

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

Report Nos.: 50-321/78-29 and 50-366/78-37

Docket Nos.: 50-321 and 50-366

License Nos.: DPR-57 and NPF-5

Licensee: Georgia Power Company 270 Peachtree St, N. W. Atlanta, Ga. 30303

Facility Name: E. I. Hatch, Units 1 and 2

Inspection at: Plant Hatch, Baxley, Georgia

Inspection conducted: August 21-24, 1978

Inspector: J. L. Skolds

Accompanying Personnel; R. J. Kellogg (August 23-24, 1978)

Approved by

P. J. Kelforg, Chief Nuclear Support Section No. 2 Reactor Operations and Nuclear Support Branch

Inspection Summary

Inspection on August 21-24, 1978 (Report Nos. 50-321/78-29 and 50-366/78-37) Areas Inspected: Routine unannounced inspection of maintenance, design changes and records. The inspection involved 24 hours on-site by one NRC inspector.

Results: Of the three areas inspected, no items of noncompliance were identified in one area, two items of noncompliance identified in two areas (deficiency-failure to follow procedure (321/78-29-01 and 366/78-37-01) -Details I, paragraph 5; deficiency-failure to follow procedure (321/78-29-02 and 366/78-37-02) - Details I, paragraph 6).

8811130286

DETAILS 1 Prepared by: - Jet Jet 1 J. L. Skolds, Reactor Inspector Nuclear Support Section No. 2 Reactor Operations and Nuclear Support

Dates of Inspection, August 21-24, 1978 Reviewed by: TOp-

Nurlear Support Section No. 2 Reactor Operations and Nuclear Support

Persons Contacted

### Georgia Power Company

\*H. C. Nix, Assistant Plant Manager \*C. E. Belflower, QA Site Supervisor \*G. E. Spell, Jr., Senior QA Field Representative \*H. W. Dyer, Operations Supervisor M. O. Schliessman, Superintendent, Maintenance \*W. B. Thigpen, QA Field Representative \*C. L. Coggin, Associate Engineer \*D. A. McCuster, QC Inspector

\*Denotes those present at exit interview.

# Licensee Action on Previous Inspection Findings

Not inspected.

Unresolved items are matters about which more information is required. in order to ascertain whether they are acceptable items, items of non-compliance, or deviations. One unresolved item disclosed during the inspection is discussed in paragraph 7 of this report (321/78-29-03 and 366/78-37-03).

#### 4. Exit Interview

The inspector met with licensee representatives as indicated in paragraph 1 at the conclusion of the inspection on August 24, 1978. The inspector summarized the scope and findings of the inspection and

1-1

discussed the items of noncompliance and the unresolved item. The licensee acknowledged the inspector's findings and indicated that the items would be reviewed.

. Maintenance

The inspector conducted a review of the following maintenance:

WR No.	Date	Title
78-8	1-3-78	CRD Flow Transmitter
78-149	1-12-78	HPCI Drain Pot Isolation Valve E41-F028
78-523	2-9-78	Accumulator Drain Block Isolation Valve
78-569	2-14-78	Containment Gas Treatment and Ventilation Vertical Panel
78-609	2-20-78	APRM "D"
78-635	2-21-78	Replacement of CRD's
78-653	2-22-78	Core Spray Pump "B"
78-705	2-27-78	RHR Logic System
78-753	3-3-78	Install Target Rock Relief Valves
78-900	3-16-78	Removal of Safety Relief Valves
78-918	2-15-78	Containment Gas Treatment and Ventilation Vertical Panel
78-958	3-21-78	LPRM 36-37-C Reading Upscale
78-997	3-26-78	Replaced V-120 on CRD 42-27
78-1002	3-27-78	CRD 46-43 Changed Out Needle Valve
78-1006	3-27-78	CRD HCU Accumulator 46-11 Needle Valve
78-1008	3-28-78	RHR B Loop Logic
78-1189	4-13-78	Recirc Valves need packing replacement
78-1331	3-28-78	RHR S). Pump
78-1385	4-25-78	HPCI Steam Supply
78-1477	5-7-78	Core Spray Pump "A"
78-1589	5-13-78	RHR SW Pump 1B
78-1661	5-22-78	Remove Safety Relief Valve Base Plate
78-1684	6-21-78	IRM "D" Drive Wire
78-1796	5-28-78	Tightened fittings, replaced "O" Ring on CRD HCU
78-1856	6-5-78	D/G 1A Heaters
78-1889	6-7-78	Lockouts on Emergency Bus Loads
78-1939	6-9-78	DG 1B Jacket Coolant Heater
78-2526	7-10-78	Hydraulic Snubber

The maintenance was reviewed to verify that:

The limiting condition for operation was met while components or systems were removed from service for maintenance

The maintenance activities were accomplished using approved procedures by qualified personnel

1-2

The maintenance activities were functionally tested or calibrated as necessary prior to returning the component or system to service

- The required administrative approvals were obtained prior to initiating maintenance activities
- The maintenance activities were inspected in accordance with the licensee's requirements

The inspector used one or more of the following acceptance criteria for the above items;

- Final Safety Analysis Report
- ANSI 18.7 1976
- Technical Specifications
- Georgia Power Company Quality Assurance Manual
- HNP-8 (Maintenance Request)
- HNP-821 (Quality Control Work Inspection)

Findings were acceptable with the exception of the items noted below.

a. HNP-821 (Quality Control Work Inspection), Section C.1 states that work may not proceed beyond a mandatory Hold Point without QC inspection. While performing Maintenance Request 78-635 (CRD Replacement) March 28, 1978, the first four hold points were not inspected by a QC inspector. The QC Inspection Hold Points form indicated that these hold points were "not observed". Conversations with plant personnel indicated that by the time the QC inspector arrived at the job site the work had proceeded beyond the first four hold points. The above item of noncompliance is designated a deficiency (321/78-29-01 and 366/78-37-01).

#### 6. Records

The records of the following activities were reviewed.

- Radiation and Contamination Survey
- Various Strip Charts
- Various Design Changes
- Shift Foreman's Log

1-3

- Various Drawings
- Instrument Calibration Procedures
- Computer printouts
- Radiation Protection Procedures

The records were reviewed to ensure that:

 The program for the control, storage, retention and retrieval of records and documents is in conformance with Technical Specifications.

1-4

- The as built drawings are being maintained in accordance with established procedures.
- The record keeping of reactor operation and equipment performance is sufficient to permit review by licensee personnel to detect long-term equipment degredation or adverse trends that could result in potential safety hazards.
- The records of tests and experiments are maintained as described in 10CFR50.59.

The following acceptance criteria were used:

- Technical Specifications
- Georgia Power Company Quality Assurance Manual
- HNP-820 (Plant Records Management)
- ANSI 45.2.9 -1974
- ANSI 18.7 1976

Findings were acceptable with the exception of the items noted below:

a. Section F.4.b of HNP-820 states that a master records requirements matrix shall be prepared and utilized to determine and audit the receipt and update of internally generated records and documentation. The inspector noted that at the time of the inspection the master records requirements matrix had not been prepared. The above item of noncompliance is designated a deficiency (321/78-29-02 and 366/78-37-02).

# Design, Design Changes and Modifications

The following design changes were reviewed:

DCR No.	Title
77-127	Reactor Recirculation Piping
77-154	Feedwater Spargers
77-179	RHR Service Water
77-207	Fission Products Monitor
77-230	HPCI Turbine
78-3	Diesel Generator
78-54	Residual Heat Removal
78-57	Unit I Vital AC
78-74	PSW Isolation
78-95	D/G 1B Load Sequence Timer
78-146	D/G Annunciator

The design changes were reviewed to verify that:

- The design changes were made in accordance with 10 CFR 50.59
- The design changes were reviewed and approved in accordance with Technical Specifications
- The design changes were conducted in accordance with approved procedures
- Acceptance tests were performed to ensure proper performance of equipment
- Drawings were updated to reflect the design change

The inspector used one or more of the following acceptance criteria:

- Final Safety Analysis Report
- 10 CFR 50.59
- ANSI 18.7-1976
- Georgia Power Company Quality Assurance Manual
- HNP-809 (Plant Modifications)

Findings were acceptable with the exception of the item noted below.

a. Section C.2.d of HNP-809 states that the Tech Staff Supervisor will provide any additional information necessary to permit modifications to be implemented, will attach the information to the original DCR and forward it to the PRB. Maintenance Request

1 . . . .

(MR) Nos. 78-569 and 78-918 were written in order to implement DCR 77-57. However DCR 77-57 was approved by the PRB prior to the initiation of Maintenance Report Nos. 78-569 and 78-918. In addition, MR 78-569 and 78-918 consisted of detailed step-by-step procedures for the implementation of DCR 77-57. ANSI 18.7-1976 states that work may be done using a step-by-step procedure or it may be done without a step-by-step procedure provided the work is within the skills normally possessed by qualified maintenance personnel. If a detailed step-by-step procedure is necessary, then the procedure requires approval by the PRB. MR 78-569 and 78-918 did not receive PRB approval. Conversations with plant personnel indicated that they did not consider MR 78-569 and 78-918 to be maintenance procedures but rather implementing instructions. The approval of Maintenance Procedures will remain unresolved (321/78-29-03 and 366/78-37-03) pending licensee review of the approval requirements of maintenance procedures and implementing information to design changes.

1-6