

NOTICE OF VIOLATION  
AND  
PROPOSED IMPOSITION OF CIVIL PENALTIES

Georgia Power Company  
Vogtle Electric Generating Plant

Docket No. 50-424  
License No. NPF-68  
EA 93-304

During an NRC inspection conducted from August 6, 1990 to August 17, 1990 and an NRC investigation completed on December 17, 1993, violations of NRC requirements were identified. In accordance with the "General Statement of Policy and Procedure for NRC Enforcement Actions," 10 CFR Part 2, Appendix C, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission proposes to impose civil penalties pursuant to Section 234 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (Act), 42 U.S.C. 2282, and 10 CFR 2.205. The particular violations and associated civil penalties are set forth below:

10 CFR 50.9(a) requires that information provided to the NRC by a licensee shall be complete and accurate in all material respects.

- A. Contrary to the above, information provided to the NRC Region II Office by Georgia Power Company (GPC) in an April 9, 1990 letter and in an April 9, 1990 oral presentation to the NRC was inaccurate in a material respect. Specifically, the letter states that: "Since March 20, the 1A DG has been started 18 times, and the 1B DG has been started 19 times." No failures or problems have occurred during any of these starts."

These statements are inaccurate in that they represent that 19 consecutive successful starts without problems or failures had occurred on the 1B Diesel Generator (DG) for the Vogtle facility as of April 9, 1990, when, in fact, of the 19 starts referred to in the letter associated with the 1B DG at the Vogtle facility, three of those starts had problems. Specifically, Start 132 tripped on high temperature lube oil, Start 134 tripped on low pressure jacket water and Start 136 had a high temperature jacket water trip alarm. As of April 9, 1990, the 1B DG had only 12 consecutive successful starts without problems or failures rather than the 19 represented by GPC. The same inaccuracy was presented to the NRC at its Region II Office during an oral presentation by GPC on April 9, 1990.

The inaccuracy was material. In considering a restart decision, the NRC was especially interested in the reliability of the DGs and specifically asked that GPC address the matter in its presentation on restart. The NRC relied, in part, upon this information presented by GPC on April 9, 1990 in the oral presentation and in the GPC letter in reaching the NRC decision to allow Vogtle Unit 1 to return to power operation.

- B. Contrary to the above, information provided to the NRC Region II Office by GPC in an April 9, 1990 letter was incomplete in a material respect. Specifically, the letter states, when discussing the air quality of the DG starting air system at the Vogtle facility, that: "GPC has reviewed air quality of the D/G air system including dewpoint control and has

concluded that air quality is satisfactory. Initial reports of higher than expected dewpoints were later attributed to faulty instrumentation."

This statement is incomplete in that it fails to state that actual high dew points had occurred at the Vogtle facility. It also fails to state that the causes of those high dew points included failure to use air dryers for extended periods of time and repressurization of the DG air start system receivers following maintenance.

The incompleteness was material. In considering a restart decision, the NRC was especially interested in the reliability of the DGs and specifically asked that GPC address the matter in its presentation on restart. The NRC relied, in part, upon this information presented by GPC in its letter of April 9, 1990 in reaching the decision to allow Vogtle Unit 1 to return to power operation.

- C. Contrary to the above, information provided to the NRC by GPC in a Licensee Event Report (LER), dated April 19, 1990, was inaccurate in a material respect. Specifically, the LER states: "Numerous sensor calibrations (including jacket water temperatures), special pneumatic leak testing, and multiple engine starts and runs were performed under various conditions. After the 3-20-90 event, the control systems of both engines have been subjected to a comprehensive test program. Subsequent to this test program, DG1A and DG1B have been started at least 18 times each and no failures or problems have occurred during any of these starts."

These statements are inaccurate in that they represent that at least 18 consecutive successful starts without problems or failures had occurred on the DGs for Vogtle Unit 1 (1A DG and 1B DG) following the completion of the comprehensive test program of the control systems for these DGs, when, in fact, following completion of the comprehensive test program of the control systems, there were no more than 10 and 12 consecutive successful starts without problems or failures for 1A DG and 1B DG respectively.

The inaccuracy was material in that knowledge by the NRC of a lesser number of consecutive successful starts on 1A DG and 1B DG without problems or failures could have had a natural tendency or capability to cause the NRC to inquire further as to the reliability of the DGs.

- D. Contrary to the above, information provided to the NRC by GPC in an LER cover letter dated June 29, 1990 was inaccurate and incomplete in material respects as evidenced by the following three examples:

The letter states that: "In accordance with 10 CFR 50.73, Georgia Power Company (GPC) hereby submits the enclosed revised report related to an event which occurred on March 20, 1990. This revision is necessary to clarify the information related to the number of successful diesel generator starts as discussed in the GPC letter dated April 9, 1990...."

1. The LER cover letter is incomplete because the submittal did not provide information regarding clarification of the April 9, 1990 letter.

The incompleteness was material in that the NRC subsequently requested GPC to make a submittal clarifying the April 9, 1990 letter.

The letter states that: "If the criteria for the completion of the test program is understood to be the first successful test in accordance with Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (VEGP) procedure 14980-1 "Diesel Generator Operability Test," then there were 10 successful starts of Diesel Generator 1A and 12 successful starts of Diesel Generator 1B between the completion of the test program and the end of April 19, 1990, the date the LER-424/1990-06 was submitted to the NRC. The number of successful starts included in the original LER (at least 18) included some of the starts that were part of the test program. The difference is attributed to diesel start record keeping practices and the definition of the end of the test program."

2. The last sentence in the above paragraph is inaccurate because diesel record keeping practices were not a cause of the difference in number of diesel starts reported in the April 19, 1990 LER and the June 29, 1990 letter. The difference was caused by personnel errors unrelated to any problems with the diesel generator record keeping practices.

The inaccuracy was material in that it could have led the NRC to erroneously conclude that the correct root causes for the difference in the number of diesel starts reported in the April 19, 1990 LER and the June 29, 1990 letter had been identified by GPC.

3. The last sentence in the above paragraph is also incomplete because it failed to include the fact that the root causes for the difference in the number of diesel starts reported in the April 19, 1990 LER and the June 29, 1990 letter were personnel errors. First, the Vogtle Plant General Manager who directed the Unit Superintendent to perform the start count (which formed the basis for the April 19, 1990 LER) failed to issue adequate instructions as to how to perform the count and did not adequately assess the data developed by the Unit Superintendent. In addition, the Unit Superintendent made an error in reporting his count. Second, the Vogtle Plant General Manager, the General Manager for Plant Support and the Technical Support Manager failed to clarify and verify the starting point for the count of successful consecutive DG starts reported in the April 19, 1990 LER.

The incompleteness was material in that, had correct root causes for the difference in the number of diesel starts reported in the

April 19, 1990 LER and the June 29, 1990 letter been presented, this information could have led the NRC to seek further information.

- E. Contrary to the above, information provided to the NRC Region II Office by GPC in a letter dated August 30, 1990 was inaccurate and incomplete in material respects as evidenced by the following two examples:

The letter states that: "The confusion in the April 9th letter and the original LER appear to be the result of two factors. First, there was confusion in the distinction between a successful start and a valid test... Second, an error was made by the individual who performed the count of DG starts for the NRC April 9th letter."

1. These statements are inaccurate in that confusion between a successful start and a valid test was not a cause of the error regarding DG start counts which GPC made in its April 9, 1990 letter to the NRC.

The inaccuracy was material in that it could have led the NRC to erroneously conclude that the correct root causes for the error in the April 9, 1990 letter had been identified by GPC.

2. The statements are also incomplete. While an error was made by the Unit Superintendent who performed the count of diesel starts for the April 9, 1990 letter, the root causes of the error in that letter were not completely identified by GPC. Specifically, the Vogtle Plant General Manager who directed the Unit Superintendent to perform the start count failed to issue adequate instructions as to how to perform the count and did not adequately assess the data developed by the Unit Superintendent. In addition, the Unit Superintendent did not adequately report his count to the Vogtle Plant General Manager.

The incompleteness was material in that, had the correct root causes for the error in the April 9, 1990 letter regarding DG start counts been reported, this information could have led the NRC to seek further information.

These violations in the aggregate represent a Severity Level II problem (Supplement VII).

Civil Penalty - \$200,000

Pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR 2.201, Georgia Power Company (Licensee) is hereby required to submit a written statement or explanation to the Director, Office of Enforcement, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, within 30 days of the date of this Notice of Violation and Proposed Imposition of Civil Penalties (Notice). This reply should be clearly marked as a "Reply to a Notice of Violation" and should include for each alleged violation: (1) admission or denial of the alleged violation, (2) the reasons for the violation if admitted, and if denied, the reasons why, (3) the corrective

steps that have been taken and the results achieved, (4) the corrective steps that will be taken to avoid further violations, and (5) the date when full compliance will be achieved.

If an adequate reply is not received within the time specified in this Notice, an order or a Demand for Information may be issued to show cause why the license should not be modified, suspended, or revoked or why such other action as may be proper should not be taken. Consideration may be given to extending the response time for good cause shown. Under the authority of Section 182 of the Act, 42 U.S.C. 2232, this response shall be submitted under oath or affirmation.

Within the same time as provided for the response required above under 10 CFR 2.201, the Licensee may pay the civil penalties by letter addressed to the Director, Office of Enforcement, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, with a check, draft, money order, or electronic transfer payable to the Treasurer of the United States in the amount of the civil penalty proposed above, or the cumulative amount of the civil penalties if more than one civil penalty is proposed, or may protest imposition of the civil penalties, in whole or in part, by a written answer addressed to the Director, Office of Enforcement, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Should the Licensee fail to answer within the time specified, an order imposing the civil penalties will be issued. Should the Licensee elect to file an answer in accordance with 10 CFR 2.205 protesting the civil penalties, in whole or in part, such answer should be clearly marked as an "Answer to a Notice of Violation" and may: (1) deny the violations listed in this Notice, in whole or in part, (2) demonstrate extenuating circumstances, (3) show error in this Notice, or (4) show other reasons why the penalties should not be imposed. In addition to protesting the civil penalties, in whole or in part, such answer may request remission or mitigation of the penalties.

In requesting mitigation of the proposed penalties, the factors addressed in Section VI.B.2 of 10 CFR Part 2, Appendix C should be addressed. Any written answer in accordance with 10 CFR 2.205 should be set forth separately from the statement or explanation in reply pursuant to 10 CFR 2.201, but may incorporate parts of the 10 CFR 2.201 reply by specific reference (e.g., citing page and paragraph numbers) to avoid repetition. The attention of the Licensee is directed to the other provisions of 10 CFR 2.205, regarding the procedure for imposing a civil penalties.

Upon failure to pay any civil penalties due which subsequently has been determined in accordance with the applicable provisions of 10 CFR 2.205, this matter may be referred to the Attorney General, and the penalties, unless compromised, remitted, or mitigated, may be collected by civil action pursuant to Section 234(c) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. 2282c.

The response noted above (Reply to Notice of Violation, letter with payment of civil penalties, and Answer to a Notice of Violation) should be addressed to: Director, Office of Enforcement, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, ATTN:

Notice of Violation

- 6 -

Document Control Desk, Washington, D.C. 20555 with a copy to the Regional Administrator, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Region II and a copy to the NRC Resident Inspector at the Vogtle facility.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland  
this 9<sup>th</sup> day of May, 1994

Georgia Power Company

DISTRIBUTION:

PDR  
SECY  
CA  
JTaylor, EDO  
JMilhoan, DEDR  
JLieberman, OE  
SEbneter, RII  
LChandler, OGC  
JGoldberg, OGC  
WRussell, NRR  
Enforcement Coordinators  
RI, RII, RIII, RIV, RV  
FIngram, GPA/PA  
EJordan, AEOD  
BHayes, OI  
EA File  
DCS

OE	NRR	RA:RIV	D:OE	DEDR
JGray	LRE YES per WRussell follow up w/P Ruthard	SEbneter Helen JLieberman DORYC	JLieberman	JMilhoan
05/16/94	05/16/94	05/16/94	05/16/94	05/19/94

Doc Name: G:\OECASES\VOGFIN.R12