

I-MOSBA-48

8-15-90

(OSI INSP)

DOCKETED  
USNRC

95 JUL 27 P4:38

1 TAPE NO. 253, SIDE 1

2 VOICE: (Laughing.)

3 VOICE: You (inaudible) out on the  
4 venture?

5 VOICE: I don't care. That was very  
6 entertaining.

7 VOICE: (Inaudible).

8 VOICE: No, it's not out there today.

9 VOICE: (Inaudible).

10 VOICE: Yeah, it has been painted now.

11 VOICE: Yes, it has.

12 VOICE: (Inaudible) waste of taken care  
13 of; get rid of that problem.

14 VOICE: The question is: Where is the  
15 computer?

16 VOICE: Yeah, that's the other question.  
17 I think that's the one that disappeared.

18 VOICE: Yeah.

19 VOICE: That's all there is.

20 VOICE: I found just one (inaudible).

21 VOICE: What's that?

22 VOICE: My wife made up fresh.

23 VOICE: Oh.

24 VOICE: That's where it just came from.

25 VOICE: Got a lump problem or?

9508170097 950718  
PDR ADOCK 05000424  
T PDR

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Docket No. 50-424/425-OLA-3 EXHIBIT NO. I-48

In the matter of Georgia Power Co. et al., Vogtle Units 1 & 2

☐ Staff ☐ Applicant ☒ Intervenor ☐ Other

☒ Identified ☒ Received ☐ Rejected Reporter KHW

Date 7/18/95 Witness Masbanih

out - II-48

AND THEN,

1 TAPE 253, PAGE 5, LINE 3 THROUGH PAGE 21, LINE 21

THEY'RE  
CONSISTANT WITH

2 McCoy: (inaudible) the meeting. We're trying to go through  
3 what our positions are. We need to do this by five  
4 o'clock, ~~so~~ we're going to give these positions to the  
5 BECAUSE NRC, so they can have their team meeting in the meeting,  
6 and go over all these divisions and be sure their system  
7 ~~is~~ what they think the concerns are. Tomorrow morning,  
8 George and I are going to meet with the team leader from  
9 the NRC to see if we can resolve any misunderstandings --  
10 THAT MIGHT ~~to see~~ where we are at fault, ~~The~~ cross purposes are ON  
11 EXIST ~~is~~ not hitting the targets, go with that kind of  
12 background, George, ~~and~~ (inaudible).  
13 Bockhold: WHY DON'T YOU TAKE OVER.  
14 Before I go to the specifics, I do have one general  
15 thing for everybody. There's still some concern from  
16 some members of the team that we are speculating about IF  
17 something, just say we're speculating. I think we all  
18 have to be careful about that. If we're not  
19 WE SHOULD ~~speculating, which is to~~ say it more as a positive fact,  
20 (inaudible) I'd like to ~~take~~ that on to help your goal. PAS  
21 You know, they know when we're speculating, and they  
22 know when we're sure about our fact, okay? The next  
23 thing I would like to do is just start through the list.  
24 We have a package put together, and it's crossed out  
25 with diesel record start failures, it's Pete Taylor,  
26 George Frederick. George Frederick has provided a new  
27 page report. Does everybody have copies?  
28 (no response)  
29 ~~Wise~~ Bockhold: Okay. AND YOU CAN'T TELL,  
30 McCoy: One thing I noticed on this is that YOU KNOW,  
31 you did not put a revision number or anything on these, each time it got  
32 revised. AND I WOULD SUGGEST THAT WE ALL GO THROUGH RIGHT NOW  
33 Bockhold: Well, I put time and date. AND JUST MARK THE CURRENT PACKAGE WE HAVE AS REV 1.  
34 McCoy: You have time and date?  
35 Bockhold: Right here.  
36 McCoy: Let's all go through and put it on every one of these.  
37 The time and date is 1500 (inaudible). OR ISSUES  
38 Bockhold: Okay, so we're going to read -- everybody's going to  
39 George Frederick's item. We're going to go ahead and  
40 comment if we've got any questions. Why don't we ~~have~~ ASK  
41 TO Teresa come down, and get a new package, that corporate  
doesn't have, and fax it to them right away?

1 McCoy: Bill, we're not sure you have the latest package up  
2 there, but we're going to fax you a complete copy. It's  
3 the latest.

4 Shipman: We're sure we don't, KEN.

5 McCoy: Okay, so we'll do it. We can't wait until you get that,  
6 but we'll just send it over to you.

7 Voice: SHIPMAN ~~okay~~. UNDERSTAND. I WANT TO SAY AFTER

8 Bockhold: On the second page, ~~there's~~ <sup>OF</sup> George's item. I'm not sure  
9 what immediate means. ~~Let's say a item~~ notification of  
10 THE WORD the residents. The revised LER was prepared.  
11 Voice: (inaudible) AND NRC REGION II,

12 Voice: (inaudible)

13 Bailey: Don't you remember we wrote that letter on the way back?  
14 McCoy: Yeah, that's right. It has the same <sup>DATE.</sup> ~~day~~.

15 Bailey: Yes.

16 Bockhold: Mike Horton. Your item two, is there a reason for why  
17 we have not always reported.  
18 Horton: GOES BACK TO THE LATE 87-88 (INAUDIBLE) I'm sure there is. UH, I DON'T WHAT THAT REASON IS. UH, THIS  
19 Bockhold: (inaudible) WHY DON'T YOU ADD A SENTENCE THAT SUMMARIZES  
20 MULTIPLE VOICES: (INAUDIBLE)  
21 ~~Bockhold: / / / / /~~  
22 Bockhold: Well, maybe you need to see the documentation Mike. And  
23 Voice: (inaudible) Mike and Rick (inaudible) very clearly ~~is~~ screwed up. (INAUDIBLE)

24 Bockhold: Well, that's right. We screwed up and we got a fairly  
25 massive effort to figure out what was all those  
26 failures.

27 Voice: (inaudible)

28 Voice: (inaudible) ORIGINALLY WE DENIED THE VIOLATION (INAUDIBLE)  
29 Multiple Voices (INAUDIBLE)  
30 Bockhold: You can read the document, basically, if something new  
31 comes out. You can read the documentation, ~~quietly~~, and  
32 if something new comes out, then you can ~~rediscover~~ --  
33 This is violation number 1 ~~for sure~~. Do we want to add  
Stu Ebnetter in here? You notified Brockman right, Ken.

1 McCoy: Bill Shipman.

2 Bockhold: Okay, Bill Shipman notified Brockman. ~~right LER~~. You  
3 want to add - you have never interviewed?

4 McCoy: Bill? <sup>STEW EBNETER</sup>  
STEW

5 Shipman: Yes, sir.

6 McCoy: What we're talking about is that there's a <sup>ZERO,</sup> statement in  
7 here that says, "Therefore, when Vogtle Management was  
8 aware of the problem in the LER 9006 rev<sup>1</sup>, NRC Region II  
9 was notified including the Chief of Reactor Projects,  
10 Ken Brockman.

11 (inaudible)

12 Well, anyway, I think we should put in here that STEW STEW  
13 Ebneter was notified, ~~(inaudible) was going for that,~~  
14 also.

15 Shipman: George Hairston called Stu according to George.  
16 McCoy: YEAH.  
17 Bockhold: So why don't, want to put the names <sup>AND</sup> in, not the, the  
titles? Including Ken Brockman and Stu Ebneter.

18 Voice: And George, you all talked to the resident.

19 Bockhold: I talked to the resident. I TALKED TO THE RESIDENT.

20 McCoy: That's the next paragraph. It's after "notification of  
21 the resident and Region II" -- The revised LER was  
22 prepared.

23 Bockhold: Why don't you say, George, <sup>FREDERICK, WHY DON'T YOU SAY</sup> ~~started (inaudible) to say,~~  
24 <sup>INCLUDING</sup> ~~"including the residents,~~ Ken Brockman and Stu Ebneter?"  
25 I think I notified Ron Aiello, but I can't remember.  
26 <sup>IT WAS</sup> ~~One of the residents.~~ <sup>AT THIS POINT.</sup>

27 Voice: (inaudible) <sup>WHY DON'T YOU</sup>

28 Bockhold: "Including the NRC residents, Ken Brockman." Why don't  
29 you say including the NRC residents, and NRC Region II,  
30 Ken Brockman and Stu Ebneter. ~~You want to,~~ just move the  
31 sentence up. After notification of the NRC the revised  
32 LER was prepared.

33 McCoy: <sup>THAT</sup> <sup>WOULD</sup> <sup>THAT IS THAT</sup> <sup>THAT</sup> The only thing I think on ~~this~~ I'm not sure the revised  
34 LER wasn't in some form of ~~after notification and the~~  
35 <sup>PREPERATION-REVISION.</sup> ~~NRC to revise preparation on revision.~~ I think ~~that~~  
36 what brought it to our attention was the LER ~~that~~ had  
37 numbers on it that ~~was~~ different than the original version.  
38 <sup>WERE</sup> <sup>THE FACT THAT</sup>



WE MIGHT WANT TO SAY INSTEAD OF "THE REVISED LER WAS PREPARED,  
"THE REVISED LER WAS SUBMITTED."

1 Voice: (inaudible)

2 Bockhold: We struggled <sup>WERE</sup> through about four or five different revs.  
3 The LERs ~~are~~ different.

4 McCoy: (inaudible). On this paragraph two, we're going to have  
5 to ~~we~~ MAKE THAT (INAUDIBLE). ONE THING ON THESE PAPERS IS  
6 Bockhold: Well, item <sup>WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO BE CLEAR (INAUDIBLE).</sup>  
7 Voice: (inaudible)

8 Bockhold: Company's position on the NRC issue -- "After thorough  
9 (INAUDIBLE) review --"

10 voice: McCoy: (inaudible) THE ISSUE ABOUT THE DIESELS AND THE LETTERS AND  
11 Fredericks: That's what worries me, ~~who prepared slides for April 8~~  
12 (inaudible). [SEE INSERT 1]

13 McCoy: Jim Bailey, did you <sup>HEAR</sup> ~~mean~~ that? A QUESTION?

14 Bailey: We prepared it here ~~and it~~ <sup>AND IT</sup> was approved by Hairston.

15 McCoy: I guess we would say that I prepared that. I worked  
16 with you on the preparations, right?

17 voice: BAILEY: ~~okay~~ CORRECT.

18 McCoy: So why don't we say that <sup>KEN</sup> ~~Tom~~ McCoy and Jim Bailey  
19 prepared the letter which was signed by ~~George~~ <sup>HAIRSTON</sup> ~~HAIRSTON~~ <sup>IN BIRMINGHAM.</sup>

20 Fredericks: On the initial LER 90-06, <sup>IT</sup> ~~who~~ <sup>REV O,</sup> ~~prepared that?~~ <sup>IT</sup> ~~Who~~ <sup>IN BIRMINGHAM.</sup>  
21 approved ~~this~~, and who reviewed ~~on the PRB?~~ I can get  
22 the PRB membership from various meetings. There's gonna  
23 be quite a few. I can also get who prepared it from the  
24 NSAC staff. I think ~~you~~ <sup>you</sup> approved it is obvious it ~~does~~ <sup>GOES</sup>  
25 out under <sup>Mr.</sup> Hairston's signature. <sup>WHO</sup>

26 McCoy: That's right. We have a blue sheet with <sup>EVERY</sup> ~~LER~~ <sup>we use up</sup>  
27 ~~there~~. A IT HAS THE REVIEW UP THERE. WE CAN LOOK AT THAT AND  
28 Fredericks: SEE WHO REVIEWED THAT ONE. I KNOW, WELL I'M NOT SURE ABOUT THAT O  
29 The next question that I have that involves corporate  
30 is: Who prepared the cover letter for ~~LE9006~~ <sup>rev one?</sup> LER  
31 That's the transmittal letter that Mr. Hairston signed.  
32 He wants to know what the attempt of that paragraph  
33 ~~which (inaudible) is~~ clarifying the LER ~~9000~~ <sup>rev O.</sup> 9006  
34 IN He's not sure ~~he~~ <sup>he</sup> actually did anything to clarify the  
diesel start that was described in the original LER.

IT

FREDERICK: JIM, IS JIM BAILEY THERE?

BAILEY: Yes.

FREDERICK: JIM, I'LL CALL YOU AFTER THE MEETING AND GET THE  
PARTICULARS ON THAT BLUE SHEET TO ANSWER THAT QUESTION.

INSERT 1

1 Frederick: I started work on some of this, for instance,  
2 there's an open question on, who prepared the  
3 slides for the 4/9 presentation; who prepared them  
4 and who proofed them?  
5  
6 Bockhold: The slides, I did.  
7  
8 Frederick: Both?  
9  
10 Bockhold: I worked with Jimmy Paul Cash and Ken Burr. The  
11 three of us worked on it. I might have put the  
12 bullets down and then got Ken Burr to make sure  
13 that the, uh, organized sequence was correct.  
14  
15 Frederick: Uh, the second question was who prepared and who  
16 approved the confirmatory action letter?

1 Fredericks: ~~well~~, So, I need to talk to, and I think it's Harry Majors,  
2 but -- and he may be out of town, and I may have to talk  
3 to Jack Stringfellow.

4 McCoy: Why don't you all go ahead and pull that piece of  
5 correspondence? Do you have a copy of ~~that~~? ~~IT DOWN HERE?~~

6 Voice: (inaudible)

7 McCoy: Okay, so after the meeting, George will give you a call.  
8 You all ~~can~~ see if you can figure out what the question  
9 is and what the answer is.

10 Fredericks: Here's the last one for you ~~Jim~~. ~~THAT WENT BEFORE THE PLANT~~  
11 the LER9006 rev O, ~~inaudible~~, ~~REVIEW BOARD~~ on the 18th of April, did  
12 not say anything about subsequent, ~~a test program~~. After  
13 George's approval between the 18th and the 19th ~~with the~~ ~~transmitted~~, there was a change made, and the words,  
14 WHEN IT WAS "subsequent to the test program," were included. The  
15 TRANSMITTED, number of diesel starts was changed to coincide with the  
16 LETTER number of starts in the April 9th ~~list~~. ~~WE~~ wants to know ~~He~~  
17 who put the words, "subsequent to the test program" in  
18 here. Initially I've been told it happened in the  
19 telephone conversation between two groups. One ~~is~~ IN  
20 corporate and one on the plant ~~side~~ SITE.

21

22 Bockhold: Ken McCoy if you remember I believe it happened ~~between~~ ~~THAT~~  
23 a group in your office and me. And we had some  
24 discussions about it, and given the fact ~~they~~ I thought  
25 the slides that I made the presentation, ~~was~~ correct, ~~WITH~~  
26 UH, AND I ~~AND I AM~~ thinking more about it, because we talked to ~~WERE~~  
27 GUESS Pete Taylor about it some. I thought that, you know -- I  
28 thought our discussion that, ~~we had~~ ~~was~~ clarifying words  
29 and my initial thought was ~~there~~ were no material change  
30 to the facts and they were ~~basically~~ correct and that's  
31 why I agreed with it. -- ~~The~~ change that was initiated in  
32 corporate --

33 Voice: (inaudible) ~~THESE WERE~~ ~~THEY~~

34 McCoy: Bill does that sound like your recollections.

35 Shipman: Yes, sir.

36 McCoy: All right, let's get that down in writing here for  
37 George. That's my recollection too. In general terms, ~~I~~  
38 don't remember the specific words but I do remember the  
39 discussion.

40 Shipman: There was a lot of word engineering that went into that  
41 response.

1 McCoy: Okay, now that response was prepared after we did the QA  
2 audit and ~~did~~ <sup>HAD</sup> all that information/?

3 Bockhold: No, No, No.

4 ~~Voice~~: ~~No, no, no.~~

5 Bockhold: Let me bring you up to <sup>THE</sup> sequence of events.

6 ~~Voice~~: McCoy: Okay.

7 Bockhold: Let me bring everybody up to <sup>THE</sup> <sup>CE</sup> sequence of events because  
8 it now involves corporate. Bill, can you hear me?

9 ~~Voice~~: SHIPMAN: Yes.

10 Bockhold: Okay, the sequence of events: On the weekend, me, Jimmy <sup>THE</sup>  
11 Paul, and Ken Burr and George Fredericks, and some  
12 others worked on transparencies that we were going to  
13 use in our conference that occurred on Monday. OKAY.  
14 Basically, Jimmy Paul came up with ~~a~~ <sup>numbering</sup> of starts  
15 and Ken Burr and I came up with the sequence. We put it  
16 together into general terms, ~~when we could discuss that.~~ <sup>SO</sup>  
17 From that point on, then we went to the conference with  
18 the NRC. We presented the slide. We really didn't talk  
19 ~~about the number of starts at the conference at all.~~ <sup>IN</sup> ~~We~~  
20 got sidetracked with a bunch of other issues. On the  
21 airplane ride back, you being ~~the~~ corporate, and Ken <sup>BECAUSE</sup>  
22 McCoy, and George Hairston and whoever revised the  
23 letter and sent it out that evening. It was dated the  
24 9th. It was Monday evening. Something like 10 days  
25 later, the 19th, okay, on the 18th, the PRB came to me  
26 with a minor revision, took the numbers up from 18 and  
27 19, respectively to a total of 20. I okayed that, and  
28 that went to corporate. On the 20th, because <sup>the</sup> <sup>OF</sup>  
29 numbers going up, I think we felt that it would be  
30 ~~better to keep the LER consistent with the presentation.~~ <sup>ED</sup>  
31 ~~we lower~~ the number to 18 because of again, word  
32 engineering. We didn't want to have 18 and 19 and break  
33 ~~the diesels with the~~ <sup>A</sup> part. And then there was some  
34 discussion about the preceding sentence, about the  
35 comprehensive testing of the engine logic, AND ...

36 McCoy: One thing that I would like to add to that. As I ~~was~~ <sup>RECALL,</sup>  
37 ~~told~~, the words were at least 18 --

38 Bockhold: <sup>AT LEAST, THE</sup>  
~~Words say --~~

39 McCoy: When the thing was brought up, to 20, it didn't change  
40 the accuracy of what was in there... .

41 Bockhold: That's correct.



IF THAT'S WHERE IT  
CAME FROM. THEN THE  
QUESTION WAS WHETHER  
18 AND 19 WAS ACCURATE.

1 voice: McCoy: ~~(inaudible)~~ WAS THE REASONING.

2 Bockhold: And why I think we came up with 20, and I'm only  
3 guessing at this point, and George is supposed to find  
4 out. But why I think it was 20 was that we probably had  
5 within that week, we had another diesel start. In one  
6 case we probably had two, and one engine we had another  
7 diesel start. But I don't remember why the PRB had 20;  
8 do you remember, John?

9 Aufdenkampe: ~~[SEE INSERT TWO]~~  
10 ~~Yeah, it was Tom Webb who wrote the LER worked from~~  
11 ~~April 9 forward and he took the numbers from the April~~  
~~9th letter one -- added the rest of them on to that.~~

12 Bockhold: Well, that corresponds with why I would guess 20 would  
13 be okay, <sup>BE</sup> cause, you know, we had another engine start --

14 Aufdenkampe: But then there were some questions in the PRB about  
15 whether 20 was an accurate number or not. That's when  
16 we had a phone call Friday night with you and Alan and  
17 me and Bill Shipman and Paul Rush and Jim Bailey. <sup>I THINK</sup> <sup>LTN</sup>

18 Bockhold: Okay, so you were -- I don't remember, you know, that  
19 all those people were in on it.

20 McCoy: Yeah. VOICE: NOPE.  
BOCKHOLD:

21 Bockhold: So everybody then agreed on at least 18? ~~Well, no --~~  
22 ~~Given the facts, if the transparency had been correct.~~

23 Aufdenkampe: Everybody agreed <sup>D</sup> that based on what you identified as  
24 the starting point for counting that the 18 and 19 were  
25 correct.  
[SEE INSERT 3]

26 Bockhold: Okay, George do you hear that? ~~(inaudible)~~. You told  
27 everybody --

28 voice: ~~(inaudible)~~

29 voice: ~~(inaudible)~~

30 ~~Bockhold: Right, yeah, that's basically transparency --~~

31 Aufdenkampe: Based on that issue, or based on that statement  
32 everyone's agreed. <sup>BOOY</sup> <sup>THAT 18 AND 19 (INAUDIBLE)</sup>.

33 voice: FREDERICK: Okay.

34 voice: Bockhold: Friday evening phone call with John, and Alan, <sup>AND WHO ELSE</sup> and Bill  
35 Shipman.

36 voice: Aufdenkampe: ~~(inaudible)~~ BILL SHIPMAN, JIM BAILEY, BAILEY WAS (INAUDIBLE)

WE TALKED ON FRIDAY NIGHT TRYING TO IRON OUT THE LER. THE  
DISCUSSION WAS WHAT WAS MEANT BY, WHERE WE GOT THE NUMBERS

INSERT 2

1     Aufdenkampe:     Yeah, it was Tom, Tom Webb wrote the LER and what  
2                       he did was take the numbers from the April 9  
3                       letter and worked from April 9th forward and added  
4                       the rest of them on to that.

INSERT 3

1 Bockhold: Okay, George, did you hear that?  
2  
3 Frederick: Part of it.  
4  
5 Bockhold: What John just said.  
6  
7 Aufdenkampe: You told everybody, well everybody there, that the  
8 18 and 19 were based on completion of the  
9 comprehensive test program.  
10  
11 Bockhold: Associated with the logic.  
12  
13 Aufdenkampe: I don't recall that.  
14  
15 Bockhold: Yeah well, that's basically what the transparency  
16 said.

1 Bockhold: That was the phone call. Okay, so the trail of fact is  
2 that I believe the transparency <sup>is</sup> correct. And then  
3 Tom Webb added some numbers on, but that appeared, in my  
4 mind, appeared to be confusing. And there was some  
5 <sup>DISCUSSION,</sup> ~~construction~~ that John went on about it, okay, that then  
6 we got at least 18 because transparency ~~is~~ correct. <sup>Y</sup>  
7 <sup>AND</sup> The other words got ~~it~~ upon completion of the test  
8 program was, in my mind, that was associated with the  
9 logic and the control testing which really didn't  
10 involve diesel starts at all. It involved the air  
11 system. <sup>THE</sup> <sup>TO BE</sup> <sup>D</sup> <sup>IN HERE ON WHAT THE</sup>

12 McCoy: (inaudible)

13 McCoy: (inaudible)

14 Shipman: <sup>E</sup> Yeah, the way this thing originally came up was when the  
15 LER came up with I think, it was 21 and 22, or something  
16 like that. George Hairston asked a question, "Well, we  
17 went to Atlanta, and we told them 18 and 19, and now the  
18 numbers 21 and 22. Are we sure that the numbers's  
19 right?" You know, we had this conference call that  
20 John's talking about to try to make sure the numbers <sup>A</sup> WAS  
21 ~~were~~ right. Coming out of that phone call, as I recall  
22 it, the decision was that we would be completely safe ~~it~~ <sup>A</sup> IF  
23 we said, "greater than 18."

24 Aufdenkampe: Given what we identified as the starting point for that  
25 count.

26 ~~Voice:~~ Bockhold: Right.

27 Fredericks: What -- where ~~were~~ the confusion factors, Bill, was when  
28 we threw in the starting point. That's what ~~the~~ <sup>THAT</sup> HAS KIND OF  
29 ~~(inaudible)~~ THROWN A MONKEY IN THE WRENCH, OR THE WRENCH  
30 ~~Voice:~~ ~~(inaudible)~~ IN THE MONKEY, WHATEVER YOU WANT TO CALL IT.

31 Shipman: How about a monkey wrench in the works?

32 Fredericks: Yeah. What happened was when we <sup>DECIDED</sup> ~~started~~ to define the  
33 starting point, we fuzzed ~~all~~ the picture up. <sup>WHOLE</sup>  
34 Bockhold: Yeah, I think, you know, hindsight, 20/20. ~~is we would~~ It  
35 <sup>BEST</sup> ~~would have been better~~ to leave the first little part of  
36 that phrase out completely.

37 Fredericks: <sup>DOMBY:</sup> LET ME ASK A QUESTION. <sup>THAT'S WHAT HE'S ASKING.</sup> <sup>DOES ANYBODY DISAGREE WITH</sup>  
38 ~~Voice:~~ DOMBY: That Friday night meeting, ~~(inaudible)~~ JOHN'S RECOLLECTION  
39 Aufdenkampe: I know <sup>IT WAS</sup> definitely ~~one~~ Alan, George, and Bill Shipman. <sup>ABOUT WHO WERE THE</sup>  
<sup>ME AND</sup> <sup>AND</sup> <sup>PARTICIPANTS ON THAT PHONE CALL?</sup>



1 Voice: (inaudible)

2 Aufdenkampe: Bill, do you remember who else was there with you on  
3 that Friday phone call?

4 Shipman: No, I don't remember, but I know there were several of  
5 us. Louis just said he was involved, and Paul, and Jim,  
6 and Jack were involved. This was one of those, "We've  
7 got to get this thing right so George will sign it out,"  
8 last minute exercise.

9 Voice: (inaudible) WE HAD PRACTICALLY EVERY PARTICALLY EVERY

10 Shipman: ~~You've got (inaudible)~~ body up here and ~~(inaudible)~~ body  
11 down there that was available on the phone call.

12 Fredericks: Well, I think I can describe that one.

13 voice: Bockhold: Okay.

14 voice: FREDERICK: ~~okay~~. I CAN TALK TO JIM BAILEY AFTER THE MEETING ON THE  
15 voice: McCoy: ~~(inaudible)~~ OTHER ONE. OKAY.

16 McCoy: ~~(inaudible)~~ IS THERE WE NEED ON THIS?  
anything else that ~~(inaudible)~~ --

17 voice: Bockhold: (inaudible) WE'LL TALK ABOUT THAT AFTER THE MEETING.  
[INSERT]

18 McCoy: ~~okay, we'll just~~ WELL, WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO  
give him ~~all~~ we got. WHAT

19 voice: Bockhold: ~~fine~~ OKAY, WE'LL JUST GIVE THEM WHAT WE GOT AT 5:00.

20 voice: SWARTZWELDER: What we <sup>VE</sup> reviewed <sup>BY 5:00?</sup> ~~(inaudible)~~ --

21 voice: McCoy: ~~(inaudible)~~ WE'RE GOING TO GIVE THEM WHAT WE GOT.

22 voice: SWARTZWELDER: ~~(inaudible)~~ WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A LOT OF COMMENTS (INAUDIBLE).  
[INSERT 4]

23 voice: ~~I don't know. This (inaudible) --~~

24 voice: ~~(inaudible)~~

25 voice: ~~(inaudible)~~

26 Bockhold: This LER, about (inaudible) -- so it's not (inaudible).  
27 It doesn't coordinate with anything, so we're not going  
28 to give him that one.

McCoy: OKAY. LET'S GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.

Bockhold: ONE COMMENT THAT JIM HAD. HE'S NOT GOING TO MAKE  
IT BY 5:00.

INSERT 4

McCoy:

The problem is they're going to have an exit on Friday and they have got to decide and we got to decide whether we understand their issues and they understand our positions, and get that all resolved tomorrow. Now, the NRC is meeting at 5:00. We won't have another team meeting probably until tomorrow afternoon and so we've got to be sure we understand the team members' concern and what we've written down as the NRC issue, fully expresses their concern, uh, for one thing, and they need, each of their people need to know what facts we have and what information we have at this point. We can continue to work after that. I guess the exposure on this (inaudible) is that (inaudible conversation).