

REGULATORY DOCKET FILE COPY

SEPTEMBER 21 1979

Docket No. 50-366

Mr. Charles F. Whitmer
 Vice President - Engineering
 Georgia Power Company
 P. O. Box 4545
 Atlanta, Georgia 30302

Dear Mr. Whitmer:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 12 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-5 for the Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 2. The amendment consists of changes to the Technical Specifications in response to your application dated September 19, 1979.

This amendment extends certain surveillance intervals for the initial cycle of Hatch 2 operation to allow the testing to be performed during a scheduled reactor shutdown. The tests involved are those valve leak rate measurements and integrated safeguards testing that would normally be performed during a refueling outage.

Copies of the Safety Evaluation and the Notice of Issuance are also enclosed.

Sincerely,

V. Rooney
 for Thomas A. Ippolito, Chief
 Operating Reactors Branch #3
 Division of Operating Reactors

- Enclosures:
 1. Amendment No. 12
 2. Safety Evaluation
 3. Notice

cc w/enclosures:
 See page 2

CP
 7910090440
 Smith moved to agreed upon Jones
 on page 4 of SEB
 STSG
 Laidis
 9/21/79
 9/21/79
 60

OFFICE →	ORB #3	ORB #3	OELD	AD-ORP	ORB #3
SURNAME →	Kreutzer	DVerrelli:mjf		WGammill	Ippolito
DATE →	9/21/79	9/10/79	9/20/79	9/20/79	9/20/79

Mr. Charles F. Whitmer
Georgia Power Company

- 2 -

cc:

G. F. Trowbridge, Esquire
Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge
1800 M Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Ruble A. Thomas
Vice President
P. O. Box 2625
Southern Services, Inc.
Birmingham, Alabama 35202

Mr. Harry Majors
Southern Services, Inc.
300 Office Park
Birmingham, Alabama 35202

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

Mr. H. B. Lee, Chairman
Appling County Commissioners
County Courthouse
Baxley, Georgia 31513

Mr. L. T. Gucwa
Georgia Power Company
Engineering Department
P. O. Box 4545
Atlanta, Georgia 30302

Mr. William Widner
Georgia Power Company
Power Generation Department
P. O. Box 4545
Atlanta, Georgia 30302

Mr. Max Manry
Georgia Power Company
Edwin I. Hatch Plant
P. O. Box 442
Baxley, Georgia 31513

U. S. Environmental Protection
Agency
Region IV Office
ATTN: EIS COORDINATOR
345 Courtland Street, N. E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Appling County Public Library
Parker Street
Baxley, Georgia 31513

Mr. R. F. Rodgers
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
P. O. Box 710
Baxley, Georgia 31513

Director, Technical Assessment
Division
Office of Radiation Programs (AW 459)
US EPA
Crystal Mall #2
Arlington, Virginia 20460



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

GEORGIA POWER COMPANY
OGLETHORPE ELECTRIC MEMBERSHIP CORPORATION
MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION 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. 12
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 September 19, 1979, 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 hereby amended by revising paragraph 2.C.(2) of Facility Operating License No. NPF-5 to read as follows:

(2) Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendices A and B, as revised through Amendment No. 12, are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications, except that for the first cycle of Hatch 2 operation, the

7910090 444

end of the current surveillance period for the Surveillance Requirements listed below may be extended beyond the time limit specified by Technical Specification 4.0.2.a until March 30, 1980. After this date, the provisions of Technical Specification 4.0.2.a shall apply.

Specifications Listed

4.0.5
4.1.5.c
4.3.1.3
4.3.2.3
4.3.6.2.1
4.4.1.1
4.5.3.1.d
4.6.1.2.d
4.6.3
4.6.6.1.1.b
4.6.6.1.1.d
4.6.6.2.b
4.7.4.4
4.7.6.1.d
4.7.6.1.g
4.7.6.1.2.c
4.7.6.1.3.c
4.7.6.2.b
4.7.6.2.c
4.7.6.3.b
4.7.6.4.c
4.7.7.a
4.8.1.1.2.c
4.8.1.1.3.c
4.8.2.3.2.c
4.8.2.3.2.d
4.8.2.6.1.a

3. This license amendment is effective as of the date of its issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



Thomas A. Ippolito, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #3
Division of Operating Reactors

Attachment:
Changes to the Technical
Specifications

Date of Issuance: September 21, 1979



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 12 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-5

GEORGIA POWER COMPANY
OGLETHORPE ELECTRIC MEMBERSHIP CORPORATION
MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION OF GEORGIA
CITY OF DALTON, GEORGIA

EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT UNIT NO. 2

DOCKET NO. 50-366

I. INTRODUCTION

By letter dated September 19, 1979, Georgia Power Company (licensee) requested an amendment to the Hatch Unit No. 2 Operating License. The proposed amendment would extend certain surveillance intervals for the initial cycle of Hatch 2 operation to allow the testing to be performed during a scheduled reactor shutdown. The tests involved are those valve and penetration leak rate measurements and integrated safeguards system testing that would normally be performed during a refueling outage.

II. BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

The licensee's request for an extension of certain surveillance intervals was submitted because of a misinterpretation of the starting time for the surveillance periods. The surveillance requirements would require Unit shutdown and outage of the same magnitude as a refueling outage. The misinterpretation is not without precedent. The licensee had established a periodic test interval which commenced with the receipt of the operating license for Hatch Unit No. 2 on June 13, 1978. The required surveillance was scheduled for March 1980 to meet an operating cycle requirement based on a surveillance interval beginning with the issuance of an operating license.

Recently, the staff advised the licensee that the time interval extends to when the surveillance was previously performed on a system following construction. Accordingly, the previous testing would have been performed prior to issuance of the license, and the proposed testing in March 1980 would be outside the authorized test interval.

The licensee's application identified those surveillance requirements which could not be performed without reactor shutdown. Such tests require reactor shutdown in order to not violate General Design Criteria, to avoid inadvertent reactor trips, physical impossibility (e.g., injection of low pressure water into a high pressure system) and inaccessibility of components while at power.

7910090 446

The licensee requested that certain surveillance intervals be extended to March 1980 based on the maintenance history of the systems in question, the lack of any information that would indicate system inoperability and the favorable operating experience to date with the same or similar components on Hatch Unit No. 1.

III. EVALUATION

The staff's requirements for 18 month surveillance intervals was set with the nominal refueling outage in mind. The intent was not to allow extension of surveillance requirements for long refueling cycles or to require more frequent testing for short refueling cycles. Thus, the refueling test frequency was intended to routinely demonstrate operability of systems over the service life of the plant. Our review of the licensee's requested one-time extension of certain surveillance intervals identified that the type testing involved includes: integrated safety system testing, integrated and periodic testing of fire protection systems and Type B and C leak rate testing of selected penetrations and valves.

The integrated safety system testing includes Standby Liquid Control System test actuation, Core Spray auto actuation and diesel generator load reject/load shedding tests. The fire protection system tests include fire pump capacity tests, sprinkler flow tests and auto and manual activation of CO₂ valves and dampers. Each of these requirements is intended to be a demonstration of total system response on a periodic basis. This requirement supplements the routine (e.g., monthly, quarterly) verification of system component operability which includes pumps, fans, valves and emergency diesel generators. The licensee is performing these routine tests to verify system operability. Our review of the performance history of integrated system response indicates that the pre-operational testing was performed adequately and that no problems are known to exist. Therefore, a onetime extension of such test intervals until the next scheduled shutdown in March 1980 is acceptable.

The local leak rate testing of valves and penetrations for which the licensee requested an increase in surveillance interval include 174 separate tests that would be required between September 1979 and March 1980. As with the integrated system response tests discussed above, the surveillance intervals were established based on a nominal operating cycle. Our review of each of these test requirements indicates that the vast majority of the tests involve penetrations. Based on our review of maintenance history of these valves we have not identified a technical basis on which the surveillance interval cannot be extended one to five months to coincide with the licensee's scheduled shutdown in March 1980 to perform these tests. Our evaluation considered the advantage of a March 1980 shutdown vs an October 1979 shutdown in order to permit the licensee to concurrently perform facility modifications

to the torus in support of the Mark I Long Term Program. We conclude that the enhancement of safety as related to Mark I containment improvements far outweigh the benefit of requiring a shutdown in October 1979 for the purpose of conducting local leak rate testing. Two separate shutdowns over a period of 6 months is not considered justified.

In summary we find that the licensee, in good faith, scheduled integrated system response tests and local leak rate tests beyond the limits authorized by current specifications. To require shutdown at this time in the absence of an identified safety issue is not considered to be in the best interest of the public. Therefore, a one-time extension of the interval for the identified surveillance requirements is justified and acceptable.

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

We have determined that the amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and pursuant to 10 CFR 51.5(d)(4) that an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

V. CONCLUSION

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and does not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (3) 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.

Dated: September 21, 1979

References

1. Letter, Florida Power and Light (Uhrig) to NRC (Davis) dated June 16, 1977.

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSIONDOCKET NO. 50-366GEORGIA POWER COMPANY, ET AL.NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY
OPERATING LICENSE

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has issued Amendment No. 12 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-5, issued to Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Electric Membership Corporation, Municipal Electric Association of Georgia and City of Dalton, Georgia, which revised the license for operation of the Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 2 (the facility) located in Appling County, Georgia. The amendment is effective as of its date of issuance.

The amendment extends certain surveillance intervals for the initial cycle of Hatch 2 operation to allow the testing to be performed during a scheduled reactor shutdown. The tests involved are those valve leak rate measurements and integrated safeguards testing that would normally be performed during a refueling outage.

The application for the amendment complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment. Prior public notice of this amendment was not required since the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

The Commission has determined that the issuance of this amendment will not result in any significant environmental impact and that pursuant to 10 CFR §51.5(d)(4) an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with issuance of this amendment.

7910090448

- 2 -

For further details with respect to this action, see (1) the application for amendment dated September 19, 1979, (2) Amendment No. 12 to License No. NPF-5, and (3) the Commission's related Safety Evaluation. All of these items 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, Parker Street, Baxley, Georgia 31513. A copy of items (2) and (3) may be obtained upon request addressed to the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D. C. 20555, Attention: Director, Division of Operating Reactors.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland this 21st day of September 1979.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



Vernon L. Rooney, Acting Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #3
Division of Operating Reactors