

I-MOSBA-250

Re: Allen Mosbaugh concern  
Interview with Mike Horton

95 OCT 20 P4 56 6/20/90

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
BOOKETING & SERVICE

We began with identification that I was looking into certain technical concerns which had been identified. The first concern to be addressed dealt with the FAVA system.

Mike Horton related that the site had requested a system from a vendor to do some water processing. The system was to be on site temporarily for testing purposes. The vendor delivered and installed the system and it was placed in operation. The test was successful and it was determined desirable to make the system permanent. Procurement and Engineering got "excited" about this due to the lack of appropriate documentation. Attempts were made to secure documents but these failed. When the permanent system was ordered, it was ordered from IMPEL instead of FAVA.

Horton felt the initial installation of FAVA violated the literal and intended meaning of Reg. Guide 1.143 and, therefore, also likely violated the FSAR. Site procedures (procurement system, design controls/reviews) were also circumvented.

Horton felt the mistakes were made by personnel in Health Physics and he was not confident that similar mistakes had been precluded from occurring again.

Horton believes that the plants design controls are viewed as cumbersome by many. It was not unusual for a department to try to circumvent these controls (not necessarily intentionally, but none-the-less). Horton has not discussed this perception with Ron DeSrand. Horton believes that there is a perceived attitude that this is condoned at the top or that the issue is "grey enough" ~~to~~ is a number of circumstances that there may continue to be similar situations.

Horton feels configuration control is not stringent - that it can accidentally or deliberately be circumvented fairly easily.

As looking at FAVA, Horton believes DeSrand lacked the knowledge/expertise to do what was done without needing to seek outside support. Horton perceives DeSrand as having a strong will/desire to implement what he sees as good ideas but that this is not tempered with a knowledge of the right way to go about it. Horton believes the Chemistry section of HP is not compelled to ask for help - if in doubt they may simply choose to proceed. Instead they should be asking Engineering for support. Horton believes the procedures are clear (although he may be more familiar than most) and that all should understand their requirements and intent.

Horton saw as somewhat comparable, two more recent issues:

- ① dissolved oxygen monitors - Engineering had analyzed cost and agreed. Purchasing initiated with no other input - no design - no specifications. A SOW was approved without Engineering input and it is believed a purchase may have been made even though design has not been done.
- ② HP has computers already in warehouse for PASS or PERMS. Horton believes the turmoil caused by FAVA is the only reason they're not being installed. The requisition for these got to "corporate" without a design change. McCoy became aware, sent the req. back and wanted to know what was going on.

- Horton had no problem with operation of the PRB

- Horton believes the issue of air quality can be resolved relatively easily with an minimal of disassembly for inspection. There may even be some removed components which may be examined.

- The issue of the reported number of starts on the diesel's being incorrect was seen as a communication problem. Horton not aware of control room log problem - says engineering log is what needs to and does meet requirements. He said this report may not be updated until just prior to a report being due (monthly)

- o Horton had no problems with how the SOWPOCO people in Birmingham responded to FAVA - felt they were less than pleased to be "reviewing" for "buy off" after the fact.

Suggested I talk with Joe Styshinger (SLS now - had been with procurement at Vogtle) who is aware of all of the procurement history on FAVA.

~~ASA~~