November 24, 1986

Dockets Nos. 50-321/50-366

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File	EJordan
NRC PDR	BGrimes
Local PDR	WJones
PD#2 Rdg	DVassallo
RBernero	OPA
OGC-Bethesda	JPartlow
NThompson	SNorris
LHarmon	GRivenbark
ACRS (10)	PD#2 Plant File
TBarnhart (8)	EButcher

Mr. J. T. Beckham, Jr.
Vice President - Nuclear Generation
Georgia Power Company
P. O. Box 4545
Atlanta, Georgia 30302

Dear Mr. Beckham:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendments Nos. 130 and 70 to Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR-57 and NPF-5, for the Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units Nos. 1 and 2. The amendments consist of changes to the license conditions and Technical Specifications (TSs) in response to your application dated July 25, 1986.

The amendments revise the fire protection license conditions (License Condition 2.C(3) for Unit 1 and 2.C(3)(b) for Unit 2) to provide consistency with the standard fire protection license condition contained in NRC Generic Letter 86-10, "Implementation of Fire Protection Requirements." The amendments revise the TSs for Units 1 and 2 to delete the fire protection surveillance and operability requirements (these have been relocated in the Hatch Fire Hazards Analysis and Fire Protection Program) and add requirements for a) review of changes to the fire protection program and procedure and b) submittal of special reports for fire protection equipment and surveillance requirements. For reasons noted in the enclosed Safety Evaluation we did not approve deleting the fire team staffing requirement from the TSs. As indicated in the enclosed Notice of Denial, you may request a hearing on this matter.

Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's Bi-Weekly Federal Register Notice.

Sincerely,

Original Signed by
George W. Rivenbark, Project Manager
BWR Project Directorate #2
Division of BWR Licensing

Enclosures:
1. Amendment No. 130 to DPR-57
2. Amendment No. 70 to NPF-5
3. Safety Evaluation
4. Notice of Denial

cc w/enclosures:
See next page

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DBL:PD#2	DBL:PD#2	OGC - Bethesda	DBL:PD#2
SNorris*	GRivenbark*	WShields*	DMuller*
11/20/86	11/20/86	11/20/86	11/24/86

*SEE PREVIOUS CONCURRENCE

cc:

Bruce W. Chruchill, Esquire
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge
2300 N Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

Mr. L. T. Gucwa
Engineering Department
Georgia Power Company
Post Office Box 4545
Atlanta, Georgia 30302

Mr. H. C. Nix, Jr., General Manager
Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant
Georgia Power Company
Post Office Box 442
Baxley, Georgia 31513

Mr. Louis B. Long
Southern Company Services, Inc.
Post Office Box 2625
Birmingham, Alabama 35202

Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Route 1, Post Office Box 279
Baxley, Georgia 31513

Regional Administrator, Region II
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
101 Marietta Street, Suite 2900
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Mr. Charles H. Badger
Office of Planning and Budget
Room 610
270 Washington Street, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Mr. J. Leonard Ledbetter, Commissioner
Department of Natural Resources
270 Washington Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Chairman
Appling County Commissioners
County Courthouse
Baxley, Georgia 31513

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

GEORGIA POWER COMPANY

OGLETHORPE POWER CORPORATION

MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC AUTHORITY OF GEORGIA

CITY OF DALTON, GEORGIA

DOCKET NO. 50-321

EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT NO. 1

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 133
License No. DPR-57

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:

   A. The application for amendment by Georgia Power Company, et al., (the licensee) dated July 25, 1986, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;

   B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;

   C. There is reasonable assurance (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations;

   D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and

   E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.

2. Accordingly, the license is amended by changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment, and paragraph 2.C.(2) of Facility Operating License No. DPR-57 is hereby amended to read as follows:

(2) Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendices A and B, as revised through Amendment No. 133, are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. The licensee is further amended by replacing page 4 to revise paragraph 2.C.(3).

4. This license amendment is effective as of its date of issuance and shall be implemented within 60 days of issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Daniel R. Muller, Director
BWR Project Directorate #2
Division of BWR Licensing

Attachments:
1. Changes to the Technical Specifications
2. Page 4 of license

Date of Issuance: November 24, 1986

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 133

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-57

DOCKET NO. 50-321

Replace the following pages of the Appendix A Technical Specifications with the enclosed pages. The revised pages are indicated by marginal lines.

Pages
V
1.0-7
3.13-1 thru 3.13-12
6-8
6-18

MM. Minimum Critical Power Ratio (MCPR) - Minimum Critical Power Ratio (MCPR) is the value of the critical power ratio associated with the most limiting assembly in the reactor core. Critical Power Ratio (CPR) is the ratio of that power in a fuel assembly, which is calculated to cause some point in the assembly to experience boiling transition, to the actual assembly operation power.

NN. Trip System - A trip system means an arrangement of instrument channel trip signals and auxiliary equipment required to initiate action to accomplish a protective function. A trip system may require one or more instrument channel trip signals related to one or more plant parameters in order to initiate trip system action. Initiation of protective action may require the tripping of a single trip system or the coincident tripping of two trip systems.

OO. (Deleted)

PP. (Deleted)

QQ. Channel Calibration - A Channel Calibration is the adjustment, as necessary, of the channel output such that it responds with the necessary range and accuracy to known values of the parameter which the channel monitors. The Channel Calibration shall encompass the entire channel including the sensor and alarm and/or trip functions, and shall include the Channel Functional Test. The Channel Calibration may be performed by any series of sequential, overlapping or total channel steps such that the entire channel is calibrated.

RR. Channel Functional Test - A Channel Functional Test shall be:

a. Analog channels - the injection of a simulated signal into the channel as close to the primary sensor as practicable to verify operability including alarm and/or trip functions.

b. Bistable Channels - the injection of a simulated signal into the channel sensor to verify operability including alarm and/or trip functions.

SS. Fraction of Limiting Power Density (FLPD) - the ratio of the linear heat generation rate (LHGR) existing at a given location to the design LHGR for the bundle type. Design LHGRs are 18.5 KW/ft for 7x7 bundles and 13.4 KW/ft for 8x8 bundles.

TT. Core Maximum Fraction of Limiting Power Density (CMFLPD) - the CMFLPD is the highest value existing in the core of the FLPD.

(These pages are intentionally left blank.)

RESPONSIBILITIES (Continued)

i. Review of the Security Plan and implementing procedures and shall submit recommended changes to the SRB.

j. Review of the Emergency Plan and implementing procedures and shall submit recommended changes to the SRB.

k. Review of any unplanned onsite release of radioactive material to the environs when such release is in excess of 1 Ci, excluding dissolved and entrained gases and tritium for liquid effluents, and in excess of 150 Ci of noble gases or 0.02 Ci of radioiodines for gaseous effluents. Also included is the preparing and forwarding to the General Manager-Plant Hatch and the SRB reports covering evaluation, recommendations and disposition of the corrective action to prevent recurrence.

l. Review of changes to the PROCESS CONTROL PROGRAM and the OFFSITE DOSE CALCULATION MANUAL (ODCM).

m. Review of proposed change(s) to plant systems and equipment to determine whether the proposed change has a potential radiological environmental impact. Such change(s) will be reported to the Manager-Nuclear Engineering and Chief Nuclear Engineer.

n. Review of the Fire Protection Program and implementing procedures and shall submit recommended changes to the SRB.

AUTHORITY

6.5.1.7. The PRB shall:

a. Recommend in writing to the General Manager-Plant Hatch approval or disapproval of items considered under 6.5.1.6(a) through (d) above.

b. Render determinations in writing with regard to whether or not each item considered under 6.5.1.6(a) through (e) above constitutes an unreviewed safety question.

c. Provide written notification within 24 hours to the Manager of Nuclear Generation or the Vice President and General Manager Nuclear Operations and the Safety Review Board of disagreement between the PRB and the General Manager-Plant Hatch; however, the General Manager-Plant Hatch shall have responsibility for resolution of such disagreements pursuant to 6.1.1. above.

RECORDS

6.5.1.8. The Plant Review Board shall maintain written minutes of each PRB meeting that, at a minimum, document the results of all PRB activities performed under the responsibility and authority provisions of these Technical Specifications. Copies shall be provided to the Manager of Nuclear Generation or Vice President and General Manager Nuclear Operations and the Safety Review Board.

d. Abnormal degradation of systems other than those specified in 6.9.1.8.c. above designed to contain radioactive material resulting from the fission process.

SPECIAL REPORTS

6.9.2. Special reports shall be submitted to the Director of the Office of Inspection and Enforcement Regional Office within the time period specified and for each activity shown in Table 6.9.2-1. Special reports for fire protection equipment operating and surveillance requirements shall be submitted, as required, by the Fire Hazards Analysis and its Appendix B requirements.

6.10. RECORD RETENTION

In addition to the applicable record retention requirements of Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, the following records shall be retained for at least the minimum period indicated.

6.10.1. The following records shall be retained for at least five years:

a. Records and logs of unit operation covering time interval at each power level.

b. Records and logs of principal maintenance activities, inspections, repair and replacement of principal items of equipment related to nuclear safety.

c. ALL REPORTABLE OCCURRENCES submitted to the Commission.

d. Records of surveillance activities, inspections and calibrations required by these Technical Specifications.

e. Records of changes made to the procedures required by Specification 6.8.1.

f. Records of radioactive shipments.

g. Records of sealed source and fission detector leak tests and results.

h. Records of annual physical inventory of all sealed source material of record.

6.10.2. The following records shall be retained for the duration of the unit Operating License:

a. Records and drawing changes reflecting unit design modifications made to systems and equipment described in the Final Safety Analysis Report.

b. Records of new and irradiated fuel inventory, fuel transfers and assembly burnup histories.

(3) Georgia Power Company shall implement and maintain in effect all provisions of the fire protection program, which is referenced in the Final Safety Analysis Report for the facility, as contained in the updated Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2 Fire Hazards Analysis and Fire Protection Program, originally submitted by a letter dated July 22, 1986. The licensee may make changes to the fire protection program without prior approval of the Commission only if the changes would not adversely affect the ability to achieve and maintain safe shutdown in the event of a fire.

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

GEORGIA POWER COMPANY

OGLETHORPE POWER CORPORATION

MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC AUTHORITY OF GEORGIA

CITY OF DALTON, GEORGIA

DOCKET NO. 50-366

EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT NO. 2

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 70
License No. NPF-5

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:

   A. The application for amendment by Georgia Power Company, et al., (the licensee) dated July 25, 1986 complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;

   B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;

   C. There is reasonable assurance (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations;

   D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and

   E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.

2. Accordingly, the license is amended by changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment, and paragraph 2.C.(2) of Facility Operating License No. NPF-5 is hereby amended to read as follows:

(2) Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendices A and B, as revised through Amendment No. 70 , are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. The license is further amended by replacing page 5 to revise paragraph 2.C.(3)(b).

4. This license amendment is effective as of its date of issuance and shall be implemented within 60 days of issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Daniel R. Muller, Director
BWR Project Directorate #2
Division of BWR Licensing

Attachments:
1. Changes to the Technical Specifications
2. Page 5 of license

Date of Issuance: November 24, 1986

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 70

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-5

DOCKET NO. 50-366

Replace the following pages of the Appendix A Technical Specifications with the enclosed pages. The revised areas are indicated by marginal lines. The overleaf pages are provided for convenience.

Pages

V
VIII
XI
XIII
3/4 3-59
3/4 3-60
3/4 7-21 thru 3/4 7-30
B 3/4 3-4
B 3/4 7-3
B 3/4 7-4
6-7
6-17

LIMITING CONDITIONS FOR OPERATION AND SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

INDEX

LIMITING CONDITIONS FOR OPERATION AND SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

INDEX

LIMITING CONDITIONS FOR OPERATION AND SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

INDEX

BASES

Correction letter of 8-2-85

BASES

BASES

BASES

(This page is intentionally left blank.)

(This page is intentionally left blank.)

(These pages are intentionally left blank.)

3/4.3.4 REACTOR CORE ISOLATION COOLING SYSTEM ACTUATION INSTRUMENTATION

The reactor core isolation cooling (RCIC) system actuation instrumentation is provided to initiate actions to assure adequate core cooling in the event of reactor isolation from its primary heat sink and the loss of feedwater flow to the reactor vessel without requiring actuation of any of the emergency core cooling equipment.

3/4.3.5 CONTROL ROD WITHDRAWAL BLOCK INSTRUMENTATION

The control rod block functions are provided consistent with the requirements of the specifications in Section 3/4.1.4, Control Rod Program Controls, and Section 3.4.2, Power Distribution Limits. The trip logic is arranged so that a trip in any one of the inputs will result in a control rod block.

3/4.3.6 MONITORING INSTRUMENTATION

3/4.3.6.1 RADIATION MONITORING INSTRUMENTATION

The OPERABILITY of the radiation monitoring instrumentation ensures that: (1) the radiation levels are continually measured in the areas served by the individual channels, and (2) the alarm or automatic action is initiated when the radiation level trip setpoint is exceeded.

3/4.3.6.2 SEISMIC MONITORING INSTRUMENTATION

The OPERABILITY of the seismic monitoring instrumentation ensures that sufficient capability is available to promptly determine the magnitude of a seismic event and evaluate the response of those features important to safety. This capability is required to permit comparison of the measured response to that used in the design basis for the unit.

3/4.3.6.3 REMOTE SHUTDOWN MONITORING INSTRUMENTATION

The OPERABILITY of the remote shutdown monitoring instrumentation ensures that sufficient capability is available to permit shutdown and maintenance of HOT SHUTDOWN of the unit from locations outside of the control room. This capability is required in the event control room habitability is lost and is consistent with General Design Criterion 19 of 10 CFR Part 50.

MONITORING INSTRUMENTATION (Continued)

3/4.3.6.4 POST-ACCIDENT MONITORING INSTRUMENTATION

The OPERABILITY of the post-accident monitoring instrumentation ensures that sufficient information is available on selected plant parameters to monitor and assess important variable following an accident.

3/4.3.6.5 SOURCE RANGE MONITORS

The source range monitors provide the operator with information on the status of the neutron level in the core at very low power levels during startup. At these power levels, reactivity additions should not be made without this flux level information available to the operator. When the intermediate range monitors are on scale adequate information is available without the SRMs and they can be retracted.

3/4.3.6.6 TRAVERSING INCORE PROBE SYSTEM

The OPERABILITY of the traversing incore probe system with the specified minimum complement of equipment ensures that the measurements obtained from use of this equipment accurately represent the spatial neutron flux distribution of the reactor core. The OPERABILITY of this system is demonstrated by irradiating each detector to be used and normalizing their respective outputs.

3/4.3.6.7 CHLORINE DETECTORS

The OPERABILITY of the chlorine detectors ensures that an accidental chlorine release will be detected promptly and the necessary protective actions will be automatically initiated to provide protection for control room personnel. Upon detection of a high concentration of chlorine the control room emergency ventilation system will automatically be placed in the isolation mode of operation to provide the required protection.

3/4.3.6.8 (Deleted)

3/4.7.4 SNUBBERS (Continued)

The service life of a snubber is evaluated via manufacturer input and information through consideration of the snubber service conditions and associated installation and maintenance records (newly installed snubber, seal replaced, spring replaced, in high radiation area, in high temperature area, etc...). The requirement to monitor the snubber service life is included to ensure that the snubbers periodically undergo a performance evaluation in view of their age and operating conditions. These records will provide statistical bases for future consideration of snubber service life. The requirements for the maintenance of records and the snubber service life review are not intended to affect plant operation.

3/4.7.5 SEALED SOURCE CONTAMINATION

The limitations on sealed source removable contamination ensure that the total body or individual organ irradiation does not exceed allowable limits in the event of ingestion or inhalation of the source material. The limitations on removable contamination for sources requiring leak testing, including alpha emitters, is based on 10 CFR 70.39(c) limits for plutonium. Quantities of interest to this specification which are exempt from the leakage testing are consistent with the criteria of 10 CFR Part 30.11-20 and 70.19. Leakage from sources excluded from the requirements of this specification is not likely to represent more than one maximum permissible body burden for total body irradiation if the source material is inhaled or ingested.

3/4.7.6 (Deleted)

3/4.7.7 (Deleted)

3/4.7.8 SETTLEMENT OF CLASS 1 STRUCTURES

In order to assure that settlement does not exceed predicted and allowable settlement values, a program has been established to conduct a survey at the site.

The allowable total and differential settlement values are based on original settlement predictions. In establishing these tabulated values, an assumption is made that pipe and conduit connections have been designed to safely withstand the stresses which would develop due to total and differential settlement.

RESPONSIBILITIES (Continued)

i. Review of the Security Plan and implementing procedures and shall submit recommended changes to the SRB.

j. Review of the Emergency Plan and implementing procedures and shall submit recommended changes to the SRB.

k. Review of any unplanned onsite release of radioactive material to the environs when such release is in excess of 1 Ci, excluding dissolved and entrained gases and tritium for liquid effluents, and in excess of 150 Ci of noble gases or 0.02 Ci of radioiodines for gaseous effluents. Also included is the preparing and forwarding to the General Manager-Plant Hatch and the SRB reports covering evaluation, recommendations and disposition of the corrective action to prevent recurrence.

l. Review of changes to the PROCESS CONTROL PROGRAM and the OFFSITE DOSE CALCULATION MANUAL (ODCM).

m. Review of proposed change(s) to plant systems and equipment to determine whether the proposed change has a potential radiological environmental impact. Such change(s) will be reported to the Manager-Nuclear Engineering and Chief Nuclear Engineer.

n. Review of the Fire Protection Program and implementing procedures and shall submit recommended changes to the SRB.

AUTHORITY

6.5.1.7 The PRB shall:

a. Recommend in writing to the General Manager-Plant Hatch approval or disapproval of items considered under 6.5.1.6(a) through (d) above.

b. Render determinations in writing with regard to whether or not each item considered under 6.5.1.6(a) through (e) above constitutes an unreviewed safety question.

c. Provide written notification within 24 hours to the Manager of Nuclear Generation or the Vice President and General Manager Nuclear Operations and the Safety Review Board of disagreement between the PRB and the General Manager-Plant Hatch; however, the General Manager-Plant Hatch shall have responsibility for resolution of such disagreements pursuant to 6.1.1 above.

RECORDS

6.5.1.8 The Plant Review Board shall maintain written minutes of each PRB meeting that, at a minimum, document the results of all PRB activities performed under the responsibility and authority provisions of these Technical Specifications. Copies shall be provided to the Manager of Nuclear Generation or the Vice President and General Manager Nuclear Operations and the Safety Review Board.

d. Abnormal degradation of systems other than those specified in 6.9.1.8.c above designed to contain radioactive material resulting from the fission process.

SPECIAL REPORTS

6.9.2 Special reports shall be submitted to the Director of the Office of Inspection and Enforcement Regional Office within the time period specified for each report. Special reports for fire protection equipment operating and surveillance requirements shall be submitted, as required, by the Fire Hazards Analysis and its Appendix B requirements.

6.10 RECORD RETENTION

In addition to the applicable record retention requirements of Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, the following records shall be retained for at least the minimum period indicated.

6.10.1 The following records shall be retained for at least five years:

a. Records and logs of unit operation covering time interval at each power level.

b. Records and logs of principal maintenance activities, inspections, repair and replacement of principal items of equipment related to nuclear safety.

c. ALL REPORTABLE OCCURRENCES submitted to the Commission.

d. Records of surveillance activities, inspections and calibrations required by these Technical Specifications.

e. Records of changes made to the procedures required by Specification 6.8.1.

f. Records of radioactive shipments.

g. Records of sealed source and fission detector leak tests and results.

h. Records of annual physical inventory of all sealed source material of record.

6.10.2 The following records shall be retained for the duration of the unit Operating License:

a. Records and drawing changes reflecting unit design modifications made to systems and equipment described in the Final Safety Analysis Report.

b. Records of new and irradiated fuel inventory, fuel transfers and assembly burnup histories.

(b) Georgia Power Company shall implement and maintain in effect all provisions of the fire protection program, which is referenced in the Final Safety Analysis Report for the facility, as contained in the updated Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2 Fire Hazards Analysis and Fire Protection Program, originally submitted by a letter dated July 22, 1986. The licensee may make changes to the fire protection program without prior approval of the Commission only if the changes would not adversely affect the ability to achieve and maintain safe shutdown in the event of a fire.

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENTS NOS. 133AND 70 TO

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSES NOS. DPR-57 AND NPF-5

GEORGIA POWER COMPANY
OGLETHORPE POWER CORPORATION
MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC AUTHORITY OF GEORGIA
CITY OF DALTON, GEORGIA

EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS NOS. 1 AND 2

DOCKETS NOS. 50-321 AND 50-366

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In a letter dated July 22, 1986, (L. T. Gucwa, GPC, to D. Muller, NRC) the licensee transmitted the Hatch 1 & 2 Updated Fire Hazards Analysis (FHA) and Fire Protection Program (FPP). The FHA contained the licensee's Fire Protection Program Plan (Section 9.1) and the Fire Protection Surveillance Requirements (Section 9.2). The FHA is referenced in the FSAR by Revision 4, Hatch 1 FSAR, 7/86, Section 10.8, and Revision 4, Hatch 2 FSAR, 7/86, Section 9.5.1.

In a letter dated July 25, 1986, (L. T. Gucwa, GPC to D. Muller, NRC) the licensee proposed changes to the fire protection license conditions in accordance with Generic Letter 86-10 "Implementation of Fire Protection Requirements". The proposed changes are:

1) Revision of the fire protection license conditions (License Condition 2.C (3) for Unit 1 and 2.C(3) (b) for Unit 2) to provide consistency with the standard fire protection license condition contained in Generic Letter 86-10.

2) Deletion of the limiting conditions for operation and the surveillance requirements for fire protection equipment from Technical Specifications Sections 3 and 4 for both units (The surveillance requirements and operating requirements have been in the FHA, which has been incorporated by reference in the FSAR).

3) Deletion of the minimum fire team staffing requirement from Technical Specification 6.2.2.

4) Revision to Technical Specification 6.5.1.6 so that Plant Review Board (PRB) review and findings are required for changes to the fire protection program and the implementing procedures.

5) Addition to Technical Specification 6.9.2 for both units of a requirement that special reports for fire protection equipment that fail to meet operating and surveillance requirements in the FHA be submitted to the Commission.

2.0 EVALUATION

The changes proposed by the licensee have been reviewed against the requirements of Generic Letter 86-10, which permits relocation of fire protection technical specifications to the FSAR (or FHA). The changes are:

- Proposed Change 1 incorporates wording suggested in Generic Letter 86-10. The change also deletes the requirement that all modifications identified in the NRC's SER dated 10/4/78 be completed. The licensee's compliance with the staff's SER is now documented in Section 9.4, Appendix D, of the FHA. The staff finds proposed change 1 to be acceptable.

- Proposed Change 2 consists of removing detailed fire protection technical specifications from the license condition so that they will not be in conflict with newer surveillance requirements in the FHA. Proposed Change 2 also includes the removal of a CO_2 suppression system in the Control Building and the deletion of two hose stations in the control building from Table 3.13.2 of the Unit 1 T. S. Most other changes to the surveillance requirements consist of bringing the existing T. S. into conformance with the G. E. BWR standard T. S. where such change results in a more stringent surveillance or performance requirement.

  Some differences in surveillance requirements in the FHA as compared to the T. S. are a result of changes made in the number and type of fire detectors placed in different fire zones around the plant. In some zones, fire detectors were added. In other zones smoke detectors were replaced by thermal detectors. All of the changes in surveillance of fire detection devices were reviewed by the staff and the changes made were in conformance with NFPA Standard 72E, and with Appendix R 10 CFR 50. It is the staff's conclusion, therefore, that protection in each area has either increased or has remained the same.

  A proposed increase in the surveillance interval for detector alarms was noted in surveillance requirement 2.2.2. This was discussed with the licensee and found to be in error. The licensee agreed to correct this error by letter. Most of the proposed changes in the surveillance requirements due to fire suppression hardware changes concern the addition of automatic sprinklers. An exception is the removal of the surveillance requirements for the manually actuated CO_2 suppression system in the computer and cable spreading rooms in the Control Building. A pre-action sprinkler system has been installed in the cable spreading room and the CO_2 system will be removed. The reason for removal of the system is to protect control room personnel from seepage of CO_2 through floor penetrations after activation of the system. The CO_2 system is presently the primary means of fire suppression in the computer room. There are no plans to remove the CO_2 system from the computer room until a Halon system is installed and made operational since the use of CO_2 in this

area is not considered a serious threat to the operators. For this reason the staff suggested that the surveillance requirements for the computer room CO_2 discharge system be placed in the FHA by listing the system in Section 1.5.1. The licensee agreed to do this in a future letter. The staff considers the removal of the CO_2 system from the cable spreading room to be acceptable.

A proposed change in surveillance requirements that does not involve a hardware change is the deletion of fire hose station T5-TA and T8-TA in the Control Building from Table 3.13-2 of the Unit 1.T.S. This table and the corresponding table in the FHA were intended to list hose stations serving areas which contain safety related equipment. Subsequent review by the licensee has determined that no safety related equipment is contained in the areas served by the hose stations proposed for deletion. Review by the staff found the hose stations to be located in the Turbine Building and not in the vicinity of safety related equipment. The staff finds the proposed change acceptable.

Another change in surveillance requirements that does not involve a hardware change is surveillance requirement 2.3.1.f.4 which refers to the fire suppression water system pressure to be maintained by fire pumps. The original T.S. set this pressure at 90 psig. The surveillance requirement in the FHA set this pressure at 85 psig. According to the licensee, this pressure was reduced because of the delay time (about 30 seconds) between when the last pump switches on (at system pressure of 90 psig) and when the pump can overtake the falling system pressure and bring the pressure up to 90 psig. The staff agrees that this change in pressure requirement does not imply system degradation and the staff finds it acceptable.

- Proposed Change 3 consists of deleting the requirement for a fire brigade of at least five members who are not part of the minimum shift crew necessary for safe shutdown of Units 1 and 2, or any personnel required for other essential functions during a fire emergency. This requirement is identified in Item F of Section 6.2.2 of the Hatch 1 & 2 T. S.. It is not found in the FHA. The staff finds that the change has not been adequately supported and concludes that the proposed change should not be made, and the requirement should be left in the Hatch 1-2 Technical Specifications.

- Proposed Change 4 adds (as Item n) to the Hatch 1 & 2 T. S. Section 6.5.1.6 to responsibilities of the Plant Review Broad: "The Plant Review Board shall be responsible for: n. Review of the Fire Protection Program and implementing procedures and shall submit recommended changes to the Safety Review Board (SRB).: Nothing was deleted in T. S. Section 6.5.1.6 of either plant. The staff finds this proposed change to be acceptable.

- Proposed Change 5 adds the following words to Section 6.9.2 of the T. S. of Hatch 1 & 2: "Special reports for fire protection equipment operating and surveillance requirements shall be submitted, as required, by the Fire Hazards Analysis and its Appendix B requirements". The FHA Appendix B requires reporting when:

1) Minimum operating requirements and/or required actions are not met;

2) Surveillance requirements are not met; or

3) Plant conditions exist which are prohibited by the Fire Hazard Analysis.

The staff considers this proposed change to be in accordance with the guidelines of Generic Letter 86-10 with regard to the licensee's obligation to notify the NRC of fire protection deficiencies which meet the criteria of 10 CFR 50.72, or 10 CFR 50.73. Therefore, the staff finds proposed Change 5 to be acceptable.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

The amendments change a requirement with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. The staff has determined that the amendments involve no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released offsite, and that there should be no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, the amendments meet the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR §51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR §51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of the amendments.

4.0 CONCLUSION

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and the issuance of the amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: R. Wescott

Dated: November 24, 1986

7590-01

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

GEORGIA POWER COMPANY, ET AL.

DOCKETS NOS. 50-321 AND 50-366

NOTICE OF DENIAL OF AMENDMENT TO

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE AND OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has denied in part a request by the licensee for an amendment to Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR-57 and NPF-5, issued to the Georgia Power Company, Oglethrope Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia (the licensee), for operation of the Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2 (the facility), located in Appling County, Georgia.

The amendments as proposed by the licensee revised the fire protection license conditions (License Condition 2.C(3) for Unit 1 and 2.C(3)(b) for Unit 2) to provide consistency with the standard fire protection license condition contained in NRC Generic Letter 86-10, "Implementation of Fire Protection Requirements." The amendments as proposed by the licensee revised the Technical Specifications for Units 1 and 2 to:

1) delete the fire protection surveillance and operability requirements;

2) add requirements for:

   a) review of changes to the fire protection program and procedures and;

   b) submittal of special reports for fire protection equipment and surveillance requirements and

3) delete item f of Section 6.2.2 which provides the requirement for a Fire Team that shall be maintained onsite at all times.

The licensee's application for the amendment was dated July 25, 1986. Notice of Consideration of Issuance of this amendment was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on September 10, 1986 (51 FR 32270).

All of the requested changes were granted, except the request to delete item f of Section 6.2.2 concerning the Fire Team which was found to be unacceptable because the licensee has not adequately supported and justified this request and was denied. The licensee was notified of the Commission's denial of this request by letter dated November 24, 1986.

Notice of Issuance of Amendments Nos. 133 and 70 will be published in the Commission's Bi-Weekly FEDERAL REGISTER Notice.

By the licensee may demand a hearing with respect to the denial described above and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding may file a written petition for leave to intervene.

A request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C., by the above date.

A copy of any petitions should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, and to Bruce W. Churchill, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

For further details with respect to this action, see (1) the application for amendment dated July 25, 1986 and (2) the Commission's letter to Georgia Power Company dated November 24, 1986which are available for public inspection at the Commission's public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., and at the Appling County Public Library, 301 City Hall Drive, Baxley, Georgia. A copy of Item (2) may be obtained upon request addressed to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Director, Division of BWR Licensing.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, 24th day of November 1986.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Daniel R. Muller, Director
BWR Project Directorate #2
Division of BWR Licensing

MEMORANDUM FOR: Sholly Coordinator

FROM: Daniel R. Muller, Director
BWR Project Directorate #2
Division of BWR Licensing

DISTRIBUTION
Docket File
PD#2 Reading File
SNorris/GRivenbark
Sholly Coordinator (Orig & 1)
OGC-Bethesda for info

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR PUBLICATION IN BI-WEEKLY FR NOTICE - NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Dockets Nos. 50-321 and 50-366, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units Nos. 1 and 2, Appling County, Georgia

Date of application for amendments: July 25, 1986

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the fire protection license conditions (License Condition 2.C(3) for Unit 1 and 2.C(3)(b) for Unit 2 to provide consistency with the standard fire protection license condition contained in NRC Generic Letter 86-10, "Implementation of Fire Protection Requirements." The amendments revise the TSs for Units 1 and 2 to delete the fire protection surveillance and operability requirements (these have been relocated in the Hatch Fire Hazards Analysis and Fire Protection Program) and add requirements for a) review of changes to the fire protection program and b) submittal of special reports for fire protection equipment and surveillance requirements.

Date of issuance: November 24, 1986

Effective date: November 24, 1986

Amendments Nos.: 130 and 70

Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR-57 and NPF-5. Amendments revised the licenses and the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: September 10, 1986 (51 FR 32270)

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated November 24, 1986

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room Location: Appling County Public Library, 301 City Hall Drive, Baxley, Georgia.

Original Signed by
D. R. Muller

Daniel R. Muller, Director
BWR Project Directorate #2
Division of BWR Licensing

DBL:PD#2	DBL:PD#2	OGC-Bethesda	DBL:PD#2
SMorris	GRivenbark	W. Shields	DMuller
11/20/86	11/21/86	11/20/86	11/24/86

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

see typo