From: T P
To: Barnum Barton
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Re: Pres Eisenhower fire 04/28/21 -----C/E Thomas Povalec & Capt Jonathan Komlosy wrongful termination
Date: Friday, December 3, 2021 5:06:43 AM

Good morning Bart,

1. Regardless of monthly EMDG testing, that was actually done in LA for 2 hrs and tested fine, I've sized up the complexity of the fire while coming down the stairs and listening / talking on the radio. Also most of the cameras were already out of the business that made me believe the fire was really serious.
In prep for possible complete shut down that I was already contemplating in my head, tried to avoid any possible hangup. Spent a minute to be present when emergency bus transition takes place. During normal testing with 1A/E I do always stay in EMDG room and make sure it happens as designed.
As in my previous experiences of many ships sometimes transition will not happen due to different reasons.
This was not time to chance that, maybe ending up in real dark without EM bus, no fire pump etc. Hence initiated manually, to make sure.

2. Normal fuel pressure for the M/E is achieved by running fuel service and booster pumps. At M/E standstill and both pumps running "normal fuel pressure" should be around 7-8 bar. I believe the pressure at standstill before departure was approximately 7 bar. Once M/E running the pressure will fluctuate somewhere between 6 to 7 bar. This depends on the demand of the M/E and the power output. Back pressure regulating valve should maintain steady output pressure. In Eisenhower case mostly closer to 6 bar at full sea speed. I would say it should be at 7 bar steady as at standstill, but spring of the pressure regulating valve was getting "tired & worn". Press regulating valve is ready for overhaul or complete replacement.

But that would have been up to the budget game. Vessel ran like this since taking over from foreign crews 3 yrs ago. None of the repair was initiated by neither C/e's as vessel had more battles to battle with other more important repairs and parts to get. Like M/e fuel pumps and injector high pressure pipes.
Also long lead time for anything to take place while still staying within budget confines.
Budget was not readily discussed or brought up as a subject, just many delays and no actions by the office.
This statement will be categorically rejected, but there are many that will agree with it. Either quit, fired or still employed by APL.

At the standstill with both supply pumps running, pressure in the return line from injectors could be the highest since there is no consumption in M/E.
As M/E fuel consumption increases up to full sea speed more fuel gets into engine through injectors and less is re-circulated back to service tank.
Pressure should / could be slightly lower or the same that of standstill. It depends on back pressure fuel regulating valve action or inaction (slow respond).

There is the possibility of pressure getting higher in the return line in a case of M/E emergency stop from full sea speed or during the storms when engine rpms fluctuate rapidly. This is possibly due to not quick enough respond of the M/E governor, not being able to keep up with the spinning out of the prop, while causing cavitation & prop coming out of the water. I've brought this subject up few times to slow down the vessel in the storm sooner than latter and that was to the attention of the office and the Captains. Not well received by some, or no comments.
Vessel had many instances of M/E fuel systems failures due to storms running, like high pressure fuel lines / other fuel piping failures etc.
Apparently happened with #5 cylinder fuel return pipe crack in the storm, as not slowing down in advance to avoid such!?

This was not the case leaving LA coming up to the sea speed at calm sea conditions.

I hope I've passed my thoughts on clearly and understandably. Not too long.

Best Rgds,

Thomas

> On Thursday, December 2, 2021, 03:06:41 PM EST, Barnum Barton [redacted] wrote:
>
> C/E Povalec,
>
> Again, thank you for the documentation and your explanation of the separation of employment memo.
>
> A couple follow up questions from the documentation you shared earlier:
>
> 1. What prompted your decision to start the EDG, connect it and split the bus manually, instead of letting this occur automatically if/when primary power was lost?
> 2. You indicated that the main engine fuel system was tested following the replacement of the return line with "normal fuel pressure."
> a. What is this normal fuel pressure (psi/bar) and how was it achieved?
> b. Would the fuel pressure in the replaced return line be different during an engine loaded/sea speed condition?
>
> Take care,
>
> Bart Barnum - NTSB
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: T P [redacted]
> Sent: Wednesday, December 1, 2021 2:05 PM
> To: Barnum Barton [redacted]
> Cc: Jonathan Komlosy [redacted]
> Subject: Pres Eisenhower fire 04/28/21 -----C/E Thomas Povalec & Capt Jonathan Komlosy wrongful termination
>
> [CAUTION] This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click any links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Bart Barnum,

Sorry to bother you this late in the game and possibly bringing more details into case investigation concerning fire aboard Pres Eisenhower.
If yours and USCG findings are not final and more info needed myself and Capt (in copy) are willing to elaborate in detail.
Please check 2 more emails fwd-ed to you concerning myself being let go after 28 years with APL .

God is our witness that we have successfully extinguished the fire aboard Pres Eisenhower.
No human causalities,, no marine collisions in Santa Barbara channel. Cargo and vessel brought back to LA harbor in one piece.

I don't have LA/LB USCG contact info for lead investigator Mr. [redacted]. Please fwd this and other emails if you feel it is relevant.

Thank you for taking time and possibly reading other emails. Happy Holidays

Best Rgds,

Thomas Povalec
[redacted]

[redacted]