



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

Report Nos. 50-321/82-35 and 50-366/82-33

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

Facility Name: Hatch 1 and 2

Docket No. 50-321 and 50-366

License Nos. DPR-57 and NPF-5

Inspection at Hatch site near Baxley, Georgia

Inspectors:	<u>John F. Rogers for</u>	<u>11/9/82</u>
	P. Holmes-Ray	Date Signed
	<u>John F. Rogers for</u>	<u>11/9/82</u>
	R. F. Rogers	Date Signed
	<u>John F. Rogers for</u>	<u>11/9/82</u>
	D. Scott	Date Signed
Approved by:	<u>V. L. Brownlee</u>	<u>11/22/82</u>
	V. L. Brownlee, Section Chief, Division of	Date Signed
	Project and Resident Programs	

SUMMARY

Inspection on September 28 - October 28, 1982

Areas Inspected

This inspection involved 118 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, and surveillance activities.

Results

Of the 9 areas inspected, no violations or deviations were identified in eight of the areas. One violation was identified in the area of Technical Specification compliance in surveillance procedures (Failure to perform complete logic train functional testing, paragraph 7).

8301250185 830105
PDR ADOCK 05000321
Q PDR

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Licensee Employees

- *H. C. Nix, Plant Manager
- *L. Summer, Superintendent Plant Engineering
- *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 site exit interviews

2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on October 8, and 15, 1982 with those persons indicated in paragraph 1 above.

3. Licensee Action on Previous Inspection Findings

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 October 9, Unit 1 commenced an outage to refuel and perform torus modifications. At the end of this report period the Unit is defueled and sipping of the fuel bundles is in progress. The Unit expects to complete the outage and return to power operations in February 1983.

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.

During the week of October 4 the adequacy of the surveillance program at Hatch was reviewed. A summary of findings followed:

- a. Administrative controls had been established which provide positive assurance that Technical Specifications changes are incorporated.
- b. Licensee has a method that provides a systematic method for assuring that all Technical Specification requirements are implemented by procedure. This system is not formalized and when questioned the licensee stated that a change is forecoming to incorporate the method into a formal system. The current method is to mark up the Technical Specification for each unit to crossreference each requirement to an implementing procedure.

- c. When verification that an effective program for surveillance scheduling, technical adequacy of procedures and performance frequency was inspected minor scheduling problems were found. None of these problems resulted in a missed surveillance and all were corrected.
- d. During review of procedures for technical adequacy, the inspectors identified that Unit 2 Standby Gas Treatment Train Automatic Initiation Procedure (HNP-2-3654) was inadequate in testing logic loops between sensor to activated device for both the LOCA and the refueling floor radiation monitor signals. The licensee was requested to verify this finding.

The licensee completed review of Unit 2 procedures and identified procedural inadequacies as follows:

<u>System</u>	<u>TS Requirement Test</u>
Standby Gas Treatment (SBGT)	4.6.6.1.d.2
Reactor Core Isolation Cooling	4.3.4.1 and Table 3.3.4.1
High Pressure Coolant Injection	4.5.1.c.1
Automatic Depressurization System	4.5.2.a
SBGT Unit	3/4.6.6.1 (U-2 TS)

Surveillance testing has been scheduled and being conducted, this problem involves a technical inadequacy in that a complete test from sensor to activated device was not being accomplished.

The inadequacies included failure to test a relay or the continuity or both of one or more sets of contacts in each of the logic systems involved. New written procedures were performed to test the previously excluded logic on Unit 2 and standby gas treatment on Unit 1. This similar procedure inadequacy is applicable to Unit 1.

This is a Violation (50-321/82-35-01 and 50-366/82-33-01).

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.

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