

# OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

**Agency:** U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

**Title:** INTERVIEW OF EDWARD JOSEPH KOZINSKY

**Docket No.**

**LOCATION:** Waynesboro, Georgia

**DATE:** March 28, 1990

**PAGES:** 1-13

**ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.**

1612 K St. N.W., Suite 300

Washington, D.C. 20006

(202) 293-3950

9202200412 520116  
PDR ADDCK 05000424  
S FDR

ADDENDUM TO INTERVIEW OF Edward J. K... ..  
 (Print Identity of Interviewee)

<u>Page</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Correction and Reason for Correction</u>
3	10	<del>EVENTS</del> TERMS - spelling
8	9	'TIC (TECHNICAL)' NOT TEST - MISUNDERSTOOD AT TRAINING
10	5	<del>LOSS</del> - WILL STATE ON 4/12/90 'LOSS OF OPERATING POWER' WILL 'STATE OF OPERATING POWER' E. J. K... .. 4/12/90



P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 MR. WEST: We are at Plant Vogtle, and the date is  
3 March 28th. The time is 3:11 p.m. and we are here to  
4 interview an individual, generally speaking, with respect  
5 to the event that occurred here at the plant on March 20,  
6 1990.

7 Whereupon,

8 EDWARD JOSEPH KOZINSKY

9 appeared as a witness herein, and was examined and testified  
10 as follows:

11 EXAMINATION

12 BY MR. WEST:

13 Q And we will now have him to introduce himself and  
14 indicate what his position is here at the Plant and also to  
15 give us a brief statement and how long you've been here at  
16 the plant.

17 A My name is Edward Joseph Kozinsky. I am shift  
18 superintendent -- or operations superintendent of admn.  
19 support currently. I am a licensed senior reactor operator.  
20 I have been at the plant six years and two months.

21 Q Now, it's my understanding that you're involved  
22 in the work -- or at least knowledgeable of the work that's  
23 related to the HPES program. Would you begin by, for the  
24 record, just tell us what the acronym stands for and then to  
25 step up through what that program deals with, please.

1           A     HPES is an acronym for the Human Performance  
2 Evaluation System, a voluntary program sponsored by the  
3 Institution Nuclear Power Operations, INPO. I was until  
4 recently the site coordinator for HPES. That involved  
5 preparation of some reports to INPO documenting human  
6 performance problems mostly -- well, exclusively in the form  
7 of event reports, event critiques. As a consequence of that  
8 I participated in numerous event reviews providing a human  
9 factors perspective in addition to my operation perspective  
10 on various even teams. I am not on the event review team  
11 for the March 20 event that you are specifically reviewing.

12           Q     Now, the HPES program, does it involve a root  
13 cause type of analysis?

14           A     The HPES program has a family of methodologies for  
15 root cause and corrective action that were generally  
16 implemented in the site procedure which was used for root  
17 cause and corrective action. It is not identical to the INPO  
18 HPES forms and the HPES form report for transmittal to INPO  
19 would be prepared in parallel, basically same information,  
20 different forms, but there were some differences in the  
21 categorization of root causes.

22           Q     Is there a specific model or various models that  
23 would be used to make the root cause determination?

24           A     There is not a specific model. The approach is  
25 multi-discipline team reviewing the event and developing

1 primarily a sequence of events approach, and then  
2 identifying the signal errors or occurrences or failures  
3 that chain together to lead to the site event. I would  
4 characterize that chain of events documentation as the  
5 general thrust of our site procedure.

6 Q And the person that will actually conduct this  
7 assessment related to the March 20 event would be who?

8 A This assessment is done by a review team, which is  
9 appointed by the Plant Manager which will consist of about a  
10 half dozen members, one from each department. I believe Mr.  
11 McCarly is a member of that team and he has, as I said,  
12 recently assumed the duties of the Human Performance  
13 Evaluation System Site Coordinator, which is to prepare any  
14 INPO reports that are produced, and encourage and assist the  
15 other departments in internal evaluations of problems and  
16 corrective actions.

17 MR. WEST: Did you want to ask any questions about  
18 HPES before I shift to another --

19 BY MR. TRAGER:

20 Q Well, it's my understanding of HPES is not very  
21 large. I guess what I was wondering is that over the several  
22 events that occurred over recent years involving RHR at mid-  
23 loop, and I would guess that some of these events would be  
24 the subject of HPES investigations by the plants on which  
25 they occurred. Do you know whether the HPES has developed

1 guidance for those investigations to, I guess, plants that  
2 belong to that program?

3 A The recommendations from events like that do not  
4 come out specifically under a HPES titled the INPO SOER's,  
5 I think is the acronym. Significant Event Report, SER's,  
6 are developed from that information and provide generic  
7 plant corrective actions and recommendations, not under a  
8 HPES flag. I'm not acquainted with any HPES materials  
9 related to loss of RHR. The information to INPO from any of  
10 those that may have been subject to an HPES review would  
11 come out in the SOER's from INPO.

12 Q So then the SOER's contain information that was  
13 developed by the HPES?

14 A They can. General information. A specific  
15 information about a plant as a result of a HPES review is  
16 confidential under the HPES program. It was crafted similar  
17 to the FAA incident reporting scheme and is a means for  
18 anonymous reporting of individuals and then anonymity of the  
19 company for the data going into the INPO data base. The  
20 public dissemination for loss of RHR would unlikely come  
21 from a HPES report, but the same individuals would -- from  
22 INPO - would go to a site and participate with a review, or  
23 at the invitation of the utility prepare an independent  
24 review of the event. That's different from a HPES site  
25 report, which would go to INPO prepared by the site. That



1 would be held in confidence by INPO, but elements of it  
2 might come out, you know, in generic recommendations.

3 Q Okay. Then I guess my understanding is that you  
4 are not aware of any reports that INPO published on this  
5 subject for this type of event?

6 A HPES reports. I don't recall if the various action  
7 letters or SOER's that I've reviewed on this were INPO  
8 SOER's or NRC generic letters. They are very similar in  
9 content and thrust sometimes. I'm not sure of the various  
10 ones I've seen in the past, if one of those was INPO or not.

11 BY MR. WEST:

12 Q So from the plant's point of view, even though you  
13 are inputting to the system, you can't retrieve individual  
14 reports; is that correct? You get it more through the SER's  
15 and SOER's?

16 A We don't get individual reports from other plants.  
17 That information is not directly available. We can inquire  
18 and the INPO individual can basically act as an information  
19 broker, and if the other plant agrees to --

20 Q I see.

21 A If the other plant agrees, you might be introduced  
22 to the contact at the other plant for follow up information,  
23 but the HPES is in general disseminated in a generic  
24 fashion, not an event specific fashion. If it is event  
25 specific, it is presented anonymous with respect to the



1 site.

2 Q So from an anonymous point of view, you could have  
3 subject searches or event kinds of searches done to pull  
4 together information in that fashion?

5 A Yes.

6 BY MR. TRAGER:

7 Q But did you do this?

8 A No, I have not.

9 Q As far as the loss RHR at mid-loop, you didn't  
10 receive information from, as far as you know, from HPES on  
11 events that may have happened at other sites that were  
12 studied by HPES?

13 A Not from HPES that I recall. I would have to  
14 refer to the history file because they come out basically  
15 once a month, and over the past several years, there are a  
16 lot of them that have accumulated and I don't recall if one  
17 of those was loss of RHR related or not.

18 Q So it would have -- being the coordinator, or  
19 being involved with HPES, then you are not aware of anything  
20 you might have forwarded to your own operations training  
21 people?

22 A Whatever I received in the way of HPES incident  
23 reports I forwarded to the training department, but I can't  
24 recall if one of those was specific for RHR or not. I could  
25 make reference to my files and be more specific on that.

1 BY MR. WEST:

2 Q I would like to shift to a few questions in the  
3 area of the safety parameter display system. Could you  
4 first give us some idea as the Unit 1 was going to an  
5 outage, what is actually available on the SPDS to your  
6 knowledge. I guess one thought I'm having, I'm not clear  
7 on, during the outage did you service the SPDS's as well?

8 A The SPDS is not routinely an outage type  
9 maintenance item because without a text spec limitation it  
10 can be repaired -- shutdown and repaired during plant  
11 operation. I'm not acquainted with any specific maintenance  
12 that was going on. The limitations on input to the SPDS  
13 come from the maintenance on all of the individual  
14 components. There are about 2000 individual inputs to the  
15 machine --

16 Q So not directly to the SPDS in terms of  
17 maintenance, but the inputs that come to the SPDS?

18 A Various inputs would be under maintenance and they  
19 may give bad data because of power being tagged out to a  
20 component or some components actually being disassembled and  
21 their limit switches being removed may or may not be giving  
22 correct indication on that, but I'm not acquainted with a  
23 specific SPDS maintenance item. The inputs during an outage  
24 would be at a reduced state because of individual  
25 maintenance on many, many items.

1 Q I know that vessel level was a variable that was  
2 of importance related to the event. Is vessel level one of  
3 the parameters that would be included in the SPDS?

4 A Vessel level is in the SPDS. As I recall it was  
5 not available when we were in the March 20 event. I looked  
6 for level on the SPDS early in the event. As I recall it  
7 was showing bad data and I did not explore why that was out  
8 of service. During the assembly of the vessel, the upper  
9 taps for the vessel level are physically removed, and I  
10 believe that maintenance was still in progress to restore  
11 the upper leg of the RVLIS where it attaches to the vessel  
12 head.

13 Q I see. You mentioned that you looked for vessel  
14 level during the event. Were you in the control room at the  
15 time of the event?

16 A No, sir. I was in the training center at the time  
17 of the event and -- Are we at a break here?

18 MR. TRAGER: Could we take it off the record a  
19 second?

20 (Off the record)

21 MR. WEST: Let's go back on.

22 WITNESS KOZINSKY: At the time of the event, I was  
23 in training at the training center and I went to the  
24 emergency operations facility when I heard that the plant  
25 had a trip. Actually I noticed that on the system monitor

1 that the plant was showing no generation. I called  
2 operations and found out that we had had a loss of off-site  
3 power. I went to the emergency operations facility where  
4 the computer display was in service, and I looked at the  
5 state of the plant and saw that a state of off-site power  
6 was in progress, looked at core thermocouples and RVLIS  
7 levels. Core thermocouples were in service, but as I recall  
8 RVLIS was not available.

9 I was in the EOF, emergency response team, so I  
10 remained there when the site area emergency was declared as  
11 assistant to the emergency director.

12 BY MR. WEST:

13 Q They have the SPDS there in the --

14 A The SPDS terminals are available real time, same  
15 hardware, tied into Unit 1 and Unit 2 in the EOF. So --

16 Q You have two separate monitors? One for Unit 1  
17 and one for Unit 2?

18 A Yes. At the time one was on Unit 1 and one was on  
19 Unit 2 so we were able to look at both units. I was there  
20 with Mr. Kitchens, the plant manager. We determined that  
21 Unit 2 had tripped and Unit 1 was in a loss of off-site  
22 power. He came back to the plant and I remained at the  
23 training center.

24 Q Do you have both of the SPDS monitors adjacent to  
25 one another in the EOF?

1           A       They are not side by side. They were about 50 or  
2 60 feet apart. They are not always both hooked up to my  
3 knowledge, but at this time both were in service. There's  
4 usually one and it's on the same data link as the technical  
5 support center, and that is switchable so it would be either  
6 on Unit 1 or 2 depending on the selection for the TSC, but  
7 the data links were hooked up so that both were available at  
8 the time of the event.

9           Q       Did you find that the SPDS information was of  
10 value during the event or was most of it in the mode of not  
11 being reliable data at the time?

12          A       It was very useful for about 20 or 30 minutes and  
13 then a large block of data went out which I attributed to a  
14 loss of power to one of the data concentrators. I wasn't  
15 sure what had happened, but it was obvious that a large  
16 block of data was out of service, which I interpreted as a  
17 result of a loss of power to one of the multiplexers or data  
18 concentrators that feed into the machine. Later in the  
19 event when the power was restored, we got that data back and  
20 were able to monitor the recovery, the restoration, of the  
21 plant. The ability to see in real time the plant parameters  
22 and configurations is extremely valuable in the emergency  
23 operations facility. Although we were not activated in this  
24 event, we remained in a standby status, but that figures  
25 very heavily into our emergency response being able to

1 monitor that in real time.

2 MR. WEST: That's all the questions I have.

3 MR. TRAGER: I just have one more question.

4 BY MR. TRAGER:

5 Q I was just wondering, the HPES group here is  
6 putting together an analysis of this event?

7 A The plant is putting together an event review --

8 Q An event review.

9 A I don't know if we will prepare an HPES report for  
10 submittal to INPO. The --

11 Q You don't submit a report on every event?

12 A No. We have not routinely submitted reports  
13 recently because of other duties. The plant event is  
14 prepared and it is, as I said, similar to the INPO. The HPES  
15 report is a separate parallel piece of paper that's prepared  
16 especially for submittal to INPO. The plant event review is  
17 the plant working document on root cause and development of  
18 corrective actions.

19 MR. WEST: Okay. We'll stop here.

20 (Whereupon, the interview was concluded at 3:35 p.m.)

21

22

23

24

25



C E R T I F I C A T E

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

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission in the matter of:

Name: Investigative interview of

EDWARD JOSEPH KOZINSKY

Docket Number:

Place: Vogtle Nuclear Generating Plant, Waynesboro, GA

Date: March 28, 1990

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original  
transcript thereof for the file of the United States Nuclear  
Regulatory Commission taken stenographically by me and,  
thereafter reduced to typewriting by me or under my  
direction, and that the transcript is a true and accurate  
record of the foregoing proceedings.

---

SUSAN M. BREEDLOVE  
Official Reporter

Ann Riley & Associates