I-MOSBA-68

INT. EXH. 68
NRC STAFF EXH. 19
TAPE 184
DATE: 8-30-90
TR. 15-23 (NRC Smooth)

BOCKHOLD: I prefer "appear."

VOICE: (Inaudible).

HORTON: Sounds like we don't know.

(Inaudible conversation).

GREENE: What we need to do is just be factual.

GREENE: What are the facts?

VOICE: (Inaudible).

GREENE: What are the facts relating to (inaudible)? What do we know?

VOICE: That's what we said.

VOICE: (Inaudible).

VOICE: (Inaudible).

BOCKHOLD: Actually, maybe the first section should be the confusion in the April 9th letter and the original LER appeared to be the results of two factors. First, there was confusion in distinction between successful start and a valid start, and in truth, that was an NRC confusion. They thought we were telling them something different than what we were telling them.

AUFDENKAMPE: (Inaudible).

BOCKHOLD: You know, and really the second thing is we screwed up in our count.

VOICE: (Inaudible) Okay.

1

1	VOICE:	(Inaudible) Yeah.
2		Or this second thing...
3	VOICE:	What's a valid start?
4	VOICE:	By definition?
5	VOICE:	Yeah.
6	GREENE:	I know what valid test is.
7	BOCKHOLD:	Okay, so we're going to say the confusion
8	--	
9	VOICE:	(Inaudible).
10	VOICE:	(Inaudible).
11	VOICE:	You're right.
12	HORTON:	A valid test is a defined term. A valid
13	successful test (inaudible) is a defined term.	
14	HORTON:	A valid successful start is not a defined
15	term.	
16	BOCKHOLD:	Why don't we say valid test?
17	VOICE:	(Inaudible) You can't link those two words
18	there.	
19	VOICE:	(Inaudible).
20	BOCKHOLD:	The confusion in the April 9th letter and
21	the original LER appear to be the result of two factors. First,	
22	there was confusion in the distinction between a successful start	
23	and a valid test.	
24	BOCKHOLD:	That's much better. I like that
25	paragraph.	
26	GREENE:	How did you change those words so far?

2

```
 1          BOCKHOLD:        I just said -- I changed the -- instead of

 2    the errors, I said the confusion in the April 9th letter and the

 3    original LER appear to be the result of two factors.  So I changed

 4    the term, errors to confusion, and then I said, first there was

 5    confusion in the distinction between successful start and a valid

 6    test.  And I left everything else the same.

 7          VOICE:          (Inaudible).

 8          VOICE:          (Inaudible) The second sentence, in other

 9    words, also refers to the confusion.

10          BOCKHOLD:       You've got confusion twice.

11          VOICE:          (Inaudible) We refer to confusion twice.

12          VOICE:          No.  We don't know (inaudible).

13          BOCKHOLD:       I mean, English-wise, it's better to mix

14    up the words, then to be technically correct.  Say you're an

15    engineer and you use the same term over again.  Good thing you're

16    an engineer and not an English major.

17          FREDERICK:      You would take error out of the last

18    sentence and say, "second, confusion?"

19          BOCKHOLD:       No, I'm willing to accept that that...

20    That is fine, error is fine.  You know, we say error in the first

21    paragraph and we say error here.

22          HORTON:         You might want to change that to start

23    (inaudible) -- in the middle sentence -- the last sentence in

24    quotes "valid successful start" (inaudible) in 108.

25          VOICE:          (Inaudible).

26          BOCKHOLD:       There   is   no   such   thing   as   valid,
```

1   successful start from 108?

2   VOICE: (Inaudible).

3   BOCKHOLD: Okay, so it's a valid, successful start

4   and that's an important comment.

5   VOICE: (Inaudible).

6   BOCKHOLD: Why did somebody put that in quotations if

7   its not in 108?

8   VOICE: (Inaudible).

9   VOICE: We need to (inaudible).

10   BOCKHOLD: You read 108. How could -- you know, how

11   could you put it in quotations, if you're not quoting from

12   something?

13   VOICE: (Inaudible).

14   AUFDENKAMPE: Those three words were in here a lot.

15   VOICE: What, valid successful --

16   VOICE: They start together.

17   VOICE: (Inaudible).

18   VOICE: (Inaudible).

19   VOICE: Now, let's go to the last paragraph.

20   VOICE: Last paragraph.

21   VOICE: Last sentence last paragraph on the first

22   page.

23   FREDERICK: When we talk about this initial count of

24   diesel generators -- it implies they were recounted. I would say

25   that we should change that last sentence to say: second, an error

26   was made by the individual who performed the count of diesel

4

1   generator starts before April 9th, or whatever.

2   VOICE: I take it --

3   FREDERICK: I wouldn't say initial, and I would define

4   the date you're talking about.

5   AUFDENKAMPE: I do think initial's right because it was

6   the first time they were counted. They have been counted many

7   times since then.

8   FREDERICK: It implies they were counted more than

9   once.

10   GREENE: Why not make a reference to the

11   presentation here?

12   FREDERICK: That's what I'm talking about.

13   HORTON: I think we need to make a -- let's clarify

14   something. Let's make a reference to what the heck we're talking

15   about there.

16   VOICE: The April 9th letter.

17   HORTON: What did you call the diesel testing?

18   VOICE: (Inaudible).

19   BOCKHOLD: Okay, second, the error was made by the

20   individual who performed the count of diesel starts for --

21   VOICE: The April 9th letter --

22   BOCKHOLD: (continuing) -- let's just say, for -- the

23   NRC presentation. For the NRC, April 9th presentation.

24   VOICE: (Inaudible).

25   VOICE: (Inaudible).

26   VOICE: For the April 9th letter.

1	VOICE:	Okay.
2	VOICE:	You can put --
3	BOCKHOLD:	The April 9th letter that's fine.
4	AUFDENKAMPE:	Okay, now that we've changed valid starts

to valid tests, would you say that there was confusion between
successful starts and valid tests?

7	VOICE:	Well, it doesn't --
8	AUFDENKAMPE:	It changes that sentence.
9	VOICE:	Which one? The one he (inaudible)?
10	AUFDENKAMPE:	It changes that sentence.
11	GREENE:	(Inaudible) We don't know that part. Our

letter -- our data didn't have to do with starts. It had to with
running.

14	BOCKHOLD:	Well, we used start in the presentation.
15	VOICE:	Yeah, we used start.
16	BOCKHOLD:	That's why this is a start was considered

successful, when the diesel was started and either ran, or was
intentionally shut down due to testing in progress, as identified
on the attached table. We've made an engineering value judgment
about each one of these and we should defend our position.

21	VOICE:	(Inaudible).
22	VOICE:	I don't have any problems.
23	GREENE:	George, I don't know where you're at.
24	VOICE:	I was on the third sentence.
25	VOICE:	(Inaudible).
26	BOCKHOLD:	Well, let's -- I don't have any issues.

1   Who has issues on this last paragraph on the first page?

2   VOICE: (Inaudible).

3   VOICE: Second is the word start?

4   AUFDENKAMPE: First, there was confusion in the

5   distinction between a successful start and a valid test.

6   (inaudible) And you changed start to test?

7   VOICE: Okay.

8   AUFDENKAMPE: Now, I want to change that sentence to say

9   there was confusion between a successful start and a valid test.

10   VOICE: You're talking about the valid part again.

11   VOICE: Yeah.

12   VOICE: I don't know, but --

13   VOICE: Valid test

14   VOICE: (Inaudible).

15   AUFDENKAMPE: Well, was Jimmy confused about successful

16   starts and valid tests?

17   BOCKHOLD: No.

18   AUFDENKAMPE: Then, that sentence is in error.

19   BOCKHOLD: Okay, no. That sentence is not in error,

20   and maybe that sentence should go someplace else.

21   VOICE: (Inaudible).

22   VOICE: (Inaudible).

23   BOCKHOLD: Everybody else, you know, everybody else,

24   the more we got in to it, the more everybody got confused. On that

25   date, Jimmy wasn't confused. He thought he had counted successful

26   starts.

1 AUFDENKAMPE: (Inaudible) I'll withdraw the comment

2 because (inaudible). We aren't necessarily referring to confusion

3 by the counter. Everybody was confused.

4   VOICE: Well, general.

5   BOCKHOLD: There was general confusion.

6   VOICE: (Inaudible).

7   VOICE: (Inaudible) We were making the counts for

8 one purpose, and they were using their standard 108 nomenclature

9 when they were reading our letter and that confused them.

10   VOICE: (Inaudible).

11   BOCKHOLD: And we, ourselves, asked. When we tried

12 to count it the second time, we were confused about what was

13 counted the first time. Everybody was confused after the first

14 count. First count was easy, only one person did it.

15   GREENE: Are we through with that first page?

16   VOICE: I think so.

17   GREENE: Let's go to the second page.

18   VOICE: Okay.

19   VOICE: (Inaudible).

20   (laughing)

21   GREENE: Number 14 on the last line.

22   VOICE: Are we on the last paragraph?

23   VOICE: Yes.

24   GREENE: We're on the second page.

25   FREDERICK: The first sentence. The purpose of this

26 letter is to correct the figures related to the number of diesel

1 generator starts reported to the -- " Ah, -- that's the opening

2 line of the letter.

3   FREDERICK: We did a lot of starts.

4   FREDERICK: In the April 9th letter we talked about

5 successful starts, sequential starts, or whatever else we had. I

6 think that clarification in there --

7   VOICE: I'm getting lost (inaudible)   the

8 information -- I don't think so. Bill's got a good point. We're

9 gonna take it--

10   GREENE: What's that?

11   VOICE: Delete the sentence.

12   GREENE: You know, that's a great sentence if

13 that's the opening line opening line of the whole letter.

14   VOICE: Yeah. That should be the first sentence.

15   VOICE: Yeah, its a little bit long under. . . .

16   VOICE: Its kind of what it gives you, you know.

17   VOICE: That's kind of where the confusion is.

18   VOICE: Its a neat sentence.

19   BOCKHOLD: Wait a second. We're starting to English

20 this now, okay?

21   FREDERICK: I agree with Tom, George. It's at the end

22 of the letter and we state the purpose.

23   BOCKHOLD: Well, you're starting to do, you know,

24 you're starting to rewrite the whole letter at this point.

25   VOICE: (Inaudible).

26   BOCKHOLD: Actually, the purpose of this letter is to

9

1　correct the, you know, determine the figures, numbers related, you

2　know, we're (inaudible) Englishing it.

3　　　　　GREENE:　　　　Why don't we say this:　This letter

4　corrects the figures related to the number of diesel generator

5　starts, reported in the lette. of April 9th, or the April 9th

6　letter.

7　　　　　BOCKHOLD:　　　I think what we're doing is working on

8　English. You know, the standard English context of writing a good

9　letter is you put the purpose in paragraph one, then you put the

10　facts, and then you put the summary in the last paragraph. That's,

11　you know, 101 standard best way to write a letter. And yeah, we

12　can restart, rewrite this letter from scratch again. But I don't

13　believe that has anything to do upon the goodness or badness of

14　this letter, or whether it's factually correct or not. You know,

15　that's just another way -- that's better syntax, maybe in --

16　　　　　VOICE:　　　　Whether or not --

17　　　　[GPC, INT: BOCKHOLD] [NRC: VOICE]:　　　We're not being

18　graded on syntax at this point. We're getting graded on [NRC, GPC:

19　accuracy] [INT: accidents] for crying out loud.

20　　　　　GREENE:　　　　What's the message there --

21　　　　　VOICE:　　　　I want to go over this.

22　　　　　BOCKHOLD:　　　That was my side comment, and if

23　Birmingham likes this letter written this way, I don't -- that's

24　what we should do.

25　　　　　GREENE:　　　　Well, let me ask the PRB a question. Do

26　you believe that that sentence distracts from the message we're

1   delivering?

2   COURSEY: I don't think it matters one way or not -

3   really.

4   VOICE: (Inaudible).

5   VOICE: (Inaudible).

6   VOICE: It doesn't confuse what we're trying to

7   tell (inaudible).

8   VOICE: (Inaudible).

9   BOCKHOLD: I think you need that sentence there, or

10 you need to rewrite the whole letter, and put a new paragraph at

11 the beginning.

12   GREENE: You understand, of course, that if it gets

13 Englished -- in Birmingham --

14   BOCKHOLD: Yeah, if you gets re-Englished it needs to

15 come back to the PRB. I ain't gonna sign this one out without you

16 recommending to me unanimously to sign it out. Folks, I just ain't

17 doing it.

18   [Laughter.]

19   GREENE: Okay, let's go to the second sentence.

20 Any questions on the second? The third? Have we gone, gone back

21 and verified those numbers based on all of our comments?

22   VOICE: Let's count them.

23   VOICE: (Inaudible).

24   GREENE: I agree with that. Does anyone have any

25 problem with that? Let's go to the next sentence.

26   BOCKHOLD: What do you mean five post maintenance

1   starts?

2   VOICE: I count twenty-four start attempts.

3   BOCKHOLD: Excluding five post-maintenance starts.

4   No, we don't agree with that line.

5   HORTON: I'd like to exclude, say excluding four.

6   BOCKHOLD: [NRC, GPC: Why don't we] [INT: Why, why,

7   why, why don't we, why don't we, why don't we] say there were so

8   many start attempts, count them all, and then exclude -- why

9   exclude any of them?

10   HORTON: Hmm. There's no need to.

11   BOCKHOLD: There's no need to, for crying out loud.

12   VOICE: (Inaudible).

13   BOCKHOLD: That's right, there's no need to, so we're

14   going to strike excluding five post maintenance starts. We're

15   going to count, add five more into the 29. (Inaudible).

16   VOICE: I get twenty-one (inaudible).

17   BOCKHOLD: Twenty-one.

18

19

20   [penlant1] H:\wpdora\tlp\licenee.pro\tapes.int\164-ex.hrc

12