



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

Report Nos.: 50-321/82-44 and 50-366/82-39

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

Inspectors: Dale L. Andrews
 D. L. Andrews
Ronald R. Marston
 R. R. Marston

1/5/83
 Date Signed
1/7/83
 Date Signed

Accompanying Personnel: E. E. Hickey, J. L. Kenoyer, W. Knox,
 D. Schultz, and J. Rogge

Approved by: G. R. Jenkins
 G. R. Jenkins, Section Chief
 Emergency Preparedness Section
 Division of Emergency Preparedness and
 Materials Safety Programs

1/7/83
 Date Signed

SUMMARY

Inspection on December 6-10, 1982

Areas Inspected

This routine, announced inspection involved 146 inspector-hours on site in the area of a radiological emergency exercise.

Results

In the area inspected, no violations or deviations were identified.

REPORT DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Licensee Employees

- *J. T. Beckham, Jr., Vice President and General Manager - Nuclear Generation
- *H. C. Nix, Plant Manager
- *S. C. Ewald, Senior Generation Engineer
- *W. H. Rogers, Health Physics Superintendent
- *C. E. Bellflower, Site Supervisor, Quality Assurance
- *G. Bockhold, Manager, Nuclear Training
- *T. C. Wilkes, Nuclear Security Supervisor
- *R. Titolo, Health Physicist
- *P. Fornel, Quality Assurance
- *W. H. Ollinger, Nuclear Licensing Engineer
- *J. DiLuzio, Senior Health Physicist
- *D. Morgan, Engineering Supervisor

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

Other Organizations

- J. Heard, Federal Emergency Management Agency
- W. Clack, State of Georgia
- J. Hardemann, State of Georgia
- Dr. C. Kanavage, Appling County Hospital

NRC Resident Inspector

- *P. Holmes-Ray, Resident Inspector

*Attended exit interview

2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on December 10, 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. Exercise Scenario

The scenario for the radiological emergency exercise was reviewed in advance of the scheduled exercise to verify that the requirements of 10CFR50.47(b)(14), 10CFR50, Appendix E, paragraph IV.F, and specific criteria of NUREG 0654, Section N.3 were met.

The scenario for the E. I. Hatch radiological emergency exercise appeared to meet the above requirements and provided for a sequence of simulated events beginning with an Unusual Event and progressing through sequentially escalating emergency classes to a General Emergency. The sequence of simulated events was coordinated in advance with State of Georgia representatives to provide an opportunity for exercising the State and local emergency response organizations.

Following a bomb threat at the beginning of the exercise, which proved to be a hoax, the scenario was modified slightly to remove a simulated bomb threat and a chlorine emergency from the exercise. The inspector concurred in the modifications to the scenario and determined that the modified scenario was adequate to fully exercise the Georgia Power Company's emergency organization. The inspectors observed the Georgia Power Company's actions during the bomb threat and concluded that the emergency was handled efficiently. Response to the bomb threat included requesting assistance from Ft. Stewart. The Ft. Stewart team arrived at the plant quickly and assisted in the search. Upon determining that the bomb threat was a hoax, the exercise was resumed. The inspectors had no further questions in this area.

6. Assignment of Responsibility

This area was observed to determine that primary responsibilities for emergency response by the licensee have been specifically established and that adequate staff is available to respond to an emergency as required by 10CFR50.47(b)(1), 10CFR50, Appendix E, paragraph IV.A, and specific criteria in NUREG 0654, Section II.A.

The inspectors verified that specific assignments had been made for the licensee's emergency response organization and there was adequate staff available to respond to the simulated emergency. The inspector had no further questions in this area.

7. Onsite Emergency Organization

The licensee's onsite emergency organization was observed to determine that the responsibilities for emergency response are unambiguously defined, that adequate staffing is provided to insure initial facility accident response in key functional areas at all times, and that the interfaces among various onsite response activities and offsite support activities are specified as required by 10CFR50.47(b)(2), 10CFR50, Appendix E, paragraph IV.A, and specific criteria in NUREG 0654, Section II.B.

The inspectors observed that the initial and augmented onsite emergency organization was well defined and that adequate staff was available to fill key functional positions as described in the Hatch Emergency Plan and Implementing Procedures. The interfaces among the onsite response activities and offsite support activities appeared to be well established and no deficiencies were observed in this area. The inspectors had no further questions concerning the onsite organization.

8. Emergency Response Support and Resources

This area was observed to determine that arrangements for requesting and effectively using assistance resources have been made, that arrangements to accommodate State and local staff at the licensee's near-site Emergency Operations Facility have been made, and that other organizations capable of augmenting the planned response have been identified as required by 10CFR50.47(b)(3), 10CFR50, Appendix E, paragraph IV.A, and specific criteria in NUREG 0654, Section II.C.

The inspectors verified that arrangements had been made for requesting and effectively using assistance resources, including Appling County Hospital, Appling County Sheriff's Department, the General Electric Company and Bechtel during the exercise. A representative of the Georgia State Department of Natural Resources, Radiation Protection Section, was present at the near-site Emergency Operations Facility (EOF) during the exercise. Additional offsite support organizations were available for assistance as indicated in the Hatch Emergency Plan. The inspector had no further questions in this area.

9. Emergency Classification System

This area was observed to determine that a standard emergency classification and action level scheme is in use by the nuclear facility licensee as required by 10CFR50.47(b)(4), 10CFR50, Appendix E, paragraph IV.C, and specific criteria in NUREG 0654, Section II.D.

The inspectors observed that the emergency classification system was in effect as stated in the Radiological Emergency Plan and in the Implementing Procedures. The system appeared to be adequate for the classification of the simulated accident. The inspectors had no further questions in this area.

10. Notification Methods and Procedures

This area was observed to determine that procedures had been established for notification by the licensee of State and local response organizations and emergency personnel, and that the content of initial and followup messages to response organizations has been established as required by 10CFR50.47(b)(5), 10CFR50, Appendix E, paragraph IV.D, and specific criteria in NUREG 0654, Section II.E.

The inspectors observed that notification methods and procedures have been established and were used to provide information concerning the simulated emergency conditions to Federal, State and local response organizations and to alert the licensee's augmented emergency response organization.

The inspectors had no further questions in this area.

11. Emergency Communications

This area was observed to determine that provisions exist for prompt communications among principal response organizations and emergency personnel as required by 10CFR50.47(b)(6), 10CFR50, Appendix E, paragraph IV.E, and specific criteria in NUREG 0654, Section II.F.

The inspectors verified that primary and alternate means for communications among the various response organizations were provided and that, in general, communications among these organizations and among emergency response personnel was good.

During the full scale emergency exercise in October, 1981, the inspectors noted that communications among the emergency response organization were generally poor. Specifically, the inspectors noted that plant status announcements were not made periodically, a plant status briefing was not held with the oncoming shift supervisor, and there was no general announcement of a simulated planned release of radioactivity.

During this exercise, communications were adequate to keep all personnel informed of emergency status and planned emergency actions. Inspector follow-up item (50-321/81-26-06, 50-366/81-26-06) is closed.

13. Emergency Facilities and Equipment

This area was observed to determine that adequate emergency facilities and equipment to support an emergency response are provided and maintained as required by 10CFR50.47(b)(8), 10CFR50, Appendix E, paragraph IV.E, and specific criteria in NUREG 0654, Section II.H.

The inspectors verified that the emergency facilities provided to support the emergency organization were adequate and appeared to function well throughout the exercise. These facilities included the Technical Support Center, the Operations Support Center and the near-site Emergency Operations Facility. Emergency equipment was available and appeared to be appropriate and adequate to support the emergency organization.

This exercise was unique in that the new simulator was used as the control room for the major portion of the exercise. Communications systems had been established to duplicate normal inplant communications from the actual Control Room. Following the initiation of the exercise in the Units 1 and 2 Control Room, the oncoming operating shift relieved the on duty shift at the simulator. A spare operating shift was brought in to continue actual

plant operations. The use of the simulator to fully exercise operations personnel and to generate real-time accident data contributed significantly to the success of this exercise. The inspectors had no further questions in this area.

14. Accident Assessment

This area was observed to determine that adequate methods, systems and equipment for assessing and monitoring actual or potential offsite consequences of a radiological emergency condition are in use as required by 10CFR50.47(b)(9), 10CFR50, Appendix E, paragraph IV.B, and specific criteria in NUREG 0654, Section II.I.

The accident assessment program includes both an engineering assessment of plant status and an assessment of the radiological hazards to both onsite and offsite personnel resulting from the accident. At Plant Hatch the engineering accident assessment team functioned to analyze the plant equipment status during the accident and to make recommendations to the Site Emergency Director concerning mitigating actions to reduce damage to plant equipment, to prevent release of radioactive materials and to terminate the emergency condition. The radiological assessment group provided continuous updates on inplant radiation hazards and potential releases of radioactive material.

The inspectors observed the actions of accident assessment teams and concluded that the teams performed adequately and provided timely and accurate information to the emergency organization.

A previous inspector follow-up item in this area (50-321/81-26-10, 50-366/81-26-10) is closed.

15. Protective Responses

This area was observed to determine that guidelines for protective actions during an emergency, consistent with Federal guidance, are developed and in place, and protective actions for emergency workers, including evacuation of nonessential personnel, are implemented promptly as required by 10CFR50.47(b)(10) and specific criteria in NUREG 0654, Section II.J.

The inspectors observed that protective responses to the simulated emergency conditions were taken promptly by plant personnel. Protective actions were initiated in accordance with the Hatch Emergency Plan and Implementing Procedures. The assembly and accountability of plant personnel were initiated upon the declaration of a site area emergency. The overall accountability procedure required approximately 30 minutes which is within the time specified in the Implementing Procedures. The inspectors had no further questions in the above area.

16. Radiological Exposure Control

This area was observed to determine that means for controlling radiological exposures, in an emergency, are established and implemented for emergency workers and that they include exposure guidelines consistent with EPA Emergency Worker and Lifesaving Activity Protective Action Guides as required by 10CFR50.47(b)(11) and specific criteria in NUREG 0654, Section II.K.

The inspectors observed that exposure control measures were utilized throughout the exercise and included dosimetry distribution to offsite support groups participating in onsite activities. Radiation surveys were conducted in the emergency facilities on a routine basis. Offsite surveys were conducted downwind from the plant during the simulated release of radioactive materials. Exposure guidelines contained in the Hatch Emergency Plan were considered in all emergency team operations. The inspectors had no further questions in this area.

17. Medical and Public Health Support

This area was observed to determine that arrangements are made for medical services for contaminated injured individuals as required by 10CFR50.47(b)(12), 10CFR50, Appendix E, paragraph IV.E and specific criteria in NUREG 0654, Section II.L.

An onsite first aid team responded promptly to the simulated medical emergency. The inspectors observed the actions of the first aid team and subsequent simulated treatment of the injury at Appling County Hospital. Overall, the medical emergency was handled efficiently by all personnel involved. The inspectors had no further questions in this area.

18. Exercise Critique

The licensee's critique of the emergency exercise was observed to determine that deficiencies identified as a result of the exercise and weaknesses noted in the licensee's emergency response organization were formally presented to licensee management for corrective actions as required by 10CFR50.47(b)(14), 10CFR50, Appendix E, paragraph IV.F, and specific criteria in NUREG 0654, Section II.N.

A formal critique of the emergency exercise was held on December 10, 1982 with all controllers, key exercise participants, licensee management and NRC personnel attending. Weaknesses in the emergency preparedness program, identified by Georgia Power Company observers as a result of this exercise were presented for management consideration. Followup of corrective actions taken by Georgia Power Company for identified weaknesses will be accomplished through subsequent NRC inspections.