

[Words in bold reflect differences from Intervenor Exhibits II-63 and II-135]

**TRANSCRIPT OF CONVERSATION**  
**TAPE 157, JUNE 8, 1990**

'95 OCT 20 P5:06

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
DOCKETING & SERVICE  
BRANCH

Mosbaugh: Buttons work here?

Aufdenkampe: What buttons? Yeah.

Mosbaugh: Good. See what this is all about.

Operator: You have dialed an invalid location number. Please verify the number and place you call again.

Mosbaugh: Got an eight and then, and, Rushton's ...

Aufdenkampe: The phone's too fast, for, to pick up the microwave.

Mosbaugh: Didn't the first eight or so.... Shhh.  
(Phone rings)

Rushton: Paul Rushton.

Mosbaugh: Yeah. Paul, this is Allen.

Rushton: Hey, Allen.

Mosbaugh: I understood from Teresa that you wanted to talk to me.

Rushton: Yeah, I did. I'm trying to get the, uh, background on that, uh, LER for the diesel generator starts.

Mosbaugh: Uh, huh.

Rushton: And, uh, we had originally reported at least eighteen and now we're gonna report that was an error, and that it was, uh, I think fifteen and fourteen, respectively, was the correct numbers. And, uh, Tom Greed told me that you had the background on that, 'cause, uh, I'm gonna need to explain it to management up here.

Mosbaugh: I think John Aufdenkampe has been talking to Jim Bailey about that.

9512200075 951006  
PDR ADDOCK 05000424  
T PDR

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
Docket No. 50-424/425-OLA-3 EXHIBIT NO. II-35A  
In the matter of Georgia Power Co. et al., Vogtle Units 1 & 2  
 Staff  Applicant  Intervenor  Other  
 Identified  Received  Rejected Reporter SD  
Date 10/6/95 Witnesses \_\_\_\_\_

Rushton: Yeah? I got, uh, part of that story, uh, John wasn't real clear in listening to John about a couple of things. Like, uh uh, I understand that the eighteen came from a tally of the starts logged in the control room operator's log. And that when we went back and filled out the diesel generator log that engineering maintained, they came up, counted them differently, and, um, it wasn't clear to me why one log has got eighteen or more but the other log only counts fifteen or fourteen.

Mosbaugh: Okay, I didn't under...  
(noise of can sliding)

Rushton: ....two logs.

Mosbaugh: Yeah, well, I guess you'd have to ask the operations people about how they keep their logs. They initiate both logs. They initiate the log in the control room and they initiate the data sheets that count the starts. So, why don't you call, uh, Jim Swartzwelder or somebody about that?

Rushton: So you don't know what the history is on this thing?

Mosbaugh: Uh, I know some of the history because, um, I was, uh, in the PRB when we, uh, approved the revision to the LER. And, uh, I can only tell you that any differences between the logs that operations generate that fills out data sheets, uh, versus the logs that they maintain in the main control room that I, uh, that you would have to ask Jim Swartzwelder why there are discrepancies between their logs.

Rushton: Okay.

Mosbaugh: And, I-I'm not sure that that that fact, uh, explains all the discrepancies. I-I do not believe actually that that fact - that fact is a discrepancy but that fact does not explain the discrepancies and the reason why the previous, uh, numbers were incorrect. I believe that mistakes were made in the previous, uh, numbers. And that, uh, that probably started, uh, with George Bockhold and his presentation, uh, to the NRC.

Rushton: If Bockhold made a presentation to the NRC then he used numbers like eighteen and nineteen.

Mosbaugh: I believe that that's where the mistake originated.

Rushton: And those got put into the LER without verification?

Mosbaugh: Um, no, I think there was, uh, I believe that, uh, inaccuracies in those numbers were, uh, were flagged, uh, were flagged, uh, in the LER, in the LER development.

Rushton: You - you - you're telling me I need to go talk to operations and find out what the problem was.

Mosbaugh: In terms of the long, in terms of log discrepancies, I can't explain why they're differences in the way operators fill out logs. That's you know, I-I don't work in that area.

Rushton: Okay, well, fine. I-I'll call operations then.

Mosbaugh: But I think, you know, I think that will not explain everything.

Rushton: So what-what else is there that I-I need to know?

Mosbaugh: I think there's whatever initial mistake was made. And, um, and as far as I know, uh, you know, uh, George Bockhold and- and maybe some of the operations people, uh, developed the initial information that George used in his presentation.

Rushton: Okay. You don't know where that information came from?

Mosbaugh: John says Jimmy Paul Cash.

Rushton: Okay.

Mosbaugh: And beyond that, it's merely a comparison between what was, uh, originally developed by- by George and them to, um, to what the data sheets and the control logs say.

Rushton: Okay. I'll check with operations then.

Mosbaugh: Okay.

Rushton: Bye.

Mosbaugh: We're see ya. Bye (Phone hangs up) What's going on?

Aufdenkampe: What?

Mosbaugh: You're acting real funny.

Aufdenkampe: I don't understand why we're giving him mis(?)information to begin with.... (noise), Hairston's evidently on a, on a tear for misinformation.

Mosbaugh: He's on a what?

Aufdenkampe: He's on a, or a, he's pissed off over misinformation.

Mosbaugh: On this?

Aufdenkampe: Well, he's pissed off over the revised, uh, uh....

Mosbaugh: LER.

Aufdenkampe: LER for a date change because, like, he didn't get stuff done on time.

Mosbaugh: Mm-hmm.

Aufdenkampe: And now he's pissed off over this thing. (pause)

Mosbaugh: I should've asked him. I-I didn't ask him at all, why-why the hell are you calling me? Um, you know. (Background noise) All I did was compare two sets of data. (Cough) That anybody can do. How they got in the spirit. Responsible parties will need to account. (unintelligible, break in tape?) ....From the middle of May and now going on Friday, today, is that....an inch.

Aufdenkampe: Well, they're they're...

Mosbaugh: Come on.

Aufdenkampe: I'll tell you why they've had it for so long.

Mosbaugh: There's something going on.

Aufdenkampe: No, no, no, no, your stock trader instincts.

Mosbaugh: Yes, yes, my instincts.

Aufdenkampe: I-I-I'll tell you why they've had-they've had it for so long is they clearly got it and they've been sitting on it, because I talked to Jack Stringfellow several times and he says he just hasn't had time to work on it with the other ones going out that have...

Mosbaugh: Right.

Aufdenkampe: ...time clock on it.

Mosbaugh: Right.

Aufdenkampe: And that's true.

Mosbaugh: Get out of here.

Aufdenkampe: That's true.

Mosbaugh: Get out of here.

Aufdenkampe: That's what they allow for. Okay.

Mosbaugh: I don't believe that for a ..

Aufdenkampe: Bailey operates on a clock.

Mosbaugh: I don't believe that for a second.

Aufdenkampe: That's true.

Mosbaugh: That's my stock trader's instinct.

**Aufdenkampe: Now, now, the second part of it is more elementary than that, and that is the same thing that always concerns you, is that we feed the NRC misleading (inaudible) information, and Hairston's getting nervous about that. [Pause] And OI's back.**

Mosbaugh: What?

Aufdenkampe: OI's back.

Mosbaugh: What do you mean, OI's back?

Aufdenkampe: They're baaaack.

Mosbaugh: They called somebody at home, but is it more than that?

Aufdenkampe: They're supposed to be here next week.

Voice: Oooh. Who'd they call at home? Did George put this out at the staff meeting?

Mosbaugh: George put out in-in the staff meeting, that...

Aufdenkampe: Not staff meeting, must have been the 7:40 meeting, 'cause I didn't hear it, so it must have been...

Mosbaugh: You're right. It was when you were gone. It was Wednesday. It wasn't yesterday. And they he put out in the 7:40 meeting that they had contacted somebody at home and he was reminding everybody of the, uh, company, uh, advice on that and referenced the old letter that we developed for him. Uh, I tried to find out who it was and wasn't able to, so I conclude that it was obviously in Skip's organization.

(Intercom rings)

Aufdenkampe: John Aufdenkampe.

Bailey: John, how are you doing?

Aufdenkampe: Wonderful.

Bailey: Are we still having, uh, uh, some difficulty **coming up with this** story on, uh, ... the diesel generator starts, the numbers? Who is supposed to have **those**, the exact story on that issue. Do you have it?

Mosbaugh: No.

Aufdenkampe: Jim, I don't think, is Paul in there with you, with you?

Bailey: Yeah.

Aufdenkampe: Okay. Well, Allen's in here with me. I don't think anybody has it, and I didn't didn't say anything **because** I'm not really sure what you're looking for with respect to the whole story. But I'm not sure anybody has a whole story as to why we got the misinformation in there. Okay?

Bailey: That's why... (unintelligible)

Aufdenkampe: The-the real bottom line on why we got the misinformation in there is, if you want to point at one thing, is because we made the decision, we as management made the decision, we as management made the decision, and the Shipman, Bockhold, uh, Bailey, Aufdenkampe, Mosbaugh, who else was on that...

Mosbaugh: Yeah.

Aufdenkampe: ...phone call to put those numbers in based on the fact that George told us that they were good numbers because they used as the start point completion of, I think it was the under-voltage testing. Okay? And when we went back, what was it that we, he said, that we...

Mosbaugh: For George's?

Aufdenkampe: Yeah, when George? He said....

Mosbaugh: I don't, I have no idea

Aufdenkampe: I'll test it...

Mosbaugh: I have no idea what George's basis was for the data he presented to the Commission.

Bailey: You're talking about George, uh, Bockhold?

Mosbaugh: Yes.

Bailey: Yeah.

Mosbaugh: But, anyway, I have no idea what that basis was.

Aufdenkampe: It was, it was based on, on his...

Mosbaugh: And it is not based on under-voltage.

Aufdenkampe: It...

Mosbaugh: It couldn't be.

Aufdenkampe: It-it was based on George's comments that, that he had used this point...

Mosbaugh: Nope.

Aufdenkampe: ...whenever the point was, whatever the point was, that's exactly what he said, as the start time and we've completed the critical testing associated with, declare, er, which ... (noises).

Mosbaugh: I don't--, George never presented what his basis was.

Aufdenkampe: And I know those numbers were counted by Jimmy Paul Cash.

Mosbaugh: The final numbers are based on starting with the UV test.

Aufdenkampe: Yes - the final number.

Mosbaugh: As the first test.

Aufdenkampe: Yes.

Mosbaugh: But what George's basis was, only George knows.

Aufdenkampe: That's right. You're right.

Rushton: When was the UV test in the sequence of events?

Mosbaugh(?): Pretty far down the line.

Aufdenkampe: Right before we declare them operable, I think. Wasn't it?

Mosbaugh: Yes.

Rushton: No, we-we may have only eighteen or nineteen successful starts, it just depends on where you start counting, Jim.

Aufdenkampe: No, that's not true.

Bailey: That's what it looks like.



Aufdenkampe: No, that's not true. There were not eighteen or nineteen successful starts, cumulative starts, regardless of where you started counting, when we reviewed the detailed data. Not consecutive.

Rushton: Starting from March 20th?

Aufdenkampe: Starting from March 20th. There were not eighteen or nineteen consecutive, which the LER implies consecutive, starts without a failure of some type or another.

Bailey: Here's what George has got listed on, uh, on his, uh, chart that he's presented at Atlanta. He said five starts in troubleshooting and the, uh, UV run test....

Rushton: Sensor calibration, logic testing, E-run bubble testing, multiple starts, five more, UV run tests, six months surveillance, diesel operable, high jacket water runs, three times, (unintelligible) UV run tests. That adds up to eighteen.

Mosbaugh: Yeah. In amongst the eighteen are numerous failures.

Aufdenkampe: ...are failures.

Bailey: There's what Joh-, what was that Allen?

Mosbaugh: There are failures in amongst those, mixed in there.

Bailey: Yeah, okay, he just said its eighteen successful starts, he didn't say they were consecutive successful starts.

Aufdenkampe: Well, what if, what we put in there was an eighteen starts without a failure?

Bailey: Yeah,...

Aufdenkampe: Well,

Bailey: ...I'm talking about on this chart. It doesn't say consecutive.

Aufdenkampe: Well, that's-that's what we put in the April 9th letter was eighteen starts without a failure.

Bailey: Yeah. The-the this-this chart implies that that you didn't mention any failures.

Aufdenkampe: Well, I think Allen...

Mosbaugh: You'd have to check the **data** but you may find that some of those five one's mentioned failed, for example.

Bailey: Five troubleshooting?

Mosbaugh: Uh huh.

Bailey: Yeah.

Mosbaugh: Yeah, I don't think you have any gua-guarantee that-that those were all successful.

Bailey: No, I-I-I, like I said, it doesn't say that, but it implies that. And it-this is why...

Mosbaugh: What? It says that, because at the bottom it says eighteen successful starts.

Bailey: Yeah, but I mean it implies that they're consecutive successful starts.

Mosbaugh: It may imply that.

Bailey: Yeah.

Mosbaugh: Yeah, it-it probably implies that.

Bailey: I think **that's the** why we led--we led the NRC to believe that in Atlanta.

**Aufdenkampe: I think that's what people thought at the time.** You know, Paul, when you go to Hairston, you've got to tell him **that** we just plain old screwed up. We had data, **based on** what we thought, or we had data that we felt **supported the statements that were** made in the LER and the, uh, and what George presented in Atlanta, and upon --, that upon further scrutiny that it did not support that. **And there were added** at the time we issued the LER. There were concerns about whether those numbers were right or wrong.

Bailey: In the, uh, the information supplied IIT, did we ever correct what we told them or do-do you know?

Aufdenkampe: We have not corrected the April 9th letter. The IIT, I guarantee you, knows exactly what happened.

Bailey: **Shouldn't had.** They had to get the information from us somehow, but we...

(?): Well...

Bailey: ...don't know what they gonna present today in Washington?

Aufdenkampe: I doubt if they'll get into that kind of specifics, but we, we have, uh...

Bailey: I-I mean in the report.

Aufdenkampe: These lists that we put together to-gave the summary of the start sequences and failures and what happened, stuff like that, that we wrote the revised LER on, the IIT was given that.

Bailey: O.K. In the revised numbers that we're presenting now, where do they-these numbers come from?

Aufdenkampe: **Kenny Stokes** took all the diesel start sheets, sat down, wrote the diesel logs, and, I guess, did he review the operators logs too? Reviewed the operators logs to make sure that we had picked up everything, that we had the big picture.

Bailey: Doesn't look like it, that there is a good story, other than we just, you know, we're in-in the process of all this confusion and stuff, that we just screwed up there.

Aufdenkampe: Well, I guess, you know, you might would argue that if there was a good story we could probably argue not revising the LER. Well, if we have some sound technical basis for what's in the LER we could-**could get around** revising it.

Bailey: Yeah.

Aufdenkampe: Is that, Paul, is that what you're looking for?

Rushton: Yeah. I was looking for a good story that, uh, you know, we could use to explain how this error had been made and not make us all look like a bunch of dummies but sounds like we were a bunch of dummies.

Mosbaugh: That's my perspective.

Rushton: Now, we did the best we could at the time, but, and we went so fast through everything that we didn't have adequate, uh, checks and balances to make sure that every single piece of data was, uh, absolutely correct and now that we've been through the IIT investigation and, uh, a lot more documentation of the problem and further review and study, we found that we were in error. And you know, and that's-that's the best story we've got to go with.

Bailey: You know, **based on that, it seems to me like it that we ought not to send in this damn LER, revised LER, until the IIT report, otherwise we may have a damn conflict in there.**

Aufdenkampe(?): Well, the I-I would-I would only make the warning and-and it's really up to you guys. Uh, we felt compelled down here as soon as we identified the problem to correct it as expeditiously as possible.

Bailey: And I-and I agree with that but I'm saying now that that report is supposed to be coming out next week or, **or today and they may give us a copy of it.**

Aufdenkampe: Well, anyway.

Bailey: And we're still confused about these numbers.

Aufdenkampe: I-I understand.

Rushton: I think that, you know, Ha-Hairston feels that, uh, you know, we've gone on-on, he's gone on the record as attesting to this information this LER the NRC and we're going to come back and say it's wrong **and, uh, and based on past precedent]** I think he's probably gonna... either documents in a cover letter on the LER or somewhere in the record why it was wrong and what corrective action we've taken to make sure we don't report wrong information in the future.

Aufdenkampe: Okay. Well, let me, I'll tell you what, Paul, let me bring that up with, uh, uh, Tom Green. Now, I'll tell you what generally the LER information is verified by my people. Okay? Up to a point..

Rushton: Yeah.

Aufdenkampe: uh, you know, they can't verify everything, but generally it's verified by my people. And my people started with the original April 9th letter as their bases.

**Rushton:** Yeah.

**Aufdenkampe:** Now, I don't I-I think that, and I'm not trying to dump this back in your lap, Jim, I just really don't recall, I think you guys generated the April 9th letter up there.

**Bailey:** We did.

**Aufdenkampe:** Okay, and-and now, we may have verified the stuff on the april 9th letter, I do not know whether I did that on site or how we did the verification of that information...

**Bailey:** The PRB reviewed it.

**Aufdenkampe:** Yeah, the PRB reviewed it, but they won't always go back and verify that kind of...Huh? (whisper in background) ... The April 9th letter? ... It was sent before we ... I'm not sure we PRB'd that. Oh, we PRB'd it. We PRB'd it did after it went out.

**Bailey:** No, PRB had it prior to that, now we made some revisions, uh...

**Aufdenkampe:** But-but I'm getting, uh, uh, a vicious shaking of the a-a- no by a head here, who will remain nameless... But anyway, regardless, regardless, uh, I don't know who did verification of that and I **suspect** that the majority of that verification was done via hearsay.

**Voice:** It probably was.

**Aufdenkampe:** And that's-and that's where we erred, if you want to point out where we erred on that, that's where we erred and **as far as written communications then George probably** erred in his presentation because a lot of that presentation was made on hearsay because of the time frame involved in putting the presentation together.

(Voice): So..

**Aufdenkampe:** And, and if Mr. Hairston wants to do something different we certainly can, but all we can do is-is say that we will verify everything before we send it out and I will certainly do that. It will just, an-and I don't mean this in a threatened nature at all, it'll just take longer sometimes. Sometimes we won't be able to make the dates that he wants to meet.

**Bailey:** Yeah, I agree with you. All right.

Aufdenkampe: So do you guys feel better now that you can understand the whole story?

(Laughter)

Rushton: Yeah. Yeah, I'm a little better equipped now that...

Aufdenkampe: Okay, I, hey-uh, Paul?

Rushton: Yeah?

Aufdenkampe: This-this is my recollection and Allen's recollection of-of how things went. We're about to go to the PRB. I will recount this conversation and the concerns that you guys have to the PRB and, uh, specifically, Tom Green, to see if he wants to do anything else.

Bailey: So th-the other one is on that-this, we've got two of 'em going on down here this afternoon where we're correcting information in LER that was wrong.

Rushton: The other one is where we said we would do something by April the 8th and we haven't got it done yet.

Aufdenkampe: Yeah. That one is pretty simple.

Rushton: Yeah.

Aufdenkampe: They didn't do it. They committed to it and didn't do it.

Rushton: Yeah, but again, it, it's uh, you know when I-

Aufdenkampe: Why didn't they do it?

Rushton: Yeah, Why didn't they do it? Why didn't we report it? You know what happened to the system, and how are we going to make sure that that doesn't happen again and make sure that that's all documented in the record. Those are going to be the questions. You know because he's got an exposure. This is the way he feels about it. He told the NRC that he was going to get something done by April 8th and he didn't get it done.

Aufdenkampe: Okay

Rushton: You know he's subject and liable to them coming back and, uh, citing us for a violation at some point in the future.

Aufdenkampe: Let me tell you how we work that and this is what we told Tom Green. Uh, LER's are reviewed and closed out by the residents.

Rushton: Okay.

Aufdenkampe: So our residents have not been very picky in, and this is just a fact, not an excuse, about getting things done exactly on the due date or before the due date. And we've closed out numerous packages when we have gotten them done after the due date. Provided we show good faith and progress on it, they usually don't say anything. And that's from John Rogge on down.

Bailey: And I also talked the same subject to, uh, to Marvin Sinclair when he was in Atlanta, and he said the same thing, but..

Aufdenkampe: Okay, now...

Bailey: That's not the way George said it.

Aufdenkampe: Okay, now, so let me-let me tell you how, based on that fact, this is how I handle the program, or have been to date. They, generally, I'll give the department managers a week or two-two beyond the due date before I get nervous. Okay? And I'll allow them to move the due date, even though it'll start showing up overdue, I'll allow them to move the due date for a couple weeks.

Bailey: Yeah.

Aufdenkampe: Beyond that, then I go force them to give me a firm commitment, a date when they can get it done, uh, usually asking for it in the next couple weeks. So if they give me a firm date and I feel confident that I will go greet the resident and get their verbal agreement that that's okay. Beyond that, when it goes beyond that time frame, I then revise the LER. And those time frames aren't exactly fixed, but they're very close to fixed.

Bailey: Yeah, I-I-I'm aware of that, and I-I know that the way we've operated in the past.

Aufdenkampe: And, and...

Bailey: ...It's only when you go back and revise one that it brings this attention to everything.

Aufdenkampe: Yeah. So anyway, that's how, that's how I have been handling it. Uh, I've **since talked** to Tom Green today and-and I'm not going to slip any overdue LER commitments as far as putting them on the **management** attention list. But that's the only real change **I want to make**. I imagine that-that they come before George, he'll still allow them to slide a week or two. Unless there's a mandated change in philosophy.

Bailey: Okay. It doesn't make sense to write a revision of LER's and process it if-if you're gonna get it done before the LER gets...

Aufdenkampe: Well, an-and we went over this too, when we talked about it some other times. 10-22 really doesn't require you to revise the LER unless it will-it changes the perceptions of the reviewer on what you actually did do, uh, how the events developed and what corrective actions you took to mitigate the consequences and when you start, if you miss your date by a couple weeks, we can argue that doesn't change the perception, but when you're missing it by three, four, five months, then what you're doing is actually different than what you said because it's taking a lot longer, it's obviously either a lower priority or harder to implement corrective action or-or something.

Bailey: That's true.

**Rushton:** So your perception changes as to **what's involved**.

**Aufdenkampe:** That's my thought process on it, or has been. Okay.

Bailey: All right, John, appreciate it.

Aufdenkampe: Bye.