

May 25, 1989

Docket No: 50-321

Mr. W. G. Hairston, III
Senior Vice President -
Nuclear Operations
Georgia Power Company
P. O. Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201

Dear Mr. Hairston:

SUBJECT: ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT NO. 162 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE DPR-57 -
EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT 1 (TAC 13277) (MPAD-17)

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 162 to Facility Operating License DPR-57 for the Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit 1. The amendment consists of changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) in response to your application dated May 4, 1984, as amended September 12, 1984, August 19, 1987, and May 16, 1989.

A copy of our Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's Bi-Weekly Federal Register Notice.

Sincerely,

LS/

Lawrence P. Crocker, Project Manager
Project Directorate II-3
Division of Reactor Projects-I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:

1. Amendment No. 162 to DPR-57
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/ enclosures:
See next page

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

LA:PDII-3
MR000
5/18/89

PM:PDII-3
LCrocker:sw
5/18/89

PDII-3
DBMatthews
5/23/89

DF01
11

CA
JH

8906050052 890525
PDR ADOCK 05000321
PDC

Mr. W. G. Hairston, III
Georgia Power Company

Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant,
Units Nos. 1 and 2

cc:

G. F. Trowbridge, Esq.
Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge
2300 N Street, N. W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

Mr. R. P. McDonald
Executive Vice President -
Nuclear Operations
Georgia Power Company
P.O. Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201

Mr. L. T. Gucwa
Engineering Department
Georgia Power Company
P. O. Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201

Mr. Alan R. Herdt, Chief
Project Branch #3
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
101 Marietta Street, NW, Suite 2900
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

Nuclear Safety and Compliance Manager
Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant
Georgia Power Company
P. O. Box 442
Baxley, Georgia 31513

Mr. Louis B. Long
Southern Company Services, Inc.
P. O. Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201

Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Route 1, Box 725
Baxley, Georgia 31513

Regional Administrator, Region II
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
101 Marietta Street, Suite 2900
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

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

Mr. J. Leonard Ledbetter, Director
Environmental Protection Division
Department of Natural Resources
205 Butler Street, S.E., Suite 1252
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Chairman
Appling County Commissioners
County Courthouse
Baxley, Georgia 31513

DATED May 25, 1989

AMENDMENT NO.162 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE DPR-57, EDWIN I. HATCH, UNIT 1

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket File

NRC PDR

Local PDR

PDII-3 R/F

Hatch R/F

S. Varga 14-E-4

G. Lainas 14-H-3

D. Matthews 14-H-25

M. Rood 14-H-25

L. Crocker 14-H-25

D. Langford 14-B-2

D. Hagan MNBB-3302

T. Meek (4) P1-137

W. Jones P-130A

ACRS (10) P-135

OGC-WF 15-B-18

ARM/LFMB AR-2015

GPA/PA 17-F-2

J. Calvo 11-F-23

L. Reyes RII

B. Grimes 9-A-2

E. Jordan MNBB-3302



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. 162
License No. DPR-57

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
 - A. The application for amendment to the Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit 1 (the facility) Facility Operating License No. DPR-57 filed by Georgia Power Company, acting for itself, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, and City of Dalton, Georgia, (the licensee) dated May 4, 1984, as amended September 12, 1984, August 19, 1987, and May 16, 1989 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 set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
 - 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. 162, are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. 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



David B. Matthews, Director
Project Directorate II-3
Division of Reactor Projects-I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment:
Changes to the Technical
Specifications

Date of Issuance: May 25, 1989

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 162

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-57

DOCKET NO. 50-321

Replace the following page of the Appendix A Technical Specifications with the enclosed page. The revised page is identified by amendment number and contains a vertical line indicating the area of change.

Remove Page

1.0-3

Insert Page

1.0-3

- K. Instrument Check - An instrument check is the qualitative determination of acceptable operability by observation of instrument behavior during operation. This determination shall include, where possible, comparison of the instrument with other independent instruments measuring the same variable.
- L. Instrument Functional Test - An instrument functional test means the injection of a simulated signal into the instrument primary sensor to verify the proper instrument channel response, alarm and/or initiating action.
- M. Limiting Conditions for Operation (LCO) - The limiting conditions for operation specify the acceptable levels of system performance necessary to assure safe startup and operation of the Unit. When these conditions are met, the Unit can be operated safely and abnormal situations can be safely controlled.
- N. Limiting Safety System Setting (LSSS) - The limiting safety system settings are settings on instrumentation which initiate the automatic protective action at a level such that a Safety Limit will not be exceeded. The region between the Safety Limit and these settings represents margin with normal operation lying on the conservative side of these settings. The margin has been established so that with proper operation of the instrumentation the Safety Limits will never be exceeded.
- O. Logic System Functional Test - A logic system functional test means a test of all relays and contacts of a logic circuit from sensor to activated device to insure that components are operable per design intent. Where practicable, action will go to completion; e.g., pumps will be started and valves opened.
- P. (Deleted)
- Q. Operable - A system, subsystem, train, component or device shall be operable or have operability when it is capable of performing its specified function(s). Implicit in this definition shall be the assumption that all necessary attendant instrumentation, controls, normal and emergency electrical power sources, cooling or seal water, lubrication or other auxiliary equipment that are required for the system, subsystem, train, component or device to perform its function(s) are also capable of performing their related support function(s).
- R. Operating - Operating means that a system or component is performing its intended functions in its required manner.

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. 162, are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. 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

Original Signed By:
David B. Matthews

David B. Matthews, Director
Project Directorate II-3
Division of Reactor Projects-I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment:
Changes to the Technical
Specifications

Date of Issuance: May 25, 1989

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

LA:PDII-3
MRood
5/16/89

PM:PDII-3
LCrocker:sw
5/16/89

OGC-WF

5/12/89

D:PDII-3
DBMatthews
5/25/89



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 162 TO

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE DPR-57

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

EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT 1

DOCKET NO. 50-321

INTRODUCTION

By letter dated May 4, 1984, as amended by letter dated September 12, 1984, and further amended by letter dated August 19, 1987, Georgia Power Company (the licensee) requested changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) for the Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit 1. The changes requested by the licensee were intended to bring the Unit 1 TS into conformance with staff guidance contained in a generic letter dated April 10, 1980. The generic letter requested licensees to (1) expand the definition of OPERABLE in existing TS to include the operability of support equipment necessary for the system, subsystem, train, component or device to perform its function; and (2) add provisions to the TS to assure that no set of equipment outages would be allowed to persist that would result in the facility being in an unprotected condition because of violation of the single failure criterion for safety systems.

Staff review indicated that all of the changes requested by the licensee were not necessary to achieve conformance to the generic letter. These matters were discussed with licensee representatives on several occasions during early 1989 and, on May 16, 1989, the licensee further amended the proposed changes such that only the definition of OPERABLE would be affected.

DISCUSSION

An event occurring in 1979, at a different licensee's facility reported in IE Information Notice No. 79-35, indicated that there might be some misunderstanding regarding use of the term OPERABLE. As a follow-up, in an April 10, 1980 letter to all power reactor licensees, the NRC clarified the meaning of the term OPERABLE. That letter included an expanded definition of the term OPERABLE and operability-related model TS Sections 3.0.3 and 3.0.5, and requested licensees to amend their plant TS to incorporate the requirements of the model specifications.

In response to the April 10, 1980 generic letter, the licensee requested changes to both the Hatch Unit 1 and Unit 2 TS. Amendment No. 49 to the Unit 2 license, issued on July 16, 1985, approved the requested changes to bring the Unit 2 TS into conformance with the April 10, 1980 letter. These changes were relatively straightforward since the Unit 2 TS are based upon the NRC's Standard Technical Specifications (STS). However, the changes needed for the Unit 1 TS appeared to be considerably more complicated since the Unit 1 TS are in an earlier, custom format, not based upon the STS.

For Unit 1, TS changes were requested by the licensee on May 4, 1984, as amended by letters of September 12, 1984 and August 17, 1987. During staff review of the requested changes, it became apparent that the existing Hatch Unit 1 TS contain requirements that are at least as restrictive as those in Sections 3.0.3 and 3.0.5 of the model TS. Thus, changes to the Unit 1 TS are not required to incorporate the requirements of Sections 3.0.3 and 3.0.5 of the model TS. These matters were discussed with representatives of the licensee during early 1989 and, on May 16, 1989, the licensee submitted a further revision to its change request.

The May 16, 1989 revision withdrew the request for changes to incorporate the requirements intended by Sections 3.0.3 and 3.0.5 of the model TS, and revised the proposed definition of OPERABLE such that it would be identical to the definition of OPERABLE-OPERABILITY in the Hatch Unit 2 TS. The Unit 2 definition is identical to the definition requested by the staff in the April 10, 1980 generic letter. The proposed Hatch 1 definition of OPERABLE thus is in conformance with the definition requested by the generic letter and is acceptable.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves changes to the installation or use of facility components located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. The staff has determined that the amendment involves no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released offsite, and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, the amendment meets 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 amendment.

CONCLUSION

The Commission made a proposed determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration which was published in the Federal Register on October 7, 1987 (52 FR 37545), and consulted with the state of Georgia. No public comments were received, and the state of Georgia did not have any comments.

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 amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributors: David Langford, PDI-1/SRP-I/II
Lawrence P. Crocker, PDII-3/DRP-I/II

Dated: May 25, 1989