

DRAFT
PREDECISIONAL INFORMATION
~~NOT FOR RELEASE WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OF THE DIRECTOR, OE~~

Rev. 5: VOGDFI3.R5 3/4/94

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of)	
)	
GEORGIA POWER COMPANY)	
(Vogtle Electric Generating)	Docket Nos. 50-425/50-425
Plant, Units 1 & 2))	License Nos. NPF-68/NPF-81
)	EA 94-036

DEMAND FOR INFORMATION
REGARDING GEORGE BOCKHOLD, JR.

I

Georgia Power Company (Licensee) is the holder of Facility License Nos. NPF-68, and NPF-81 (Licenses) issued by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or Commission) pursuant to 10 CFR Part 50. The Licenses authorize the operation of the Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (VEGP) Units 1 and 2, in accordance with conditions specified therein.

II

Information in this record was deleted
in accordance with the Freedom of Information
Act, exemptions 95-81
FOIA- 95-81

On December 17, 1993, an investigation of licensed activities was completed by the NRC's Office of Investigations (OI) at Licensee's VEGP facility. The investigation was initiated in response to information received in June 1990 by NRC Region II alleging, in part, that material false statements were made to the NRC by senior Licensee officials regarding the reliability of the Diesel Generators (DGs). The pertinent events involved in this matter are described below.

On March 20, 1990, during a refueling outage at VEGP Unit 1, GPC declared a Site Area Emergency (SAE) when offsite power was lost concurrent with the failure of the only Unit 1 DG that was available (1A). The other Unit 1 DG (1B) was unavailable due to maintenance activities.

The NRC immediately responded to the SAE at the VEGP site with an Augmented Inspection Team (AIT). The NRC effort was upgraded to an Incident Investigation Team (IIT) on March 23, 1990. The IIT was composed of NRC Headquarters technical staff and industry personnel. The results of this investigation are documented in NUREG-1410, "Loss of Vital AC Power and the Residual Heat Removal System During Mid-Loop Operations at Vogtle Unit 1 on March 20, 1990."

On March 23, 1990, the NRC issued a Confirmation of Action Letter (CAL) to GPC that, among other things, confirmed that GPC had agreed not to return VEGP Unit 1 to criticality until the Regional Administrator was satisfied that appropriate corrective actions had been taken, and that the plant could safely return to power operations.

On April 9, 1990, GPC made a presentation to the NRC in the Region II offices in support of GPC's request to return VEGP Unit 1 to power operations. As part of this presentation, GPC provided information on DG starts in response to a specific NRC

request that GPC address DG reliability in its April 9 presentation. GPC submitted a written summary of its April 9 presentation in an April 9, 1990 letter, "Vogtle Electric Generating Plant Confirmation of Action Letter."

On April 12, 1990, the NRC formally granted permission for VEGP Unit 1 to return to criticality and resume power operations.

On April 19, 1990, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.73, GPC submitted Licensee Event Report (LER) 50-424/90-06, "Loss of Offsite Power Leads to Site Area Emergency."

On June 29, 1990, GPC submitted a revised LER, 50-424/90-06-01. The purpose of the submittal was to clarify information related to successful DG starts that were discussed in the April 9, 1990 letter and the April 19, 1990 LER, and to update the status of corrective actions in the original LER.

From August 6 through August 17, 1990, the NRC conducted a Special Team Inspection at VEGP, as a result of NRC concerns about, and allegations related to, VEGP operational activities. This inspection examined the technical validity and safety significance of the allegations, but did not investigate alleged wrongdoing. The Special Team informed GPC that the June 29, 1990 submittal failed to address the April 9, 1990 data and requested that GPC clarify DG starts reported on April 9, 1990. Results of

this inspection are documented, in part, in NRC Inspection Report No. 50-424,425/90-19, Supplement 1, dated November 1, 1991.

On August 30, 1990, GPC submitted a letter, "Clarification of Response to Confirmation of Action Letter." The purpose of the submittal was to clarify the diesel start information that was addressed in the April 9, 1990 submittal.

III

The NRC has reviewed the evidence associated with these events, submittals, and representations to the NRC. Specifically, the NRC reviewed information gathered as part of the OI investigation, information gathered during the IIT, NUREG-1410, Supplement 1 of NRC Inspection Report 90-19, discovery responses in the Vogtle operating license amendment proceeding (Docket Nos. 50-424 OLA-3, 50-425 OLA-3), and other related information.

Prior to GPC briefing the Regional Administrator, Region II, on VEGP's readiness for restart, the NRC asked GPC to address DG reliability as part of its restart presentation on April 9, 1990. For that presentation, Mr. Bockhold was personally involved in the preparation of data regarding DG reliability and tasked the Unit Superintendent with collecting the number of successful DG starts for the 1A and 1B DGs. [

In fact, Mr. Bockhold stated no criteria for successful starts, a term not formally defined, when he directed the Unit Superintendent to gather successful DG starts. [

Information was then presented to the NRC in the April 9, 1990 oral presentation by Mr. Bockhold and the April 9, 1990 letter submitted by GPC that there were 18 and 19 consecutive successful starts on the 1A and 1B DGs, respectively, without problems or failures.

GPC's report of starts in the presentation and letter included three 1B DG starts with problems that occurred during DG overhaul and maintenance activities (a high lube oil temperature trip on March 22, 1990; a low jacket water pressure/turbo lube oil pressure low trip on March 23, 1990; and a failure to trip on a high jacket water temperature alarm occurring on March 24, 1990). The correct number of consecutive successful starts without problems or failures was 12 for 1B DG--a number less than that reported by GPC to the NRC on April 9, 1990.

LER 90-006, submitted to the NRC on April 19, 1990, was based, in part, on information presented to the NRC on April 9, 1990.

- 7 -

[During review of the draft LER, site personnel questioned its accuracy. Given that there were trips in the 1B DG after March 20, 1990, they did not think that the statement concerning "no problems or failures" was correct. A teleconference was subsequently held between site and corporate personnel]

]the 1A and

1B DG start counts reported on April 19, 1990 overstated the actual counts by including starts that were part of the CTP.

The Senior Vice President - Nuclear Operations also stated that he thought the April 19, 1990 data had been checked.

On May 2, 1990, Mr. Bockhold was given a list of DG starts that showed that the start counts reported in the April 9, 1990 presentation, the April 9, 1990 CAL response letter, and the April 19, 1990 LER were incorrect. Mr. Bockhold agreed that the LER needed to be revised to reflect the correct number of starts. Mr. Bockhold also agreed that the April 9, 1990 letter needed to be corrected because he asked and was informed that the April 9, 1990 error was different than the April 19, 1990 error. It was also agreed that uniform language would be used to correct both documents.

During the NRC's Special Team Inspection exit interview on August 17, 1990, GPC was specifically notified by the NRC that the revised LER did not adequately clarify the DG start information contained in the April 9, 1990 letter, and NRC requested GPC to provide clarification of this submittal. GPC forwarded a submittal to the NRC on August 30, 1990 regarding the April 9, 1990 letter. A draft of the August 30, 1990 letter, sent to the site for review, suggested that one of the reasons for the error in the April 9, 1990 letter was "confusion in the distinction between a successful start and a valid test" by the individuals who prepared the DG start information for the April 9, 1990 letter. During an August 29, 1990 Plant Review Board (PRB) meeting which, among other things, reviewed the proposed August 30, 1990 submittal to the NRC, the VEGP Manager - Technical Support raised concerns about the accuracy of that statement. Mr. Bockhold admitted to the PRB that the Unit Superintendent (who originally collected the DG start data at Mr. Bockhold's direction) was not confused about the distinction between successful starts and valid tests when the start data was collected for the April 9, 1990 letter, but stated that the sentence was not in error because other people were confused. Mr. Bockhold acknowledged that there was

confusion among individuals after April 9, 1990, but admitted that the Unit Superintendent was not confused when he developed the information. [

[

]

[

]

Mr. Bockhold

was aware of the NRC's interest in DG reliability in the context of an NRC decision on restart [

]

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

James L. Milhoan
Deputy Executive Director
for Nuclear Reactor Regulation,
Regional Operations, and Research

Dated at Rockville, Maryland
this ____ day of ____ (Month) 19(XX)