

ENCLOSURE 4

ERRATA PACKAGE FOR THE FINAL SALP REPORT

<u>Page</u>	<u>Paragraph</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Initial Report Reads</u>	<u>Final Report Reads</u>
1 of the transmittal letter	Subject Line	2	50-425/89-26	50-425/89-30
1 of the transmittal letter	3	1	The overall level of performance attained during this SALP is comparable...	Deleted
1 of the transmittal letter	3	2	...to that of the last SALP period.	Deleted
1 of the transmittal letter	3	5	Improvements have been noted...	Improvements were noted...
Coversheet of SALP Report	-	2	INITIAL SALP REPORT	FINAL SALP REPORT
5 of SALP Report	1	1	While the overall performance demon- strated by the plant is comparable...	Deleted
5 of SALP Report	1	2	...to that of the last SALP period, the...	Deleted

9002260343 890130
PDR ADOCK 05000424
R PDC



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION II
101 MARIETTA STREET, N.W.
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30323

REVISED

December 6, 1989

Docket Nos. 50-424, 50-425
License Nos. NPF-68, NPF-81

Georgia Power Company
ATTN: Mr. W. G. Hairston, III
Senior Vice President -
Nuclear Operations
P. O. Box 1295
Birmingham, AL 35201

Gentlemen:

SUBJECT: SYSTEMATIC ASSESSMENT OF LICENSEE PERFORMANCE
(NRC INSPECTION REPORT NOS. 50-424/89-26 AND 50-425/89-30)

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Systematic Assessment of Licensee Performance (SALP) Board has completed its periodic evaluation of your Vogtle facility for the period October 1, 1988, through September 30, 1989. The results of this evaluation are documented in the enclosed SALP Report. This report will be discussed with you at a public meeting to be held at your Vogtle facility in Waynesboro, Georgia, on December 14, 1989, at 10:00 a.m.

The performance of your Vogtle facility was evaluated in the functional areas of plant operations, radiological controls, maintenance/surveillance, emergency preparedness, security and safeguards, engineering/technical support, safety assessment/quality verification, preoperational testing, and startup testing. Although the functional areas evaluated during this assessment period are not identical to those evaluated in the previous period, a close correlation can be made for identifying changes in performance.

Lessons learned during startup and early operation of Unit 1 were effectively applied to Unit 2 activities. Professionalism in the control room was a strength and management support for operations was strong. Improvements were noted in the areas of maintenance/surveillance and radiological controls. Further improvements in radiological controls are expected as the plant staff gains experience. Although the Security Program, as defined on paper, is sound, implementation deficiencies have caused declining performance in this area. A decline of performance in the emergency preparedness area was also noted. The decline in this area is attributed to the loss of command control and the failure to make a timely General Emergency declaration during your exercise. As discussed in the previous SALP, improvement in communications between management and the NRC residents was needed. Progress has been made in this area; however, communication channels need to be further nurtured. Attention to detail within the plant staff was also a source of performance short-comings. Increased management attention is warranted in this area.

ENCLOSURE
FINAL SALP BOARD REPORT

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION II

SYSTEMATIC ASSESSMENT OF LICENSEE PERFORMANCE
INSPECTION REPORT NUMBERS
50-424/89-26 AND 50-425/89-30
GEORGIA POWER COMPANY
VOGTLE, UNITS 1 AND 2
OCTOBER 1, 1988 - SEPTEMBER 30, 1989

with five being feedwater components. It should be noted, however, that during July and August 1989, both units were concurrently on-line at full power operation.

The following concerns and/or observations are presented for review and action, as appropriate.

- The Security Program's implementation has not been consistent or at the level of effectiveness expected. Deficiencies concerning both personnel and control of safeguards information have been noted. These deficiencies are repetitive in nature to incidents over the past several years and do not reflect that adequate attention is being given to the identification of the root cause of the problem or to the implementation of effective corrective action(s).
- Attention to detail by the plant staff continues to be a recurring source of both operational and administrative problems. In this regard, procedural inadequacies, both in content and application, are contributing factors. Management expectations for procedural compliance have not been effectively conveyed to the plant staff. Further, the staff has not been aggressive in identifying and correcting procedural deficiencies.

B. Facility Performance Overview

<u>Functional Area</u>	<u>Rating Last Period</u>		<u>Rating This Period</u>
	<u>Unit 1</u>	<u>Unit 2</u>	<u>Both Units</u>
Plant Operations	2	NR	2
Radiological Controls	2	NR	2(I)
Maintenance/Surveillance	2	NR	1
Emergency Preparedness	1	NR	2
Security and Safeguards	2	NR	2(D)
Engineering/Technical Support	2	1	2
Safety Assessment/Quality Verification	2	1	2
Preoperational Testing (Unit 2 Only)	NR	1	1
Startup Testing (Unit 2 Only)	NR	NR	1

NR - Not Rated

(I) - Improving Trend

(D) - Declining Trend