay, on the 18th, the PRB came to me with a minor revision, took the numbers up from 18 and 19, respectively to a total of 20. I okayed that, and that went to corporate. On the 20th, because the OF numbers going up, I think we felt that it would be ED better to keep the LER consistent with the presentation. we lower the number to 18 because of again, word engineering. We didn't want to have 18 and 19 and break A the diesels ~~with the~~ part. And then there was some discussion about the preceding sentence, about the comprehensive testing of the engine logic, AND ...

McCoy: One thing that I would like to add to that. As I ~~was~~ ~~told~~, the words were at least 18 -- RECALL,

Bockhold: AT LEAST, THE Words say --

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

Bockhold: That's correct.

, IF THAT'S WHERE IT CAME FROM. THEN THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER 18 AND 19 WAS ACCURATE.

~~Voice~~: McCoy: ~~(inaudible)~~, WAS THE REASONING.

Bockhold: And why I think we came up with 20, and I'm only guessing at this point, and George is supposed to find out. But why I think it was 20 was that we probably had within that week, we had another diesel start. In one case we probably had two, and one engine we had another diesel start. But I don't remember why the PRB had 20; do you remember, John?

[SEE INSERT TWO]

Aufdenkampe: ~~Yeah, it was Tom Webb who wrote the LER worked from April 9 forward and he took the numbers from the April 9th letter one -- added the rest of them on to that.~~

Bockhold: Well, that corresponds with why I would guess 20 would be okay, cause, you know, we had another engine start --

Aufdenkampe: But then there were some questions in the PRB about whether 20 was an accurate number or not. That's when we had a phone call Friday night with you and Alan and me and Bill Shipman and Paul Rush and Jim Bailey.

Bockhold: Okay, so you were -- I don't remember, you know, that all those people were in on it.

McCoy: Yeah.

VOICE: NOPE.
BOCKHOLD:

Bockhold: So everybody then agreed on at least 18? ~~Well, no --~~ Given the facts, if the transparency had been correct.

Aufdenkampe: Everybody agreed that based on what you identified as the starting point for counting that the 18 and 19 were correct.

[SEE INSERT 3]

~~Bockhold~~: ~~Okay, George do you hear that? (inaudible). You told everybody~~ --

~~Voice~~: ~~(inaudible)~~

~~Voice~~: ~~(inaudible)~~

~~Bockhold~~: ~~Right, yeah, that's basically transparency~~ -.

Aufdenkampe: Based on that issue, or based on that statement everyone's agreed.

Voice: FREDERICK: Okay.

~~Voice~~: BOCKHOLD: Friday evening phone call with John, and Alan, and Bill Shipman.

~~Voice~~: AUFDENKAMPE: ~~(inaudible)~~ BILL SHIPMAN, JIM BAILEY, BAILEY WAS (INAUDIBLE)

WE TALKED ON FRIDAY NIGHT TRYING TO IRON OUT THE LER. THE DISCUSSION WAS WHAT WAS MEANT BY, WHERE WE GOT THE NUMBERS

INSERT 2

Aufdenkampe: Yeah, it was Tom, Tom Webb wrote the LER and what he did was take the numbers from the April 9 letter and worked from April 9th forward and added the rest of them on to that.

INSERT 3

Bockhold: Okay, George, did you hear that?

Frederick: Part of it.

Bockhold: What John just said.

Aufdenkampe: You told everybody, well everybody there, that the 18 and 19 were based on completion of the comprehensive test program.

Bockhold: Associated with the logic.

Aufdenkampe: I don't recall that.

Bockhold: Yeah well, that's basically what the transparency said.

Bockhold: That was the phone call. Okay, so the trail of fact is that I believe the transparency ~~is~~ correct. And then Tom Webb added some numbers on, but that appeared, in my mind, appeared to be confusing. And there was some ~~construction~~ discussion that John went on about it, okay, that then we got at least 18 because transparency ~~was~~ correct. The other words got ~~it. Upon~~ completion of the test program was, in my mind, that was associated with the logic and the control testing which really didn't involve diesel starts at all. It involved the air system.

McCoy: (inaudible)

McCoy: (inaudible)

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

Aufdenkampe: Given what we identified as the starting point for that count.

~~Voice~~: Bockhold: Right.

Fredericks: What -- where ~~were~~ the confusion factors, Bill, was when we threw in the starting point. That's what ~~(inaudible)~~ has kind of thrown a monkey in the wrench, or the wrench in the monkey, whatever you want to call it.

~~Voice:~~ ~~(inaudible)~~

Shipman: How about a monkey wrench in the works?

Fredericks: Yeah. What happened was when we ~~started~~ decided to define the starting point, we fuzzed ~~all~~ the picture up. Whole

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

Fredericks: ~~Part of that~~. Where did that ~~phrase~~ come from? Let me ask a question. That's what he's asking.

~~Voice~~: Domby: That Friday night meeting, ~~(inaudible)~~ Does anybody disagree with John's recollection about who were the participants on that phone call?

Aufdenkampe: I know definitely ~~one~~ Alan, George, and Bill Shipman. It was me and George and Bill.

Voice: (inaudible)

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

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

Voice: (inaudible)

Shipman: ~~You've got (inaudible)~~ WE HAD PRACTICALLY EVERY body up here and ~~(inaudible)~~ PARCTICALLY EVERY body down there that was available on the phone call.

Fredericks: Well, I think I can describe that one.

~~Voice~~: BOCKHOLD: Okay.

~~Voice~~: FREDERICK: ~~Okay.~~ I CAN TALK TO JIM BAILEY AFTER THE MEETING ON THE OTHER ONE.

~~Voice~~: McCOY: ~~(inaudible)~~ OKAY.

McCoy: ~~(inaudible)~~ Is THERE anything else that WE NEED ON THIS? ~~(inaudible)~~ --

~~Voice~~: BOCKHOLD: (inaudible) WE'LL TALK ABOUT THAT AFTER THE MEETING.

[INSERT]

McCoy: ~~Okay, we'll just~~ WELL, WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO give him ~~all~~ we got. WHAT

~~Voice~~: BOCKHOLD: ~~Fine.~~ OKAY, WE'LL JUST GIVE THEM WHAT WE GOT AT 5:00.

~~Voice~~: SWARTZWELDER: What we 'VE reviewed BY 5:00? ~~(inaudible)~~ --

~~Voice~~: McCOY: ~~(inaudible)~~ WE'RE GOING TO GIVE THEM WHAT WE GOT.

~~Voice~~: SWARTZWELDER: ~~(inaudible)~~ WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A LOT OF COMMENTS (INAUDIBLE).

[INSERT 4]

~~Voice~~: ~~I don't know. This (inaudible)~~ .

~~Voice~~: ~~(inaudible)~~

~~Voice~~: ~~(inaudible)~~

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

McCOY: OKAY. LET'S GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.

BOCKHOLD: ONE COMMENT THAT JIM HAD. HE'S NOT GOING TO MAKE IT BY 5:00.

INSERT 4

McCoy: The problem is they're going to have an exit on Friday and they have got to decide and we got to decide whether we understand their issues and they understand our positions, and get that all resolved tomorrow. Now, the NRC is meeting at 5:00. We won't have another team meeting probably until tomorrow afternoon and so we've got to be sure we understand the team members' concern and what we've written down as the NRC issue, fully expresses their concern, uh, for one thing, and they need, each of their people need to know what facts we have and what information we have at this point. We can continue to work after that. I guess the exposure on this (inaudible) is that (inaudible conversation).