

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT

CONTROL BLOCK.

(PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE ALL REQUIRED INFORMATION)

01 | G | A | E | I | H | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | | | 5
2 8 9 LICENSE CODE 14 15 LICENSE NUMBER 25 26 LICENSE TYPE 30 57 CAT 59

CONT

01 | L | 6 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 9
2 8 REPORT SOURCE 60 61 DOCKET NUMBER 68 69 EVENT DATE 74 75 REPORT DATE 80

EVENT DESCRIPTION AND PROBABLE CONSEQUENCES (10)

EVENT DESCRIPTION AND PROBABLE CONSEQUENCES (10)

0 2 | During normal power operation while performing routine surveillance on Plant Service

0 3 | Water Pump "D" it was indicated that the test data, when compared to the reference

0 4 | data for the pump, was out of range allowed per the ASME Section 11 requirements.

0 5 | The pump was declared inoperable resulting in Unit 2 being declared in a limiting

0 6 | condition of operation per the Technical Specification section 3.7.1.2. Following

0 7 | a review of the pump's past surveillance data and performance of a subsequent test

0 8 | that the pump was declared operable; hence, negating the limiting (continued)

7 8 9

7	8	9	SYSTEM CODE W A 11		CAUSE CODE X 12	CAUSE SUBCODE Z 13	COMPONENT CODE P U M P X X 14		COMP. SUBCODE G 15	VALVE SUBCODE Z 16
0	9		9	10	11	12	13	18	19	20
7		8	EVENT YEAR 7 9 21 22		— 23	SEQUENTIAL REPORT NO. 1 0 5 24 26		— 27	OCCURRENCE CODE 0 3 28 29	
17 LER/RO REPORT NUMBER										
ACTION TAKEN H 18		FUTURE ACTION G 19		EFFECT ON PLANT Z 20		SHUTDOWN METHOD Z 21		HOURS 0 0 0 0 22		ATTACHMENT SUBMITTED Y 23
33 34		35 36		36 37		37 40		41 42		43 44
								NPRD-4 FORM SUB. N 24		PRIME COMP. SUPPLIER N 25
										COMPONENT MANUFACTURER J 1 0 5 26
										44 47

CAUSE DESCRIPTION AND CORRECTIVE ACTIONS (27)

10 Since pumping capacity degradation due to normal wear would tend to gradually decrease
11 the ratio of test data to reference data, over the pump life a review of the surveil-
12 lance test data was performed. A comparison of the new test data taken on 9-19-79,
13 to the reference data taken on 9-9-79, revealed a ratio of 1.09 for flow rate as op-
14 posed to the acceptable ratio range of .94 to 1.02. The review also (continued)

FACILITY STATUS			% POWER			OTHER STATUS			METHOD OF DISCOVERY			DISCOVERY DESCRIPTION		
1	5	E	0	9	1	NA			B	Surveillance Testing				
ACTIVITY CONTENT						AMOUNT OF ACTIVITY			LOCATION OF RELEASE					
RELEASED						RELEASE			NA					
1	6	Z	0	0	0	NA								
PERSONNEL EXPOSURES						DESCRIPTION			POOR ORIGINAL					
1	7	0	0	0	0				1148 338					
PERSONNEL INJURIES						DESCRIPTION								
1	8	0	0	0	0									
LOSS OF OR DAMAGE TO FACILITY						DESCRIPTION								
1	9	Z												
PUBLICITY						DESCRIPTION			NRC USE ONLY					
2	0	N							7910170 228					

NAME OF PREPARER: C. L. Coggin, Supt. Plt. Eng. Serv. PHONE 912-367-7781

Georgia Power Company
Plant E. I. Hatch
Baxley, Georgia 31513

Event Description and Probable Consequences (continued)

condition of operation. This event is a non-repetitive occurrence for the Plant Service Water pumps. Public health and safety were not affected by the event. The remaining Plant Service Water pumps along with the standby Plant Service Water pump were available and operable.

Cause Description (continued)

revealed that the reference data was re-set on 9-9-79, following a procedure revision; however, the code has no provision for re-setting reference data unless a major pump modification has been performed. Also the reference data taken on 9-9-79 appeared erroneous when compared to the pump's historical performance.

In order to better establish confidence in the pump's true condition, another test was performed using the initial reference data taken 6-18-78. As a result of this test, a ratio of .923 for flow rate was calculated. Although this ratio (.923) is in the "Alert Range", thereby requiring an increase in the surveillance frequency, this value is more realistic considering the pump's life.

In addition, the architect-engineer has been consulted for a precise interpretation of the ASME Section 11 requirements, which will be reflected in an appropriate procedure revision. Also, the associated personnel have been instructed as to the importance of verifying the correctness of data.