

**From:** [Cameron, Jamnes](#)  
**To:** [West, Steven](#); [Louden, Patrick](#)  
**Cc:** [Lara, Julio](#); [Mitlyng, Viktoria](#); [Chandrathil, Prema](#); [Roberts, Darrell](#); [Mills, Daniel](#); [Garza, Michelle](#); [Rutkowski, John](#); [Harvey, Jacquelyn](#)  
**Subject:** RE: RE: LETTER TO MR. GURDZIEL  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 30, 2018 1:03:00 PM

---

Steve, as we discussed, I called Mr. Gurdziel this afternoon to address his followup email to you. As I indicated, he had called the Davis-Besse resident office and talked to Michelle last week, and he called me this morning. Both of the calls were specific to his concern about an apparent discrepancy in the LER where it described the SFAS system logic differently in two sections.

After I reviewed the LER (2016-008-000 and 2016-008-001) and the plant's UFSAR, I called him and described the system logic – the 4 sensing channels require 2 out of 4 logic and the actuation channel logic requires 1 out of 2, specifically actuation channel 1 requires that sensing channels 1 and 3 be de-energized, and actuation channel 2 requires that sensing channels 2 and 4 be de-energized, to initiate safety features. This is as described in the licensee's LER, which was taken verbatim from the UFSAR.

Mr. Gurdziel stated that he was satisfied with my explanation. I offered to followup with an email providing the description I gave him over the phone, to which he declined.

He had no further questions.

Jamnes

---

**From:** West, Steven  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 23, 2018 7:36 AM  
**To:** Louden, Patrick <Patrick.Louden@nrc.gov>; Cameron, Jamnes <Jamnes.Cameron@nrc.gov>  
**Cc:** Lara, Julio <Julio.Lara@nrc.gov>; Mitlyng, Viktoria <Viktoria.Mitlyng@nrc.gov>; Chandrathil, Prema <Prema.Chandrathil@nrc.gov>; Roberts, Darrell <Darrell.Roberts@nrc.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: RE: LETTER TO MR. GURDZIEL

Let's discuss a short email reply to Mr. Gurdziel. Should probably come from the POC we noted in our letter – Jamnes.

Steve

---

**From:** Clay, Jim  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 23, 2018 7:31 AM  
**To:** West, Steven <Steven.West@nrc.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: RE: LETTER TO MR. GURDZIEL

---

**From:** Tom Gurdziel [<mailto:tgurdziel@twcnv.rr.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 22, 2018 9:11 PM  
**To:** Clay, Jim <[Jim.Clay@nrc.gov](mailto:Jim.Clay@nrc.gov)>

**Cc:** Bridget Frymire <[bridget.frymire@dps.ny.gov](mailto:bridget.frymire@dps.ny.gov)>; 'Ed Stronski' <[estronski@aol.com](mailto:estronski@aol.com)>; Holden, Tammy L:(GenCo-Nuc) <[Tammy.Holden@exeloncorp.com](mailto:Tammy.Holden@exeloncorp.com)>; Lyon, Jill:(NMP) <[jill.lyon@exeloncorp.com](mailto:jill.lyon@exeloncorp.com)>; [DLochbaum@ucsusa.org](mailto:DLochbaum@ucsusa.org); Screnci, Diane <[Diane.Screnci@nrc.gov](mailto:Diane.Screnci@nrc.gov)>; CHAIRMAN Resource <[CHAIRMAN.Resource@nrc.gov](mailto:CHAIRMAN.Resource@nrc.gov)>  
**Subject:** [External\_Sender] RE: LETTER TO MR. GURDZIEL

Good morning Jim Clay,

Thank you for the letter. I read it and also quickly read over LER 2016-008-001 (which I found on the NRC website.)

I think the LER, very early, (first paragraph on page 1), gives a clear view of why these plants are going bankrupt today. How can you justify spending 29 hours and 22 minutes doing scheduled maintenance on a level transmitter at 100% power? Can you afford such an expense? Can you afford the risk exposure? Suppose that the I & C technicians were allowed a full 12 hour shift to do the repair and completed the job in that time. Do you realize that Channel 1 would have been back in service BEFORE Channel 2 failed (at 15 hr 13 min)? In other words, there would have been no need to write an LER. How much money would that have saved FirstEnergy? I will bet we are talking here of \$50,000 to \$100,000.

Also, I don't know what "normalized deviation" on page 1 of 7 means. (Also on page 4 of 7).

And I think they have inaccurately described their actuation logic on page 2 of 7 where, in paragraph 1 they mention "two-out-of-four" but, in paragraph 3 of the same page they seem to be describing 1 of 2, taken twice logic. Did anybody notice this? They are NOT the same thing.

Observe, too, on the bottom of page 5 of 7 that, when "culpability" is shared, nobody is held responsible. At least, that is the way I would look at it.

These nuclear merchant plants today need to be thinking of how things can be done better, faster, cheaper, more effectively. Then they have to implement those changes. I'll bet that is how their gas turbine competition acts.

Thank you,

Tom Gurdziel

---

**From:** Clay, Jim [<mailto:Jim.Clay@nrc.gov>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 22, 2018 8:55 AM  
**To:** [tgurdziel@twcny.rr.com](mailto:tgurdziel@twcny.rr.com)  
**Cc:** West, Steven  
**Subject:** LETTER TO MR. GURDZIEL

On behalf of Steven West, Regional Administrator, Region III, I am forwarding Region III's response to your April 20, 2018, email.

*Jim Clay, CWCA*

***Administrative Assistant to Steven West  
Regional Administrator, Region III***

***Phone: 630-829-9657***

Purpose means intention, objective, goals based on your deepest core values.

Meaning is of value, significance, and important to me.

***Email: [jim.clay@nrc.gov](mailto:jim.clay@nrc.gov)***



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)