

DOCKETED
USNRC

GPC EXHIBIT 40
AUFDENKAMPE EX. N

'95 JUN -6 P12:42

1

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Transcription of Audiotape No. 157

10 transcribed by Janice Walters, Certified Court

11 Reporter and Notary Public.

12

13

14

15

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

16

Docket No. 50-424-OLA-3 Official Ex. No. GPC II-40

17

In the matter of GPC et al

18

Staff IDENTIFIED

19

Applicant RECEIVED

20

Intervenor REJECTED

21

Contg. Offr.

Contractor DATE 5-17-95

Other Witness Aufdenkampe

Reporter C Riner

22

23

24

BROWN REPORTING, INC.
1100 SPRING STREET, SUITE 750
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30309
(404) 876-8979

25

[APPROXIMATELY 10% THROUGH SIDE A]

2

1 (Phone dial tone and phone ringing.)

RUSHTON: Paul Rushton.

2 MOSBAUGH: Paul, this is Allen. I

3 understood from Theresa you wanted to talk to me.

4 RUSHTON: Yes, I did. I am trying to get
5 the background on this LER for the diesel generator
6 starts.

7 MOSBAUGH: Uh-huh.

8 RUSHTON: And we had originally reported
9 at least 18 and now we are going to report that was
10 in error and that it was, I think, 15 and 14
11 respectively was the correct numbers and Tom Greene
12 told me that you had the background on that because
13 I am going to need to explain it to management up
14 here.

15 MOSBAUGH: I think John Aufdenkampe has
16 been talking to Jim Bailey about that.

17 RUSHTON: Yeah. I got a part of that
18 story. John -- wasn't real clear in listening to
19 John about a couple of things. Like, I understand
20 that the 1st came from a tally of the starts logged
21 in the control room operator's log, and that when we
22 went back and filled in the diesel generator logs
23 that Engineering maintains, they came up and counted
24 them differently.

25 And it wasn't clear to me why one log has

1 got 18 or more but other logs only count 15 or 14.
2 I didn't understand the difference between the two
3 logs.

4 MOSBAUGH: Yeah. Well, I guess you would
5 have to ask the Operations people about how they
6 keep their logs. (Pause.) They initiate both logs.
7 (Ice biting sounds.) They initiate the log in the
8 control room and they initiate the data sheets that
9 count the starts. (Pause.) So why don't you call
10 Jim Swartzwelder or somebody about that?

11 RUSHTON: So you don't know what the
12 history is on it?

13 MOSBAUGH: I know some of the history
14 because I was in the PRB when we approved the
15 revision to the LER. And I can only tell you that
16 any differences between the logs that Operations
17 generates that fills out data sheets versus the logs
18 that they maintain in the main control room that
19 I -- that you would have to ask Jim Swartzwelder why
20 there are discrepancies between their logs.

21 RUSHTON: Okay.

22 MOSBAUGH: And I am not sure that that
23 fact explains all the discrepancies. I do not
24 believe actually that that fact is a discrepancy,
25 but that fact does not explain the discrepancies and

1 the reason why the previous numbers were incorrect.

2 I believe that mistakes were made in the
3 previous numbers and that that probably started with
4 George Bockhold and his presentation to the NRC.

5 RUSHTON: If Bockhold made a presentation
6 to the NRC, then he used numbers like 18 and 19.

7 MOSBAUGH: I believe that that is where
8 the mistake originated.

9 RUSHTON: And those got put into the LER
10 without verification?

11 MOSBAUGH: Uhm. No, I think there was --
12 I believe that inaccuracies in those numbers were
13 flagged -- were flagged in the LER, in the LER
14 development. (Ice biting sounds.)

15 RUSHTON: You are telling me I need to go
16 talk to Operations and find out what the problem
17 was?

18 MOSBAUGH: In terms of logs, the log
19 discrepancies, I can't explain why there are
20 differences in the way operators fill out logs. You
21 know, I don't work in that area.

22 RUSHTON: Okay. Well, fine. I will call
23 Operations then.

24 MOSBAUGH: But I think that will not
25 explain everything.

1 RUSHTON: What else is there that I need
2 to know?

3 MOSBAUGH: I think there is whatever
4 initial mistake was made. And, as far as I know,
5 George Bockhold and maybe some of the Operations
6 people developed the initial information that George
7 used in his presentation.

8 RUSHTON: Okay. You don't know where
9 that information came from?

10 MOSBAUGH: (Biting ice sounds.) John says
11 Jimmy Paul Cash.

12 RUSHTON: Okay.

13 MOSBAUGH: Beyond that it is merely a
14 comparison between what was originally developed by
15 George and them to what the data sheets and the
16 control logs say.

17 RUSHTON: Okay. I will check with
18 Operations then.

19 MOSBAUGH: Okay.

20 RUSHTON: Bye.

21 MOSBAUGH: See ya. Bye.

22 (Movement sounds.)

23 MOSBAUGH: What's going on?

 (Inaudible)

24 AUFDENKAMPE: Hairston's evidently on a
25 tear for misinformation.

1 MOSBAUGH: He's on a what?

2 AUFDENKAMPE: He's on a-- He's on a--
3 He's pissed off over misinformation.

4 MOSBAUGH: On this?

5 AUFDENKAMPE: Well, he's pissed off over
6 the revised LER for a date change because Lackey
7 didn't get the stuff done on time and he's pissed
8 off over this one.

(Movement sounds)

9 MOSBAUGH: (To himself) I should have
10 asked him. I didn't ask him why the hell are you
11 calling me. All I did was compare two sets of
12 data. That, anybody can do. Now, they have got the
13 experience, the responsible parties will need to
14 account.

15 (Pause in tape.)

16 MOSBAUGH: (Inaudible) from the middle of
17 May and now on Friday today is, it's finished.-- Well,
18 come on.

19 AUFDENKAMPE: I can tell you why they've
20 had it for so long.

21 MOSBAUGH: Something's going on.

22 AUFDENKAMPE: Nah, nah. (Inaudible) your stock
trader's. . .

23 MOSBAUGH: Yes, my instinct.

24 AUFDENKAMPE: I will tell you why they
25 have had it for so long is basically they have got

1 it and they have been sitting on it because I talked
2 Jack Stringfellow several times, and he said he
3 hasn't had time to work on it with the other ones
4 going out that have a time clock on them.

5 MOSBAUGH: Right. [Facetious tone.]

6 AUFDENKAMPE: -- times clocks on it.

7 MOSBAUGH: Right. [Facetious tone.]

8 AUFDENKAMPE: And that is true. That is
9 true.

10 MOSBAUGH: Get out of here. I don't
11 believe that for anything.

12 AUFDENKAMPE: That's the way Bailey
13 operates, Bailey operates the clock.

14 MOSBAUGH: I don't believe that for a
15 second.

16 AUFDENKAMPE: That is true.

17 MOSBAUGH: That is my stock trader's
18 instinct.

19 AUFDENKAMPE: The second part of it is
20 more elementary than that and that is the same thing
21 that always concerns you is that the NRC misleading
22 diesel information and Hairston gets nervous about
23 that.

24 (Pause.)

25 * * * *

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

(Phone rings.)

AUFDENKAMPE: John Aufdenkampe.

1 BAILEY: John, how are you doing?

2 AUFDENKAMPE: Wonderful.

3 BAILEY: I don't think we've had the full
4 story on the generator starts, the numbering, who
5 is supposed to have the exact story on that.

6 AUFDENKAMPE: Jim, I don't think -- is
7 Paul in there with you?

8 BAILEY: Yes.

9 AUFDENKAMPE: Okay. Allen is in here with
10 me. I don't think anybody has and I didn't say
11 because I am not really sure what you are looking
12 for with respect to the whole story, but I am not
13 sure anybody has the whole story as to why we've
14 got misinformation in there, okay.

15 RUSHTON: That's the --

16 AUFDENKAMPE: The real bottom line on why
17 we have the misinformation in there, if you want to
18 point at one thing, is because we made the decision
19 -- we as management made the decision and the
20 Shipmans, Bockholds, Bailey, Aufdenkampe, Mosbaugh,
21 who else was on that phone call -- to put those
22 numbers in based on the fact that George [Bockhold]
23 told us that they were good numbers because they
24 used as the start point, completions of, I
25 think it was, the undervoltage testing, okay.

1 And when we went back, what was it he
2 said?

3 MOSBAUGH: For George's?

4 AUFDENKAMPE: Yeah, George.

5 MOSBAUGH: I have no idea. I have no
6 idea what George's basis was for the data he
7 presented to the Commission.

8 BAILEY: You're talking about George
9 Bockhold?

10 MOSBAUGH: Yes. But I have no idea what
11 the basis was.

12 AUFDENKAMPE: It is based on --

13 MOSBAUGH: It was not based on
14 undervoltage. It couldn't be.

15 AUFDENKAMPE: It was based on George's
16 comment that that, that he had used this point,
17 whatever the point was, whatever the point was,
18 that's exactly what he said as the start point. And
19 we have completed the critical testing associated
20 with declaration of or with (operability?).

21 MOSBAUGH: George never presented what
22 his basis was.

23 AUFDENKAMPE: And I know those numbers
24 were counted by Jimmy Paul Cash.

25 MOSBAUGH: The final numbers are based on

1 starting with the UV test as the first test. But
2 what George's basis was, only George knows.

3 RUSHTON: When was the UV test in the
4 sequence of events?

5 AUFDENKAMPE: Pretty far down the line.
6 Right before we declared them operable, I think.

7 MOSBAUGH: Yes.

8 RUSHTON: So we may have done 18 or 19
9 successful starts, but it just depends on where you
10 start counting.

11 BAILEY: Yeah.

12 AUFDENKAMPE: No, that is not true.

13 BAILEY: That's what it looks like.

14 AUFDENKAMPE: No, that is not true.

15 There were not 18 or 19 successful starts,
16 continuous starts, regardless of where you started
17 counting when we reviewed the detailed data, not
18 consecutive.

19 RUSHTON: Starting from March 20th?

20 AUFDENKAMPE: Starting from March 20th.
21 There were not 18 or 19 consecutive, which is the
22 LER implies to consecutive starts without a failure
23 of some type or another.

24 BAILEY: Here is what George has got
25 listed on his chart that he presented in Atlanta.

1 BAILEY/RUSHTON: He said five starts in
2 troubleshooting, there is a UV run test, sensor
3 calibration, logic testing, E-run bubble testing,
4 multiple starts five more, UV test, six months'
5 surveillance, high jacket water runs three times and
6 the UV run test. That adds up to 18.

7 MOSBAUGH: In amongst 18 are numerous
8 failures.

9 AUFDENKAMPE: Failures.

10 BAILEY: What was that, Allen?

11 AUFDENKAMPE: There are failures in
12 amongst those, mixed in with.

13 BAILEY: Yes. Okay. He just says 18
14 successful starts. He didn't say there were
15 consecutive successful starts.

16 AUFDENKAMPE: What we put in there was 18
17 starts without a failure.

18 BAILEY: I am talking about on the chart,
19 it doesn't say consecutive.

20 AUFDENKAMPE: That is what we put in the
21 April 9th letter was 18 starts without a failure.

22 BAILEY: This chart implies that, that he
23 didn't mention any failure.

24 MOSBAUGH: You have to check the data but
25 you may find that some of those five ones mentioned

1 failed, for example.

2 BAILEY: Five troubleshooting?

3 MOSBAUGH: Uh-huh.

4 BAILEY: Yes.

5 MOSBAUGH: I don't think you have any
6 guarantee that those were all successful.

7 BAILEY: Like I said, it doesn't say
8 that, but it implies that. And this is --

9 MOSBAUGH: It says that, because at the
10 bottom it says 18 successful starts.

11 BAILEY: I mean, it implies that they
12 were consecutive successful starts.

13 MOSBAUGH: It may imply that. Yeah. It
14 probably implies that.

15 BAILEY: I think that that's what we led
16 the NRC to believe that in Atlanta.

17 AUFDENKAMPE: I think that's what people
18 thought at the time. You know, Paul, when you go to
19 Hairston, you have got to tell him that we just
20 plain old screwed up; that we had data based on what
21 we thought -- we had data that we felt supported the
22 statements that were made in the LER and the, what
23 George presented in Atlanta; that upon further
24 scrutiny that it did not support that and at the
25 time we issued the LER we were more concerned about

1 whether those numbers were right or wrong.

2 BAILEY: The information was supplied to
3 IIT. Did we ever correct what we told them or do
4 you know?

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

8 BAILEY: They had to get the information
9 from us somehow, but we don't know what they are
10 going to present today in Washington?

11 AUFDENKAMPE: I doubt they will get into
12 those kind of specifics. But we have --

13 BAILEY: I mean, in the report.

14 AUFDENKAMPE: But these lists that we put
15 together, this gave the summary of the start
16 sequences as failures and what happened and stuff
17 like that we wrote the revised LER on, the IIT was
18 given that.

19 BAILEY: In the revised numbers that we
20 are presenting now, where did these numbers come
21 from?

22 AUFDENKAMPE: Kenny Stokes took all the
23 diesel starts, put that down, wrote the diesel log,
24 and I guess -- did he review the operator's logs,
25 too? He, reviewed the operator's logs to make sure that

1 we had picked up everything, that we had the big
2 picture.

3 BAILEY: Doesn't look like there is a
4 good story other than we were just in the process of
5 all the confusion and stuff that we just screwed up.

6 AUFDENKAMPE: You know, you might would
7 argue that if there was a good story, we could
8 probably argue not revising the LER. If we had some
9 good sound ^{technical} basis for what is in the LER, we could
10 get around revising it.

11 BAILEY: Yeah.

12 AUFDENKAMPE: Paul, is that what you are
13 looking for?

14 RUSHTON: Yes. I was looking for a
15 good story that, you know, we could use to explain
16 how this error had been made and not make us all
17 look like a bunch of dummies, but sounds like we
18 were a bunch of dummies.

19 AUFDENKAMPE: That is my perspective
(chuckling).

20 RUSHTON: We did the best we could at
21 the time and we went so fast through everything that
22 we didn't have adequate checks and balances to make
23 sure that every single piece of data was absolutely
24 correct and now that we have been through the IIT
25 investigation and done a whole lot more

1 documentation, probably with further review and
2 study we found that we were in error, you know.

3 And that's the best story we got to go
4 with.

5 BAILEY: You know, based on that it
6 seemed to me like that we ought not to send in this
7 damn LER or revised LER until the IIT report.
8 Otherwise we may have a damn conflict in there, [in the
9 revised LER].

10 AUFDENKAMPE: Well, I would only make the
11 warning -- and throw it up to you guys. We felt
12 compelled down here as soon as we identified the
13 problem to correct it as expeditiously as possible.

14 BAILEY: And I agree with that, but I am
15 saying now that that report may be coming out next
16 week or today that we give them (inaudible).

17 AUFDENKAMPE: Well, anyway.

18 BAILEY: We still are confused about
19 these numbers.

20 AUFDENKAMPE: I understand.

21 RUSHTON: I think that, you know,
22 Hairston feels that we have -- he's gone on the
23 record attesting to the information in the LER and
24 now we come back and say it's wrong.

25 And based on past precedent, I think he's going to

1 probably either document it in the cover letter on
2 the LER or somewhere in the record why it was wrong
3 and what corrective action we have taken to make
4 sure we don't report wrong information in the
5 future.

6 AUFDENKAMPE: Okay. Let me, I will tell you
7 what, Paul, let me bring that up with Tom Greene.
8 Now, I will tell you what, generally the LER
9 information is verified by my people, okay, up to a
10 point.

11 BAILEY: Yes.

12 AUFDENKAMPE: We can't verify everything,
13 but generally it is verified by my people. Now, my
14 people started with the original April 9th letter as
15 their bases.

16 RUSHTON: Yes.

17 AUFDENKAMPE: Now, I don't think -- I
18 think -- I am not trying to dump this back in your
19 lap, Jim. I just really don't recall. I think you
20 guys generated the April 9th letter up there.

21 BAILEY: We did.

22 AUFDENKAMPE: We may have verified this
23 stuff on the April 9th letter. I do not know
24 whether I did that on-site or how we did the
25 verification of that information.

1 MR. RUSHTON: The PRB reviewed it.

2 AUFDENKAMPE: Yes, the PRB reviewed it,
3 but they won't always go back and verify that kind
4 of -- huh? The April 9th letter.

5 MOSBAUGH: I'm not sure we PRBed that --
6 It was sent before.

7 AUFDENKAMPE: The PRB did after it went
8 out.

9 BAILEY: Well, the PRB had it prior to
10 that time. We made some revisions.

11 AUFDENKAMPE: I am getting a vicious
12 shaking of a "no" by a head here, who will remain
13 nameless.

14 But anyway regardless, regardless. I
15 don't know who did verification of that and I
16 suspect that the majority of that verification was
17 done through hearsay (inaudible).

18 MR. RUSHTON: Probably was.

19 AUFDENKAMPE: And that's where we erred.
20 If you want to point out where we erred on that,
21 that's where we erred and -- as far as written
22 communications.

23 And George probably erred in his
24 presentation because a lot of that presentation was
25 made on hearsay because of the time frame involved

1 in putting the presentation together.

2 So, if Mr. Hairston wants to do something
3 different, we certainly can, but all we can do is
4 say that we will verify everything before we send it
5 out and I will ~~personally~~ ^{certainly} do that and it will -- I
6 don't mean this in a threatening nature at all. It
7 just takes longer sometimes. Sometimes we won't be
8 able to make the dates that we want to meet.

9 BAILEY: I agree with you.

10 RUSHTON: All right.

11 AUFDENKAMPE: Do you guys feel better now
12 that you understand the whole story?

13 BAILEY: (Laughter.)

14 RUSHTON: Yeah. Yeah. I am a little
15 better equipped now.

16 AUFDENKAMPE: Paul --

17 RUSHTON: Yeah.

18 AUFDENKAMPE: -- this is my recollection
19 and Allen's recollection of how things went. We are
20 about to go to the PRB. I will recount this
21 conversation and concerns that you guys have to the
22 PRB and specifically Tom Greene to see if he wants
23 to do anything else.

24 * * * *

25