

I-MOSBA-253

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

 Staff  Applicant  Intervenor  Other Identified  Received  Rejected  Reporter S.P.

Date 9/15/95 Witness BOCKHOLD

Re: Allen Mosbargh concern  
Interview with Skip Kitchens

June 26, 1990  
95 OCT 20 P4:39

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
DOCKETING & SERVICE  
BRANCH

Skip advised that there was notification to him last Friday by George Bockhold that there was some type of lawsuit in process and that there were issues with the FAWA system. This was all he knew of the concern at this point.

o Skip advised that the PRB was upgraded to line managers last summer (8/1 or 7/1). It had previously been comprised of lower level/technical personnel. Skip became chairman and Allen was Vice Chairman. No Tech Spec change was required as the term used in it was somewhat generic. There were no procedure changes. The PRB responsibility is to report and recommend to the General Manager on issues affecting the safety of the plant. The procedure is 002-C; there are also requirements in the Tech Specs. Responsibilities relate primarily to design or procedure changes, including safety evaluations. There are six members plus the chairman - the chairman only votes in the event of a tie.

Approximately 20 DC cards are reviewed for reportability each week. The Technical Support Group (under Jim Aufenkamp) does detailed review and makes recommendations to the PRB. The PRB

reviews and discuss and votes to concur or disagree. As an example, Skip discussed a recent DC on an overpower event. It came down to the number of decimal places you rounded off to as to whether it had been a violation which should be reported. Skip felt they (PRB), under his leadership, may have been better off to have waited a little longer before voting.

- o On the missed surveillance on the steam generator blowdown valve, Skip thought it may have occurred last Fall. Work was done on one valve and a stroke test should have been done before returning it to service. The issue was that they missed the Tech Spec requirement and also failed to implement the "action statement"; it would be reportable. Skip felt that if taken "ver batum" both had not been missed. John Rogge later disagreed and said it should have been reportable.

The PRB voted 4-3 not to report. George Bockhold took this and Rogge's feelings into consideration and sent in an LER. Skip recalled that under "reason reported" they did not put "Tech Spec Violation", but put instead that it was reported even though they felt it may not

be reportable. NRC issued a violation for improper reporting.

o With regard to the incorrectly reported number of diesel starts on the UH, Skip reported it had been submitted within 30 days as required. It included a general description of events, root cause and corrective action. The number of successful starts was also listed but the statement "without any problems" was also included. The confusion centers around whether failures were "valid" or "non-valid". Examples of "non-valid" would be just after major maintenance prior to releasing for operation or if there were operator error. Tech Spec guidelines are based on "valid" failures. The change was to "valid starts without a failure". The initial and revised responses were prepared by personnel under Allen Mosborough.

Skip said the 8 1/2 x 11 sheets for reporting starts were difficult to complete. Logs were not consistent ~~with~~ with sheets turned in to Engineering. Engineer Kenny Stokes maintains a separate log of diesel starts which he updates 1/week or 1/month. Skip suggested talking to George Frederick about this.

- o On diesel air quality Skip explained that each diesel had two air start systems - only one was required to start. Each has a blower and a dryer. IIT asked (while trying to discern why no start) if they (plant) had had any problems with air quality. Air for controls also comes off of this system. During an IIT meeting it was asked if dew point had been checked recently. A little over a day later, Bockhold reported that there was no problem with dew point - that everything had checked out. Tests had actually shown dew point was out of spec. Since had monthly tests for over a year on Unit 1 and for several months on Unit 2, they doubted the meter. Another meter was secured and everything tested OK.

Prior to testing with new meter Allen Mosbaugh had reported to Skip that Bockhold had reported incorrectly to IIT. Skip called George, told the check had been out of spec. Believes George told IIT. (Skip asked to check back a year only - there may be records of dew point measurements that date further back.)

With regard to condition of the air systems, Skip stated that Maintenance does preventative maintenance on the control air systems. He believed the air systems had been checked but didn't know of

specific check for scale. They did blow down the air lines during this time. Operators open a blow down valve; checks for water regularly on their rounds. IIT reported no chronic problem on air quality.

- ° On Cal-con switches, Skip said the Part 21 had been issued on pressure switches. The Cal-con switches brought into question on the diesels were jacket water temperature switches. Lewis Ward (Bham - Maintenance Support Manager) Harvey Handfinger, Ken Burr may also have info. Part 21 review may have been done.
- ° With regard to taking the final FAVA vote while Allen Mosbany was out, Skip indicated he perceived Allen didn't want to be there. Skip felt Allen had an erratic attendance pattern. Skip indicated if he had known there was a legitimate problem, he would have held up on the vote. Skip felt Horton (and possibly Auptenkamp) were particularly stressed by this issue and vote.

Skip felt you could still buy things for experimental purposes along the lines of FAVA, but not for temporary modifications. He also felt it should not have been left in so long.