

MAR 05 1986

Georgia Power Company
ATTN: Mr. R. J. Kelly
Executive Vice President
P. O. Box 4545
Atlanta, GA 30302

Gentlemen:

SUBJECT: REPORT NOS. 50-321/85-32 AND 50-366/85-32

Thank you for your response of January 13, 1986, to our Notice of Violation issued on December 12, 1985, concerning activities conducted at your Hatch facility. We have evaluated your response to the violations and found that violation No. 2 of your letter meets the requirements of 10 CFR 2.201. We will examine the implementation of your actions to correct violation No. 2 during future inspections.

After careful consideration of the bases for your denial of violation 1, we have concluded, for the reasons presented in the enclosure to this letter, that the violation occurred as stated in the Notice of Violation. Therefore, in accordance with 10 CFR 2.201(a), please submit to this office within 30 days of the date of this letter a written statement describing steps which have been taken to correct violation 1 and the results achieved, corrective steps which will be taken to avoid further violations, and the date when full compliance will be achieved.

The response directed by this letter is not subject to the clearance procedure of the Office of Management and Budget issued under the Paperwork Reduction Act, PL 96-511.

We appreciate your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

Original signed by
J. N. Grace

J. Nelson Grace
Regional Administrator

Enclosure:
Staff Assessment of Licensee Response

cc w/encl:
J. T. Beckham, Vice President and
General Manager
H. C. Nix, Site General Manager
P. E. Fornel, Site QA Supervisor
L. Gucwa, Manager, Nuclear Safety
and Licensing

bcc w/encl: (See page 2)

8603110099 860305
PDR ADOCK 05000321
PDR

MAR 05 1986

Georgia Power Company

2

bcc w/encl:
NRC Resident Inspector
Hugh S. Jordan, Executive Secretary
Document Control Desk
State of Georgia

RII

msd
AIgnatonis
2/28/86

RII

B
VBrownlee
2/28/86

RII

YRF
GJenkins
2/28/86

RII

RDW
RWalker
2/29/86

ENCLOSURE

Staff Assessment of Licensee Response

Region II has reviewed the licensee's response of January 13, 1986, to the Notice of Violation (NOV) issued on December 12, 1985. After a careful review of the Georgia Power Company response to the two violations, the staff has found the licensee's response to violation No. 1, as presented in the NOV, to be acceptable, but disagree with the licensee's assessment that violation No. 2 of the NOV, did not occur. There is sufficient justification that violation No. 2 of the NOV, designated as violation No. 1 in the licensee's January 13, 1986 letter, is an appropriate example of noncompliance with 10 CFR 50.72(b)(2)(i) reporting requirements. This violation should remain as stated for reasons stated below.

10 CFR 50.72(b)(2)(i) requires that a four-hour telephone notification be made of any event found while the reactor is shutdown, and that, had it been found while the reactor was in operation, would have resulted in the plant, including its principal safety barriers, being seriously degraded or being in an unanalyzed condition that significantly compromises plant safety. On December 15, 1984, with Unit 1 shut down, the licensee identified a nonisolable linear through wall crack approximately 2 3/4-inches long in the 18-inch nitrogen inerting and purge line by the magnetic particle inspection method.

At the time of discovery, as stated by the licensee, the shift supervisor was notified of the finding and judged that the crack would not significantly compromise plant safety, and hence did not make a four-hour telephone report to the NRC. However, subsequently a written report was submitted to the NRC per the requirements of 10 CFR 50.73.

While the shift supervisor's assessment of the problem was eventually verified to be correct, in that the crack would not significantly degrade primary containment boundary in the event of a design basis accident, his conclusion was not supported by an engineering analysis until much later. The results of the analysis were presented to the NRC on November 8, 1985. Therefore, from the time of discovery to the time of completed engineering analysis, the nonisolable crack in the nitrogen inerting and purge line was in an unanalyzed condition. The purpose of the four-hour NRC telephone reporting requirement is for the licensee to promptly identify items such as cracks and breaks in piping that may significantly compromise plant safety. Therefore, while credit is given to the licensee in making an engineering judgement of NRC reportability determination under 10 CFR 50.72(b)(2)(i) criterion, the significance of this condition (i.e. nonisolable crack) was not adequately assessed. In this case, visual and magnetic particle inspections were not sufficient bases for determination of condition significance. An engineering evaluation was also required to determine safety significance.

For the aforementioned reasons, the violation remains as written.