



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
REGION II  
101 MARIETTA STREET, N.W.  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

Report No. 50-366/79-09

Licensee: Georgia Power Company  
270 Peachtree Street, N.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Facility Name: E. I. Hatch, Unit 2

Docket No. 50-366/79-09

License No. NPF - 5

Inspection at Hatch Site, near Baxley, Georgia

Inspector: *R. J. Vogt-Lowell* 3-23-79  
R. J. Vogt-Lowell Date Signed

Approved by: *R. D. Martin* 3/23/79  
R. D. Martin, Section Chief, RONS Branch Date Signed

SUMMARY

Inspection on February 20-23, 1979

Areas Inspected

This routine unannounced inspection involved 26 inspector-hours onsite in the area of review of startup testing activities.

Results

Of the areas inspected one apparent item of noncompliance was found in one area involving failure to effect proper corrective action in disseminating the corrected value for Core Maximum Peaking Factor (366/79-09-01).

7906050100

## DETAILS

### 1. Persons Contacted

#### Licensee Employees

- \*M. Manry, Plant Manager
- \*H. Nix, Assistant Plant Manager
- \*S. Baxley, Superintendent Operations
- \*M. Kehoe, Senior Plant Engineer
- \*C. Miles, QA Field Supervisor
- \*G. E. Spell, Senior QA Field Representative
- \*P. E. Fornel, QA Field Representative
- \*D. Brock, Startup Test Director
- C. Coggin, Startup Engineer

#### Other Organizations

- R. M. Wyatt, General Electric Company
- F. Tehranchi, Southern Company Services

#### NRC Resident Inspector

- \*R. Rogers

\*Attended exit interview.

### 2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on February 23, 1979 with those persons indicated in Paragraph 1 above. The inspector discussed the apparent item of noncompliance related to the use of the incorrect Core Maximum Peaking Factor (CMPF) in ascertaining acceptance of results of certain startup tests. The licensee did not take exception to the findings and committed to conduct a re-evaluation of the potential adverse impact on the acceptability of all startup test results to date due to the usage of an incorrect CMPF.

### 3. Licensee Action on Previous Inspection Findings

Not inspected.

### 4. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items were not identified during this inspection.

5. Startup Test Results Evaluation

Six completed startup test procedures were reviewed by the inspector to ascertain whether uniform criteria are being applied for evaluating completed startup tests to assure their technical and administrative adequacy. Each procedure was reviewed to verify:

- a. Each procedure change was approved in accordance with the pertinent administrative procedures.
- b. That the test change had been completed if it entailed specific action.
- c. That the procedure change did not change the basic objectives of the test.
- d. That all test exceptions had been resolved and that the resolution had been accepted by appropriate management.
- e. That outstanding exceptions have been identified and if completed, proper approval signature obtained.
- f. If required, the retest requirements have been completed.
- g. Licensee review and evaluation of the test results and acknowledgement that testing demonstrated system design requirements.
- h. That the licensee specifically compared test results with established acceptance criteria.
- i. That data sheets had been completed and that all data recorded where required are within acceptable tolerance.
- j. That those personnel charged with responsibility for review and acceptance of test results have documented their review and acceptance of test package.

The following documents were reviewed:

HNP-2-10422, Pressure Regulator Startup Testing - T.C. 1  
HNP-2-10522, Pressure Regulator Startup Testing - T.C. 2  
HNP-2-10622, Pressure Regulator Startup Testing - T.C. 3  
HNP-2-10722, Pressure Regulator Startup Testing - T.C. 4  
HNP-2-10822, Pressure Regulator Startup Testing - T.C. 5  
HNP-2-10625, Main Steam Isolation Valves - T.C. 3

Three examples of the use and subsequent supervisory approval of an incorrect value of Core Maximum Peaking Factor (CMPF) were identified

by the inspector in three different startup test procedures (STP). All three cases involve Data Sheet 68 (from HNP-2-10001) which is used to calculate the neutron flux scram setting for comparison to the observed neutron flux peak during the particular startup test. Specific acceptance criteria for these STP's delineates the minimum acceptable margin to the scram setpoint trip. A value of 2.48 instead of the required 2.38 for CMPF was utilized in the calculation yielding a higher than prescribed scram setpoint. This in turn had the potential of compromising the acceptability of the test results relating to the "flux-peak-to-scram-setpoint" acceptance criteria.

Such use of the incorrect CMPF was identified in the following STP's:

HNP-2-10422, Pressure Regulator (Attachment E/11)  
HNP-2-10522, Pressure Regulator (Attachment E/13)  
HNP-2-10625, MSIV (Attachment D/33)

The licensee committed to conduct a re-evaluation of all startup test results to date whose acceptability could be adversely affected by the above described findings.

The particular deviation from the original 2.48 value of CMPF to the currently applicable value of 2.38 came as a result of the process computer's calculational method of handling 150 inch 8x8R fuel assemblies and was identified by the licensee via their internal Deviation Report No. 78-444.

Paragraph 16.1 of Section 16, "Corrective Action", of the Plant Hatch Quality Assurance Manual obligates the licensee to "establish measures to assure that conditions adverse to quality such as failures, malfunctions, deficiencies, deviations, defective material and equipment, and nonconformances are promptly identified and corrected." In the case of significant conditions adverse to quality paragraph 16.1 further requires that "the measures shall assure that the cause of the condition is determined and corrective action taken to preclude repetition".

Based on the findings discussed above, it appears that adequate corrective action was not taken to disseminate the new value of CMPF for use, as appropriate, in plant procedures. This is an item of noncompliance (366/79-09-01).

#### 6. Quality Assurance Audits

The following QA audits of startup activities performed by the onsite QA staff were reviewed:

QA-78-254      Audit of Unit 2 Startup Testing at Test Condition 1

QA-78-280      Audit of Unit 2 Startup Testing at Test Condition 3

Within the areas inspected, no items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.