



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION II
101 MARIETTA ST., N.W., SUITE 3100
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

Report Nos.: 50-321/82-43 and 50-366/82-41

Licensee: Georgia Power Company
P. O. Box 4545
Atlanta, GA 30302

Docket Nos.: 50-321 and 50-366

License Nos.: DPR-57 and NPF-5

Facility Name: Hatch 1 and 2

Inspection at Hatch site near Baxley, Georgia

Inspector: John F. Rogge for 1/7/83
P. Holmes-Rag Date Signed

Approved by: V. L. Brownlee 1/7/83
V. L. Brownlee, Chief, Section 2B Date Signed
Project Branch No. 2
Division of Project and Resident Programs

SUMMARY

Inspection on November 20 - December 19, 1982

Areas Inspected

This inspection involved 112 inspector-hours on site in the areas of Technical Specification compliance, operator performance, overall plant operations, quality assurance practices, station and corporate management practices, corrective and preventive maintenance activities, site security procedures, radiation control activities, surveillance activities, and refueling operations.

Results

Of the 10 areas inspected, no violations or deviations were identified.

REPORT DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted*

Licensee Employees

- *H. C. Nix, Plant Manager
- *T. Greene, Assistant Plant Manager
- *C. T. Jones, Assistant Plant Manager
- S. Baxley, Superintendent of Operations
- *C. Belflower, QA Site Supervisor

Other licensee employees contacted included technicians, operators, mechanics, security force members and office personnel

*Attended exit interview

2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on December 16, 1982, with those persons indicated in paragraph 1 above.

3. Licensee Action on Previous Enforcement Matters

Not inspected.

4. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items were not identified during this inspection.

5. Plant Tours (Units 1 and 2)

The inspector conducted plant tours periodically during the inspection interval to verify that monitoring equipment was recording as required, equipment was properly tagged, operations personnel were aware of plant conditions, and plant housekeeping efforts were adequate. The inspector also determined that appropriate radiation controls were properly established, critical clean areas were being controlled in accordance with procedures, excess equipment or material is stored properly and combustible material and debris were disposed of expeditiously. During tours the inspector looked for the existence of unusual fluid leaks, piping vibrations, pipe hanger and seismic restraint settings, various valve and breaker positions, equipment caution and danger tags, component positions, adequacy of fire fighting equipment, and instrument calibration dates. Some tours were conducted on backshifts.

Within the areas inspected, no violations or deviations were identified.

6. Plant Operations Review (Units 1 and 2)

The inspector, periodically during the inspection interval, reviewed shift logs and operations records, including data sheets, instrument traces, and records of equipment malfunctions. This review included control room logs and auxiliary logs, operating orders, standing orders, jumper logs and equipment tagout records. The inspector routinely observed operator alertness and demeanor during plant tours. During normal events, operator performance and response actions were observed and evaluated. The inspector conducted random off-hours inspection during the reporting interval to assure that operations and security remained at an acceptable level. Shift turnovers were observed to verify that they were conducted in accordance with approved licensee procedures.

On December 7, 1982, Unit 2 tripped from 50% power due to runout of "A" Recirculation Pump. The pump controller malfunctioned such that, when scoop tube lock was removed returning control to the controller, the pump ran out to maximum speed. An average power range monitor trip resulted. All systems functioned normally. The pump controller was repaired and the unit returned to power by December 8, 1982.

Within the areas inspected, no violations or deviations were identified.

7. Technical Specification Compliance (Units 1 and 2)

During this reporting interval, the inspector verified compliance with selected limiting conditions for operations (LCO's) and results of selected surveillance tests. These verifications were accomplished by direct observation of monitoring instrumentation, valve positions, switch positions, and review of completed logs and records. The licensee's compliance with selected LCO action statements were reviewed on selected occurrences as they happened.

Within the areas inspected, no violations or deviations were identified.

8. Physical Protection (Units 1 and 2)

The inspector verified by observation and interviews during the reporting interval that measures taken to assure the physical protection of the facility met current requirements. Areas inspected included the organization of the security force, the establishment and maintenance of gates, doors and isolation zones in the proper condition, that access control and badging was proper, and procedures were followed.

As the yearly Emergency Preparedness Drill was getting started (about 10:15 p.m., EST, December 8, 1982), a bomb threat was received by phone by the guard at Gate-1. The drill was suspended and proper response to the bomb threat was conducted. No bomb was found. The call had been made by a member of the Hatch Security Force and was a hoax. The guard was fired and jailed. The drill then recommenced about 4:00 a.m., December 9, 1982.

On December 2, 1982, a testing procedure identified electrical grounds in eight newly installed cables for the partially complete DCR 80-369, Installations of Control Room Level Alarms For Each Feedwater Heater. Investigation revealed that all eight cables had been damaged by cutting off the insulation. There is currently a \$12,500 reward for the apprehension of the person or persons responsible for cutting the cables. The health and safety of the public was not affected by this event.

Within the areas inspected, no violations or deviations were identified.

9. Emergency Preparedness Drill

After the bomb threat mentioned in paragraph 8 above, the Emergency Preparedness Drill proceeded to completion at about 2:00 p.m., December 9, 1982. The unique aspect of this drill was the use of the Hatch (Unit-2 specific) simulator. The realism provided by using the simulator added greatly to the drill. The evaluation of the various parts of the drill is not the subject of this report.

Within the areas inspected, no violations or deviations were identified.