

Board (PRB) Meeting, and ultimately to acknowledge his role in count errors. The failure of the PRB to address accuracy concerns demonstrates that GPC lacked the questioning attitude that we would expect in assuring the accuracy of communications with the NRC.

The Board is confident, however, that throughout these events, GPC assured that the DGs were reliable and operable. GPC fell short in these instances, however, with respect to the level of importance and diligence accorded communications to the NRC *and* promptly resolving concerns that information provided to the NRC may be inaccurate or incomplete. It can be said that these failures resulted from a "cavalier" attitude about NRC communications and a tendency sometimes to fix the words rather than to check and recheck the facts. It is evident, however, that Mr. Bockhold's management style contributed to an atmosphere where site employees were reluctant to question the accuracy or completeness of communications to the NRC, unless they had information that directly contradicted information to be submitted to the NRC. In addition, subjective assessment of the validity of Intervenor's concerns also clouded GPC's judgment as Messrs. Greene, Horton, Majors, and Frederick were quick to discount (and failed to resolve) concerns raised by Intervenor about accuracy and completeness of the June 29 cover letter to the LER. The reluctance to question correspondence generated or revised by superiors and to determine the accuracy and completeness of information submitted to the NRC contributed (1) to the four month delay before GPC corrected the April 9 count and (2) the four year delay (until the issuance of the NOV) in GPC squarely addressing the failures of the General Manager and others to insure complete and accurate communications to the NRC.