

- Seyfrit

JAN 9 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR: Richard C. Lewis, Director  
Division of Project and Resident Programs  
Region II

FROM: Karl V. Seyfrit, Chief  
Reactor Operations Analysis Branch  
Office for Analysis and Evaluation  
of Operational Data

SUBJECT: EVALUATION OF HATCH UNITS 1 AND 2 LERS FOR THE  
PERIOD NOVEMBER 1, 1982 TO OCTOBER 31, 1983

The Office for Analysis and Evaluation of Operational Data has assessed the Licensee Event Reports (LERs) submitted under Docket Nos. 50-321 and 50-366 during the subject period. This has been done in support of the ongoing SALP review of the Georgia Power Company, with regard to their performance as licensee of the Edwin I. Hatch nuclear power plants. Our perspective was indicative of that of a BWR system safety engineer who, although knowledgeable, is not intimately familiar with the detailed site specific equipment arrangements and operations. Our review focused on the technical accuracy, completeness, and intelligibility of the LERs.

The licensee submitted 163 LERs for Hatch 1 and 215 LERs for Hatch 2 during the assessed period. For this review, we randomly selected 50 of the LERs from the total submitted for each plant in order to provide a statistically significant base for our assessment while limiting the number of LERs reviewed. In order to have at least 90 percent of all the submitted LERs acceptable at the 95 percent confidence level for each of the plants, approximately 48 out of the 50 LERs we reviewed for each plant would have to be acceptable by our criteria as itemized in the attachment. From this sample review, we note that in general the LERs typically provided clear descriptions of the cause and nature of the events as well as adequate explanations of the effects on both system function and public safety. For most of the LERs supplemental information was provided in attachments to the LER forms. This enabled the LER reviewer to better understand the nature of the events encountered thereby facilitating evaluation of the safety significance of the event. In most cases the described corrective actions taken or planned by the licensee were considered to be commensurate with the nature, seriousness, and frequency of the problem found. We also note that the licensee did not report any of the component failures to NPRDS. We recognize that reporting to NPRDS is not a requirement. However, we understand that Georgia Power Company has committed to participate in NPRDS. Accordingly, their lack of participation should be noted emphasizing that the success of NPRDS is dependent on their participation. The attachment provides additional observations from our review of the LERs.

8402030491 XA  
CF/ADDO/50.321

A/4/34

OFFICE					
SURNAME					
DATE					

In summary, our review of the licensee's LERs indicates that, except for nonparticipation in HPRDS, the licensee provides an adequate description of the events as indicated by statistical measure stated above and the criteria contained in the attachment.

If you have any questions, please contact either myself or Sai Salah of my staff on FTS-492-4432.

Karl V. Seyfrit, Chief  
Reactor Operations Analysis Branch  
Office for Analysis and Evaluation  
of Operational Data

Attachment:  
As stated

cc: w/attachment:  
Morton Fairtile, NRR  
Richard V. Crlenjak, SRI  
Peter Holmes-Ray, RI

DISTRIBUTION:

DCS  
AEOD CF  
ROAB CF  
ROAB RF  
SSalah, ROAB  
SRubin, ROAB  
KSeifrit, ROAB  
CJHeltemes, Jr., AEOD  
Tippolito, AEOD

OFFICE	ROAB	ROAB	ROAB:C	AEOD:DD		
SURNAME	SSalah/cj	SRubin	KSeifrit	Tippolito		
DATE	1/9/84	1/9/84	1/9/84	1/ /84		

SALP REVIEW FOR HATCH 1 AND HATCH 2

The licensee submitted 163 LERs for Hatch 1 and 215 LERs for Hatch 2 in the assessment period from November 1, 1982 to October 31, 1983. For each of the two units we reviewed 50 randomly selected LERs submitted by the licensee.

The LER review covered the subjects and the general instruction of NUREG-0161. The results of our SALP review is presented below with the topic reviewed followed by comments on that topic.

1. Review of LERs for Completeness

- a) Is the information sufficient to provide a good understanding of the event?

We found the information in the narrative sections and the included attachments to be adequately informative.

- b) Review of Coded Information

We have checked the codes the licensee selected against the narrative description of the event for accuracy. We agreed with the licensee in every coded block examined.

- c) Do the reports contain supplementary information when needed?

Fourty of the fifty LERs for Hatch 1 and thirty-seven of the fifty LERs for Hatch 2 contained supplementary information as a separate attachment. The supplemental information provided was considered to be sufficient when needed.

- d) Follow-up Reports

The licensee submitted 9 follow-up LERs for Hatch 1 and 20 follow-up LERs for Hatch 2.

- e) Were similar occurrences properly referenced?

The licensee appropriately referenced the similar prior occurrences as necessary.

2. Is component failure or other appropriate information being reported to NPRDS?

The licensee does not participate in NPRDS.\*

3. Multiple event reporting in a single LER

The licensee did not report any multiple events in a single LER.

Our review of the licensee's LERs indicates that except for nonparticipation in NPRDS, the licensee provides adequate descriptions of the events as indicated by the statistical measure and the criteria stated above.

---

\*Participation by the licensee would be desirable.