

August 20, 1990

Docket No. 50-366

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.107TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-5 -
EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT 2 (TAC 76674)

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. to Facility Operating License No. NPF-5 for the Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit 2. This amendment consists of changes to the Technical Specifications (TSs) in response to your letter dated April 11, 1990.

The amendment revises TS 4.0.2 by deleting the requirement that the combined time interval for any three consecutive surveillance intervals not exceed 3.25 times the specified surveillance interval. The changes are consistent with the guidance of Generic Letter 89-14, "Line-Item Improvements in Technical Specifications - Removal of the 3.25 Limit on Extending Surveillance Intervals."

A copy of the related Safety Evaluation supporting the amendment is also enclosed. Notice of issuance of the amendment will be included in the Commission's biweekly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,

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

Enclosures:

1. Amendment No. 107to NPF-5
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/enclosures: See next page

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY
Document Name: HATCH AMEND 3.25 LIMIT

LA:PDII3 PM:PDII3 PM:PDII3
RIngram FRIngram:sa LCrocker
7/31/90 8/1/90 8/1/90

OGC
8/1/90
DAPDII3
Matthews
8/16/90

9009060076 900820
PDR ADOCK 05000366
PDC

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

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

cc:

Mr. Ernest L. Blake, Jr.
Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge
2300 N Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

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

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

Mr. H. C. Nix
General Manager, Nuclear Plant
Georgia Power Company
Route 1, Box 439
Baxley, Georgia 31513

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

Mr. R. P. McDonald
Executive Vice President -
Nuclear Operations
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

Mr. Dan Smith
Program Director of
Power Production
Oglethorpe Power Corporation
100 Crescent Centre
Tucker, Georgia 30085

Charles A. Patrizia, Esq.
Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker
12th Floor
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036



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

GEORGIA POWER COMPANY
OGLETHORPE POWER CORPORATION
MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC AUTHORITY OF GEORGIA
CITY OF DALTON, GEORGIA
EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT 2
AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 107
License No. NPF-5

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

- A. The application for amendment to the Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit 2 (the facility), Facility Operating License No. NPF-5 filed by the Georgia Power Company, acting for itself, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, and City of Dalton, Georgia (the licensees) dated April 11, 1990, 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 license 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 hereby amended by page 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:

Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendices A and B, as revised through Amendment No. 107, 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: August 20, 1990

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 107

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 pages are identified by amendment number and contain vertical lines indicating the areas of change. Overleaf page provided to maintain document completeness.

Remove Pages

3/4 0-1
3/4 0-2
B 3/4 0-1
B 3/4 0-2

Insert Pages

3/4 0-1
3/4 0-2
B 3/4 0-1
B 3/4 0-2

3/4 LIMITING CONDITIONS FOR OPERATION AND SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

3/4.0 APPLICABILITY

LIMITING CONDITION FOR OPERATION

3.0.1 Limiting Conditions for Operation and ACTION requirements shall be applicable during the OPERATIONAL CONDITIONS or other states specified for each specification.

3.0.2 Adherence to the requirements of the Limiting Condition for Operation and associated ACTION within the specified time interval shall constitute compliance with the specification. In the event the Limiting Condition for Operation is restored prior to expiration of the specified time interval, completion of the ACTION statement is not required.

3.0.3 In the event a Limiting Condition for Operation and/or associated ACTION requirements cannot be satisfied because of circumstances in excess of those addressed in the specification, the facility shall be placed in at least HOT SHUTDOWN within 6 hours and in COLD SHUTDOWN within the following 30 hours unless corrective measures are completed that permit operation under the permissible ACTION statements for the specified time interval as measured from initial discovery or until the reactor is placed in an OPERATIONAL CONDITION in which the specification is not applicable. Exceptions to these requirements shall be stated in the individual specifications.

3.0.4 Entry into an OPERATIONAL CONDITION or other specified applicability state shall not be made unless the conditions of the Limiting Condition for Operation are met without reliance on provisions contained in the ACTION statements unless otherwise excepted. This provision shall not prevent passage thru OPERATIONAL CONDITIONS required to comply with ACTION requirements.

3.0.5 When a system, subsystem, train, component, or device is determined to be inoperable solely because its emergency power source is inoperable, or solely because its normal power source is inoperable, it may be considered OPERABLE for the purpose of satisfying the requirements of its applicable Limiting Condition for Operation, provided: (1) its corresponding normal or emergency power source is OPERABLE; AND (2) all of its redundant system(s), subsystem(s), train(s), component(s), and device(s) are OPERABLE, or likewise satisfy the requirements of this specification. Unless both conditions (1) and (2) are satisfied, the unit shall be placed in at least HOT SHUTDOWN within 6 hours, and in at least COLD SHUTDOWN within the following 30 hours. This specification is not applicable in Conditions 4 or 5.

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

4.0.1 Surveillance Requirements shall be applicable during the OPERATIONAL CONDITIONS, or other states specified for individual Limiting Conditions for Operation, unless otherwise stated in the individual Surveillance Requirements.

4.0.2 Each Surveillance Requirement shall be performed within the specified surveillance interval with a maximum allowable extension not to exceed 25 percent of the surveillance interval.

APPLICABILITY

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS (Continued)

4.0.3 Performance of a Surveillance Requirement within the specified time interval shall constitute compliance with OPERABILITY requirements for a Limiting Condition for Operation and associated ACTION statements unless otherwise required by the specification. Surveillance requirements do not have to be performed on inoperable equipment.

4.0.4 Entry into an OPERATIONAL CONDITION or other specified applicable state shall not be made unless the Surveillance Requirement(s) associated with the Limiting Condition for Operation have been performed within the applicable surveillance interval or as otherwise specified.

4.0.5 Surveillance Requirements for inservice inspection and testing of ASME Code Class 1, 2, and 3 components shall be applicable as follows:

- a. During the time period:
 1. From issuance of the Facility Operating License to the start of facility commercial operation, inservice testing of ASME Code Class 1, 2, and 3 pumps and valves shall be performed in accordance with Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code 1974 Edition, and Addenda through summer 1975, except where specific written relief has been granted by the Commission.
 2. Following start of facility commercial operation, inservice inspection of ASME Code Class 1, 2, and 3 components and inservice testing of ASME Code Class 1, 2, and 3 pumps and valves shall be performed in accordance with Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and applicable Addenda as required by 10 CFR 50, Section 50.55a(g), except where specific written relief has been granted by the Commission pursuant to 10 CFR 50, Section 50.55a(g) (6) (i).
- b. Surveillance intervals specified in Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and applicable Addenda for the inservice inspection and testing activities required by the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and applicable Addenda shall be applicable as follows in these Technical Specifications:

3/4.0 APPLICABILITY

BASES

The specifications of this section provide the general requirements applicable to each of the Limiting Conditions for Operation and Surveillance Requirements within Section 3/4.

3.0.1 This specification states the applicability of each specification in terms of defined OPERATIONAL CONDITION and is provided to delineate specifically when each specification is applicable.

3.0.2 This specification defines those conditions necessary to constitute compliance with the terms of an individual Limiting Condition for Operation and associated ACTION requirement.

3.0.3 This specification delineates the ACTION to be taken for circumstances not directly provided for in the ACTION statements and whose occurrence would violate the intent of the specification. For example, Specification 3.5.1 calls for the HPCI to be OPERABLE and specifies explicit requirements if it become inoperable. Under the terms of Specification 3.0.3 if the required additional systems are not OPERABLE, the facility is to be placed in HOT SHUTDOWN within the next 5 hours and be in COLD SHUTDOWN within the following 30 hours. The unit shall be brought to HOT SHUTDOWN and COLD SHUTDOWN within the required times by promptly initiating and carrying out an orderly shutdown. It is intended that this guidance also apply whenever an ACTION statement requires a unit to be in (at least) STARTUP within 2 hours or in (at least) HOT SHUTDOWN within 6 hours.

3.0.4 This specification provides that entry into an OPERABLE CONDITION must be made with (a) the full complement of required systems, equipment or components OPERABLE and (b) all other parameters as specified in the Limiting Conditions for Operation being met without regard for allowable deviations and out of service provisions contained in the ACTION statements.

The intent of this provision is to insure that facility operation is not initiated with either required equipment or systems inoperable or other limits being exceeded.

Exceptions to this provision have been provided for a limited number of specifications when startup with inoperable equipment would not affect plant safety. These exceptions are stated in the ACTION statements of the appropriate specifications.

3.0.5 When a system, subsystem, train, component, or device loses either its normal electrical supply or its emergency electrical supply, the equipment is still capable of performing its intended function in the required manner. The safety analyses are performed assuming the loss of function of a critical piece of equipment; thus, with a source of electrical power unavailable, a single failure is still required to reach the conditions analyzed in the FSAR. It is recognized, however, that operation with one source of electrical power unavailable means the system, subsystem, train, component, or device is in a degraded mode. The ACTION statement for the loss of an electrical source is designed to allow operation to continue for a reasonable time while repairs are affected and the lost electrical source returned to service. Therefore, there is no need for all equipment supplied by the electrical source to be placed in ACTION statements.

APPLICABILITY

BASES

4.0.1 This specification provides that surveillance activities necessary to insure the Limiting Conditions for Operation are met and will be performed during the OPERATIONAL CONDITIONS for which the Limiting Conditions for Operation are applicable. Provisions for additional surveillance activities to be performed without regard to the applicable OPERATIONAL CONDITIONS are provided in the individual Surveillance Requirements.

4.0.2 This specification establishes the limit for which the specified time interval for Surveillance Requirements may be extended. It permits an allowable extension of the normal surveillance interval to facilitate surveillance scheduling and consideration of plant operating conditions that may not be suitable for conducting the surveillance; e.g., transient conditions or other ongoing surveillance or maintenance activities. It also provides flexibility to accommodate the length of a fuel cycle for surveillances that are performed at each refueling outage and are specified with an 18-month surveillance interval. It is not intended that this provision be used repeatedly as a convenience to extend surveillance intervals beyond that specified for surveillances that are not performed during refueling outages. The limitation of this specification is based on engineering judgment and the recognition that the most probable result of any particular surveillance being performed is the verification of conformance with the Surveillance Requirements. This provision is sufficient to ensure that the reliability ensured through surveillance activities is not significantly degraded beyond that obtained from the specified surveillance interval.

4.0.3 The provisions of this specification set forth the criteria for determination of compliance with the OPERABILITY requirements of the Limiting Conditions for Operation. Under this criteria, equipment, systems or components are assumed to be OPERABLE if the associated surveillance activities have been satisfactorily performed within the specified time interval. Nothing in this provision is to be construed as defining equipment, systems or components OPERABLE, when such items are found or known to be inoperable although still meeting the Surveillance Requirements.

4.0.4 This specification ensures that surveillance activities associated with a Limiting Condition for Operation have been performed within the specified time interval prior to entry into an applicable CONDITION. The intent of this provision is to ensure that surveillance activities have been satisfactorily demonstrated on a current basis as required to meet the OPERABILITY requirements of the Limiting Condition for Operation.



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 107 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-5
GEORGIA POWER COMPANY, ET AL.
DOCKET NO. 50-366
EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT 2

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated April 11, 1990, Georgia Power Company, et al. (the licensee) proposed a change to the Technical Specifications (TSs) for the Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit 2. The proposed change removes the provision of Specification 4.0.2 that limits the combined time interval for three consecutive surveillances to less than 3.25 times the specified interval. Guidance on the proposed TS change was provided to all power reactor licensees and applicants by Generic Letter 89-14, dated August 21, 1989.

2.0 EVALUATION

Specification 4.0.2 includes the provision that allows a surveillance interval to be extended by 25 percent of the specified time interval. This extension provides flexibility for scheduling the performance of surveillances and permits consideration of whether the prevailing plant operating conditions are conducive for such testing. Such operating conditions include transient plant operation or ongoing surveillance or maintenance activities. Specification 4.0.2 further limits the allowance for extending surveillance intervals by requiring that the combined time interval for any three consecutive surveillances not exceed 3.25 times the specified time interval. This provision assures that surveillances are not extended repeatedly as an operational convenience resulting in an overall increase of the surveillance interval.

Experience has shown that the 18-month surveillance interval, with the provision to extend it by 25 percent, is usually sufficient to accommodate normal variations in the length of a fuel cycle. However, the NRC staff has routinely granted requests for one-time exceptions to the 3.25 limit on extending refueling surveillances because the risk to safety is low in contrast to the alternative of a forced shutdown to perform these surveillances. Therefore, the 3.25 limitation on extending any three consecutive surveillances has not practically limited the use of the 25-percent allowance for surveillances performed on a refueling outage basis.

Extending surveillance intervals during plant operation can result in a benefit to safety when a scheduled surveillance is due at a time when plant conditions are not suitable for conducting the surveillance. This may occur when the plant is in a transient operating condition or when safety systems are out of service and performance of the surveillance test would either further degrade plant safety system operability or unacceptably increase the risk of a challenge to plant safety systems. In such cases, the safety benefit of extending a surveillance interval exceeds any safety benefit derived by limiting the use of the 25-percent allowance for any three consecutive surveillance intervals and requiring performance of the surveillance. Furthermore, there is the administrative burden associated with tracking the use of the 25-percent allowance to ensure compliance with the 3.25 limit.

In view of these findings, the NRC staff concluded that Specification 4.0.2 should be changed to remove the 3.25 limit for all surveillances because its removal will have an overall positive effect on safety. The guidance provided in Generic Letter 89-14 included the following change to this specification and removes the 3.25 limit on three consecutive surveillances with the following statement:

"4.0.2 Each Surveillance Requirement shall be performed within the specified surveillance interval with a maximum allowable extension not to exceed 25 percent of the specified surveillance interval."

The licensee's proposed change to TS 4.0.2 is consistent with the above recommended GL 89-14 guidance. In addition, the Bases of TS 4.0.2 were updated to reflect this change and therein it is noted that it is not the intent of the 25-percent allowance to repeatedly extend surveillance intervals merely for operational convenience. On the basis of its review of this matter, the staff finds that the above change to the TSs for Hatch Unit 2 is acceptable.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves a change in surveillance requirements. 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.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission's proposed determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration was published in the Federal Register (55 FR 20358) on May 16, 1990. The Commission consulted with the State of Georgia. No public comments were received, and the State of Georgia did not have any comments.

On the basis of the considerations discussed above, the staff concludes 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 (3) the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributors: Thomas G. Dunning, OTSB/DOEA
Frank Rinaldi, PDII-3/DRP-I/II

Dated: August 20, 1990

DATED: August 20, 1990

AMENDMENT NO. 107 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-5 - Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear
Plant, Unit 2

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket File

NRC PDR

Local PDR

PDII-3 R/F

Hatch R/F

SVarga 14-E-4

GLainas 14-H-3

DMatthews 9-H-3

RIgram 9-H-3

FRinaldi 9-H-3

LCrocker 9-H-3

T. Dunning 9-A-1

OGC-WF 15-B-18

EJordan MNBB-3302

GHill (4) P1-137

ACRS (10) P-135

WJones P-130A

JCalvo 11-F-23

GPA/PA 17-F-2

OC/LFDCB AR-2015

DHagan MNBB-3302