

August 23, 1994

DISTRIBUTION

Mr. J. T. Beckham, Jr.
Vice President - Plant Hatch
Georgia Power Company
P. O. Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201

Docket File
NRC/Local PDRs
PDII-3 Reading
H.Berkow
K.Jabbour
L.Berry
OGC, 0-15 B18

ACRS (10), TWF
D.Hagan, T-4 A43
S.Varga
G.Lainas
E.Merschhoff, RII
OC/LFDCB, T-9 E10
OPA, 0-2 G5

Dear Mr. Beckham:

SUBJECT: EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT NO. 1 - NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT (TAC NO. M90214)

The Commission has forwarded the enclosed "Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for Hearing" to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

This notice relates to your August 16, 1994, application, to revise for one-time only Hatch Unit 1 Technical Specification 3.9.C to permit only one emergency diesel generator (DG) to be aligned to its associated core or containment cooling system during a specific time of the fall 1994 outage, provided the fuel pool gates are removed and the cavity is flooded. This revision is needed to allow you to perform local leak rate testing on the residual heat removal system loops and maintenance on DG 1A.

Sincerely,

original signed by

Kahtan N. Jabbour, Project Manager
Project Directorate II-3
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-321

Enclosure:
Notice

cc w/enclosure:
See next page

*See previous concurrence

OFFICE	PDII-3/LA	PDII-3/PM	PDII-3/D	
NAME	C.NORSWORTHY	K. JABBOUR	*H. BERKOW	
DATE	8/23/94	8/23/94	8/23/94	

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY
FILE NAME: G:\HATCH\FR90214.LTR

9408310230 940823
PDR ADOCK 05000321
P PDR

ENC FILE CENTER COPY

DF01



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

August 23, 1994

Mr. J. T. Beckham, Jr.
Vice President - Plant Hatch
Georgia Power Company
P. O. Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201

Dear Mr. Beckham:

SUBJECT: EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT NO. 1 - NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION
OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT (TAC NO. M90214)

The Commission has forwarded the enclosed "Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for Hearing" to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

This notice relates to your August 16, 1994, application, to revise for one-time only Hatch Unit 1 Technical Specification 3.9.C to permit only one emergency diesel generator (DG) to be aligned to its associated core or containment cooling system during a specific time of the fall 1994 outage, provided the fuel pool gates are removed and the cavity is flooded. This revision is needed to allow you to perform local leak rate testing on the residual heat removal system loops and maintenance on DG 1A.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Kahtan N. Jabbour".

Kahtan N. Jabbour, Project Manager
Project Directorate II-3
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-321

Enclosure:
Notice

cc w/enclosure:
See next page

Mr. J. T. Beckham, Jr.
Georgia Power Company

Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant

cc:

Mr. Ernest L. Blake, Jr.
Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge
2300 N Street, NW.
Washington, DC 20037

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

Mr. S. J. Bethay
Manager Licensing - Hatch
Georgia Power Company
P. O. Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201

Mr. Ernie Toupin
Manager of Nuclear Operations
Oglethorpe Power Corporation
2100 East Exchange Place
Tucker, Georgia 30085-1349

Mr. L. Sumner
General Manager, Nuclear Plant
Georgia Power Company
Route 1, Box 439
Baxley, Georgia 31513

Charles A. Patrizia, Esquire
Paul, Hastings Janofsky & Walker
12th Floor
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW.
Washington, DC 20036

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

Mr. Jack D. Woodard
Senior Vice President -
Nuclear Operations
Georgia Power Company
P. O. Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201

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

Chairman
Appling County Commissioners
County Courthouse
Baxley, Georgia 31513

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

Harold Reheis, Director
Department of Natural Resources
205 Butler Street, SE., Suite 1252
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSIONGEORGIA POWER COMPANYDOCKET NO. 50-321NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO
FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE, PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS
CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION, AND OPPORTUNITY FOR A HEARING

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-57 issued to the Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia (the licensee) for operation of the Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, located in Appling County, Georgia.

The proposed amendment would make a one-time change to Technical Specification (TS) 3.9.C for Hatch Unit 1 regarding the emergency diesel generator (DG) operability requirements during reactor shutdown conditions. Current TS 3.9.C requires two DGs be operable during reactor shutdown when a core or containment cooling system is required to be operable. The proposed amendment would revise the current requirement such that only one emergency DG is required to be aligned to its associated core or containment cooling system during a specific time of the outage. During this time period the decay heat removal (DHR) system will be in service. The DHR system, which is completely independent of the existing shutdown cooling system, is powered by the Baxley substation and has its own DG as a backup power supply.

The licensee is requesting this one-time change for the fall 1994 Unit 1 refueling/maintenance outage to perform local leak rate testing on the residual heat removal system loops and maintenance on DG 1A. Other

limitations are: (1) the other DG will be aligned to its corresponding core or containment cooling system, (2) the reactor cavity is flooded, and (3) the fuel pool gates are removed.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

This proposed change does not involve a significant hazards consideration because it does not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Although the proposed change slightly increases the probability of a loss of RHR [Residual Heat Removal] shutdown cooling, the probability of the total loss of decay heat removal for the core is not increased. Upon an LOSP [Loss-of-Offsite Power], coupled with the failure of one DG, RHR shutdown cooling (with two RHR pumps and their respective DGs available) will still be available. One diesel out of service, as will be the case on outage days 5 and 6, an LOSP, coupled with a diesel failure, will render RHR shutdown cooling unavailable. However, on outage days 5 and 6, the DHR system is also affected by the LOSP, its backup diesel can be manually placed into service. Furthermore, the RHR shutdown cooling system is susceptible to a single failure on loss of suction path (inadvertent closure of either valve E11-F008 or F009 even without an LOSP).

However, on outage days 5 and 6, the RHR and DHR systems will be available for decay heat removal; thus, the unit will not be susceptible to either single failure with respect to core decay heat removal.

This proposal does not involve any changes to the secondary containment, secondary containment ventilation systems, the standby gas treatment system or any other radiological release control systems. Therefore, the consequences of a loss of decay heat removal event are not increased.

This evolution is being performed in the refueling mode of operation, outside the realm of FSAR [Final Safety Analysis Report] assumed accidents, except for a refueling accident. Since this proposal does not involve changes to any fuel handling mechanisms, the probability of a refueling accident is not increased. Furthermore, this proposal does not involve any changes to the operation or maintenance of any safety-related component designed to prevent or mitigate the consequences of previously analyzed events.

Therefore, based on this discussion, the proposed Technical Specifications change does not increase the probability or consequences of any previously analyzed accident or transient.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different event from any previously analyzed.

This proposed change does not introduce any new modes of operation. All affected system; i.e., the RHR systems, DGs, and the DHR system, will be operated within their design specifications. Although the nonsafety-related DHR is a relatively new system, it was installed, successfully tested, and used for decay heat removal during the Spring 1994 Unit 2 outage. Therefore, no failure modes that have not been previously considered are introduced by this proposed change.

3. Significantly reduce the margin of safety.

The proposed decay heat removal configuration, which will be in use during outage days 5 and 6, uses the DHR system as the primary decay heat removal mechanism, with RHR loop A as a backup. Although the DHR system is not designed as a safety-related system, it is conservatively designed with sufficient heat removal capacity and redundancy to provide full heat removal capacity in a variety of conditions. In fact, testing during the Unit 2 Spring 1994 outage showed that even early in the outage (approximately day 3) the DHR system is fully capable of handling the decay heat load of the reactor and the spent fuel pool. Additionally, even though the DHR system takes a suction from, and discharges to, the spent fuel pool, adequate natural circulation is firmly established between the pool and the reactor vessel such that adequate decay heat removal is

taking place for both the pool and the reactor. This was demonstrated via special test performed during the Spring Unit 2 refueling outage. In addition, duplicates of major components are provided so that loss of any one component does not result in loss of system function. Therefore, as far as decay heat removal capability is concerned, the margin of safety is not reduced.

As discussed previously, if an LOSP occurs, failure of DG 1C will result in a total loss of RHR shutdown cooling capacity, since RHR loop 1B will be out of service for LLRT. However, a loss of decay heat removal will not occur, since the DHR system is in service and is supplied power from the Baxley, Georgia, substation. However, if the Baxley power supply should fail, the DHR system has its own backup diesel that can be placed in service manually within 4-hour period. Therefore, the margin of safety associated with an LOSP is not reduced as a result of this proposal.

Furthermore, the configuration of decay heat removal systems on days 5 and 6 in is compliance with the existing Unit 2 Specifications, which only require one RHR pump and one DG in Condition 5 (Specifications 3.9.12 and 3.8.1.2, respectively). Thus, the margin of safety, with respect to the existing Unit 2 Specifications, is not reduced.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves

no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the FEDERAL REGISTER a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and should cite the publication date and page number of this FEDERAL REGISTER notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D22, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20555.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By September 26, 1994, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20555 and at the local public

document room located at the Appling County Public Library, 301 City Hall Drive, Baxley, Georgia 31513. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order. As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above. Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the

issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20555, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last 10 days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1-(800) 248-5100 (in Missouri 1-(800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number N1023 and the following message addressed to Herbert N. Berkow: petitioner's name and telephone number, date petition was mailed, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 1, and publication date and page number of this FEDERAL REGISTER notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and to Ernest L. Blake, Jr., Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated August 16, 1994, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20555 and at the local public document room located at Appling County Public Library, 301 City Hall Drive, Baxley, Georgia 31513.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this day of

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Kahtan N. Jabbour

Kahtan N. Jabbour, Project Manager
Project Directorate II-3
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

X Note: The last line of this notice "Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this day of ." Will not appear in the Federal Register publication.