

1 U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
2 FIRST ENERGY NUCLEAR OPERATING COMPANY
3 PUBLIC MEETING

3 Meeting held on Tuesday, July 16, 2002, at
4 2:00 p.m. at the Oak Harbor High School, Oak Harbor, Ohio,
5 taken by me Marie B. Fresch, Registered Merit Reporter, and
6 Notary Public in and for the State of Ohio.

7 - - -

8 PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

9 U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

10 Mr. John Grobe, Chairman, MC 0350 Panel
11 William Dean, Vice Chairman, MC 0350 Panel
12 John Jacobson, Branch Chief,
13 Mechanical Engineering Branch, DRS
14 Anthony Mendiola,
15 Section Chief PDIII-2, NRR
16 Douglas Pickett, Project Manager, NRR
17 Christopher (Scott) Thomas,
18 Senior Resident Inspector - Davis Besse
19 Christine Lipa, Projects Branch Chief

20 FIRST ENERGY NUCLEAR OPERATING COMPANY

21 Lew Myers, FENOC Chief Operating Officer
22 Robert W. Schrauder,
23 Director - Support Services
24 J. Randel Fast, Plant Manager
25 James J. Powers, III
Director - Nuclear Engineering
Howard Bergendahl, Vice President-Nuclear
Michael J. Ross,
Manager - Operations Effectiveness
Michael J. Stevens, Director - Maintenance
Steve Loehlein

26 - - -

27

28

29

30

31

1 MR. GROBE: Good afternoon. I
2 was trying to set the tone by taking my coat off. Please
3 feel free to. It's a bit warm today.

4 My name is Jack Grobe. I'm the Director of Reactor
5 Safety for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Office for
6 Region 3 in Chicago. We have responsibility to the office
7 for the safety of the nuclear power plants in the midwest.

8 We're here today for our third meeting, public
9 meeting with the Licensee, First Energy, responsible for
10 operation of Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station. The focus
11 of this meeting is what we refer to as the Manual Chapter
12 0350 Restart Oversight Panel. In a minute, I'll introduce
13 the panel members and other NRC staff that are here today.

14 Our meeting today is being transcribed by Marie
15 Fresch. And Marie was here last time and had some trouble
16 hearing. I think Mr. Stocker has the microphones turned
17 way up, so that should help, but please make sure when
18 you're making comments today, so the public can hear in the
19 audience, as well as Marie transcribing the meeting, that
20 you use the microphone.

21 Let me start by introducing the NRC staff here
22 today. On my far right, is John Jacobson. John is a
23 Senior Mechanical Engineer in Region 3 Office and a member
24 of the Restart Panel.

25 Right next to me on my immediate right is Christine

1 Lipa. Christine is a Projects Branch Chief. She's the
2 Manager of Region 3 responsible for oversight at the
3 Davis-Besse Plant on a day-to-day basis.

4 On my immediate left is Bill Dean. Bill is the Vice
5 Chair of the Restart Panel and Senior Manager in our
6 office, Nuclear Reactor Regulation, our office
7 headquarters, and it's in the Washington, D. C. area.

8 Two of the, two other additional staff from the
9 office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. Tony Mendiola. Tony
10 is the manager responsible for overseeing the licensing
11 activities. And on his left is Doug Pickett. Doug is the
12 Licensing Project Manager specifically for Davis-Besse.

13 Then at the end of the table is a very important
14 person. That's Scott Thomas, Senior Resident Inspector
15 that works at the Davis-Besse Plant every day. He works
16 for the Region 3 Office of the NRC.

17 We have a couple of additional NRC staff I want to
18 recognize. Helping out at Davis-Besse is the Resident
19 Inspector from the Perry Plant, east of Cleveland, it's
20 John Elgood; and John is operating the slide machine right
21 now, but he's been inspecting the plant to help us out.

22 Nancy Keller was out front. Nancy is our
23 Administrative Assistant. She's done an outstanding job.
24 I appreciate her support. Nancy had out front a stack of
25 handouts both from the NRC as well as the Licensee

1 available for you. If you didn't receive one, please feel
2 free to obtain one of those handouts.

3 In addition out front, Nancy had what we refer to as
4 feedback forms. They're preaddressed, no postage necessary
5 forms that you can fill out and give us feedback on the
6 quality of our meeting, and other aspects of the conduct of
7 the meeting or content of the meeting; either one.

8 We would certainly appreciate and encourage you to
9 fill out one of those forms and give us feedback, so we can
10 continually improve the quality of our interface with the
11 public.

12 At this time, Lew, I would like you to introduce
13 your staff here today.

14 MR. MYERS: Okay. Thank you
15 very much. We have some people out front of our audience
16 that are our technical, some of our technical experts. We
17 also have our Root Cause Team, that we'll introduce later
18 on.

19 First with our technical experts, I would like to
20 introduce Tim Chambers. Tim is in charge of the
21 Containment.

22 Mark McLaughlin, also the Containment.

23 Dave Baker, Head Resolution.

24 Dave Eshelman -- is Dave here? Dave is in charge
25 of helping us with Human Performance.

1 Clark Price is our Restart Action Plan Lead.

2 Tony Staller, Restart and Post Restart.

3 Neil Morrison. Neil comes to us from our Beaver
4 Valley Plant, and he's helping us with program reviews.

5 Bill Rogers. He's doing our System Health Reviews.

6 So, for each one of these, we have a man at the
7 table that has responsibility, and technical leads with us
8 today.

9 Would you want me to go on to our desired outcomes
10 now?

11 MR. GROBE: If you don't mind,
12 introduce your staff at the table.

13 MR. MYERS: Okay. To my right
14 is Howard Bergendahl.

15 Steve Loehlein is next. Steve is doing the
16 Management in Human Performance and Root Cause.

17 Jim Powers is next to him. Jim is the Director of
18 Engineering.

19 Bob Schrauder next to him. Bob is taking, a new
20 employee taking the job as Service Director, is new with
21 our company, new with that position.

22 Randy Fast is after him. Randy is our Plant
23 Manager.

24 And, Mike Stevens is Director of Maintenance.

25 And, at the very end I think is Mike Ross. I can't

1 see. So, Mike Ross comes to us from, he's a new addition,
2 comes to us from, from the Three Mile Island Plant. So,
3 the Plant Manager there is really experienced, and is part
4 of our discussions later on.

5 MR. GROBE: Okay, thank you.

6 At this time, if there is public officials or
7 representatives of public officials here in the audience, I
8 would like to give you an opportunity to introduce
9 yourself. Please stand and up introduce yourself. Do we
10 have any public officials with us today?

11 MR. KOEBEL: Carl Koebel,
12 Ottawa County Commissioner.

13 MR. WITT: Jere Witt, Ottawa
14 County Administrator.

15 MR. GROBE: Any others?

16 Okay, very good. Thanks, Carl and Jere.

17 John has a slide up on the overhead projector right
18 now that describes the agenda, and each of you should have
19 a copy of that.

20 In a moment, I'm going to allow Lew to make opening
21 remarks, and then I'm going to briefly summarize the last
22 meeting we had on June 12th. We'll then turn the meeting
23 over to First Energy for presentation of the information
24 that they have prepared for today.

25 Then the NRC is going to discuss the framework that

1 we're using for, what we refer to as our research
2 checklist. I'll talk about that a little later, and a
3 number of the staff will help describe the framework for
4 our research; that is the NRC research. We'll conclude the
5 business portion of the meeting at that time.

6 Following the business portion of the meeting
7 between the NRC and First Energy, we'll open the meeting up
8 for public questions and public feedback or inquires to the
9 NRC staff. I certainly hope that we have a good
10 participation by members of the public here today. At that
11 time, we'll adjourn the meeting.

12 In addition to this afternoon meeting, there is
13 going to be a meeting this evening at 7:00. Bill Dean will
14 chair that meeting. And that meeting is specifically
15 focused on receiving input from the public, as well as
16 answering any questions members of the public have.

17 So, if you're here this afternoon, and you think of
18 something, any additional questions or comments later this
19 evening, please come back at 7. We're also making it
20 available to other individuals who were unable to be here
21 this afternoon.

22 I think that concludes the logistics for the
23 meeting.

24 Oh, I do want to recognize Mr. Stucker. He's been
25 here for each of our meetings. Oak Harbor High School

1 continues to make this fine facility available for our
2 meetings, and we certainly appreciate that. And,
3 Mr. Stucker works very hard to make sure that the sound
4 system and lighting and everything is just right. And, I
5 certainly appreciate his efforts and I want to thank Oak
6 Harbor High School and Mr. Stucker for that.

7 Did you have some comments before we begin, Lew?

8 MR. MYERS: We're ready to get
9 started. Is that okay?

10 MR. GROBE: Okay. Do you want
11 me to just summarize the June 12th meeting first?

12 MR. MYERS: Yes.

13 MR. GROBE: Okay, very good.

14 Next slide, John.

15 I wanted to make you aware, particularly members of
16 the public aware, of several documents First Energy has
17 submitted over the past several months, and make you aware
18 of our Web site where those can be obtained.

19 An Early Risk Assessment was provided by First
20 Energy. That was received by the NRC on April 8th, 2002.
21 We continue in our assessments of the risk plan and we're
22 using the input that we receive from First Energy,
23 evaluating the input and continuing to ask questions and do
24 analyses to support the risk assessment that the NRC is
25 conducting.

1 A Preliminary Root Cause Analysis Report was
2 submitted on April 18th. That addressed in preliminary
3 fashion both the technical side of root cause, what caused
4 the cracking of the head penetrations, as well as the
5 corrosion; and also to a certain extent addressed the
6 contributing factors to that situation.

7 The Return to Service Plan; the first revision of
8 that was submitted to us on May 21st, and it was recently
9 revised last week July -- I'm sorry, yes, July 12, 2002.

10 All of these documents are available on the NRC Web
11 site at www.nrc.gov. And you can get to the Davis-Besse
12 link on that Web site, which contains just a tremendous
13 compendium of information; that would be head degradation
14 issue that occurred at Davis-Besse, NRC activities,
15 Licensee activities in response to that. So, please feel
16 free to gain access to that Web site to obtain that
17 information.

18 Our last meeting of the Restart Oversight Panel was
19 June 12th.

20 John, next slide.

21 The focus of that meeting was the Return to Service
22 Plan that First Energy submitted to the NRC. Return to
23 Service Plan had associated with it a number of what First
24 Energy called Building Blocks. They're listed there on the
25 slide.

1 We discussed in some detail their plans at that
2 time, with the first five of the Building Blocks, and had a
3 number of questions regarding those various Building
4 Blocks.

5 First Energy's evaluation of what they were trying
6 to accomplish as well as receiving input from the NRC
7 resulted in a revision to their Restart Plan and Building
8 Blocks, and I anticipate during today's meeting that we're
9 going to get into several Building Blocks in more detail
10 than we talked about last June, as well as get into a
11 substantial amount of detail in the Management and Human
12 Performance area.

13 So, we're going to continue with these meetings. At
14 this point, to a large extent, we've been addressing and
15 discussing the plans that First Energy is proceeding. And
16 we'll continue to discuss those plans.

17 During this meeting, get into, I think, more
18 progress that they're making; and, as these meetings
19 continue over the summer months, we will be getting into
20 greater and greater detail in the implementation of those
21 plans, the results that the company is seeing, and
22 corrective actions that they're taking.

23 We are transcribing this meeting this afternoon.
24 We'll also be transcribing the meeting this evening. Those
25 transcripts will be available on the Web site when they're

1 completed. As I'm sure you can appreciate, it takes a
2 couple weeks to get a transcript typed up, reviewed and
3 ready for posting on the Web site.

4 The transcript of the June 12th meeting is available
5 on the Web site. And as I said, these transcripts will
6 also be available within several weeks for those
7 individuals who are unable to attend the meeting.

8 At this point, Lew, I would like to turn it over to
9 you and your staff for the presentation that you prepared
10 for us today.

11 MR. MYERS: Okay. Thank you
12 very much.

13 It's our pleasure to be here today to discuss Return
14 to Service Plan that we discussed last time. Our desired
15 outcome today is to show that we're no longer in the
16 planning phase. Typically, you go through a planning
17 phase, a discovery phase, and implementation phase. Today
18 we want to demonstrate that we're fully in the
19 implementation phase towards safe, reliable and sustained
20 operation for the Davis-Besse Plant.

21 We want to provide you with a status of several of
22 our Building Blocks. We want to demonstrate the closure of
23 several of the actions that were discussed at our last
24 meeting, and also in our Restart Oversight Plan Meeting the
25 day before.

1 We also want to introduce you to some of the
2 Management and Human Performance elements in our Management
3 and Human Performance Excellence Plan that we've laid out;
4 some of the things that we know now, and we'll be prepared
5 to discuss that in detail today.

6 Starting out, you remember the last time, I thought
7 we had really seven Building Blocks, six of which are
8 Building Blocks that feed into the Restart Action Plan.

9 The Reactor Head Resolution Plan was sponsored by
10 Bob Schrauder, who is at the table. Our Program Compliance
11 Plan was by Jim Powers, the Director of Engineering. The
12 Containment Health Assurance Plan sponsored by Randy Fast,
13 the Maintenance Director. And the System Health Assurance
14 Plan is Jim Powers' responsibility. Restart and Post
15 Restart Test Plan is Randy Fast. And finally, the
16 Management and Human Performance Excellence Plan, I'm
17 responsible for that.

18 As you see, our plans all feed into the Restart
19 Action Plan, and that feed goes to what we call a Restart
20 Overview Panel. That's a very important ingredient, and
21 people are talking about it independent of oversight.

22 Let me share with you the Restart Overview Panel, if
23 you will. This panel provides an independent oversight and
24 review of all of our plant activities. You can see this of
25 the FENOC Senior Executive Team.

1 That team consists of Bob Saunders, President;
2 myself, Gary Leidich, and Bill Pearce. Gary is in charge
3 of the, Executive in charge of Engineering. Bill Pearce is
4 in charge of Oversight.

5 All of us may or may not be at any one meeting,
6 because of other obligations. The majority of us are at
7 each meeting. Let's talk about the panel members that we
8 asked to give us input.

9 First, we looked for someone who had extended outage
10 experience, and we picked Chris Bakken from the D.C. Cook
11 Plant. D.C. Cook went through some very tough times a few
12 years ago. And Chris Bakken was the Executive of the
13 Restart Plan, and has good experience.

14 We wanted somebody from the industry. Somebody that
15 communicates to us and to the industry. That person is
16 Buzz Galbraith. Buzz works the Nuclear Operations, which
17 is an industry oversight review group that has basic
18 building blocks, one of which is, one of the cornerstones
19 is operating experience. So, he shares that with us.

20 Finally, we wanted somebody on our Nuclear Review
21 Board. We normally have a Nuclear Oversight Review Board,
22 and we wanted somebody to feed into that Nuclear Review
23 Board. That person is Jack Martin. Jack Martin is on our
24 board and he's very involved with this panel and our routine
25 activities going on at the plant.

1 Finally, we wanted somebody that had real raw based
2 experience from a nuclear regulatory standpoint and a
3 troubled plant standpoint that could help us through this.
4 So, we went and got Joe Callan. Joe was the Executive
5 Officer of the NRC at one time, and he's retired now;
6 provides us raw base experience, many years of experience
7 with other plants, extended shutdowns like this.

8 We wanted somebody from the community. Jere Witt
9 supplies that for us, a community leader here in Ottawa
10 County.

11 We wanted somebody that had a good history of the
12 plant, so we brought back one of the previous executives at
13 the Davis-Besse Plant that was here for the previous
14 problems through good performance. We brought in Lou Storz
15 to help us throughout whatever developments, what's changed
16 at the time of good performance.

17 So, we believe, we believe today that we have an
18 Oversight Review Panel. As that panel is made up today, it
19 provides very good independent input to First Energy's
20 Senior Team to help us ensure that we can not only restart
21 Davis-Besse in a safe and reliable manner, but insure that
22 we have safe performance.

23 We've also made several changes in our management
24 structure since our last meeting that we'll talk about.

25 Howard, do you want to continue?

1 MR. GROBE: Lew, before you go
2 on, who chairs the Restart Oversight Panel, or Restart
3 Overview Panel, who is the chairman of that?

4 MR. MYERS: Right now, I've
5 been chairing the panel. We've been talking to Joe Callan
6 about the possibility of chairing that panel; and the
7 reason for that is to give us a true balance, has more
8 independence.

9 MR. GROBE: Okay. Thank you.

10 MR. MYERS: Okay, Howard.

11 MR. BERGENDAHL: Okay, I wanted
12 to -- can you hear me?

13 I wanted to introduce some of the new members of our
14 team. There is an organization chart there, which
15 highlights basically the yellow blocks, are individuals
16 that are new in positions since about the first of the
17 year. So, there has been a lot of change at the site, and
18 many of the oversight individuals, Lew has already
19 mentioned across the top of the organizational chart, but
20 we have some of the key senior managers from Davis-Besse
21 sitting here at the table and I wanted to take an
22 opportunity to introduce them.

23 We've put together a team of very experienced and
24 qualified nuclear professionals that puts together the
25 senior management team that I know can do a good job at

1 Davis-Besse.

2 I'm going to start with Jim Powers, two seats over
3 to my right. Jim is the Director of Engineering. I think
4 we introduced him last time. He joined us from the Perry
5 Plant. He has an excellent reputation and a major asset to
6 our organization.

7 Next to Jim is a new addition to the Davis-Besse
8 organization. He's been with First Energy, but he's now
9 joined Davis-Besse full time, Bob Schrauder will be our
10 Director of Support Services. Bob has had experience as
11 the Director of Engineering and also as a nuclear plant,
12 Plant Manager. And so, he brings a wealth of experience to
13 the team.

14 Next to Bob is Randy Fast. We've introduced Randy
15 in the past. He's new to Davis-Besse in January. His
16 background includes Beaver Valley and a long stretch at the
17 South Texas Plant.

18 Next to Randy is Mike Stevens. Mike is brand new in
19 the position of Director of Maintenance. And Mike has been
20 with First Energy for about two years. He spent most of
21 his career with the Cinergy Plants down in Southeastern
22 United States and most recently he joined First Energy from
23 the Exelon Corporation.

24 We've also hired in some experience from outside the
25 company, from other power plants in the industry. Mike

1 Ross at the end of the table comes to us from another
2 Babcocks and Wilcox designed plant at Three Mile Island
3 Station. Mike led the Operations Department at Three Mile
4 Island through their brief start through many years as an
5 Operations Manager and Plant Manager. Mike has joined
6 Davis-Besse to provide oversight to our operations
7 activities to ensure we have high standards that we know
8 Mike accomplished through Three Mile Island.

9 Also not at the table here today, joining our
10 company July 30th, is Pete Roberts. We hired Pete from the
11 sale of Oak Creek Station, New Jersey, to be our new
12 Manager of Maintenance.

13 So, we put together quite a team here and I know
14 we've got good things to come.

15 MR. MYERS: Bob Schrauder
16 would like to take a few moments and discuss the Reactor
17 Head Resolution Oversight Plan, if you will. We're going
18 to the phase now where we're going to present the status of
19 several of our plans.

20 Go ahead, Bob.

21 MR. SCHRAUDER: Thank you, Lew.

22 Thanks, Howard.

23 First, let me start out by saying, I'm very pleased
24 to join the Davis-Besse team, after what seems like a
25 short nine and a half year hiatus from the plant. I do

1 believe, as Howard does, that we have a good solid team in
2 place, and that we will lead Davis-Besse back to a safe,
3 reliable plant that shows sustained performance.

4 Since our last meeting, I have been really pleased
5 on the progress that we have made on obtaining a new head
6 for Davis-Besse. We have accomplished a great deal in a
7 very short 30 days.

8 One of the things I'm really happy to report is that
9 we've executed in excess of 30,000 person hours at the
10 Midland site retrieving that head, under some significant
11 challenging circumstances there.

12 As this slide indicates, we are on target with the
13 head replacement to support safe, reliable plant
14 return-to-service sometime during fourth quarter of this
15 year.

16 I'll talk a little bit about our activities at
17 Midland. We were able to successfully open the
18 containment. We had to chip away about three and a half
19 feet of concrete. We had to remove three layers of rebar,
20 and we had to detension the pre-cement tensioning elements
21 in this containment.

22 These two pictures up here show us the progress of
23 opening that containment and then in the lower right-hand
24 corner with the team that helped us open that containment.
25 Again, the team worked very safely and very effectively for

1 us.

2 The service structure at Midland, service structure
3 on these reactor vessel heads is in three parts. The lower
4 two parts will remain on the Midland head and we will
5 transfer the upper portion from the Davis-Besse head onto
6 this service structure.

7 We have implemented the modification on the service
8 structure, the lower portion of the service structure at
9 Midland with ten large diameter openings that will allow us
10 clear access to the bare head inspections that we will do
11 on this head going forward in the future. That
12 modification, as I said, is completed.

13 The last time we got together, we had indicated our
14 inspection plan for this head. We had divided those
15 inspections, and identified they have three purposes. The
16 first was to supplement the original co-data package that
17 went with this head. The second was to baseline this head
18 for ongoing in-service inspection program. And the third
19 was to provide supplementary exams to assure ourselves that
20 no damage had occurred to the head during its storage
21 period at the Midland Plant.

22 I'm pleased to tell you that all of those
23 inspections have been completed satisfactorily on the
24 Midland, on the replacement head for Davis-Besse, and we
25 know now that we do have a very good compliment for use at

1 Davis-Besse.

2 One of the records that we also talked about last
3 time associated with the co-data package was the
4 radiographs; both for the dome, the flange weld on the
5 head, and the radiographs on the flange to nozzle. The
6 records that we were able to retrieve did not have either
7 of those films, nor did they have the records of the
8 inspections of those films, other than a signed-off log
9 entry that indicated that the exams had been completed
10 satisfactorily.

11 So, in order to resolve that, we reradiographed
12 those major welds on this head, and they did confirm that
13 we had good welds in all those locations. We were able to
14 achieve a hundred percent coverage of the flange-to-nozzle
15 weld and we achieved a 95 percent coverage of the
16 dome-to-flange weld. And, the remaining part of that weld
17 we were unable to get to, due to the lifting devices that
18 were put on the head after the original manufacturing.

19 Again, though, we confirmed with those that we did
20 have very good welds in all those locations. And that
21 information, coupled with the previous records that we had
22 that identified that the previous owner had accepted this
23 head and had identified that it had all the appropriate
24 records, and the signed off co-data form from the American
25 Nuclear Insurer, we assured ourselves that we did have a

1 good head and good going forward records.

2 As a result of the 95 percent coverage, we will be
3 submitting our results to the NRC for their concurrence
4 approval that we do in fact have a high level of assurance
5 and certainty that this weld is good.

6 MR. JACOBSON: Bob, let me just
7 mention briefly some of the inspection activities we've
8 done in this regard. We've dispatched one of our
9 nondestructive examination experts out to the Midland site
10 and he spent a few days out there observing some of the
11 inspections that, that FENOC was doing on the head; also
12 reviewed all the radiographs that were done on the head.
13 And I did also, I reviewed a good portion of the
14 radiographs. So, that's some of the work that we've done
15 to date.

16 And the next phase is going to be to review all the
17 documentation of the head that supports the code, code and
18 stamp that needs to be on that head in order to use it.

19 MR. SCHRAUDER: Thanks, John.

20 That's a good point. I wanted to say our nuclear
21 inspector was present during all of these examinations
22 also, as well as our code experts and our departmental
23 experts.

24 The picture you see up there with the lifting glove.
25 That's Lew inspecting that lifting glove and those are the

1 attachments that are used to lift this head off and on the
2 reactor during service.

3 MR. GROBE: John, before we go
4 on, could you characterize the results of your inspections
5 to-date?

6 MR. JACOBSON: Pardon?

7 MR. GROBE: Could you
8 characterize the results of your inspections to-date?

9 MR. JACOBSON: The results of the
10 radiographs that we've looked at to-date were, met all code
11 requirements; and, in fact, the weld on the flange to the
12 dome was extremely clean, extremely good. It's one of the
13 best welds that I've personally seen in a long time. And,
14 I've looked at a lot of them. So, we did get that done.

15 We've also looked at some of the welds up on the
16 control rod drive penetrations, and those also meet all
17 code requirements. So, to-date, all of the nondestructive
18 examination that we've reviewed is acceptable.

19 MR. SCHRAUDER: Thank you. At
20 Midland right now our activities are centering around final
21 cleaning and preparation for shipment of the head. This
22 picture that you see here, is the, now there is a cover on
23 it. This is a cover on the reactor vessel head, but
24 this is actually the reactor vessel head being lifted off
25 the stand that it was sitting on at Midland.

1 Next picture, please.

2 This is our opening, and that is the head stand that
3 we had to pull out in order to be able to retrieve the
4 head.

5 And in the next picture, again, the head being
6 readied to be lowered onto a temporary transportation
7 system to get it out to its main transport.

8 This is a picture of the type of transporter that
9 we'll be using to bring the head to Davis-Besse. That head
10 weighs about 80 tons. And this small truck that you see is
11 about 180 feet long. We will be transporting that head for
12 arrival at Davis-Besse prior to the date we set earlier,
13 which is August the 1st, which would be the latest date
14 that we would expect to have that on the site.

15 Now let's talk about some of the activities under
16 way at Davis-Besse. Our reactor pressure -- our head at
17 Davis-Besse is being repaired for removal from the
18 containment.

19 This is a picture of the service structure that I
20 spoke of earlier. The upper portion of the service
21 structure, which we will use on the new head when it
22 arrives. We will lift that off, that's a 40,000 pound
23 piece of equipment that's floating through the air to its
24 temporary resting place where it would be repaired for
25 installation on the Davis-Besse head. And, the head now at

1 Davis-Besse is being properly cleaned and prepared for
2 removal from the containment building.

3 We have gotten our construction packages from our
4 vendor and we are in the process of reviewing those now.
5 We have got the engineering packages available, and these
6 engineering packages are the packages that we put together
7 to open the containment and subsequently restore the
8 containment to its full design requirements.

9 We are making preparations for the containment
10 building opening itself. Again, this is a shot of the back
11 side of our containment where we will be making
12 approximately a 20 foot by 20 foot opening into that
13 containment, which happens to coincide with the original
14 construction opening in this building.

15 The process again for opening this containment will
16 not be the chipping or cutting techniques that we used at
17 Midland. This is a very high pressure water wash system,
18 which essentially separates the cement from the aggregate
19 in the concrete, washes it off the rebar. Then the rebar
20 is tagged, cut and removed and replaced in its original
21 condition when we're ready to restore the container.

22 We did have to do some leveling of the ground in
23 this area in order to get our transport mechanism that will
24 go through the containment to move the old head out and new
25 head in. We did some ground leveling in there.

1 And we are in the process of right outside this,
2 just off to the righthand side out of your view on this
3 picture is our start-up transformer at the plant. We will
4 tag that transformer out, disconnect it, and put protection
5 around it so there is no way to injure that transformer
6 during the period of time that we're under construction.

7 Another item that came up in our last meeting is the
8 restoration of the pressure vessel. Again, the containment
9 at Davis-Besse is a shield building made out of about three
10 feet of concrete and a freestanding pressure vessel with
11 annular space between them. Both of those obviously have
12 to be cut to get access into the containment, moved ahead
13 in and out. Then we have to restore that pressure vessel
14 per code requirements.

15 We had indicated the last time we were here that we
16 were contemplating doing a localized test around that
17 restoration process, in that we had just completed an
18 integrated test on this pressure vessel at previous
19 outings.

20 Since that time, we have identified several other
21 things that we'll be doing in containment, and we have
22 reached the conclusion that the best thing to do is to
23 perform an integrated leak grade test on this containment
24 vessel when it is restored.

25 Those are our current plans that are incorporated

1 into our plan and process. Unless there are questions,
2 that's all I have on the activities for replacing the
3 head.

4 MS. LIPA: I do have one
5 question. I walked down the area where this transformer is
6 yesterday. What plans do you have for protection, what
7 kinds of barrier?

8 MR. SCHRAUDER: The major plans
9 are to disconnect it, and then there are coverings that
10 will go over the bushings and the like on the transformer
11 itself, and I believe there is going to be a
12 scaffolding-type arrangement around it. Basically, we're
13 protecting the major components on getting any kind of
14 water spray or dust or aggregate into it. Make sure that
15 -- we have to put up a large scaffolding and large platform
16 in order to get into that. That opening is about 20 feet
17 off the ground, 18 feet off the ground. We want to make
18 sure that scaffolding we have up there also doesn't have,
19 if it should happen to fall for any reason, it won't impact
20 or harm the transformer.

21 MS. LIPA: Okay, thank you.

22 MR. GROBE: Bob, you said that
23 you have construction procedures that have been submitted
24 and engineering packages that are nearing completion.
25 Could you describe in a little more detail the scope of

1 those construction procedures and engineering packages and
2 what they address?

3 MR. SCHRAUDER: Well, the
4 construction procedures are the procedures for opening up
5 the containment, the detailed process on how do you go
6 about opening up the containment.

7 We're looking at things in those packages, and I
8 want to separate the construction package and the
9 engineering package; these are each, have some element of
10 the other.

11 We look at things, like the travel path for the
12 vehicle that would bring the head in on. As you know, at a
13 lot of nuclear plants or all the nuclear plants, there are
14 underground piping, underground utilities there. We have
15 to go through and assess all of those to make sure that
16 this vehicle won't impact those.

17 Engineering packages includes things like the
18 NCFR 5059 Evaluation to see if this could be done without
19 formal approval of the NRC or whether it fits within the
20 regulation, allows us basically to do those, if they don't
21 change our updated safety analysis report.

22 Those are included in those; and the detailed
23 engineering on, for instance, the pressure vessel itself,
24 has equipment hanging on it as part of its design. We have
25 to make sure that taking a 20 foot by 20 foot section out

1 of that pressure vessel doesn't impact its structural
2 capabilities, and where we would need to put in reinforcing
3 supports or the like for that. Also we analyze things like
4 missile protection, while it's open.

5 MR. GROBE: Any other
6 questions? Okay, very good. Thank you, Bob.

7 MR. MYERS: Thank you.

8 As you can see, we're making good progress on the
9 placement head project, and we're well into the
10 implementation phase. New head is being prepared for
11 shipment. We've opened up our containment and the whole
12 head has been dismantled, making good progress there.

13 The next area is Containment Health Plan. Jim
14 Powers and Randy Fast would discuss that.

15 MR. FAST: Good afternoon. I
16 too am excited about our new team. Today I will discuss
17 the status of our Containment Health Plan Building Block.
18 As you can see, the last time we met, we called this
19 containment condition. It was focused principally on boric
20 acid corrosion on mechanisms which encountered with our
21 reactor vessel head; however, it became apparent that we
22 wanted to expand the scope for all of containment to really
23 talk about the health of everything that's within that
24 building.

25 Part of that plan scope was increased to include

1 containment vessel, the liner evaluation. And, we have had
2 ongoing work there. We have done an analysis. We have a
3 team undergoing a review, a comprehensive review of the
4 design requirements, but as well we did ultrasonic testing
5 to ensure metal thickness and we have an interim
6 disposition on that. However, we can do more exhaustive
7 testing to ensure with every confidence that it meets
8 design requirements.

9 We've also included environmental qualification of
10 our equipment.

11 MR. GROBE: Randy, before you
12 go on, I believe at our last meeting, one of our inspectors
13 Mel Holmberg identified a question regarding a potential
14 for corrosion below the concrete base mat on the inside of
15 the, of the pressure vessel and also around the outside of
16 the annular region. Have you done anything to evaluate
17 that issue?

18 MR. FAST: That evaluation is
19 ongoing. A team is assembled and we'll be doing
20 comprehensive reviews, which will include all of the
21 containment liner areas.

22 MR. MYERS: We have taken some
23 action to-date.

24 MR. FAST: Yes. We did about
25 1700 ultrasonic examinations for metal thickness in the

1 areas that were adjacent to those areas that Mel had
2 identified. That was our immediate corrective action;
3 however, we're looking at all of the containment vessel for
4 integrity.

5 MR. GROBE: Okay. I read in
6 the paper this morning something that I think was already a
7 focus of both the NRC and First Energy, that's the issue of
8 what's referred to as MIC, or microbial induced corrosion.
9 Could you comment on that a little bit?

10 MR. FAST: Well, that's
11 something that has to be evaluated. Micrologically induced
12 corrosion, MIC, as it's called, is a naturally occurring;
13 and if we've had ground water in-seepage around the vessel
14 area, that would potentially be susceptible. So, we'll
15 have to do some evaluation and analysis to ensure that we
16 do not have any MIC present.

17 MR. BERGENDAHL: We have, in fact
18 have an individual working on that right now.

19 MR. POWERS: I'm taking water
20 samples to physically look for that as well as corrosion
21 problems.

22 MR. GROBE: Okay.

23 MR. FAST: We're aware as
24 well it is an item that is under investigation and
25 evaluation.

1 MR. GROBE: I don't believe
2 that Mel has had a chance to come back and look at the
3 results of your ultrasonic tests. Could you briefly
4 summarize the results of what you found?

5 MR. FAST: What we did was an
6 analysis that looked at minimum wall thickness. That
7 vessel liner is about an inch and a half thick. We didn't
8 see any significant degradation. There is some local
9 surface pitting, which is just expected of a carbon steel
10 component, but no deduction in the overall ability of the
11 areas that we did evaluate; nothing that would require any
12 additional remediation.

13 MR. GROBE: You indicated, you
14 indicated that you were planning additional inspections.
15 Could you characterize those?

16 MR. FAST: Well, I try to
17 describe what this vessel liner looks like for our folks
18 out in the public. If you've ever changed out a thermos
19 bottle, the glass liner inside that bottle is effectively
20 what our pressure vessel in the containment is like.

21 So, you see the concrete structure outside that
22 extends about 240 feet above the grade elevation; 2.4
23 million cubic feet of volume, but within that is a steel
24 structure much like this thermos bottle. And that's the
25 structural integrity that ensures that under a design basis

1 accident, that peak pressures that would be held during
2 that event are being contained within the containment; that
3 is the barrier that protects the environment from a design
4 basis accident.

5 So, that thermos bottle with its steel structure,
6 the integrity of that has to be evaluated to make sure it
7 meets design requirements.

8 So, part of those inspections is in the annular
9 space. That's about a four foot wide space outside the
10 steel liner, but inside of the concrete, the external
11 concrete structure. We'll be building scaffolding and
12 doing hand-over-hand reviews of the structural integrity,
13 as well as put together some additional ultrasonic tests to
14 make sure we meet the minimum wall requirements for
15 pressure retention. That will extend all the way to the
16 top of the vessel.

17 MR. GROBE: Okay. And, are
18 you doing similar inspections on the inside of the
19 containment?

20 MR. FAST: Yes, we are.

21 MR. GROBE: What sort of
22 inspections are you planning, for lack of a better phrase,
23 for the subterranean section of the vessel?

24 MR. POWERS: I'll handle that
25 one. We did inspections on the inside where there was a

1 gap identified between the concrete at the base of this
2 containment thermos bottle Randy described. Concrete was
3 originally poured at the base on the inside and interfaced
4 right up against the steel vessel structure.

5 With time that concrete has shrunk a bit and there
6 is a narrow gap formed there, and there was concern about
7 whether water could have gotten down into that gap. So, we
8 went in and we did stick feeler gauges down to as much as
9 42 inches into that gap and found no moisture.

10 So, that was positive result from those initial
11 tests, and we're going to continue further to characterize
12 all the way down to the bottom areas what the situation is,
13 whether there is any moisture down there, and characterize
14 what the wall thickness is and integrity at the lower
15 elevations.

16 MR. GROBE: Okay.

17 MR. FAST: Just to try to
18 clarify the ultrasonic tests that we've done so far. In
19 the area adjacent, in the lower elevation of containment
20 where Mel identified the small annular space where the
21 concrete had shrunk and there is some gap between the
22 concrete and steel liner, where Jim just identified we dip
23 sticked. On the exterior side, there is a section about a
24 couple, three feet on the outside where there is no
25 concrete; and we were able from the annular space to do

1 ultrasonic testing to be sure we had full integrity.

2 That would tell us if there were degradation in
3 areas that could not be seen by the naked eye, that you
4 would be able to tell we had full depth and integrity on
5 the steel liner.

6 MR. GROBE: Okay.

7 MR. FAST: The other areas
8 that we've incorporated as part of our Containment Health
9 Environmental Qualification is we're concerned about such
10 things as electrical equipment, such as air operated or
11 motor operated valves. We'll be going through a
12 comprehensive review of that equipment and other
13 environmental qualified, to ensure that the conditions in
14 containment, that all of that equipment is operated in or
15 as fine a condition within its design requirements.

16 One of the areas that we're focusing on, this is
17 really an industry lesson learned is the containment sump;
18 and we're looking from a design perspective at ensuring
19 that the emergency sump is intact and that it meets
20 requirements. As a matter of fact, our vision of success
21 is to improve margin.

22 We think there is opportunities to actually extend
23 and improve the isolation from around the containment
24 emergency sump. So, we have a team in place that will be
25 looking at that as well. Looking at, where we're moving

1 fibrous insulation, we could impact clogging that sump.
2 So, that will be removed from containment. We will have
3 all metal insulation.

4 The other things that we're looking at is, the Decay
5 Heat Valve Pit, which is, I'm going to call it a legacy
6 issue. There are two motor operated valves, which are
7 located in a pit adjacent to the emergency sump. And we
8 have traditionally sealed those plates and done a pressure
9 test, what we call a drop test, to ensure in a design basis
10 condition those valves are not environmentally qualified,
11 so we have to keep them from the flooded conditions when it
12 exists. And we've traditionally gone in and sealed those
13 and verified their integrity from this drop test.

14 But that's not a standard that we continue to
15 operate to. So, we have a design team looking at that and
16 we have several options under evaluation, which would
17 include extending the operators outside of the flooded
18 region, putting valves outside of containment, or
19 qualifying operators that could operate under the harsh
20 environments that would exist on design basis access.

21 So, all of those are being evaluated and again, our
22 intent is to improve our margin of safety in this area.

23 Containment air coolers.

24 MR. GROBE: Tony is clearing
25 his throat. I wanted to make sure.

1 MR. MENDIOLA: I did have a
2 question.

3 MR. GROBE: Okay. Go ahead.

4 MR. MENDIOLA: I want to retreat
5 a second. Going back to the liner for a second. Two
6 questions I have.

7 MR. FAST: Yes.

8 MR. MENDIOLA: When you mentioned
9 that you evaluated the inside gap between, I guess, the
10 concrete and the inside of the liner, going down with a
11 feeler gauge and you found no moisture, but is there any
12 plans on sealing that gap or, or leaving the gap as found?

13 MR. POWERS: We're still in
14 evaluation on that one, Tony. We're working on an overall
15 plan about surveiling the lower elevations even below that
16 gap area and restoring that as necessary. So, it's a
17 detail we haven't finalized yet, but it's part of our
18 evaluation.

19 MR. MENDIOLA: Okay. Then
20 similarly, is there a similar gap on the outside of the
21 liner, something like that's on the inside.

22 MR. POWERS: On the outside,
23 there is ground water that has seeped through the
24 concrete. It's not unusual for this to happen with any
25 type of concrete, has small cracks in it. And what Randy

1 described earlier with surveiling the outside, yes, there
2 is, there is an area or space where water can migrate
3 alongside of the liner.

4 In fact, in the past, originally we did
5 modifications in that area injecting the ground to work on
6 sealing that, sealing that gap. And then we're going to be
7 evaluating that as part of the overall integrity assessment
8 of the vessel; that's going to be included.

9 MR. MENDIOLA: Okay, thank you.

10 MR. GROBE: Just feel free to
11 clear your throat at any time.

12 I had just a couple of questions. Some of these
13 activities appear to be directly related to the boric acid
14 issue. Some of these activities appear to be unrelated.

15 You mentioned that the containment emergency sump,
16 there have been questions in operating experience from
17 other plants as well as you yourself have identified the
18 decay heat valve pit as something that you want to look
19 at.

20 Why weren't these issues identified and corrected
21 earlier? Why are they being identified and corrected now?

22 MR. BERGENDAHL: Let me take a
23 shot at that. As we're going to discuss later, the
24 management issues, according to one of the things we're
25 looking at is the standards of the oversight and ownership

1 of the power plant and programs. And as part of our new
2 initiatives to raise the standards and clarify that we're
3 meeting requirements is not our standard. Our standard is
4 to exceed and do things the best.

5 The fresh outlook has exposed some areas where we
6 have performed to meet requirements, and that's it. So,
7 although that pit may have met the requirements, it doesn't
8 meet our new standards of robust safety way.

9 MR. MYERS: I've been on the
10 Davis-Besse Oversight Review Board Meetings several times
11 over the years. We've been looking at those two issues and
12 they're not new issues to us. So, while we're in this
13 extended outage, why not go and take them up. Perfect
14 opportunity to do that. That's what we're going to do.
15 And it will give us an opportunity to gain knowledge.

16 MR. GROBE: Okay.

17 MR. FAST: Next item, our
18 containment air coolers, and we're going through complete
19 remediation. This is another example where our intention
20 is to improve margin.

21 We've investigated the opportunity to get some
22 coolers of higher efficiency, better thermoconductivity and
23 we'll be doing a complete remediation of those containment
24 air coolers. So, they will be brought up to better than as
25 new condition; all three of those containment air coolers.

1 That's the comprehensive plan. We'll actually start the
2 disassembling of those coolers next week.

3 MR. MYERS: Where are those?

4 MR. FAST: Those are the
5 original coolers that were installed at the plant. It's
6 like a radiator in your car, the way I would describe it
7 for the public, obviously. And it has deteriorated over
8 time.

9 It's a normal phenomenon for equipment and it's time
10 now to go in and replace it and renew it and bring it up to
11 standards. And in this case, we can gain, because of
12 improvements in technology over the years, should have an
13 opportunity to actually improve their thermo performance.

14 MR. DEAN: Randy, are you
15 talking about replacing them or just refurbishing them by
16 replacing the tubes or innards?

17 MR. FAST: Primarily, the
18 design of the containment air cooler is a series of heat
19 exchangers. And those heat exchangers were replaceable
20 individually as a maintenance function. However, over the
21 years they degrade, so we're going to be replacing probably
22 90 plus percent of those coolers. I'm trying to think how
23 many coolers there actually are, but there are a few that
24 have been replaced recently as part of the normal
25 maintenance process, the old coolers were galvanized

1 steel. The newer ones are stainless steel. They have
2 improved in design and improved thermoconductivity.

3 So, effectively when you look at it now, there are
4 other elements of the containment air coolers. We did
5 receive notification of motor problems and we have two
6 brand new motors, two of the three will receive brand new
7 motors and as well the register, the duct work have been
8 completely reworked and will be remediated to, to as-new
9 condition, so principally, that heat exchange will be
10 replaced.

11 MR. GROBE: Okay. So, this
12 wasn't necessarily an artifact of the boric acid situation,
13 this was just an aging, normal aging, equipment aging?

14 MR. FAST: Well, there are
15 really two factors, Jack. First is the aging, the normal
16 aging process of equipment, but the other is, that through
17 the trailing of boric acid, those would collect on the
18 fins and those have been cleaned numerous times by our
19 staff, that did take their toll, the boric acid that
20 collected on the, on those cooling fins could be cleaned.
21 But, that repetitive action did degrade the equipment.

22 MR. GROBE: It sounds like
23 modification, not replacement for the component limit.
24 Will there be a substantive test program, heat transfer
25 testing program, following the replacement?

1 MR. FAST: One of the things
2 we're not going into a lot of detail today is restart, post
3 restart test plan, but all modifications for the plant will
4 undergo an extensive testing prior to restart of the plant.
5 So, that is, when you look at the chart or for the Restart
6 and Post-Restart Test Plan, that comprehensive test or plan
7 extends beyond the reactor coolant system and all the
8 support systems, and in this case that would be tested
9 extensively.

10 MR. MYERS: Jack, you asked
11 the question, one of the things we can tell you, we could
12 probably go out and clean these coolers up, work on them
13 and meet the minimum requirements. We have, we have an
14 opportunity to replacement and gain on the margin, so
15 that's what we're going to do.

16 MR. GROBE: Okay.

17 MR. FAST: Okay, there were
18 questions as we met last time about our inspections for
19 systems that contained borated water outside of the
20 containment. We talked about that, and said, where do we
21 want to do those reviews to ensure that we have a good
22 comprehensive review of systems outside of containment.

23 I mentioned here that we did roll that into our
24 System Health Assurance Plan to insure that any systems
25 that contain borated water are thoroughly evaluated for

1 their functional requirements and design capability. So,
2 it's not part of the Containment Health Plan, however that
3 element has been rolled into the System Health Assurance
4 Plan.

5 Since we met last, we have gone through a review of
6 our Inspector Training Program, and we actually saw
7 opportunities to improve. As we had talked previously
8 about inspection criteria, inspection requirements, we went
9 back and used our systematic approach to training to
10 review, to insure that our engineers were qualified to the
11 right standards for the inspections that had been done.

12 We saw opportunities to improve it by using the
13 systematic approach to training. Did incorporate it then,
14 lessons learned and being able to then apply inspection
15 techniques to civil, structural, electrical, mechanical and
16 our Alloy 600 reviews.

17 So, subsequently, we revamped our training program
18 for our engineers, and we have trained them. We have job
19 familiarization guides that are implemented and we are in
20 the process of reestablishing our baseline inspections and
21 verifying inspections that were done previously were, would
22 meet our standards of excellence.

23 We'll be detailing any differences between the
24 initial inspections and the subsequent inspections. And
25 using condition reports to identify those differences, and

1 they'll go into the engineering evaluation process.

2 MR. GROBE: I think I have two
3 things there I want to make sure I understand it. I think
4 I hear that you're going to reperform inspections and if
5 you identify any deficiencies, those deficiencies will go
6 into corrective action guidelines, condition reports, but
7 in addition, I think I heard you say that when you identify
8 deficiencies between your first inspection and the
9 reinspection for the improved training that you're going to
10 identify that difference as something to learn from, from
11 the standpoint of the systematic approach to training. Is
12 that, help me understand?

13 MR. FAST: We want to make
14 sure that we understand that the inspections that were
15 done, we want to see what differences there are. We see
16 improvements in the training. In fact, the previous
17 training program, we brought some industry experts in and
18 tested them, and we identified shortfalls with even
19 industry experts in their understanding and knowledge of
20 inspection techniques. So, we've incorporated that.

21 We think we have an excellent training program. And
22 we expect to see that through this reinspection, there will
23 be some differences. And what we want to do is document
24 those differences. Now, if we saw something that were
25 generic in nature, we want to certainly apply that across

1 the board, but we will be documenting many of those
2 differences and doing evaluation and inspection.

3 MR. DEAN: Randy, you
4 characterized what it was that drove you to revise the
5 field inspection training program?

6 MR. FAST: Yeah, I'll try to
7 digress a little bit. As we originally identified our
8 extended condition, we were focused on extended condition
9 principally in the area of boric acid degradation through a
10 threat of Alloy 600 components.

11 We adopted a standard, which was set by the American
12 Society of Mechanical Engineers called a VT-2 Inspection.
13 We applied that VT-2 Inspection. We had some problems,
14 problematic problems in our inspection program. We went
15 back, rebaseline, redeveloped that program. And as we
16 raised standards, we self-identified that there were
17 shortfalls, that although this would be good for credible
18 Alloy 600 Inspections, it did not meet our inspection in
19 other areas, such as electrical components or other
20 structural components within the containment. So, we took
21 on a more, I would say, full body inspection program with
22 better criteria.

23 Okay, the other thing that we originally, in our
24 original plan had inspection plans that were developed by
25 engineering. We have subsequently rolled all of our

1 inspection plans into plant procedures.

2 Plant procedures are in hand. Have specific
3 criteria requirements for the entry and exit from those
4 procedures. And so part of our training program as well is
5 on these new procedures and the use of these procedures.

6 As identified the validation of inspections is in
7 progress. As well, we have now a group of independent
8 inspectors that are as well going through, using the same
9 criteria inspection programs that we'll be doing validation
10 of our inspected areas.

11 MR. GROBE: Help me understand
12 the word independent. Independent of what?

13 MR. FAST: It's not the same
14 folks we're using principally; our engineers from design
15 engineering and from our performance engineering, plant
16 engineering. These are individuals that we brought into
17 the organization with experience outside of Davis-Besse;
18 and they were trained to our same program and they will be
19 looking independently at the inspections and checking and
20 verifying and validating that we've done a good job on
21 those inspections.

22 MR. GROBE: I just want to
23 make sure I understand this. When I think of the different
24 kinds of assessments of work that's done on nuclear plants,
25 which is what I refer to as line assessments; those were

1 assessments by the organization responsible for conducting
2 the work. And then there is independent assessments that
3 we've recently established, Vice President of Oversight,
4 and that's a second level of independence. What kind of
5 independence are we talking about?

6 MR. FAST: We actually have
7 two pieces of independence. One is our First Energy's
8 quality assessment and that is ongoing. So, our quality
9 organization under Bill Pearce, the Vice President of
10 Quality, has also been training or doing assessments, but
11 we also brought in an external assessment organization.
12 So, we have both internal oversight and external
13 oversight.

14 MR. GROBE: Okay. The
15 external oversight reports to the containment health team
16 as part of that team's activities?

17 MR. POWERS: That's correct,
18 yes.

19 MR. GROBE: Yes.

20 MR. POWERS: Containment health
21 organization has a new kind of review and oversight
22 organization, and that's part of our engineering assessment
23 board that we've assembled consisting of outside industry
24 experts, you know, providing oversight of all of our
25 activities.

1 MR. GROBE: Okay.

2 MR. FAST: Since we met
3 previously, we made significant progress in containment.
4 As an example, we have off-loaded all of our nuclear fuels,
5 177 bundles have been transferred to spent fuel pool. This
6 has allowed us now to make the record cool system more
7 available for other inspections.

8 We have installed nozzle dams. We are in the
9 process this week. We will refill the cavity. We will
10 reinsert the import thimbles, then drain down, remove the
11 sealing plate, remove the insulation adjacent to the
12 reactor vessel flange, and we'll be doing thorough
13 inspections of the tops of the nozzles adjacent to the
14 reactor vessel itself.

15 After that is completed, we will also then be able
16 to do cleaning, and as well, we are going to be installing
17 a permanent cavity seal, which is something many plants
18 across the country have been able to install a permanent,
19 it's a stainless steel plate that joins the liner from the
20 cavity to the vessel to insure that there is no leakage
21 path, which is one of the items.

22 If you have a temporary seal, then you have some
23 temporary, some minimal amount of leakage, leak path that
24 comes down the vessel. With the permanent cavity seal,
25 there is no leakage. Subsequently, we have no opportunity

1 then for any additional degradation under the vessel. So,
2 that is part of our going forward plans.

3 The other things we're doing is we have mobilized a
4 significant number of painters, went through a
5 qualification program. We've got some pictures, some
6 slides here that show. We currently have 20 fully
7 qualified painters, effective in containment right now.

8 If you go in, you'll see these four foot by four
9 foot squares where each painter actually went through a
10 qualification process. That was the in-field exercise to
11 insure that they met standards of excellence for coating.
12 And you can see their names and Social Security numbers on
13 the wall where we did this. And we go back subsequently
14 and test and verify the paint is applied properly.

15 We have an additional 20 painters that are in the
16 pipeline in training, and they'll be reporting to the
17 station to help as well, and with coatings in the
18 containment. And another 14 will come this week.

19 So, we have a significant number of painters, and
20 they'll be painting the entire containment dome, and as
21 well all of the surface areas from 603 elevation, that's
22 the operating deck, up to the polar crane.

23 So, it's a nice bright white and we are in the
24 process of prepping it right now. As a matter of fact, I
25 was in yesterday and you can see where, you can see over

1 the years, many years of operation and training, just dirt
2 and normal dust, oils and thing that have collected on the
3 walls. Just like in your home, that can be cleaned and
4 those areas are brighter significantly.

5 That's part of the preparation for the surface
6 prep. And that's going to brighten the containment
7 significantly, but that will demonstrate our standards and
8 our expectations for the quality of condition of the
9 containment. So, I'm particularly excited about that.

10 Additionally, we've decontaminated a significant
11 amount of areas in containment. All of the containment air
12 cooler duct work, which we've had people inside doing that
13 work. We do have the containment air recirc fan running,
14 which is redistributing air throughout the containment.

15 We also have a temporary cooling package, which is
16 connected to our containment purge supply, and that is
17 providing cooler air, so that we get better environmental
18 conditions for the folks working inside containment.

19 That's made environmental conditions more favorable
20 and really putting a lot better situation for the work that
21 we're doing. So, we have a significant measurable progress
22 in cleaning and housekeeping remediation in our
23 containment.

24 That concludes my presentation. Any questions?

25 MR. THOMAS: I have one, Randy.

1 When they scope the evaluation for the containment air
2 coolers --

3 (Requested speaker to repeat.)

4 MR. THOMAS: I asked if the
5 evaluation of the grade containment, potentially degraded
6 air coolers would include a past operability evaluation and
7 scope of their inspection?

8 MR. FAST: The simple answer,
9 Scott, is we are doing a past operability determination.

10 MR. THOMAS: Thank you.

11 MR. DEAN: Randy, I have a
12 question about where, can you give us a sense of where you
13 gauge the percentage of which you have completed, at least,
14 the evaluation phase in terms of impact for the boric acid
15 disposition containment.

16 MR. FAST: I try to use
17 numbers. I believe these are accurate. Mark, if I'm
18 wrong, you can correct me. But we have about 280 condition
19 reports, which is actually about over 2000 individual line
20 items that have to be dispositioned. About 30 of those
21 have been dispositioned and turned into work orders for
22 work that's going to occur. The rest are in some phase of
23 evaluation and will be forthcoming.

24 I see a nod there, so it looks like I was pretty
25 close.