

RESULTS OF INTERVIEW WITH EDDIE LEE HENNINGTON ON  
MARCH 26, 1984 AS PREPARED BY ROBERT H. BURCH

On March 26, 1984, Eddie Lee HENNINGTON was interviewed at his residence by Investigator Robert H. Burch. HENNINGTON, who resides at [redacted] advised he has been employed at the Mississippi Power and Light Company's (MP&L) Grand Gulf Nuclear Plant (GG) as a Mechanical Maintenance Supervisor since March 1981. He advised that prior to working at GG he was employed in a similar position for five years at Virginia Electric and Power Company's Surry Nuclear Power Plant. He said he is retired from the U.S. Navy where he served in the nuclear surface program.

HENNINGTON advised that when he first came to the MP&L/GG facility in March 1981 there was no plant administrative procedure for the Mechanical Maintenance Non-Licensed Training program. He said that the GG plant did not actually belong to MP&L at that time since Bechtel had not completed the start up program. He said the start up engineers were employees of Bechtel, General Electric, other contractors and MP&L, although Bechtel was responsible for all of the start up activities. HENNINGTON advised that by January 1982, when Administrative Procedure 01-S-04-17, Revision 0, Mechanical Maintenance Training Program was issued, most of the GG systems had been turned over to MP&L. He said the MP&L/GG Training Department was given the responsibility for implementing the Mechanical Maintenance Non-License Training Program. He said that MP&L employee Jim JONES was the individual responsible for ensuring that the Practical Factor (PF) Sheets, an attachment to the Administrative Procedure, were distributed to the mechanics for completion.

HENNINGTON advised that he first saw the PF sheets in early 1982. He described the PF document as a listing of approximately 40 tasks that each mechanic is required to perform as a part of their work assignments. He said this is considered on-the-job training for mechanic personnel. HENNINGTON said he did not see the Administrative Procedure which implements the PF sheets for a considerable time after he first saw the PF sheets. He stated that PF sheets listing the 40 tasks were given to him in early 1982 for each of the six to eight mechanics in his crew by the Assistant Maintenance Superintendent Billy BOOTS. He said BOOTS gave absolutely no instructions regarding the completion of the PF sheets and no time limit was placed on the completion of these documents. He said the only comment that he recalled from BOOTS was that the signatures and dates to be placed on the PF sheets by supervisors should be spread over a period of time. He said BOOTS did not elaborate on this remark. HENNINGTON advised that BOOTS gave no further instructions regarding completion of the PF sheets. He said that, in his opinion, BOOTS did not suggest falsifying the PF sheets or completing them "just for the sake of filling in blanks." He stated that neither BOOTS nor Maintenance Superintendent D. O. STAER, made any remarks regarding the completion of the PF sheets which he interpreted as improper or illegal. HENNINGTON stated that, in his opinion, the mechanical maintenance supervisors had to use their own imaginations as to how they were to complete the PF sheets for their mechanics since upper maintenance management did not provide any instructions or directions regarding completion of this document.

HENNINGTON advised that since he was not given instructions regarding the completion of the PF sheets, he and fellow supervisor Bill BRADLEY discussed alternative methods for performing this requirement. He said that he and BRADLEY mutually agreed to allow mechanics in their crews to identify the first date they had performed the tasks listed on the PF sheets. He said he told BOOTS that he intended to complete the PF sheets in this fashion. He said BOOTS responded that he did not care how the PF sheets were completed as long as supervisors felt comfortable that the mechanics could perform the listed tasks. He said BOOTS also told him that every journeyman mechanic should be able to perform all of the tasks listed on the PF sheets. HENNINGTON advised that with this limited guidance from BOOTS and not having seen the Administrative Procedure at the time, he distributed the PF sheets to all mechanics in his crew. He said he told each mechanics to review all of the tasks on the PF sheets and to indicate the date each had performed the listed tasks or one similar to it. HENNINGTON advised that he did not begin work on the PF sheets immediately and estimated that there was a delay of from six months to a year before he seriously began to complete the PF sheets for his crew members. He stated that when he collected the PF sheets from his crew members after they had indicated the dates on which they had performed listed tasks he began to satisfy himself that each mechanic could perform the listed tasks. He said he satisfied himself by discussing the tasks separately with each mechanic and required them to verbally explain the manner in which they had performed the tasks. HENNINGTON advised that he did not personally witness the performance of each and every task listed on the PF sheets by his mechanics but he satisfied himself that they knew how to perform these tasks through their verbal explanation of each process. He advised that he required each of his mechanics to explain the method of performing the task and the type of equipment used in the process.

HENNINGTON advised that not all of his crew members had performed all of the tasks listed on the PF sheets, however, some members of his crew had performed most all of the tasks listed. He stated he always assigned an inexperienced crew member with an experienced crew member and therefore trained his personnel in this manner to perform the tasks listed on the PF sheets. HENNINGTON advised that because some PF sheet tasks are performed more frequently than others, only about two or three mechanics actually completed all of the listed tasks. He advised that since January 1982 approximately 20 different mechanics have been assigned to his crew and he said he signed and dated some tasks on all of these PF sheets. He explained that he personally witnessed the performance of some of the tasks and he required individual mechanics to verbally explain the accomplishments of some tasks before he signed and dated the PF sheets. He reiterated that he was satisfied that each mechanic could perform the listed tasks before he signed and dated the PF sheets.

HENNINGTON advised that when the PF sheets were first distributed to the mechanics in January 1982 he was not aware that a "walk through" was required to verify that each mechanics could perform the listed task. He said that superintendents STAER and BOOTS were apparently not aware of this requirement either since they did not instruct the first line supervisors to conduct the verifications in this manner. He advised that because he and BRADLEY had initially agreed, and BOOTS concurred, that mechanics would indicate the date on which they had first performed a task listed on the PF

sheets, some of the dates they listed were dates prior to their coming to work at the MP&L/GG facility. HENNINGTON advised that as many as one third of the dates initially indicated by the mechanics are dates prior to their employment at the GG facility. He said this situation was first realized in about February 1984 and Superintendent BOOTS instructed all mechanical maintenance supervisors to correct these PF sheet dates and to have them coincide with the period of time during which each mechanic had been employed by the GG facility. HENNINGTON advised that in February 1984 he corrected some PF sheet dates for mechanics currently assigned to his crew. He stated that although he did not personally witness all of these tasks, he required each mechanics to again verbally explain the manner in which each was performed. He reiterated that he was satisfied all mechanics were able to satisfactorily perform all PF sheet tasks which he signed and dated. HENNINGTON further advised that the mechanics assigned to his crew had, at one time or another since their employment at the GG facility, performed most of the tasks listed on the PF sheets. He stated that the dates he placed on the PF sheets are dates on which he interviewed the mechanics and had them verbally explain the performance of the tasks listed on the PF sheets.

HENNINGTON reiterated that he at no time falsified the PF sheets by signing and dating the tasks listed thereon. He stated that when he signed a PF sheet task for his crew members he was totally and completely satisfied that they could perform the listed task.

HENNINGTON advised that at no time did superintendents BOOTS or STAER direct or instruct him to falsify or improperly complete the PF sheets. He stated he would not have done so even if told to complete them in an illegal manner. He said he did not realize or understand the requirements of the Administrative Procedure regarding the completion of the PF sheets until approximately February 1984, at which time he began to correct the mistakes he had made. HENNINGTON advised that as of the time of his interview he had witnessed approximately 98 percent of all tasks listed on the PF sheets for each mechanic in his crew. He explained that the only tasks he has not witnessed relate to fork lift training and he said this is accomplished in a specialized school of instruction for operators.

HENNINGTON identified communications problems between maintenance supervisors and superintendents as a primary cause of the PF sheets issue. He explained that superintendents rarely, if ever, give adequate directions and instructions to supervisors and the supervisors are expected to be knowledgeable of maintenance activities in spite of the failure of superintendents to keep them apprised of activities. He said maintenance efficiency and morale would improve markedly if superintendents would spend time with supervisors and listen to their complaints and concerns.

HENNINGTON advised that he is also dissatisfied with the current tagging procedures to isolate a particular valve or components. He stated he has expressed this concern to his supervisors who have shown no interest in changing the present procedures. HENNINGTON explained that the current procedure allows the maintenance employee to tag a component needing maintenance rather than making the control room supervisor responsible for this activity. He said the control room personnel are better acquainted with all of the systems and components than are the maintenance personnel

and therefore are in a better position to isolate and/or deactivate a particular component that needs repairs. HENNINGTON advised that the maintenance department is not on the distribution list for updated prints and therefore maintenance personnel frequently find themselves working with prints which are out of date or having to locate a current print before performing a particular maintenance function.

HENNINGTON concluded that he is not aware that any maintenance supervisor has falsified PF sheets and further advised he never discussed completion of the PF sheets with any person except Bill BRADLEY. He reiterated that at no time did Billy BOOTS, D. O. STAER or any other Maintenance Superintendent direct or instruct him to falsify PF sheets or deliberately sign and date these documents without first satisfying himself that the mechanics were able to perform all tasks listed in a satisfactory and safe manner. HENNINGTON declined to provide a sworn statement, citing personal reasons as the basis for his declination.

END OF RESULTS OF INTERVIEW WITH EDDIE LEE HENNINGTON ON MARCH 26, 1984.

  
Robert H. Burch, Investigator



RESULTS OF INTERVIEW WITH CHARLES RANDY HUTCHINSON  
ON APRIL 12, 1984 AS PREPARED BY ROBERT H. BURCH

Charles Randy HUTCHINSON was interviewed in his office at Mississippi Power and Light Company's (MP&L) Grand Gulf Nuclear Station (GG) on April 12, 1984 by Investigator Robert H. Burch. HUTCHINSON advised that he has been employed with MP&L on the GG project since July 1973. He said he has served in his present job as an Assistant Plant Manager since October 1983. He advised that as an Assistant Plant Manager he is responsible for the Plant Maintenance Division at the GG facility:

HUTCHINSON advised that after the recent operator training deficiencies at the facility, which were investigated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the President of MP&L, Mr. Jack RICHARD requested that GG plant officials conduct a review of non-license training in accordance with the FSAR commitments. He said this study was conducted by him and other GG officials and found that, although the FSAR commits MP&L to the training of employees assigned in the mechanical, electrical and instrumentation and control disciplines, it does not require Practical Factor (PF) sheets or Qualification Cards for maintenance personnel. He stated that he reviewed the requirements of the MP&L/GG procedure entitled Mechanical Maintenance Training Program, 01-S-04-17, in March 1984 after the Senior Resident Inspector (SRI) for the NRC advised at a March 9, 1984 exit conference that an unresolved item would be issued regarding the mechanical Practical Factors sheets. He said the SRI indicated he was citing the GG facility for violating its own procedure pertaining to PF sheets. HUTCHINSON stated that the GG Plant Manager then directed him to make inquiries regarding this matter and to determine the manner in which this plant procedure requirement had been implemented at the facility. He stated that the findings of the SRI reflected that one mechanical maintenance mechanic had a date entered on his PF sheet which was prior to the time the mechanic was actually employed by the MP&L/GG facility and said it was his (HUTCHINSON's) understanding that the Plant Manager desired him to determine the reason this incident had occurred.

HUTCHINSON advised that he conducted a very limited inquiry as directed by Plant Manager CROSS and found that Maintenance Mechanics BRADLEY and HANDLEY had been credited with completing a PF task prior to the time they had been employed by MP&L/GG. He stated he reviewed the circumstances of these two instances and determined they were given credit for the PF tasks because of prior experiences in these tasks at previous employment locations. HUTCHINSON advised that these two individuals told him they understood prior employment experience was acceptable in completing the Mechanical Maintenance PF sheets. HUTCHINSON further advised that he determined Mechanical Maintenance Mechanics were not familiar with the contents of the plant procedure entitled Mechanical Maintenance Retraining and Replacement Training Program. He said he also determined that Mechanical Maintenance mechanics and supervisors had violated this procedure by improperly certifying completion of the tasks listed on the PF sheets. HUTCHINSON advised that his limited inquiry further disclosed no evidence of a deliberate, willful violation of the plant procedure and that unfamiliarity with the procedure had caused the PF sheets tasks to be