

VEGP PLANT REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES

MEETING NO. 90-67 DATE 5/10/90 PAGE 1 OF 3
 MEETING CONVENED 1:20 AM/PM; MEETING ADJOURNED 2:05 AM/PM
 (* VIA TELECON)

THIS MEETING CHAIRED BY:
 () CHAIRMAN (x) VICE CHAIRMAN A. L. Mosbaugh

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: J. G. Aufdenkampe M. W. Horton
J. E. Swartzwalder H. M. Handfinger
 PRB SECRETARY C. Cross Tynan

NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: M. B. Lackey L. M. Dannemiller
G. R. Frederick

VOTING ALTERNATES PRESENT:

P. A. Cure FOR R. L. LeGrand
 FOR

NON-VOTING ALTERNATES PRESENT:

FOR
 FOR
 FOR
 FOR
 FOR

GUESTS/TECHNICAL ADVISORS:

A. G. Rickman
T. E. Webb

PRB ACTION ITEMS OPENED: NONE
 PRB ACTION ITEMS CLOSED: NONE
 PRB MINUTES APPROVED : 90-65

PRB SECRETARY

PRB CHAIRMAN

PRB MEETING MINUTES CONTINUATION SHEET

- A. Meeting Minutes 90-65 were unanimously approved as presented.
- B. The following items were unanimously recommended for approval. No unreviewed safety question involved.
- | | |
|------------------|--|
| 19212-C, Rev. 2, | "FR-S.2 Response to Loss of Core Shutdown" |
| 19222-C, Rev. 5, | "FR-C.2 Response to Degraded Core Cooling" |
| 19235-C, Rev. 4, | "FR-H.5 Response to Steam Generator Low Level" |
| 00057-C, Rev. 5, | "Event Investigation" |
| 18007-C, Rev. 5, | "Chemical and Volume Control System Malfunction" |
| LDCR FS 90-023, | Revise FSAR Section 13.1.2.2.2 page 13.1.2-4 to add Assistant General Manager - Plant Support to the line of succession of responsibility for plant operation. |
- Transmittal Letter - Emergency Plan Revision 12 (ELV-01591)
- Transmittal Letter - Emergency Plan Revision 13 (ELV-01592)
- LDCR SP 90-03, (SAFEGUARDS)
- 00656-C, Rev. 1, "Vehicle Control"
- C. The following items were unanimously recommended for approval with comment. No unreviewed safety question involved.
- | | |
|------------------|---|
| 00262-C, Rev. 8, | "Control of Chemicals / Fluids". Section 2.1.2 - Clarify and use exception listing. Section 2.6 - Include Demin. Water Building. Section 4.5.2.2 - Include writeup / reference of HP signoff acceptance of contaminated chemicals. Generic comment - Delete "I" from Nuclear Specialist title. Include ensuring MSDS on file prior to entering PA in Receipt Inspection procedure - J. G. Aufdenkampe to take action. |
| 00260-C, Rev. 6, | "Hazardous Substance and Waste Control". Section 2.22 - Definition of critical areas should be modified to address this specific procedure. Section 9.1.3 - correct reference (8.9.1 should be 8.8.1). |
- Letter to NRC - Site Area Emergency Corrective Actions (ELV-01632). Ensure Corrective Actions are completed as stated prior to this letter being issued. General Manager needs to determine if clarification provided in LER should also be included in this letter (Diesel starts).

- D. The board unanimously concurred with the reportability determination for the following Deficiency Cards.

1-90-0149
1-90-0242
1-90-0243
2-90-0046
2-90-0048
2-90-0049

Meeting Adjourned

JUN 20 1990

REC'D

IZML

To: Ken Brockman

From: John Rogge

Subject: GPC Meeting with Alan Mosbaugh

On June 19, 1990 at 9:30 am I met with George Bockhold and Alan Mosbaugh to discuss the technical issues of his recent quality concerns. Mr. Mosbaugh has filed a complaint with the Department of Labor. The meeting was called by Mr. Bockhold to solicit all the technical quality concerns so GPC could verify that appropriate action had been taken. Mr. Mosbaugh stated that his lawyer had advised him not to discuss information pertaining to the filing, but he would discuss technical issues. The technical issues identified by Mr. Mosbaugh were the FAVA Quality Concern, Diesel Air Quality, and Diesel Reliability. The meeting concluded with Mr. Mosbaugh stating that he was reviewing previous concerns and would be identifying them to GPC by the normal methods established for handling them.

At the start of the meeting I was allowed to read the two page complaint filed. The complaint was to establish that Mr. Mosbaugh was performing protected activities and had been removed from his current assignment and responsibilities. It did not identify specific concerns, but indicated that concerns had been submitted.

Three concerns were discussed at the meeting in brief as follows:

1. FAVA Quality Concern. Mr. Mosbaugh stated that this was one of the issues. He had an additional concern that when he tried to access the file last Friday that he could not. I asked if he had been denied access and learned that the file was removed from the site and was in the GPC lawyers office. His concern was with the ability of the file to remain intact. At the end of the meeting Mr. Bockhold clarified that the quality concern program included legal review and advise, but did not include access by the allegor due to confidentiality of those interviewed in resolving the concern. The FAVA concern also involves part 21, 50.72 and 50.73 potential reporting violations. Mr. Mosbaugh was also concerned that the investigation was not independent because Mr. Bockhold took over the investigation. Mr. Bockhold prompted his memory that Paul Rushton performed the technical part and he made decisions on the management of the investigation.

2. Diesel Reliability. Mr. Mosbaugh stated that he had concerns with the starts and failures of the 1A & 1B from March 20 to now and how the issue was resolved. He asked way for instance a revised LER had not been sent in. Mr. Bockhold stated that a decision was made to submit a complete revision and not just a count change. Mr. Mosbaugh stated that the revision had been in corporate for over a month with no action.

NOTE 1: In the afternoon of June 19, Mr. Mosbaugh met with me in my office to convey additional information that he was not at ease with in stating in front of Mr. Bockhold. He told me that the material was false and significant. The falseness could be considered careless and possibly careless disregard. Documents that are false are the LER regarding the site area emergency, COA

8/14/9

response and the slides used in a presentation to the NRC. These documents stated that they had 18 starts without failures when the number was more like 11. The LER revision will be misleading in that the new numbers will include successful starts up to the time of revision. The original error can be attributed to carelessness in allowing an inexperienced person count the starts when the information was necessary to support a release from a COA. The verbal presentation to the region to release the plant for criticality contained this wrong information. The written response to the COA was more misleading by not revealing that a problem existed. He felt that the delays in submitting a revised LER were related to completing the IIT hearing before the Commissioners and that the slowness could be construed to be willful.

NOTE 2: On the morning of June 20, Mr. Bockhold came by to clarify the GPC action that I may not be aware of. While the error in the counting was evident the resolution of how to count diesel starts and tests results was not. The operators who collected the data were counting successive starts when the diesel started and a ready to load light came on. In order to determine to a Valid or Invalid test result the procedures were not clear regarding a Safety Injection or Black Out condition for the diesel. The issue of how to properly evaluate the data was the issue and not just a simple recount. Corporate decided that a entire revision was necessary to properly present the information. Mr. Bockhold said that there were no residents onsite to inform last week, but Ken McCoy had talked to Ken Brockman and George Hairston had talked to Mr. Ebner.

3. Diesel Air Quality. Mr. Mosbaugh stated that he had a concern with diesel air quality regarding the humidity or dew point. Mr. Bockhold stated that Mike Horton who worked for him at the time got the information from Cooper Industries. Mr. Mosbaugh replied that he had met with him (Bockhold) and expressed the concern that since we did not know the air quality history that the effect on sensors and equipment could not be determined.

Note: The meeting did not discuss what Cooper Industries had advised the plant of or any other details of the issue.

The last subject was directed at determining if any other concerns existed. Mr. Mosbaugh stated that he was not prepared to discuss any new concerns. He stated that he was reviewing the past and would raise any new concerns through the GPC channels.

On June 20, when Mr. Bockhold met with me he stated that Lee Glenn was now assigned to do a independent review and that Mr. Mosbaugh was now assigned the primary task of identifying any further concerns he has.

John Rogge

To: Ken Brockman

From: John Rogge

Subject: GPC Meeting with Alan Mosbaugh

Item
109

On June 19, 1990, at 9:30 am I met with George Bockhold and Alan Mosbaugh to discuss the technical issues of his recent quality concerns. Mr. Mosbaugh has filed a complaint with the Department of Labor. The meeting was called by Mr. Bockhold to solicit all the technical quality concerns so GPC could verify that appropriate action had been taken. Mr. Mosbaugh stated that his lawyer had advised him not to discuss information pertaining to the filing, but he would discuss technical issues. The technical issues identified by Mr. Mosbaugh were the FAVA Quality Concern, Diesel Air Quality, and Diesel Reliability. The meeting concluded with Mr. Mosbaugh stating that he was reviewing previous concerns and would be identifying them to GPC by the normal methods established for handling them.

At the start of the meeting I was allowed to read the two page complaint filed. The complaint was to establish that Mr. Mosbaugh was performing protected activities and had been removed from his current assignment and responsibilities. It did not identify specific concerns, but indicated that concerns had been submitted.

Three concerns were discussed at the meeting in brief as follows:

1. FAVA Quality Concern. Mr. Mosbaugh stated that this was one of the issues. He had an additional concern that when he tried to access the file last Friday that he could not. I asked if he had been denied access and learned that the file was removed from the site and was in the GPC lawyers office. His concern was with the ability of the file to remain intact. At the end of the meeting Mr. Bockhold clarified that the quality concern program included legal review and advise, but did not include access by the allegor due to confidentiality of those interviewed in resolving the concern. The FAVA concern also involves part 21, 50.72 and 50.73 potential reporting violations. Mr. Mosbaugh was also concerned that the investigation was not independent because Mr. Bockhold took over the investigation. Mr. Bockhold prompted his memory that Paul Rushton performed the technical part and he made dicisions on the management of the investigation.

2. Diesel Reliability. Mr. Mosbaugh stated that he had concerns with the starts and failures of the 1A & 1B from March 20 to now and how the issue was resolved. He asked why for instance a revised LER had not been sent in. Mr. Bockhold stated that a decision was made to submit a complete revision and not just a count change. Mr. Mosbaugh stated that the revision had been in corporate for over a month with no action.

NOTE 1: In the afternoon of June 19, Mr. Mosbaugh met with

me in my office to convey additional information that he was not at ease with in stating in front of Mr. Bockhold. He told me that the material was false and significant. The falseness could be considered careless and possibly careless disregard. Documents that are false are the LER regarding the site area emergency, COA response and the slides used in a presentation to the NRC. These documents stated that they had 19 starts without failures when the number was more like 11. The LER revision will be misleading in that the new numbers will include successful starts up to the time of revision. The original error can be attributed to carelessness in allowing an inexperienced person count the starts when the information was necessary to support a release from a COA. The verbal presentation to the region to release the plant for criticality contained this wrong information. The written response to the COA was more misleading by not revealing that a problem existed. He felt that the delays in submitting a revised LER were related to completing the IIT hearing before the Commissioners and that the slowness could be construed to be willful.

NOTE 2: On the morning of June 20, Mr. Bockhold came by to clarify the GPC action that I may not be aware of. While the error in the counting was evident the resolution of how to count diesel starts and tests results was not. The operators who collected the data were counting successive starts when the diesel started and a ready to load light came on. In order to determine a Valid or Invalid test result the procedures were not clear regarding a Safety Injection or Black Out condition for the diesel. The issue of how to properly evaluate the data was the issue and not just a simple recount. Corporate decided that an entire revision was necessary to properly present the information. Mr. Bockhold said that no residents were onsite to inform last week, but Ken McCoy had talked to Ken Brockman and George Hairston had talked to Mr. Ebnetter.

3. Diesel Air Quality. Mr. Mosbaugh stated that he had a concern with diesel air quality regarding the humidity or dew point. Mr. Bockhold stated that Mike Horton who worked for him at the time got the information from Cooper Industries. Mr. Mosbaugh replied that he had met with him (Bockhold) and expressed the concern that since we did not know the air quality history that the effect on sensors and equipment could not be determined.

Note: The meeting did not discuss what Cooper Industries had advised the plant of or any other details of the issue.

The last subject was directed at determining if any other concerns existed. Mr. Mosbaugh stated that he was not prepared to discuss any new concerns. He stated that he was reviewing the past and would raise any new concerns through the GPC channels.

On June 20, when Mr. Bockhold met with me he stated that Lee Glenn was now assigned to do a independent review and that Mr. Mosbaugh was now assigned the primary task of identifying any

further concerns he has.


John Rogge